



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 182 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, May 3, 2002

—

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, May 3, 2002

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

• (1010)

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 81 to inform the House that the motion to be considered Monday during consideration of the business of supply is as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should cease and desist its sustained legislative and political attacks on the lives and livelihoods of rural Canadians and the communities where they live.

The motion, standing in the name of the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville, is not votable. Copies of the motion are available at the table.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1020)

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY ACT, 2002

The House resumed from May 2, 2002 consideration of the motion: that Bill C-55, An Act to amend certain Acts of Canada, and to enact measures for implementing the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, in order to enhance public safety, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and the amendment.

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, rising to speak to Bill C-55 does not require one to redefine in detail the context we find ourselves in since September 11, since the impact of those attacks has been discussed more than once, along with the steps to be taken to prevent, or at least deal with, such events.

The Bloc Québécois has, moreover, proposed some clear paths toward solutions that would eliminate one of the most fertile grounds for terrorism: the abject poverty in which millions live in this world. We have moreover agreed that it was also important to protect our territory from any possibility of attack. Public safety must be ensured through practical measures and clearly defined legislation that has been the object of informed debate.

We must, however, take care not to go to the opposite extreme and enact legislation with potential negative impact on the rights and freedoms of those we wish to protect, under the guise of fighting terrorism. We do not have to go far back in time to recall the late unlamented Bill C-42, so criticized for its negative effects on fundamental rights and freedoms.

At the time, the government was busy boasting right and left of what an ardent promoter of public security it was, rejecting the criticisms that were being made from this side of the House. Now here we are again, starting off a new debate on a similar bill, although a few changes have been made.

Why are we having this new debate? Simply because the public, which is not stupid, condemned, like the Bloc Québécois, Bill C-42, since it violated civil liberties and made us fear the worst by bringing back bad memories, including what happened in 1970 with the War Measures Act. So, the government had no choice but to recognize that the public's judgment can make the Liberals blush.

The bill now before us is a new version of Bill C-42. How is Bill C-55 different? Is it an improved version? These are two fundamental questions that must be answered.

First, in what way is it different? Unfortunately, there is very little difference. In the first draft of this bill, because it is certainly appropriate to call Bill C-42 a draft, great power was given to a single person, namely the Minister of National Defence.

How could the government put such power in the hands of a single person, this at a time when the authority delegated to the executive branch is being questioned, at a time when we are asking the legislative branch to have more of a say in the decision making process? The situation is all the more alarming because the decision to suspend people's fundamental rights will be based on the minister's judgment.

A lot of things have happened since Bill C-42 was introduced. Indeed, we were able to witness the very high degree of judgment of the Minister of National Defence, who omitted to inform the Prime Minister of the capture of Afghan prisoners and their handing over to the Americans. Everyone still clearly remembers the uproar created in this House by this whole story. Under Bill C-55, it is that same person who would have control over our rights and freedoms. Mr. Speaker, if you feel a chill running down your spine do not worry, it is not the flu; you are perfectly normal, you are a person of judgment.

Government Orders

Just think about this for a moment. This minister can, all alone, decide to create controlled access military zones and determine their dimensions. If he deems it appropriate to keep the whole thing secret, he also has the power to do so. It is legitimate to hope that the criteria under which he would make all these decisions are well defined and specified in the legislation, but this is not the case at all.

The bill simply says that the minister must base his decisions on what he believes is reasonably necessary. Could the wording be any more discretionary? I doubt it. Not only are we talking about judgment, which is hardly objective or reassuring, but then on top of that it says reasonably necessary.

Allow to me raise the following question: what does reasonably necessary really mean? How can such a qualifier restrict and limit a minister's actions?

I, for example, may find it reasonably necessary to remove these terms from the bill and define specific restrictions on the minister. I may also believe that it is reasonably necessary, given that we live in a representative democracy, for parliament to be consulted prior to proposing such measures. Will my interpretation be similar to that of the minister's? The answer is obvious.

• (1025)

When it comes to controlled access military zones, the minister does not need the approval of the provincial government. Which includes, obviously, all of the consequences of this power. Should this information be made public? No, not really, the government will tell us. How else are we supposed to react, other than to be suspicious and remain vigilant about this situation that, incidentally, seems to have survived the demise of Bill C-42 only to resurface again in Bill C-55.

Another issue related to these famous military zones that has left us perplexed is the lack of recourse before the courts for persons wronged by a controlled access military zone. For those who are wronged by the creation of such a zone, there is no recourse available, even if the government claims otherwise. The bill states clearly, and I quote:

260.1 (14) No action for loss, damage or injury lies by reason only of the designation of a controlled access military zone or the implementation of measures to enforce the designation.

If the designation of a military zone violate a person's rights in any way, and causes this person to be wronged, there is no legal recourse available to them. What is more, the following subsection stipulates:

(15) Any person who suffers loss, damage or injury by reason of the exercise of any of the powers conferred by this section shall be compensated from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

How lovely. It is the Consolidated Revenue Fund that will determine the compensation I am owed.

This should give us pause. Why? Because we have made the decision to live under the rule of law. What has now become of this principle? With a stroke of its electronic pen, the government decides to change things on us? In certain situations, the rule of law prevails, while in others, we just have to put up and shut up if we are wronged?

Members will recall that it was not so long ago that the government was proudly commemorating the 20th anniversary of

the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. They will also recall that it neglected to mention the unilateral patriation of the constitution, probably not thinking it was reasonably necessary. Now, just a few dark nights and one brief burst of sunshine later, this same government is prepared to set aside these rights and freedoms in the name of the fight against terrorism. How is it that while, on the one hand, the Liberal government is proudly extolling the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, on the other, it is crushing those same rights and there is nothing to stop it? A bit of consistency would do this government a lot of good, but perhaps we are dreaming in colour.

Mr. Speaker, if the designation of a zone has harmed you in some way, that will be just too bad for you. But you can take comfort in the fact that the maximum length of time for which such a zone may be designated is two years. Members will admit that that is a bit long. Here again, the government will tell you that there is no use claiming that your rights and freedoms have been violated and that, wonder of wonders, we live in a country which operates under the rule of law.

The bill has carefully retained the provisions allowing various ministers to make interim orders. However, there is a slight difference which is worth pointing out. The initial duration of interim orders has gone from 90 to 45 days. Then, orders will have to be tabled in each house of parliament on any of the first 15 days on which that house is sitting after the interim order is made. So far, so good. But then we find out the real nature of these interim orders. It is clearly set out in subsection (4) that an interim order is exempt from the application of section 3 of the Statutory Instruments Act. In plain language, this means that the interim order does not have to be consistent with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Bill of Rights.

Does that not prove that this government is seeking the power to restrict our rights and freedoms with total impunity? What we fear and what was deliberately included in this bill in order to set aside the most important elements of our democracy is the loss of total respect for the rights and freedoms of every citizen.

Some were pretty harsh in criticizing Bill C-55, including the privacy commissioner. He stated clearly that the government drew its inspiration from practices commonly used by totalitarian states. The commissioner did not even give this new antiterrorist legislation a passing grade. It is not very good for a supposedly liberal government, particularly since it cannot label as partisan the comments made by the privacy commissioner.

I have other interesting comments, but I will pass them on to my colleagues, who may be able to use them.

In closing, at the beginning of my speech, I mentioned two questions. The first one was: is Bill C-55 different? The answer is no. To some extent, it is even worse. The second question was: has it been improved? Obviously, the new bill does not meet our expectations nor does it allay our fears.

Government Orders

•(1030)

In these times where respect for each and every individual is more essential than ever, we cannot tolerate that fundamental rights and freedoms be taken away on the grounds that we are trying to fight terrorism. The very people whom we want to protect from terrorism must also be protected from abuse. Nothing leads us to believe that this would be the case, should Bill C-55 go through.

[English]

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it shows us how seriously the government takes the legislation. It took 20 minutes to get enough of its members in the House to begin parliament. I even question whether there are enough members in here at the present time.

The government introduced the legislation as an anti-terrorism bill in response to September 11. I would argue that the bill is anything but a bill that deals with terrorism.

In his speech on Bill C-42, the minister said the bill was another important step in the fight against terrorism. In the omnibus bill the only common theme, which omnibus bills are supposed to have, was that it centralized the power in the hands of the executive branch of government with little or no parliamentary review. Bill C-55 remains a ministerial power grab.

The Minister of Transport in November 2001, in response to a question by the member from Fraser Valley, said:

When there is a localized one time emergency ministers need to act quickly. That is what happened on September 11. Had there been further terrorist attacks and the country was in a state of apprehension then obviously the Emergencies Act would have been invoked.

This question has to be asked. If there was legislation that allowed the ministers to respond in kind at that time, why do they need this legislation today? I would argue that they want to enhance the powers of the minister and take it out of the hands of parliament.

The amendments that Bill C-55 brings to bear are not exact. It introduces two new security measures. One is about unruly passengers or air rage, and the opposition thinks the measures are a good thing. The other is the requirement of air carriers to provide information on their passenger manifests to various departments.

The difference between the old bill, Bill C-42, and the new one, Bill C-55, is that Bill C-55 is very specific about how this is to be handled. In the old bill the minister was given the discretion through regulations on how to handle this.

Before the Christmas break the transportation committee produced an excellent report on how to handle airline security. It balanced all the details of implementing the system with some discretion for the minister to act. Instead, the current Minister of Transport wants *carte blanche* to do whatever he wants to do and to be the sole authority on security measures.

It is interesting that the Liberal backbenchers seem quite willing to allow the executive branch of parliament, the cabinet, to take away their ability to be involved.

Another change from Bill C-42 is with regard to the Immigration Act. The new bill deletes parts from the previous bill which referred to the Immigration Act. In Bill C-42 the government introduced

amendments to the Immigration Act that it had just put into place through Bill C-11 but which had not been implemented. Bill C-42 would have repealed Bill C-11 changes such as a 72 hour time limit on referrals and a 90 day limit on processing time which would have severely curtailed the appeals process. Bill C-42 removed that.

In February 2001 we had proposals of changes to Bill C-11. In November 2001 we had the elimination of those proposed changes. Now in April 2002, we are now getting rid of the proposed changes to Bill C-11 that would have been done in February. It is no wonder that Canadians have little or no faith in the immigration department, the minister and the Immigration Act. Does anybody over there on the government side know what is going on with the Immigration Act?

•(1035)

Other changes are proposed for the National Defence Act. Some are good, some are bad and some are questionable. The proposed inclusion of armed conflict in the definition of emergency, which already includes insurrection, riot, invasion and war, is presumably meant to ensure that the events of September 11 would be officially designated as an emergency. However it is questionable whether the term armed conflict appropriately defines the terrorist acts of September 11, or a biological or chemical attack, or even a major cyber attack on our computer networks. Rather the government should specifically include terrorism in the definition of an emergency.

The opposition supports job protection for officers and non-commissioned members of our reserve forces. We have been calling for such protection for years however we are concerned that this job protection is only limited to emergencies. What does this mean for the reservists that are called out for peacekeeping duties? Are they not afforded any job protection?

We are also concerned about the creation of controlled access military zones. The government claimed under Bill C-42 and again under Bill C-55 that these controlled access military zones would only protect military equipment and personnel and would not be used to battle public demonstrations. However by changing the section from how it was drafted in Bill C-42 to how it has been drafted now, the government is admitting that these military security zones that were mentioned in Bill C-42 were intended to be used against legitimate protest groups despite the minister's assertions to the contrary.

Since we could not trust the minister then, why would he think that we would trust him now not to be using these special provisions against public demonstrations? It would appear that these measures are designed for protesters and those engaging in civil disobedience, not terrorists.

Government Orders

Why do I come to that conclusion? We must look at the example the minister of defence used, which was the attack on the *USS Cole* in Yemen by the al-Qaeda in October 2000 where a boat full of explosives was used against the side of a military ship. What would the government do in this legislation? It would use some force and fine the terrorists \$1,000. What kind of deterrent is that to terrorists, to fine them \$1,000?

In order to fight terrorists we must use lethal force. We do not fine them \$1,000 and slap them on the hand. That is why it is clear to me that this is not anti-terrorism legislation. This is to be used against civil disobedience. If the government were to do that, that is fine with me, but it should be upfront, honest and open to the public and say that is what it is attempting to do and not hide it.

We have a problem with the interim orders giving that kind of overwhelming authority to cabinet. We are upset there is no parliamentary oversight and review. That is necessary to hold the government and the executive branch accountable.

I must say this is another attempt by the government to take the responsibility out of the hands of parliament and place it in the hands of cabinet. The government is not willing to allow these interim orders to go before a cabinet committee. It only requires four cabinet ministers to agree. That should not be difficult. It has a hard time getting its members here, but surely it is not that hard to get four cabinet ministers to sit down with legislation that supposedly is designed to fight terrorism. One really has to question the intent.

Our party is quite apt to say that the legislation should be split. That is what this amendment is all about. Let us take the good parts of the legislation, deal with them and forget this thing about it being anti-terrorism. That is not what the bill is all about.

● (1040)

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak as another New Democrat in opposition to Bill C-55 that is being debated today.

I want to refer to comments made by our transport critic, the hon. member for Churchill. It was yesterday when, in describing the effects and impacts of the bill, she correctly pointed out that the power Bill C-55 confers, contrary to what the government is putting forward to the public, on individual cabinet ministers and the government to exercise in an environment of secrecy is, as she said, under the cloak of national security.

This gets to the core of what the bill is about. We saw a huge outcry from the public regarding the previous bill, Bill C-42, because Canadians understood that the bill had little to do with national security, and it had everything to do with a massive infringement on the civil liberties and rights of Canadians. I can say that those of us in the NDP who have had an opportunity to review this latest version, the second try of the government with its introduction of Bill C-55, have come to the same conclusion.

The bill is being put forward in parliament under the cloak of national security, yet it is a bill that must be examined carefully line by line. When we read it we understand the massive power contained in the bill which can be used by individual ministers, by cabinet and by the federal government. The NDP wants to sent out a warning to

alert Canadians that Bill C-55 fundamentally differs very little from the original bill, Bill C-42.

For that reason we are standing in opposition to the bill as it goes through the House and committee. We will be calling upon Canadians to stand and assert their political and civil rights to make it clear that the bill is completely unacceptable.

That is not just the opinion of the New Democratic Party. It is also the opinion of a growing number of people who, in examining the bill, are realizing that its impact on our democratic society is something that we should be terribly concerned about.

I read a news release from the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. This is a person and an office that was established by parliament to protect the privacy of Canadians, to create and to look at the right balance between the need for government to bring in legislation to protect the public interest and the need to protect individual privacy rights.

Government members in particular should be taking note of what the office of the privacy commissioner had to say. In his press release he zeroed in on one section of the bill, section 4.82. These are the provisions that would allow the RCMP and CSIS unrestricted access to the personal information of all Canadian air travellers on flights within Canada as well as on international routes.

The commissioner's concern was that the provision in the bill would fundamentally take away the important privacy right of Canadians with regard to police and other agents as they go about their day to day lives, including travel. The press release stated:

In Canada, it is well established that individuals do not have to identify themselves to police unless they are being arrested or unless they are carrying out a licensed activity such as driving...Empowering the RCMP to obtain and scan passenger lists in search of anyone subject to an outstanding warrant for any offense punishable by imprisonment of five years or more has no apparent connection to the purported anti-terrorism purpose of Bill C-55. It appears, rather, to be a dramatic expansion of privacy-invasive police powers without explanation or justification as to its necessity.

● (1045)

Are government members paying attention to this? Are they hearing what the privacy commissioner had to say? He said the bill would allow officials to go into air traveller lists, but where would it stop? Would we then be looking at train travellers, bus travellers or even someone renting a car?

I felt terribly concerned when I read the privacy commissioner's press release. This person is in office in an official capacity to uphold the privacy rights of Canadians. Bill C-55 would trample on those privacy rights. We must question the government, on what basis is the bill being put forward?

Our transport critic and other members of the House have argued forcefully that the government already has at its disposal any measure of legislation, tools that already exist, to deal with legitimate national security concerns. We must ask why the bill is being brought in? Why has the government not received the message from Canadians, including legal experts, international law experts or civil libertarians? Why has the government not understood that what it is about to do is a complete violation of democratic principles established in this country.

Government Orders

This kind of pervasive, military and police intrusion into civil society is something that is creeping along every day. In my own riding in East Vancouver, in the downtown east side, police are about to install surveillance cameras in public locations to watch what is going on on the streets. The same privacy commissioner has criticized that too as an invasion of privacy.

I see these issues being linked. I see it as my responsibility as one member of parliament along with my colleagues in the New Democratic Party to say that we should be terribly concerned about these invasions into the privacy of Canadians.

Even though the government claims that the language in Bill C-55 has been softened there are still very significant provisions that would allow the establishment of military zones when equipment is brought in. It would still allow the potential of vast abuse when international gatherings are being held.

If a foreign leader were to bring in military personnel as we saw during APEC, would it be on that basis that the provisions of the bill could suddenly come into effect? We saw that happen in Vancouver when the president of Indonesia came here. He brought his own folks with him toting guns. Is it on that basis that the provisions of the bill could suddenly come into effect and before we know it a peaceful civil protest could be turned into a military zone, closed down, censored and people arrested?

Those are some of the concerns that the NDP have. We will continue to oppose the bill because we see it as a dangerous bill. It is a violation of our fundamental civil liberties, and an invasion into the privacy of Canadians. Bill C-55 would undermine the democratic foundation that we in the House are elected to protect.

• (1050)

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I understand that everybody will be so spellbound with what I have to say that the Chair actually wants me to stop partway through, so they can digest it, and then start again after question period.

We are in fact debating the Canadian Alliance amendment to split the bill. As the government is wont to do, it has made this such an omnibus bill covering so many different areas and even different jurisdictions that this is actually a bill that is about one-third transport and two-thirds justice. Yesterday in the justice committee we raised the fact that we are faced with dealing with a bill that actually has more justice items in it than transport items. That is why we suggested that it should be split into two bills, one for the transport portion of it and one for the justice portion of it.

What is even more alarming is the fact that the government wants to fast track the bill. In fact, the Prime Minister has publicly vowed that he will fast track Bill C-55. To hell with debate and to hell with democracy, which is something we have already seen in the House, he wants to fast track the bill and ram it through parliament. Those are his own words.

Instead, we say that if the government thinks there is merit in this and if we think there are a lot of problems, problems that have just been disclosed in part by the last speaker from the NDP, let us look at it, but let us put it into its proper sections and let us take the time that

is necessary, not only to debate it in the House but to have good public input.

The very thought that the government would want to fast track a bill that the privacy commissioner himself has stated should alarm law-abiding citizens is a reason for not fast tracking it. However, at times the Prime Minister likes to fast track things. For example, the Prime Minister fast tracked buying over \$100 million worth of new jets for himself and his cabinet colleagues to fly around in, despite the fact that the people responsible for the present jets say they are perfectly serviceable. He fast tracked it to the point that he even skipped by his own cabinet and rammed this thing through just before the Easter break.

Let us look at some of the things the Prime Minister perhaps could fast track and has not. He could fast track buying new helicopters for the military. After all, the military is flying 40 year old machines. That is the equivalent of the cabinet driving around Parliament Hill in flathead Fords. We see the government trading their cars in quite regularly. They are not driving flathead Fords. They are not even driving very old models, yet the government expects the military to be flying around in 40 year old helicopters. One of these days one of those helicopters is going to end up at Rockcliffe. When a former serviceman takes his grandchildren out to see one of these things and tells them that he actually flew it, they will not believe him. In fact, one of the ironies is that in some cases we currently have members of the armed forces flying these machines whose own grandfathers may have flown those machines in the Canadian military as well.

As well, the Prime Minister has not fast tracked obtaining proper uniforms for our fighting forces in Afghanistan. The government loves to throw it at us that we are not supporting our troops, that we are not recognizing the incredible job they do. We do. We recognize that our troops are over there in jungle uniforms buying beige paint to splash on their uniforms. With the full approval of their senior officers, our troops are putting beige paint on their uniforms and on some of their weapons in order to camouflage themselves, and it is paint, not even clothes dye, because paint is what they can get. When we see the Canadian forces go into action in Afghanistan we can always tell who they are, even in a multi-country force, because they are the ones in the dark uniforms in the desert.

Also, the government has not fast tracked legislation dealing with child pornography. We still have people such as John Sharpe in British Columbia, who says that he has artistic merit in the pornography that he writes and who is still able to publish books glorifying this type of pornography.

The Prime Minister is also not fast tracking any action on the softwood lumber issue. In fact, the minister responsible for this has gone so far as to say there is no real need for alarm because nobody has really lost a job. It is just an industry readjustment. The government is so far behind in its thinking that it is quite unbelievable.

S. O. 31

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

•(1055)

[*English*]

YOUTH ORCHESTRA FESTIVAL

Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Exchanges Canada programs run by the Department of Canadian Heritage aim to help young Canadians gain knowledge and understanding of Canada.

This weekend Exchanges Canada brings together 270 young musicians in Ottawa for the Canadian Youth Orchestra Festival. When all nine youth orchestras perform this weekend, it will truly be an example of the unifying role music can play. These young musicians have travelled from British Columbia, Newfoundland, New Brunswick and all across Ontario to learn from each other and share their mutual love of music.

In its second year the Youth Orchestra Festival is dedicated to stimulating, challenging and supporting the musical talent of young Canadians. I welcome these outstanding young people to the nation's capital and wish them and the organizers of this special event an exciting and rewarding weekend.

* * *

HOCKEY

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, sport competitions are great unifiers and they make communities proud. That is certainly how the citizens in my riding are feeling this week after the tremendous victory of the Tisdale Trojans in the Canadian Midget Hockey Championship.

Last Sunday the Trojans took the Air Canada Cup, the ultimate prize in Canadian midget hockey, in an impressive 6 to 2 victory over the Dartmouth Subways. The star player in the final game was Myles Zimmer, the son of Tisdale Mayor, Rollie Zimmer. Myles scored a hat trick and made his father and everyone in Tisdale very proud. Head coach Darrell Mann hails from Sylvania, a community just south of Tisdale.

Tisdale is a town of 3,800 people. It has tremendous civic pride. Congratulations to the town of Tisdale and the Trojans on this magnificent victory.

* * *

•(1100)

THE NETHERLANDS

Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this Sunday is a special day for both Dutch and Canadian citizens. It is the anniversary of the liberation of the Netherlands.

Occupied in May 1940, the Netherlands was liberated in stages, beginning in October 1944, primarily by Canadian troops. This Sunday we commemorate the more than 7,600 Canadians who sacrificed their lives to liberate the Netherlands. At the same time we take comfort in the knowledge that out of the horrors of the second world war there developed sincere and profound ties of friendship and respect between our two countries which exist to this day.

The evidence of this friendship may be seen in the tulips which bloom in Ottawa each spring, in the friendships made and in the care and attention bestowed by the Dutch people on the burial places of our war dead.

This Sunday, May 5, gives us the opportunity to pause and reflect both on the sacrifice of our Canadian veterans in the liberation of the Netherlands and on the strong ties of friendship which have endured between our two countries to this day.

* * *

DIABETES AWARENESS

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that today is National Aboriginal Diabetes Awareness Day.

Diabetes is a major cause of premature death, blindness, kidney and heart disease, stroke, limb amputation and other significant health problems.

The burden of diabetes and its complications is particularly severe among aboriginal people. In fact diabetes rates are three to five times that of the general Canadian population. Type two diabetes is now being diagnosed in children.

In 1999 the government created the Canadian Diabetes Strategy, which includes a major Aboriginal Diabetes Initiative to address this epidemic. The Aboriginal Diabetes Initiative was launched earlier this morning at the Wabano Centre here in Ottawa. This is a national campaign to raise awareness of diabetes prevention among aboriginal people.

Please join me in wishing success to all of the organizations and people who are working hard to fight the diabetes epidemic among aboriginal people.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

Mr. Tony Tirabassi (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in congratulating the Prime Minister for an insightful and timely speech in Montreal yesterday. At this time of strife around the world, it is vital that Canadians remain true to our values of diversity and respect.

The Prime Minister said "The Canadian experience is based on the ideal of unity and diversity of a society where people can live and work together regardless of their language, their religion or the colour of their skin".

The Prime Minister also advised Canadians to guard against intolerance at home. He said "The lessons of history teach us that we ignore acts of intolerance at our peril".

This has never been more true. I urge Canadians to act positively to ensure that we will always remain an open and accepting society.

THE NETHERLANDS

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the sacrifices being made by our brave men and women in Afghanistan today remind us of the sacrifices that were made by an earlier generation of Canadians fighting in Europe toward the end of World War II.

Fifty-seven years ago this Sunday General Charles Foulkes, commanding the 1st Canadian Corps, accepted the surrender of enemy forces in the Netherlands. The fighting in the Netherlands was one of the most difficult campaigns ever fought by the Canadian army and it cost the lives of 7,600 Canadians. While the campaign was arduous and terrible, the victory that was won brought freedom to the Dutch people and created a lasting bond of friendship between Canada and the Netherlands.

On this coming Sunday as we remember our men and women in Afghanistan in prayer, let us also celebrate the victory won in Europe so many years ago by so many brave Canadians who not only helped to preserve our freedom but also to restore it to the people of the Netherlands.

* * *

[Translation]

CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on April 17, the 20th anniversary of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 200 people all over the country received Canadian citizenship.

This was a particularly propitious day for them to declare their commitment to Canada. Many people choose our country because of the values of freedom and respect that are entrenched in our charter.

In a world where many have no access to that choice, where many have been expelled from their homes by intolerance or injustice, we need to be proud of how we are respecting our international commitments by helping true refugees to start new lives in Canada.

These newcomers contribute to our economic growth and enrich our culture; they deserve all of our encouragement and support.

* * *

•(1105)

BELL WALK FOR KIDS

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the first annual Bell Walk for Kids will take place on Sunday, May 5, from coast to coast.

Money raised from the Walk will support Kids Help Phone, a phone counselling and referral service available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, in both official languages, to children and youth.

Every day, some 1,000 young people are able to talk to someone who is ready to listen, and provide reassurance and guidance. None of their many and diversified concerns is treated as taboo. Regardless of what their problem is, young callers find an attentive and compassionate listener, for every child deserves to be heard, to have access to resources, and to take charge of his own life.

If you share this vision, get out and walk on May 5, or make a pledge. The society in which we live is a reflection of us, and only

S. O. 31

the solidarity we show our youth will prepare them for their future responsibilities as citizens. If you feel the same way as I do about this, please call 1-866-925-5454.

* * *

[English]

MULTICULTURALISM

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last night in Montreal the Prime Minister made a speech in which he urged Canadians to be tolerant and accepting of one another. I would like to take a moment to echo these sentiments.

When listening to the news around the world today there are abundant examples of tension and violence between ethnicities and religious groups. Canadians must be vigilant in ensuring that we remain open, tolerant and respectful of each other's values. The Prime Minister said that:

In recent times we have witnessed a number of troubling acts of intolerance in the world. Acts of anti-Semitism in France and elsewhere in Europe, and even here in Canada where synagogues have been desecrated...We have witnessed hatred against Muslims after Sept. 11 in Canada and other countries...intolerance is absolutely and totally unacceptable.

I ask that the members of the House and all Canadians listen to the Prime Minister's words and ensure that Canada remains—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Palliser.

* * *

WOODROW LLOYD

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, many seniors with us today may recall it was 40 years ago that doctors, backed by the Canadian and American medical associations, fought bitterly to stop the introduction of medicare in Saskatchewan. There were threats to the premier's children. His home was vandalized. A leading cleric declared that if the government did not abandon medicare there would be blood in the streets.

Amidst this maelstrom, on May 3, 1962, Premier Woodrow Lloyd spoke to 600 doctors of the Saskatchewan Medical Association, truly the shock troops in the war against medicare. He entered the hall in Regina amid booing, spitting and hissing. Few present were converted but many grasped the depth of his determination. The premier would not back down. Medicare would be implemented.

His act was one of unsurpassed courage, and today's generation that takes medicare for granted should remember Premier Woodrow Lloyd.

* * *

TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Oak Ridges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the past few days we have heard the word corruption used with impunity in the House. I would like to inform the House of the solid facts concerning corruption.

S. O. 31

Transparency International has proven Canada to be one of the least corrupt countries in the world. It is the only non-governmental organization devoted to curbing corruption and its annual Corruption Perceptions Index is cited by the world's media as the leading index in the field.

Transparency International ranked 91 countries in 2001 in terms of the degree of corruption perceived to exist among public officials and politicians. This ranking is a composite index drawn from 14 different polls and surveys carried out among business people and country analysts, including surveys of residents, both local and expatriate. Ninety-one countries, both developed and developing, were analyzed. Canada ranked 7th, indicating very low levels of perceived corruption. It may be of interest to know that Australia was 11th, the United Kingdom 13th and the United States 16th.

It is time for the opposition to look at the facts and stop playing games.

* * *

PREMIER OF ONTARIO

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the new member for the provincial riding of Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, the Hon. Ernie Eves, the premier of Ontario.

Last evening the people of Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey endorsed the new premier. It was a victory for the pragmatic, contemporary conservatism of Ernie Eves. It was a victory for progressive conservatism. It was a victory for fiscal responsibility and social compassion. It was a victory for pragmatism and good government over dogma.

We also know that it was a victory for Progressive Conservatives in Ontario but was indeed a loss for the Liberal Party of Ontario. Despite a perceived 20% lead in the polls, Dalton McGuinty's Liberals had a near collapse in the riding of Nipissing. Not only will we see a leadership review in the Liberal Party of Canada, but we are about to see leadership questions happening in the Liberal Party of Ontario as well.

* * *

● (1110)

[Translation]

CULTURAL COMMUNITIES

Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last night the Prime Minister made an important speech in front of 1,500 people in Montreal. He reiterated the importance of being tolerant and respectful of cultural communities in Canada.

Events taking place around the world affect us directly and personally, but it is important to consider the context and not to associate minority groups in Canada with the unfortunate events taking place elsewhere.

Canada has a long tradition of being a country that welcomes people from around the world. Every year, people come from far and wide to find freedom, respect and harmony, and therefore a better future for their family.

Today, I would like to add my voice to the Prime Minister's by saying that intolerance is unacceptable. I would like to salute the minority communities of the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, which contribute to making our regions one of the most interesting places to live.

* * *

[English]

CHURCH OF THE NATIVITY

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the entire world is saddened by the ongoing occupation of the Church of the Nativity, one of Christianity's holiest shrines.

Over a month ago some 30 gunmen from Hamas and Islamic Jihad invaded the church, along with other Palestinians seeking to escape from Israel's Operation Defensive Shield. That Israeli operation has proved to be enormously successful, at least in the short term, in reducing terrorist attacks and civilian deaths by 96% from March to April.

For the past month the Israeli Defence Force has demonstrated restraint and respect for the sanctuary of the church by refusing to forcibly enter it even though monks who have escaped have reported being beaten and robbed by some of the terrorists inside.

The ancient tradition of sanctuary was never meant to provide armed terrorists with an excuse to invade and defile a Christian shrine. The whole civilized world, and in particular religious leaders, should intervene to call on the gunmen to end their occupation and give themselves up to the appropriate authorities. If they have not committed crimes they have nothing to be afraid of, and if they have they should face the consequences of justice.

Above all, we all hope and pray that this invasion of the church will have a quick and peaceful end.

* * *

ASIAN HERITAGE MONTH

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the month of May is Asian Heritage Month. This acknowledges the long, rich history of Asian Canadians and their contributions to Canada.

In Canada our cultural diversity enriches all of us socially, politically, economically and culturally in numerous ways. Asian Heritage Month is an ideal occasion for all to celebrate the beauty and wisdom of various Asian cultures.

Since the inaugural Asian Heritage Month celebration in Toronto in 1993, cities across Canada, including Halifax, Montreal, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver, have been holding annual festivities during the month of May to recognize Asian Heritage Month. In December 2001 the Senate of Canada passed a motion designating May as Asian Heritage Month.

I invite every Canadian to take part in the celebration—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Lotbinière—L'Érable.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

WORLD PRESS FREEDOM DAY

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière—L'Érable, BQ): Mr. Speaker, World Press Freedom Day is being celebrated today around the world under the theme of "Media and Terrorism". The purpose of this event is to raise public awareness of the importance and the value of freedom of expression as a fundamental right.

The events of September 11 and recent terrorist activities have obviously had an impact on freedom of information. Every day, journalists assigned to cover these events are targets for terrorists in conflict areas. They must be on guard and, more importantly, demonstrate enormous courage in order to report accurate and objective information in a context where their security is constantly in doubt.

I would like to pay tribute here to the journalists who risk their lives for the freedom of the press. In particular, Daniel Pearl comes to mind, a reporter with the *Wall Street Journal*, who was assassinated in Pakistan in February, and to all of the other journalists who demonstrate perseverance and courage on a daily basis to provide information to the public, that refers to—

* * *

• (1115)

[English]

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the dismal economic predictions from last December have given way to unexpected economic growth for the first quarter of 2002. Tax revenues are flooding into federal coffers and economists now peg the federal surplus at between \$7 billion and \$10 billion.

The big question is, what is the Minister of Finance going to do with this surplus? I say he should keep as much as possible from his free spending cabinet colleagues to pay down the \$547 billion national debt. When faced with an unexpected windfall most reasonable people would take advantage and pay down a chunk of their debt. They would not go on a new excessive spending spree, especially if interest payments were almost one quarter of their budget.

Last year interest payments on debt cost Canadian taxpayers \$42 billion. The Liberal government must control its spending habits or debt repayment will fall by the wayside. If we do not pay off the debt during good economic times, when will we?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

TRADE

Mr. John Reynolds (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, working families across Canada have been betrayed by the government's failure to deal with significant trade issues.

Canada's economy depends on trade. With the U.S. decision on softwood lumber and the passage of the new U.S. farm bill the government has failed to protect hard-working Canadian families. The Prime Minister has failed. It turns out he has no influence in Washington and no clout to protect Canadians.

Will the acting prime minister explain to Canadian families why the government has failed to protect their interests from U.S. protectionism?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in terms of softwood lumber, the record is quite clear. The government has acted aggressively. The Minister for International Trade has marshalled a unanimous position among stakeholders and provincial governments. The Prime Minister has spoken with the president about it repeatedly. The government has been solidly behind the industry, the communities and the stakeholders and we will continue to work our way toward free and fair trade which is what we favour.

Mr. John Reynolds (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government has done so well we now have 30,000 people not working in this industry. Perhaps if it was Bombardier and not hard-working families the government would have taken real action.

The minister staggered Canadians yesterday when he fluffed this off as industrial restructuring. The parliamentary secretary called these innocent victims nervous nellys just a couple of months ago.

How can the minister account for this pattern of neglect, mismanagement, bungling, ignorance and arrogance?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the record is clear and it speaks for itself. What we have is a chronology of co-ordinated efforts on behalf of the government, all provincial governments, the industry and the communities. We have taken our case to the Americans. We have taken our case to the World Trade Organization, and we are right. We will prevail. We are pursuing all legal avenues and will ensure that we stand behind the communities of the industry.

The minister has worked very hard with his colleagues across the country to put our case forward. What we want is free and fair trade and we will continue to work our way toward that result.

Mr. John Reynolds (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister has failed and communities are dying right across Canada. In response to questions about helping innocent families, yesterday the international trade minister said "We have to take the right decision at the appropriate time". We are astounded that the minister thinks he can get away with such utter nonsense. Even in British Columbia, and the minister knows this, there is a 13 and a half week wait for EI claims. That is regular right now.

Canadians, British Columbians and everyone needs to know exactly what the government will do to help the 30,000 to 50,000 people who will be unemployed in the country because of this minister's failure. I am referring not to the minister who is talking today but to the minister who has failed on this project. What is he going to do to help Canadians?

Oral Questions

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. member that this is a team effort on behalf of this government, its ministers and ministers in provincial governments. We have stood together on this issue. It is a Canadian approach.

Let me also make it clear that we will stand behind the communities and support the workers and the people who will be affected by this very unfair and outrageous tariff.

We must remember the real problem here. It is not in this House, it is on the other side of the border. We again call on the American administration to listen to all the voices in this debate, including those voices in the congress who are urging the administration to favour free and fair trade. That is our objective.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, U.S. protectionism extends well beyond softwood lumber. Our farmers are also under attack as the Liberals continue to fail to come to their defence. The U.S. will be dumping an additional \$73 billion into its farm programs. Our farmers cannot fight against the U.S. treasury on their own.

Why has the government failed to secure international opportunities for Canadian farmers through trade negotiations that would phase down these international subsidies?

• (1120)

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada got exactly what the industry asked us to get in the declaration on agriculture at Doha and the WTO round. We have, for the first time, the requirement and the hope of all WTO countries, including us, for the reduction and eventual elimination of such things as trade distorting and production distorting domestic subsidies.

Unfortunately some countries, and it has been emphasized in the U.S. farm bill in the last few days, are not walking the talk that they gave in Doha.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that seems to be about the same answer we had in the House in 1993 when this government came to power. We are no further along.

The government seems to have no idea what it is up against. It is an election year in the United States and American lawmakers are determined to pass a massive subsidy bill on agriculture.

It is way past the time that the Prime Minister directly involves himself in this issue. The Prime Minister needs to be involved. Why has he failed working families so badly in softwood lumber and in agriculture to protect their livelihoods?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows very well that the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, myself, the industry and many others have expressed our concerns and our views to the United States.

The hon. member is a member of a party that wants Canada to make laws in Canada. Unfortunately the reality is that the United States makes laws in the United States. We can express our views on its laws and try to change them but we do not have the voting power in its congress and, fortunately, it does not have voting power in our House either.

* * *

[Translation]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as regards the softwood lumber dispute, the government must implement a plan to help workers and companies, and thus show the Americans that Canada will not be pushed around, particularly since the guaranteed loans to companies do not violate WTO rules.

It is this government that failed in the negotiations. It is this government that has the responsibility to act and the industry is unanimously asking for its help. What is it waiting for to get to work and, at last, help communities, workers and the industry, since they cannot handle this 27% surtax?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we intend to continue to fight the duties imposed by the Americans.

We will explore every possible recourse before the World Trade Organization, and we will support the industries and communities affected by these duties.

As the Prime Minister and the Minister for International Trade clearly stated yesterday, we will continue to fight for free trade.

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, workers and communities are waiting for practical measures and we are anxious to see what these measures will be.

I also remind the minister that, during the last election campaign, the Liberals made all sorts of promises and boasted that they would solve the employment insurance problems, that they would help the regions and, moreover, that they would create jobs. Now, the softwood lumber dispute requires that the government take action.

Now that the situation requires this, what does the government intend to do to make good on its unfulfilled commitments?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, programs to support individuals, families and communities affected by the duties imposed by the Americans already exist. We are open to other measures.

We are currently discussing the situation with our provincial counterparts. We will continue to work to ensure that communities are protected against the Americans' unfair practices.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with the softwood lumber industry facing an unprecedented trade war, the Minister for International Trade is trotting out one ambiguous statement after another.

Yesterday, he said that job losses in the softwood lumber industry did not come about because of the American ruling, but because of normal market restructuring.

Oral Questions

Is the minister telling us that the government is using restructuring as an excuse to do nothing?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Not at all, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, the Minister for International Trade made our position clear.

Clearly, we are going to continue working with the provincial governments, the provincial ministers and the industry. We are going to continue to argue our case before the panels in order to obtain the results we are seeking as a government.

We feel that the duties imposed by the Americans are completely unfair.

• (1125)

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that all sounds very wonderful. But the Association des manufacturiers de bois de sciage du Québec maintains that job losses are strongly linked to the uncertainty associated with countervailing duties, and the unions are saying that governments must stimulate the construction industry.

Given these reactions, what steps does the government intend to take to save the softwood lumber industry from disaster?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have not discounted any option. All the options are on the table and we are now considering them. We will take action in due course.

[*English*]

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government's position is not clear. For months the Minister of Human Resources Development has been touting her department's programs to help workers laid off because of the softwood lumber dispute. She obviously thinks there has been some job losses here. Yesterday the international trade minister suddenly claimed that the U.S. protectionist measures have not caused any job losses at all.

I would like to ask the Minister of Industry, who should know a thing or two about the file, which of his colleagues is mistaken. Have U.S. tariffs caused any job losses?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the position is clear. The tariffs are wrong. They are unjust and protectionist. We have opposed them throughout. We negotiated hard in Canada's interest. The Americans are acting unreasonably. We want the administration to start listening to other voices in congress who are calling out for fairness in free trade between our two nations.

Regardless of the cause for the job losses, I want the member to know that we will be there to support the communities and the families affected by these unjust actions.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government's position is as clear as mud. We want to know what on earth the government's game plan is? The trade minister has a lot of gall saying that there are no direct job losses. I would like to take that minister and other ministers into some of these coastal communities where they have already suffered 15,000 job losses and up to 50,000 overall.

What is the government's game plan? Is this government bankrupt in ideas? What about affordable housing? Let us use our own

lumber. Even the Liberal urban task force is talking about this. Exactly what is the government's plan to protect—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Industry.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that member and her party do not have a monopoly on concern for those communities, those individuals and the families affected. That very concern is what motivated the Minister for International Trade to work for months painstakingly developing a Canadian position reflecting the interests of the provincial governments and those very communities. He negotiated hard.

The Americans are being unreasonable. We intend to use all existing programs to help those communities and, if need be, we shall do what is required to make sure they are protected from this unreasonable American action.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is not that the government did not know that the U.S. farm bill was coming. Now Canadian agriculture is devastated: \$180 billion in U.S. subsidies; inclusion of pulse crops; and country of origin labelling. This is the final nail in our agricultural coffin and our minister has no plans.

I have a suggestion: match the U.S. subsidies. Will he?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that program payments to Canadian farmers last year were \$3.7 billion. We have programs in place this year. We recognize the need for bridging and supporting farmers as we move into a much better policy approach than in the United States.

I remind the hon. member that even the *New York Times* has stated that the farm bill, agreed to by a house and senate conference committee, was a regrettable reversion to some of the worst policies of the past. We will put good policies of support in place, not bad policies.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, those are policies that will absolutely devastate Canadian agriculture. The Liberal government is made up of a bunch of trade powder-puffs.

Neither the Minister for International Trade nor the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food have backbones, or maybe they just do not care.

I will quote Larry Combest, republican U.S. ag committee chair, who yesterday said that the farm bill "is for rural America. It's not for rural Mexico. It's not for rural Canada. It's not for rural Europe".

When will the government and the minister stand up for rural Canada. Why does he not care?

Oral Questions

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has shown very clearly that it cares. We have taken the lead at the WTO. I think we stand with every other country in the world today in condemning the policies and the direction of the United States farm bill that in the long run will not help American farmers. Their own research has shown that it gets incorporated into the cost of their inputs and they are already well above the least cost producers.

We will assist our farmers in bridging into a profitable industry in Canada so that our farmers will succeed.

* * *

•(1130)

LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, some of the large lumber companies that have interests in the U.S., like Canfor and Weyerhaeuser, are going to sue the U.S. under NAFTA for injuries suffered because of the countervail and anti-dumping lawsuits decided in the U.S. yesterday.

Is the government doing anything to make the smaller Canadian lumber companies, who might have U.S. interests, aware of their legal rights to sue under NAFTA?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are pursuing all legal avenues available to the Government of Canada. We are taking all these actions by the Americans to the appropriate tribunals and we are seeking redress.

We are working with the provincial government in B.C. and others across the country. If we can make individual companies aware of the rights they have we will be happy to work with provincial partners in doing so.

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have scar tissue on my tongue from biting it so often. I am trying to co-operate here.

Now that Canada has lost in the lumber lawsuit at the U.S. international trade commission, the minister must be aware that fear will threaten to split the solidarity of the provinces and the industry.

Divide and conquer is what the U.S. used last time with the softwood lumber agreement in 1996 and this could happen again if the different interest groups go off to try to fight this on their own.

What is the minister doing to keep the industry and Canada together?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for one thing, the Minister for International Trade was in British Columbia on Monday of this week to meet with industry and provincial representatives.

I think one of the real achievements of the Minister for International Trade in this whole matter has been the solidarity he has achieved among all Canadian interests so there is one Canadian voice speaking on the issue.

The problem is not in Canada. The problem is in the United States of America with a protectionist congress and an administration that is not listening to all the voices that favour free trade.

[*Translation*]

URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to media reports, the Prime Minister has apparently commented on recent statements by the Minister of Finance, who is seeking a way of getting funding to the municipalities by going over the heads of the provinces, by saying that there was no question of the government's taking such an approach.

Given the contradictions between these statements by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and Prime Minister in waiting, may we know the official government position?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the official position of the government may be found in the Speech from the Throne. It contains the statement that we are seeking solutions to help municipalities throughout the country, with the consent of the provinces.

The Prime Minister was the one who gave the hon. member for York West the mandate to develop some ideas, and these were contained in the report she tabled yesterday. This is an excellent report and one that will guide us with future policies.

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when this government is incapable of assuming its own responsibilities in such areas as employment insurance, softwood lumber and help for seniors, would it not be better off minding its own business and not creating expectations in areas that do not fall under its jurisdiction in any way, and opening up new areas of confrontation with the provinces?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 80% of the population lives in major urban centres, and it is in the federal government's interests to provide them with help and assistance.

We are going to work in conjunction with the provinces to seek solutions. This is clear. Our government will be the one to provide the leadership in this matter, because of our concern for the major centres in our country and the people who live in those centres.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, instead of standing in the farmers' corner and fighting for our farmers and ranchers, it seems that the minister of agriculture is content to remain silent. He was silent while his colleagues in cabinet drafted species at risk legislation without compensation for landowners. He was silent while a cruelty to animals bill was drafted that will leave the men and women who produce our food open to lawsuits from animal rights activists who believe that rats should have the same rights as children.

When will the minister of agriculture start placing the needs and the concerns of Canadian farmers and ranchers first instead of last?

Oral Questions

• (1135)

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no stronger group in Canada that recognizes the support for species at risk than our primary producers, our ranchers and our farmers across the country. There is no stronger group of people in providing the proper care and treatment of animals and the management of that.

Those producers, through the rural caucus and through members of this caucus here, have made those views very clear to the appropriate ministers. I am confident that as we go forward in this the concerns of everyone in the House will be addressed.

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, those are lovely platitudes but farmers are not interested in the minister's platitudes or his claims to care. They are interested in his support. They are interested in the results that they should be receiving from him and from the government.

Where are the sections in Bill C-5 that provide mandatory compensation for landowners who happen to have endangered species on their land? Why does the government's animal cruelty legislation not protect the tried and true animal husbandry practices of Canadian farmers from attack by animal rights' activists?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered this question for the Alliance earlier this week. The section is section 64 of Bill C-5. If the Alliance members would care to read it they will find the phrase "provide fair and reasonable compensation to any person for losses suffered as a result of any extraordinary impact". If they have difficulty with the long words we will help them.

* * *

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, even though he claims to want to respect Canada's international obligations, the minister of immigration has suspended the implementation of the refugee appeal division for one year.

He is thus leaving the fate of refugees in the hands of one person, knowing very well that a removal decision can mean torture, imprisonment and even death.

Will the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration commit to maintaining two members until the appeal division is implemented in order to give refugees the assurance that their applications will be processed fairly?

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question. I think that we must make one thing clear. As it now stands, already 55% of all applications that are handled by the board are reviewed by one member. This is the first point.

Second, there is already a process in place. If applicants are not satisfied, they can appeal to the federal court and, before removal, there is also another step to protect them.

Not only is Canada a signatory to the international convention, but I believe we also have a reputation for protecting people who may be tortured.

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal court cannot rule on the facts on which the Immigration and Refugee Board bases its decisions, nor can it reverse the board's decisions.

The appeal division, however, would have this power. Will the minister make a commitment to ensure that there are at least two members in place during the period when the appeal division is suspended?

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is important is that we ensure that for the next phase, we have a system that works.

We are fulfilling our obligations under the Geneva convention to ensure that there is a swift, fair and equitable process for refugees. That is what we are doing right now.

This government's priority is clear: to ensure that we have a system that protects refugees while fulfilling our international obligations.

* * *

[English]

CANADA CUSTOMS AND REVENUE AGENCY

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general recently said that Bill C-55 would help make authorities aware of individuals "like murderers or whatever that could be entering the country and we would be able to arrest them".

Perhaps he should have talked to the revenue minister who recently compared Canada customs agents to bank tellers, and supports the position that armed and dangerous individuals should not be detained at the border.

Why is the government tabling bills that give it powers that even the federal privacy commissioner says should alarm law-abiding citizens when we are not even providing the tools to Canada Customs to do the job of protecting our border?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that my hon. colleague would criticize the government for giving the police the tools it needs to do the job. That is what the government will do. It will make sure the police force has the tools, the legislation and the finances to make sure this country remains one of the safest countries if not the safest country in the world.

• (1140)

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it sounds like a case of tweedledum and tweedledumber. The government wants to give the police more power so it can do the job that has been unloaded on it because the government did not give customs the job.

Before we pass legislation with non-accountable powers for Liberal ministers, and most certainly before the government spends over \$100 million in unneeded new jets for the Prime Minister, will the government at least provide the tools Canada customs agents need to do the job of protecting our borders? Will the government stop treating them like bank tellers and tax collectors?

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our priority is security. Our priority is ensuring a balance between openness and diligence.

What we really need is a partnership between all of the departments to ensure that we can do our job. That is exactly what this bill will accomplish.

* * *

[English]

CANADA-U.S. BORDER

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister.

One-quarter of all of Canada's trade crosses the border at Windsor to Detroit across the Ambassador bridge, 13,000 commercial vehicles a day. Since September 11 there have been delays at the crossing because of security concerns.

What is the government doing to consult the Canadian businesses that are affected by the delays in order to resolve the problem?

Mr. Joe Jordan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member may be aware, the Deputy Prime Minister has been working very closely with his U.S. counterpart Tom Ridge on implementing the smart border action plan.

Since the very beginning of this process the Deputy Prime Minister and his cabinet colleagues have received very constructive insights from a variety of sources, including the business community. This input is crucial to ensure that the action plan supports the initiatives of Canadians and Canadian businesses. In fact, on Monday the Deputy Prime Minister, along with the hon. Minister for International Cooperation, will be participating in another of the ongoing dialogues with border stakeholders in Windsor.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister of agriculture will tell his American counterpart today that the Bush administration is wrong in signing the insidious U.S. farm bill. We agree. They are wrong, we are right; another moral victory. However at the end of the day after all the huffing and puffing, the U.S. farmers have the dough and Canadian farmers have Doha.

What besides rhetoric does the government have to assist Canadian farmers?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his support. He certainly showed his support in expressing our concerns to the United States when he joined me in Washington a few weeks ago.

As I said earlier in the House, we are putting in place with the provinces and the Canadian industry an agriculture policy framework. We recognize there needs to be some bridging and transition as we move into that. However we are working on policy that will improve the livelihood and the profitability of Canadian farmers, not

policy such as the United States policy which goes in the opposite direction.

* * *

HEALTH

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Vancouver city council voted unanimously to support harm reducing and lifesaving measures to respond to the public health emergency in Vancouver's downtown east side. This is despite the efforts of the ideas conference to drag us into the dark ages. What we need now is a clear indication that Health Canada and the government are willing to support and implement safe injection sites so more lives are not lost.

How long does this community have to wait for the government to do the right thing and bring in safe injection sites and a comprehensive plan? When will it do that?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, without question Health Canada recognizes that injection drug use is a serious health problem for Canadian cities. The department is also working at the federal-provincial-territorial level on the question of injection drug use.

These issues are generally surrounded with the questions that are faced by the group here in the House of Commons that is looking at the issues facing Canadians and the use of drugs. Let me say that any such initiatives that would come to the Government of Canada in this regard would certainly have to have the broad support of the local city councils and of the provinces.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's hockey analogy at a recent Liberal fundraiser in Montreal minimizes the softwood lumber crisis. His comment that his failure to get the tariffs lifted on softwood as a result of the Canadians beating the United States in Olympic hockey are not only irrelevant, they are immature. The Prime Minister obviously does not understand the nature and the impact of the crisis.

The Minister for International Trade thinks there are no job losses linked to softwood lumber. When will the Prime Minister take this issue seriously? Does he have a plan and what is the time frame?

● (1145)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's involvement in this file has been continuous and effective. He has raised the issue again and again with the American president. He has co-ordinated the cabinet's efforts in organizing a team Canada approach involving provincial governments and the industry.

The Prime Minister is providing the leadership necessary to make sure that our position prevails. Legally and morally we should be there to support the communities, stand behind the industry and achieve free trade for Canada.

Oral Questions

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's involvement has failed on all fronts, failed to have free trade applied to softwood lumber, failed to save jobs. A WTO settlement is years away. Now is the time to fast track assistance to mill towns and forestry workers to help ease the burden of the American countervail and anti-dumping duties.

What immediate assistance will the Prime Minister offer forestry workers across Canada?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have made it clear we will do what is required to provide that assistance with existing programming. We have an open mind with respect to whatever else may be required.

Let me remind the members opposite the real issue here is not in this House, in this government or in this country. The real issue is across the border.

If the hon. member and his party have some constructive suggestions as to how we might advance our case internationally, they should make them. They should make a constructive suggestion. That is something we have not heard from the opposition on this subject.

* * *

[Translation]

MICROBREWERIES

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Canada's microbreweries are struggling to survive because of confiscatory Liberal taxes. Small brewers have to pay as much in federal excise taxes as they do in production costs. This is why a third of our microbrewers have recently gone bankrupt.

When will the government give small brewers the same tax treatment as their U.S. competitors, by creating a 40% excise rate for these struggling small businesses?

[English]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, Bill C-47 does not deal with beer. It deals with wine, spirits, tobacco and ships' stores.

The member should know that right now the government is reviewing proposals from the microbreweries and the beer industry generally. We will act prudently and appropriately in dealing with this very important issue for all Canadians.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, inaction while these job creating microbreweries go broke is not prudent. It is bad economic policy.

Dozens of microbreweries are struggling for survival because they are spending as much in excise taxes as they do in production costs. When will the government listen to this industry and stop killing jobs in it by reducing the rate of excise tax on small brewery products immediately?

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are listening. It is the opposition that is not listening. In fact, the beer industry asked us to move

forward on Bill C-47. We are taking very clear steps in reviewing the information we received and we will respond accordingly.

The member across the way would have us respond in an inappropriate manner and not do the right thing. We will do the right thing. We will do the right thing for the microbreweries and we will do it soon.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while European Union countries managed, in the year 2000, to reduce by 3.5% their greenhouse gas emissions, compared to their 1990 level, Canada increased its emissions by 20%. This is a dismal failure on the part of the Canadian government. Each day that goes by is used by the government to justify its failure.

Does the Minister of the Environment agree that his government's inaction and lack of leadership will end up being very costly for Canadians?

[English]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a basic contradiction in the member's question. On the one hand, he complains of the remarkable economic achievement of Canada over the last eight years which has resulted in a 30% increase in output, without having commensurate increase in emissions I might add. On the other hand, he suggests that we should erode economic confidence and that somehow we should reduce emissions by not having that kind of growth.

What we are trying to do on our side of the House is to make sure we have an effective, growing economy and at the same time a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the measures taken by the federal government are totally inadequate, as shown by the 20% increase in Canadian emissions.

Since the minister refuses to set a deadline, will the government at least pledge to take immediate action, until the Kyoto protocol is ratified, so that Canada can immediately begin intensifying the reduction of its greenhouse gas emissions? Would the minister agree to increase Canadian investments in renewable energies?

● (1150)

[English]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member is aware of the total contradiction of his statements with respect to consultation with the provinces and just about everything we have heard from his party over the last eight years.

We have said clearly on this issue that we intend to consult with the provinces, territories, the affected industry and Canadians generally from coast to coast. At the same time we want a plan which does not penalize any region of the country in an unfair or unusual way.

Oral Questions

We think such consultations with the provinces are necessary. They do not. That is fine. But at least it is clear who believes in the unilateral use of federal power and—

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

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, during a debate in the U.S. congress this week, Congressman Nick Smith from Michigan said that the attempt to cap farm subsidies had utterly failed. In short, Congressman Smith said that the U.S. farm bill provides unlimited farm support for the next six years.

What is the Liberal government going to do to protect Canadian farmers from these new American subsidies?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member realizes there are some people in the United States themselves, as I stressed earlier, that realize the ridiculousness of the policy which they have put in place. Also a big chunk of the money that they have put out does not even go to farmers themselves. The farmers with small and medium size farms in the United States get a very small portion of that.

Our programs here in Canada are equally available to all farmers and are on the whole farm. They are not production distorting. They are not trade distorting. They are not putting our Canadian farmers in a non-competitive situation from that perspective. We will continue to bridge and to help—

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

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to rhetoric I would give the minister an *A* plus. When it comes to results however, I would give the minister a failing grade for nine consecutive years. Talk about Liberal government decay. Talk about it.

When is the minister going to announce an effective program to protect our farmers against these new subsidies?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will state it again. What we need for our Canadian farmers is a number of different approaches. That is a comprehensive and integrated approach to help our industry adapt to the demands of the consumer and the market opportunities.

We also know we need to have some bridging and transition to that in order to do all we possibly can to mitigate the ridiculous policies of the United States as far as support to agriculture.

* * *

AFRICA

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Cooperation.

The new partnership for Africa's development will have to involve civil society. How is the Government of Canada going to accomplish this very worthy but extremely challenging objective?

Hon. Susan Whelan (Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has taken measures to ensure that all levels of society, both in Africa and in Canada, are given the

opportunity not only to discuss but to debate the principles of the new partnership for Africa's development.

This weekend in Montreal I will be hosting a conference with African and Canadian partners to discuss the implications of NEPAD. As well, Canada has also established a \$500,000 fund for consultations in Africa itself.

Our government is committed to working toward reducing poverty in Africa and also to ensuring that all parties are part of this very important process.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the hardworking families of Saskatchewan need to hear from the government.

Why will the trade minister, the agriculture minister and our own wheat board minister not accept the invitation of the province of Saskatchewan to go there and explain what they are going to do to protect Saskatchewan's farm families?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the minister of agriculture in Saskatchewan should come forward and say is that I was in his presence last week for five hours in the west. He will be joining me and all of my provincial and territorial colleagues on Sunday night, all day Monday, Monday night and most of Tuesday next week in Ottawa.

We have had lots of opportunity and will continue to have that opportunity to have that discussion. I welcome that discussion with him and all of his colleagues.

● (1155)

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I still have to ask my question.

The government needs to work for Saskatchewan farm families for a change. The legislature has invited them to go there. The wheat board minister is very familiar with that place.

Why will the ministers not go there and talk directly to those people who are so severely affected by the government's abject failures?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was only about three or four weeks ago that I spent over a full day in Saskatchewan. I spoke to the Saskatchewan Agrivision Corporation. I met with producer groups at that time. I do that all the time, as my colleagues do, and will continue to do so.

The minister in charge of the wheat board, as the hon. member said, is very familiar and is there quite often. We will continue to do that as we have in the past. Before this day is over, I will be meeting with more representatives of the Saskatchewan grains industry.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

AUTO INDUSTRY

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Mr. Speaker, despite the enormous growth the Canadian auto industry has experienced since the signing of the auto pact, Quebec has never received its fair share of the benefits.

With the closing of the GM assembly plant in Boisbriand, over 1,400 direct jobs will disappear from the greater Montreal area.

Will the government finally decide to do its job and take action to save the GM plant in Boisbriand?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are naturally concerned about the possibility of job losses. This was the reason we were behind the support committee. We worked with the mayor of Boisbriand, with local stakeholders, and with the government of Quebec. The previous ministers of industry visited Detroit with Mrs. Marois. We are continuing to bring all possible pressure to bear on GM to resolve these problems. And we are concerned about—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Hillsborough.

* * *

[English]

COMMUNICATIONS CANADA

Mr. Shawn Murphy (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for Communications Canada. I, like I believe most Canadians, am very proud of the federal government website and the capability that website affords all Canadians to communicate with the government.

What plans does the government have to ensure that this website remains ahead of all competition?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for raising this very important issue. As the House will know the government's online project was nominated for the second consecutive year as being the best in the world. However we are now improving it to give better access to Canadians, particularly those with mobility impairments and so on.

There will be a new feature, a new site accessible to MPs, particularly opposition MPs so they will know what is going on, where information from 35 departments and agencies will be posted—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Southwest.

* * *

LEADERSHIP CAMPAIGNS

Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton Southwest, Canadian Alliance): That is a tough question to follow, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Industry still needs to account for the work of his personal staff in his leadership campaign. All week on this side of the House we have been trying to confirm whether or not his staff has been flying on taxpayer dollars.

I ask the minister yet again, and I do not want to hear whether documents were tabled or not, a simple question about his personal staff. What does Mr. Thiara do for Industry Canada?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member cannot have it both ways. He asked for information about expenses incurred. The information was provided. The member's position now appears to be that there were not enough expenses incurred.

All those expenses that were incurred on public business were claimed and the information has been produced.

* * *

[Translation]

ÉCOLE DE MÉDECINE VÉTÉRINAIRE DE SAINT-HYACINTHE

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since 1999, the École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe has been fighting to keep its accreditation with the American Veterinary Medical Association.

Without this recognition, the school, the only such French language school in North America, which is located in this agri-food high-tech hub, will lose its research expertise and will not be able to survive.

Will the minister of agriculture tell us when the federal government will do its part and come up with the \$59 million needed for the school's survival?

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, we need to recognize that post-secondary education is the responsibility of the provinces. Certain parties in the House have a problem when the federal government gets involved, such as with the millennium scholarships.

However having said that, we also recognize the importance of the francophone college for veterinarians in Canada and the importance of other veterinarian colleges in Canada from the standpoint of the health of Canadians and animal health. The government will continue to look at ways in which we can assist that because we also recognize the importance of the international accreditation of those colleges.

* * *

● (1200)

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today the Canadian Wheat Board reports that conditions in southern Alberta north to Red Deer and areas in Saskatchewan from Saskatoon through the whole southwest area of the province remain extremely dry with no soil moistures. Meanwhile all the money for drought relief under the PFRA has already been allocated. It is only May but the money is all gone. This has nothing to do with the US farm bill.

Will the minister of agriculture commit to increased funding, immediately and significantly, to help increasingly desperate farmers and ranchers?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member will recognize that it was just last week that the PFRA was able to fund 800 applications that could not be funded prior to that.

I am proud to say in one way that we did it fully federally. I am disappointed to say that the province of Saskatchewan, even with its importance to agriculture, decided it did not have enough money to support its farmers in that way.

We will have more money available for the farmers in Saskatchewan through the rural water programs and in other ways as well.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC): Mr. Speaker, thanks to former minister Gagliano, the government entered into a contract which resulted in aviation and military spare parts being stored and marketed out of a warehouse in Florida owned and operated by a convicted international money launderer and drug smuggler.

What happened to those spare parts? Did the government receive payment for them? Were they seized by U.S. authorities or did they fall into the hands of international terrorists? Why was an investigation not launched into the sale of these spare parts owned by Henry McFliker, a convicted felon in the U.S.? What happened to these spare parts?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is the first that the hon. member has brought this to our attention about these spare parts for the Canadian military being warehoused in Florida. I have no idea whether that information is accurate or not.

We will verify it of course and I will gladly inform him or the House, if he raises the question again, at the earliest opportunity.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Deputy Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the Speaker's gallery of the Honourable Geraldine Fras-Moleketi, Minister for the Public Service and Administration of South Africa.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Speaker: I would also like to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the north public gallery of the 29th Canadian Armoured Reconnaissance Regiment, South Alberta Regiment.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Speaker: Our visitors will be in Room 253D and they look forward to the visit of those members who might be available to do so.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. André Harvey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to one petition.

* * *

● (1205)

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

M. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans.

[Translation]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee has completed its study of the management of Little Harbour causeway issue.

* * *

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-461, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (child adoption expenses).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from South Surrey—White Rock—Langley for seconding my bill today.

I rise today to introduce a bill to amend the Income Tax Act, specifically to make the act more equitable for parents, in this case, those who have adopted a child. The bill if passed, will allow adoptive parents to deduct the expenses related to the adoption of a child up to a maximum of \$7,000. The expenses must have been incurred in that taxation year or in the previous two years.

Canada is faced with the challenges of an aging population and a low birth rate. We as legislators should be doing everything possible to encourage childless couples to start a family. This bill if supported, would be a great first step.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

CRTC

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here representing constituents from all over the lower mainland and area. The petitioners are concerned about violence, pornography and so on that their children have access to on television during the early hours of the evening.

The petitioners call upon the House of Commons to legislate the CRTC to reduce the sexual and violent content contained in the basic cable and satellite packages.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. André Harvey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

CANADA-U.S. RELATIONS

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair has received notice of an application for an emergency debate from the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. John Reynolds (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I wrote to you for leave to make a motion pursuant to Standing Order 52 for the purpose of discussing Canada's trade relations with the United States which requires urgent consideration by the House.

Yesterday the U.S. International Trade Commission ruled against Canada in a lawsuit filed by the U.S. softwood lumber industry. The USITC ruled that Canadian imports of softwood lumber imposed a threat of injury to the U.S. industry.

This announcement is the worst disaster case scenario for Canadian forestry workers, communities and the industry and is a major hit on the Canadian economy. The Canadian federal government must take bold action and strong leadership at this crucial time. A contingency plan announcement containing worker relief and tariff payment measures is required immediately.

In addition, the U.S. congress adopted its farm aid bill yesterday which will now put an additional \$73.5 billion U.S. into its farm subsidy program and the new bill will introduce protectionist barriers that will restrict Canadian exports worth billions of dollars each year. The government must move quickly to protect Canadian farm families. Any additional delay could be disastrous for the agriculture industry.

This affects two of our major industries and tens of thousands of people will be out of work. We must talk about it in the House of Commons, and the sooner the better.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair has considered the grave issues raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast. I recall yesterday he was on his feet on one of those subject matters as well. I also take into account the fact that next week, following the declaration on the Thursday business

Government Orders

question yesterday, there will be three opposition days where these subject matters could be thoroughly debated.

Accordingly at this time the Chair finds that the request does not meet the terms of the standing orders.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1210)

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY ACT, 2002

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-55, an act to amend certain acts of Canada, and to enact measures for implementing the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, in order to enhance public safety, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to go to something which arose during question period today. In discussing Bill C-55 the solicitor general said that the bill would help authorities become aware of individuals, like murderers or whatever, that could be entering the country and that we would be able to arrest them. In question period today he said we should be pleased that the government is giving the police the powers to deal with this.

The fact of the matter is we already have border security with our Canada customs agents. These are dedicated, well trained people who know how to detect these types of people coming across the border. However they do not have those tools that the solicitor general says he has given to the police to deal with them when they are right at the border.

This goes back to the former minister of immigration who could not deal with inappropriate people coming in under her portfolio so she got demoted to the revenue portfolio, and now supports an internal document that states:

Should a customs officer encounter an individual who is identified as being the subject of an armed and dangerous lookout, the customs officer should allow the individual to proceed and immediately notify the police and provide as much detail as possible to enable apprehension...

That is garbage. In defence of this ridiculous policy the minister then went on to compare Canada customs agents to bank tellers. I am sure the Minister of Finance already looks upon them as tax collectors. He has after all in the past been heard to say something along the line that he never met a tax he did not like. Naturally he would want them to devote their energies to collecting money for the cash-hungry government.

To say, as the solicitor general has done today, that we have given the tools to the police to deal with inappropriate people coming across our border is the same as the minister who deals with the softwood lumber issue saying that the government is dealing with this and have employment insurance for those people who are losing their jobs. We would rather have real jobs for those people.

Government Orders

It would also be comparable to saying that the government will enhance ambulance services in this country to better enable them to take accident victims to the hospital instead of doing something about the deplorable condition of the national highway system.

Part of the mix of course, because Liberal ministers often like to talk in two different directions at the same time, is that the same minister, who said the government was taking steps to deal with job losses through the EI system for softwood lumber, also claimed there were no direct job losses and the natural restructuring of the industry was taking place, so no real action was required by the government. I guess that is how it justifies the position it takes.

It is ironic that the government has brought in a bill that has a lot of draconian powers that even some of its own backbenchers are speaking out against. At the same time it is not taking the simple, obvious steps such as equipping our Canada customs people to do the job right at the border. They are the first line of defence for this country's borders and they are not being given the tools they need to do the job.

We are debating our amendment to the bill and we will come back to the bill during other stages. I assure the House that I will be here. I will be speaking out on behalf of Canadians who have concerns with the bill, who are alarmed at a government that would ram it through without proper debate. They are alarmed at a government that continues to put these kinds of omnibus bills through without even considering splitting them up so they can be examined properly by their various departments.

•(1215)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, on April 17 to be more precise, several members of this House celebrated, their hands to their hearts, not what is referred to in Quebec as the result of the night of the long knives, not what is called the unilateral patriation of the Constitution—since they were trying to keep away from less unifying subjects—but rather the anniversary of the charter of rights and freedoms.

They told us how the charter of rights and freedoms has changed the face of Canada and made its citizens feel like they were living in a democracy where their fundamental rights would be protected by a legal document enshrined in the Constitution.

The hon. member for Frontenac—Mégantic told us that the charter of rights and freedoms is what defines his identity, his beliefs and the values he holds dear. The member for St. Paul's argued the same day that the fundamental rights of Canadians are defined in that same charter of rights and freedoms. Also on the issue of the charter, the ineffable President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs stated, and I quote, "The charter will protect their rights"—meaning the rights of all Canadians—"in the future, as it has for the past 20 years". Funny how the future does not always last all that long.

What are we debating today? We are debating Bill C-55. We most certainly could have celebrated Bill C-55. In these times where our fellow citizens are increasingly uncertain, cynical and losing interest in politics, Bill C-55 could very well have been an occasion to

celebrate—to celebrate the fact that the government had finally stopped being arrogant, shown some modesty and listened to the many voices that spoke out against the previous safety bill, Bill C-42, which the government chose to withdraw, voices that did not come only from elected representatives here in parliament, but also from the general public as well.

That is why we could have been proud. We could have celebrated the fact that the government had responded to the expectations and concerns expressed by the public. And yet, what do we have before us? A bill, Bill C-55, entitled an act to amend certain Acts of Canada, and to enact measures for implementing the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, in order to enhance public safety. This is a wordy title if I ever have seen one. All this to say that, in the end, this title is just camouflage for a bill which, for all intents and purposes, is almost identical to Bill C-42.

Of course, a few cosmetic changes were made, but the fact remains that this bill, like its predecessor, seriously threatens the very rights and freedoms that we or, should I say, that our colleagues from other political parties celebrated, with their hand on their heart, on April 17.

•(1220)

I cannot help but remind members of what privacy commissioner George Radwanski said regarding Bill C-55, which is before the House today. In the May 2 issue of *La Presse* he was quoted as saying:

—the Chrétien government new anti-terrorism bill smacks of practices similar to those that exist in totalitarian states—

That is quite a statement. We are talking about Canada. We are talking about a bill which, according to the privacy commissioner, is aimed at implementing practices that existed in totalitarian states.

And again, still in yesterday's issue of *La Presse*: "—these 'exceptional measures'" provided for in Bill C-55 are "far from being tools to fight terrorism—"

This is serious because this bill is supposed to provide us with additional tools to fight terrorism. The privacy commissioner added that:

—these "exceptional" measures, far from being tools to fight terrorism, are really "a dramatic expansion of privacy-invasive police powers without explanation or justification as to its necessity".

In an article published in today's issue of *Le Soleil*, Mr. Radwanski is quoted as saying:

The precedent set by section 4.82 could open the door, in principle, to practices similar to those that exist in totalitarian societies where police routinely board trains or establish roadblocks to check identification papers.

Government Orders

This is cause for great concern. It would appear that in the House only the opposition is worried by what the privacy commissioner is reported to have said.

Indeed, yesterday, the member for Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot had the nerve to grandstand and rise on a point of privilege to complain that the privacy commissioner had not fulfilled his obligation, first, by not advising the House of the comments he made regarding Bill C-55.

The autocratic tendency of the government goes as far as trying to muzzle officers of the House to prevent them from saying what has to be said about the troubling nature of some pieces of legislation put forward by this government.

We are getting increasingly concerned by repeated comments of this kind on the part of members of this House. We have every reason to be perplexed, to say the least.

Since when do we ask House appointed officers, such as the auditor general or the chief electoral officer, to report to this House each time they express themselves publicly, when they are interviewed by the media, for example?

On the face of it, the arguments made by our colleague from Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot are absolutely pointless and fallacious, and we must refute them without the slightest hesitation.

Obviously, I could have dwelt on the main concerns, on the controlled access military zones, about which my colleague from Laval—Centre spoke at length this morning, on the interim orders, on the fact that the RCMP and CSIS can obtain personal information on passengers from the air carriers.

Needless to say, we are very disappointed with this bill. We were very happy that the government listened to the Bloc Quebecois, among others, and withdrew the despicable Bill C-42, but we are greatly disappointed to see that the government withdrew it only to bring it back under another guise, although its substance is very similar if not identical.

• (1225)

[*English*]

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity today to enter into the debate on the amendment to Bill C-55. I understand it is the nature of the motion to have the bill referred not just to the transport committee but to the justice committee. I think the NDP caucus is generally in support of that idea because no one has told us to our satisfaction why such a broad sweeping, omnibus piece of legislation should have arrived before the transport committee anyway. No one has been able to tell us how a bill that changes 19 different statutes and covers 9 different ministerial jurisdictions is it to be referred to the transport committee. Many MPs have this question.

Even though I can support the Alliance amendment, I would go further and ask why this bill is not divided up into manageable sized pieces and distributed to the committees of the nine different ministerial portfolios that it affects. The only reason given by the government was that it was in the interest of expediency. It wants it treated as an omnibus bill rather than go through the more long and

drawn out process of actually going to the standing committees that have jurisdiction over that area. I do not accept that there is any urgency to fast track Bill C-55.

If in fact Bill C-55 finds its origins in some terrible emergency, which it does, the tragic events of 9/11, that urgency no longer exists. If the government is using the fact that it is an urgent situation to justify fast tracking this bill, why did it languish for four long months between its previous incarnation and its current incarnation? Why was it not an urgent emergency after Bill C-42 was withdrawn because it was hastily thrown together? Why did four months pass before we even saw Bill C-55 and now it has become urgent to ram it through?

Canadians have reservations about the bill because it seeks to diminish the basic human rights and freedoms by which Canadians define themselves as Canadians. It is serious business.

I am not trying to sound the alarm that something subversive is going on, that big brother is trying to change our lives, but these measures do impact on the basic privacy freedoms that Canadians enjoy, and Canadians deserve to know about them.

I would argue that the bill should not be fast tracked not to give more members of parliament chances to make long winded, boring speeches but the period of time to engage Canadians in the debate. If the government has its way, the bill will be rammed through the House. Canadians will not even know because, frankly, they do not pay daily attention to what we are doing here. Canadians will not learn about it until it is too late. Canadians should be allowed to consult Canadians, to engage Canadians in this fundamental question of whether they are willing to sacrifice some of their personal freedoms in exchange for national security issues. Until we can ask Canadians that question there should be no fast tracking of Bill C-55.

We know Bill C-42 enhanced a number of powers of the various enforcement agencies. Bill C-55 is not just a cleaned up version of Bill C-42. Bill C-55 introduces brand new measures that require and call for a fulsome debate and the engagement of Canadians.

I will start with the point that I am very critical of this thinly veiled attempt to, I believe, sell Canadians a Trojan horse, a whole package of goods. As I said, 19 statutes will be amended by the bill and all of it will wind up before the 15 members of the Standing Committee on Transport and Government Operations.

Statutes like the criminal code are being amended. Why will the justice committee not deal with the criminal code amendments?

The health act is being amended by this omnibus bill, Bill C-55. Should that not be properly before the Standing Committee on Health? The Export and Import Permits Act should go to the foreign affairs committee. Surely the party critics who sit on the foreign affairs committee deserve the opportunity to study the bill clause by clause. They will not have that opportunity.

Government Orders

•(1230)

All opposition parties select specific individuals with special expertise to be their representatives on various committees. Our expert on health will not have the opportunity to review Bill C-55 because it will not go to the health committee.

There are all kinds of good reasons for Canadians to be apprehensive about such a broad and sweeping piece of legislation that could change the very way we conduct ourselves in the country. By the time the government rams it through the House Canadians will not even notice unless they are the type of people who watch CPAC daily, and I do not think most Canadians are.

I do not want to accuse the government of trying to slip something by or imply that this is a Trojan horse, although I have heard the term used. However I will say, without any fear of contradiction and without overstating the case, that Bill C-55 is a ministerial power grab. There is no question in my mind that it enhances executive authority and diminishes parliamentary oversight. That should be a concern because it is a trend we have noticed. In the few short years that I have been a member of parliament it has become a running motif. It is a theme that we see developing in just about every piece of legislation tabled in the House. We see an enhanced executive authority and diminished opportunity for parliament to have any say.

This shift of power is an insidious thing. It has been happening slowly. It is like wearing away the concept that most Canadians have of parliament. Canadians may even see parliament through rose coloured glasses. It is one of the greatest democracies in the world and they like to believe that their members of parliament are allowed to debate issues and even influence bills.

However when we strip away the ability for elected members of parliament to have true contact and true participation in the development of legislation, we really have the executive making the laws in the country and very little opportunity for the rest of the members of parliament, who were freely elected as well, to have any input.

We are very critical. We believe, if nothing else, Bill C-55 is deliberately designed, not by accident but by design, to increase ministerial power. It is a power grab. It enhances executive authority and it diminishes parliamentary oversight. I am mostly concerned about that and Canadians should be concerned.

I think Canadians are catching on to the debate. I wish there was more time so we could engage more Canadians but they can read the critical statements made by the office of the privacy commissioner. Granted, there is an argument to be made that perhaps the office of the privacy commissioner should really be making its comments to parliament and not to a media scrum, but he uses words like totalitarian which is harsh and extreme language. In fact he states things more strongly than even I would but he warns people that this is a dramatic expansion of police powers.

I would argue that the police forces in Canada already have expansive and adequate powers. The RCMP, CSIS and our customs agents and the people who protect our well-being do have the tools they need to protect Canadians. Arguably, those rules or tools could be honed, modified or sharpened, but the privacy commissioner points out that this is a dramatic expansion of police powers.

We have to be cautious when we weigh personal freedoms with legislation that is regulatory. We want to err on the side of caution, which is certainly one of the fundamental tenets of any kind of legislation when we are dealing with a free and open society like Canada.

The NDP caucus will not be voting in support of Bill C-55. We do support the amendment that it should go to the justice committee, but we believe Bill C-55 has in it inherent flaws that any of the goodwill or good intentions that the government may have had are vastly overshadowed by the possible danger of diminishing basic human rights and freedoms in the country. We are not prepared to go that far at this time.

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join colleagues from both sides of the House in debating the amendments that have been brought forward from Bill C-55, as it relates to the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act.

Bill C-55 amends the proceeds of crime—

•(1235)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Upon review of our lists, the hon. parliamentary secretary has already spoken at this stage of debate on the amendment. Therefore she will have to wait until there is possibly a subamendment or some other opportunity.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, perhaps no other bill passed in this place, outside of a bill dealing with personal income taxes, will directly affect Canadians as much as Bill C-55.

Yesterday in the House the member for Scarborough—Rouge River took the opportunity to delve into debate and voice his concern on a number of issues. A couple of those issues had a real resonance for members of parliament on the opposition benches and, I suspect, for members of the government. The essence of what member said was that the bill should not go to the transport committee.

The member for Scarborough—Rouge River said, and I quote:

It is certainly not out of any disrespect for their abilities on the transport committee, but it appears clear that the bulk of the bill does not involve mainline transportation issues.

I would go so far as to question the theory that somehow a bill of this magnitude should be focused into a narrow special interest group on a transport committee. I would be very leery if many of them have even appeared on debate at second reading stage.

Second reading of any bill in the House before it goes to committee is absolutely the most important reading of legislation. This is the opportunity for debate and for questions and answers. Second reading stage is when members suggest changes that should be made to any piece of legislation and the government has time to implement them or committee members have time to take them to committee in the form of amendments.

Government Orders

One of the reasons and certainly the most valid reason that Bill C-55 should not go to the transport committee is because it involves too many other committees. The bill affects the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the Department of Health Act, the Food and Drugs Act, the Hazardous Products Act, the Navigable Waters Protection Act, the Pest Control Products Act, the Quarantine Act, the Radiation Emitting Devices Act, the Canada Shipping Act and the Canada Shipping Act, 2001.

This legislation covers an extremely wide spectrum of government agencies and laws. Every Liberal member of parliament and indeed every member of the committee should be questioning the government's motives. They should not indulge in some type of fantasy that the transport committee will be enough to deal with the complexities of the legislation.

Bill C-55 is very controversial legislation that has been withdrawn, reintroduced and has members on all sides of the House divided. Which committee does the Prime Minister feel will offer the path of least resistance?

All of us should feel a little disappointed. The contempt and disregard in which those around the Liberal cabinet table hold committees is obvious. Committees are capable of doing the real work that needs to be done in the House if they are allowed to do their job.

The member also talked of partisan rhetoric. He said that it was all part of the job. We in the Progressive Conservative Party agree with him and his suggestion. Should he or any members of cabinet be able to convince the government that it should listen to its backbenchers this time and send the bill to the appropriate committees, they would have our full support.

This is not some type of backbench fantasy that perhaps some Liberal members of parliament are having that I want to recognize. They have an opportunity to shape the legislation. It needs to be shaped and desperately needs to be changed.

• (1240)

The government has had other opportunities in bills like Bill C-68. It has had opportunities with bills that dealt with compensation for hepatitis C victims. There have been opportunities on legislation on SARA, the species at risk bill. It has had opportunities to change legislation on bills such as the prevention of cruelty to animals bill. The reality is that the government has not used those opportunities. It talks.

We can all read the papers, which state that there is a backbench revolt in the Liberal Party, that the rural members have finally found the intestinal fortitude to start up on their hind legs and vote against the government. I would suggest to Canadians that they check the voting record. I used to keep sheep and I know a little bit about sheep. When one sheep leads, the rest of the sheep follow. I would suggest that Canadians check the record. It is very plain to see.

I believe that the suggestion that a special legislative committee be constructed and comprised of some individuals from the transport committee and some from the justice committee would receive support from all opposition parties. In fact, I would go one step further and I would suggest that members from each of the committees affected by the bill should be formed into a special

committee to deal with this special piece of legislation. It would be a novel thought because it would actually give democracy a chance.

Moving on with this discussion, in the wake of the tragic events of last September it was understandable that legislation on the drawing board would go to extreme measures, but the arbitrariness of the decision making process is palpable. Putting so much power in the hands of ministers does nothing to benefit Canadians. We have interim orders, orders made by a minister alone without parliamentary approval, to remain secret for 23 days. Let me say that again: without parliamentary approval. The orders can be in effect for 45 days without any cabinet approval whatsoever. As well, unless specified in the order, the order can be in effect for a year and if the minister so chooses it can be renewed for at least another year. That is two years.

The changes from Bill C-42, a bill that very few members of parliament were supportive of, are extremely slight. Once again, parliament and the public are relegated to a back seat. The changes to the National Defence Act are a perfect example. We have a minister who in the past has been less than forthright with the public and parliament, his own party, his caucus and even his leader. He takes three briefings to get up to speed and the Prime Minister wants him to have the ability to declare, unchecked and unfettered, a controlled access military zone anywhere in Canada. I do not think so. Surely this is a mistake. Surely we are not going to reward incompetence.

Make no mistake about it. Under this legislation the government can drive a tank onto any street corner in Canada and, at the discretion of the minister of defence, call it a military secured zone. It is shocking. Under proposed paragraph 260.1(1)(b), on controlled access military zones, there is some question as to what the government means by property. Is this real property as in real estate, or property in terms of equipment, such as the tank that I suggested could be driven onto any street corner in the country? I would suggest that for those who want to read the bill closely, the answer comes in proposed subsection 260.1(3) with the designation of the nature of the zone. It states:

A controlled access military zone may consist of an area of land or water, a portion of airspace, or a structure or part of one, surrounding a thing referred to in subsection (1) or including it, whether the zone designated is fixed or moves with that thing.

That is any piece of military hardware. Proposed subsection 260.1(3) continues:

The zone automatically includes all corresponding airspace above, and water and land below, the earth's surface.

The key here is "or moves with that thing".

• (1245)

If the nature of the legislation were to create these zones in or around areas with permanent structures not designated as military bases, there would be no need for clarification of this type. This gives the minister the ability to designate a controlled military access zone around any piece of military property he feels necessary, and as the equipment moves through an area, so goes the zone. Canadians work too long and too hard for everything they own in this country. The fact that a minister at the stroke of a pen can negate that takes away the old adage that a person's home is his castle.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, like all my other colleagues, to make a few comments about Bill C-55.

As parliamentarians, all party politics set aside, our role is not to exaggerate the impact of a law, but rather to try to fully understand the scope of a bill like Bill C-55, which, of course, is the result of very intensive consultations with provincial and territorial governments, and with many other Canadians.

We have to realize that we are not dealing with an easily identifiable opponent, but rather terrorists operating in many countries and using great cunning to perpetrate their dastardly deeds. They had proven this long before the attacks of September 11.

My colleagues from the Bloc made comments that, at times, I found rather exaggerated. Luckily, exaggeration does not make one sick, otherwise some of them would suffer from an incurable disease. I remember their speeches on Bill C-7, concerning young offenders. The end of the world was near.

As a matter of fact, the governments of the provinces and of Quebec will benefit from massive injections of tens of millions of dollars for the administration of Bill C-7. I am convinced that the children of Quebec will not all be in prison tomorrow morning. Luckily, our justice minister assumed his responsibilities. He steered this act through the House of Commons.

If we look back at how the act has been administered over the last few months, we see that, despite all the dire consequences the Bloc members were talking about at the time—it was worse than Chernobyl—everything is going fine.

Our country has to deal with a very serious situation. The government's responsibility is, rightly so, to deal with it. We have to do everything we can to fight this very insidious and imperceptible evil, which caused the death of thousands of people in a few seconds in the United States, our main trading partner. The Americans are people with whom we share economic, cultural, and recreational values, among others. The role of responsible governments in the world is to assume their responsibilities and to make laws.

Bill C-55 will allow us to amend 20 acts affecting several departments. This is not an ad hoc process. The provisions of this bill allow us to take measures that also respect the democracy in which we live. Our role is to take our responsibilities to obtain the tools that will allow us to respond to emergencies. This will not be done only at the behest of one person, someone responsible for a department, whether defence, justice or transport.

Let us take the example of September 11. If the Minister of Transport had not had the authority to react to the closure of U.S. airspace, what could have happened? The number of dead in New York could have skyrocketed. The government's role is to acquire the tools that are essential to assume its responsibilities.

In the hours that follow, it is time to justify measures taken. After that, it is time to get the government and our institutions back to normal.

Bill C-55 affects several departments, health, environment, justice, solicitor general and transport, which I have the pleasure to work with, in partnership with the minister directly assigned to this department. All the ministers are doing their job with the greatest respect for all democratic institutions.

It is not true to say that all of Canada will be considered as a controlled access zone. There are limits to exaggerating things.

• (1250)

Our fellow citizens are beginning to realize that exaggeration should be checked. If exaggeration made people sick, some would have an incurable disease and would have trouble finding a treatment. This situation has to be dealt with in a balanced way, and this is what the government is doing with this bill.

This bill has been introduced in this House, but it will also be referred to a committee, which will analyze all aspects of the bill. Some improvements may have to be made. We will have the opportunity to consider them thoroughly. We did that to such an extent with Bill C-42 that it was finally withdrawn. The bill was reworked and replaced with Bill C-55. This bill is not perfect, and will be referred to a committee to be improved.

I wish to emphasize that a \$7.7 billion budget has been allocated to various departments in order to improve our control structure and increase security for Canadians. We also travel throughout the world. Quebec is not the exclusive property of the PQ and the Bloc.

As a matter of fact, exaggeration goes over so badly that they are only at 20% or 25% in the polls. I know them well. I have fought several election campaigns against them. It is a real pleasure to campaign against them and to talk about their record. I wish to tell them once again that we are pleased to introduce Bill C-55. It is not perfect, but it can be improved.

After extended consultations with provincial governments across the country, we will now refer the bill to the committee. We are not naive and we know that nothing is perfect. We believe that Bill C-55, which allows us to improve several legislative measures involving several departments, must be approached meticulously and with respect for our fellow citizens.

Quebec will not be surrounded by a barricade. This is not how things work in life. We saw at the Quebec summit that the security perimeter was erected after a period of consultation, in order to allow people from all these countries to hold their discussions in peace. Access to important activities must be controlled. Whether we like it or not, this is how things work. We also have to protect ourselves.

When officials from all over the world are gathered together, we make every effort to ensure that the discussions are taking place in a serene environment, to promote a positive outcome.

Government Orders

I am looking forward to Bill C-55 being referred to a committee. I am looking forward to hearing witnesses and my friends from the opposition parties, particularly those from Quebec, the Bloc Québécois members. I am convinced that we will be receptive to what stakeholders have to say. I am looking forward to it and I am used to hearing their speeches. I try to react with wisdom to all their attacks. As I said before, what I like best is to campaign against Bloc Québécois members. I really enjoy it, particularly when we win. Balance is important in a democracy. They have a point of view. When things go bad, it is always Canada's fault. When things go well, it is always thanks to Quebec. This is not how things work in real life.

I am convinced that we have an important role to play as a government, and it is not the sometimes negative comments of Bloc Québécois members that will slow us down.

I look at the situation in Quebec and I see that all Quebecers want a provincial election. But the PQ does not dare call an election. A few months ago, Bloc Québécois members were all set to run as candidates in a provincial election. Now, not a single one of them is interested in doing it, because they fear that Quebecers may be tired of hearing the same old speeches after 20, 25 or 30 years.

● (1255)

Quebecers want reconciliation. They are increasingly aware that they co-own a large continent. The role of the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord is to do everything possible so that the Canadian government will help us come out of isolation. It is not PQ members who have looked after the regions the most.

[*English*]

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, if hon. members from the government and from the Bloc Québécois could step outside they might settle this dispute they seem to be having. While it is always entertaining to listen to the ongoing banter and discourse between the government and the Bloc it is not adding a lot to the debate of Bill C-55.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Marleau): Order, please. This is no time to fight. The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River.

[*English*]

Mr. Jay Hill: Madam Speaker, thank you for trying to restore a shred of decorum to the Chamber on this Friday afternoon.

I found it quite astounding to listen to the dissertation by the hon. member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord. I noticed he did not refer very much to the bill. It seemed to be an attack against the Bloc Québécois.

I have always felt that it is unfortunate when debate reaches the stage where we have just 10 minutes of debate with no questions and comments. It does not allow for the back and forth parry and thrust of a good debate. However that is where we are at and so we will continue along. Hopefully if the members still want to discuss it between the two of them they could do it outside.

I have noticed one thing about government members when they address Bill C-55. They seem to indicate that this is something the

government and country needs because of the events of September 11. All of us agree those were tragic and unprecedented events in the annals of history, certainly modern aeronautical history. Somehow that means we need to bring forward legislation like Bill C-55.

We have heard them say that we need to fast track the legislation and get it in place just in case. God forbid something like that would threaten us in the future. Hopefully the government would have the power and authority to act quickly to prevent something like that.

I want to refer to the Standing Orders of the House of Commons. Standing Order 29 states that should a quorum appear not to exist at the time the House meets, a count of the House will be taken, that if fewer than 20 members are present the Speaker will adjourn the House until the next sitting day and that the Speaker may take such an initiative only before the House has been called to order.

The interesting thing about this is the government's claims that there is a need to get the legislation before the House, get it debated, get it to committee, and get it into law. The government has 170 or so members. This morning the House waited for 23 minutes before the government could muster 20 bodies into this place to get quorum in order to debate the legislation.

● (1300)

Hon. Denis Coderre: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to remind the House that there are only three members of the Alliance now so we must be careful—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Marleau): Order, please. The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Jay Hill: Madam Speaker, obviously that does not sit well with the government. There is a responsibility of all members to be in the Chamber to listen and participate in debate. We all agree to that. However the responsibility primarily is on the government.

I have news for the government over there. It is the responsibility of the government to be here when it brings its legislation forward. It is not the legislation of the Canadian Alliance. I have an urgent breaking press release for those characters over there. It is government legislation that it is telling us is important and it cannot get 20 people to show up on a Friday to debate it.

An hon. member: Nonsense.

Mr. Jay Hill: That is not nonsense it is the truth. If the hon. member had been here this morning he would have seen that happen. I seem to have touched a raw nerve. We can hardly hear ourselves think in this place all of sudden. Even though they are few in numbers they seem to be making a lot of noise.

The hon. member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord who just spoke said opposition members should not exaggerate when they are talking about this legislation. He said they should not exaggerate the extent of the bill. He went on to say quite correctly that it amends 20 other pieces of legislation. Therefore it is an all-encompassing omnibus bill. We all agree on that.

Government Orders

This is a huge bill. It amends many statutes. The amendment to Bill C-55 put forward by my hon. colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam that we are debating states that the House should decline to give second reading to Bill C-55 since the bill reflects several principles unrelated to transport and government operations rendering it impractical for the Standing Committee on Transportation and Government Operations to properly consider it. I believe that is a well thought out amendment.

By their own admission government members who have addressed the bill, including several ministers, have pointed out how all-encompassing the bill is and yet they somehow expect the standing committee on transport to deal with this. That is totally unreasonable.

Are opposition members exaggerating when they voice concerns about the bill? Here are some concerns that were expressed yesterday in *Hansard*. We will see if they are an exaggeration. The first statement is:

First, while the bill seeks to circumscribe the power initially conferred upon the Minister of National Defence in the predecessor Bill C-42 to designate any part of Canada a military security zone, the scope of both the exercise and application of this power remain problematic.

I wonder if the hon. member from Chicoutimi would say that is an exaggeration. This particular member went on to say:

However, the definition of a “controlled access military zone” has a certain indeterminate feature to it, which could, however inadvertently, be stretched to result in the very thing that this revised version was designed to prevent, for example, the application of this power to something like the G-8 meeting in Kananaskis, simply because the presence of Canadian military equipment or personnel or foreign diplomatic personnel with their related equipment may result in a military zone being nonetheless designated.

Further on the member voiced another concern:

Second, and more important, even if the scope of this exercise of ministerial power is appropriately delineated and clarified, the absence of any cabinet or parliamentary accountability is disturbing. In effect, there is no requirement for cabinet authorization of this ministerial decree.

I wonder if the member, who is still sitting in the Chamber, would say that is an exaggeration to be concerned about that. At the end of this particular member's speech he went on to say:

However, there are also disconcerting features, as I have also described, that taint the bill and which need to be addressed and redressed so we can promote human security without unnecessarily intruding on civil liberties.

● (1305)

I agree with this particular member. It was a Liberal member, the hon. member for Mount Royal, who gave a great speech in this place about the bill. He voiced some thoughtful concerns about it.

However, I did not hear any of the Liberals. They are applauding now but if one of the opposition members were to raise those same concerns they would say we were exaggerating and not presenting them truthfully. However when it is a Liberal member who voices the same concerns everyone over there applauds. They nod their heads and say that is great.

It is a little ridiculous that we can never have a debate in this place without the government trying to play these partisan tricks on the public. However I think the public sees through this for what it is.

This piece of legislation has been ill thought through. The powers that are being bestowed upon the ministers are completely

unnecessary. By their own admission, when we were confronted by the emergency of September 11, the Minister of Transport, the Prime Minister and other ministers had the authority and the power to act appropriately. They do not need this legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to speak today on Bill C-55. Although I am not the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport in the House, my speech will be a responsible one, unlike his. In principle, he should be quite familiar with the bill and should have addressed the substance of it. Instead, all he has done is to resort to a kind of political demagoguery in order to attack the work the Bloc Québécois is doing in the House.

I have no need to be lectured by the hon. member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord. I have here a list of three pages of statements made by that member when he was on this side of the floor, and took it upon himself to assess the government on the other. I will quote from a few of them. This is a particularly strong one. Quoting the hon. member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord:

In Quebec, we have been putting up with that for 30 years from the former Prime Minister and the current one.

This was on March 20, 2000 in the House of Commons. Today, we have the hon. member on the other side of the floor.

If we want to see public confidence in politicians restored, all members of this House must have a bit of gumption and a bit of consistency.

Hon. Denis Coderre: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has spoken of the people who voted for the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, but I would also like to hear something about Lucien Bouchard.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Marleau): I am sorry, but this is not a point of order.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Madam Speaker, I said it earlier. You did not hear me. I told the member for Bourassa that I have a lot of respect for Lucien Bouchard because he at least was consistent. He did cross the floor of the House because he had certain beliefs. He did not act out of political opportunism.

I could keep on quoting the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord. For instance, on April 7, 2000, he said and I quote, “This is why I am saying that this government has no economic or social agenda”.

I will stop here to get back to the subject matter of the bill, because I am convinced that this is what people in Quebec and Canada are expecting of us. They do not expect us to criticize those who are supposed to represent voters. They want us to deal with issues they believe are a priority.

Therefore, I am very happy to rise today to speak to Bill C-55, which replaces the now defunct Bill C-42, which we did criticize and about which we raised several concerns regarding its various provisions.

Government Orders

First, if we look at only one aspect of the bill, the controlled access military zones, we must admit the government heeded the advice of the Bloc Québécois, which was asking for significant changes to the provisions contained in Bill C-42. Bill C-55 is proof the government accepted the Bloc's arguments and tightened the criteria to create controlled access military zones.

However, several aspects of the bill, as they currently stand, seem to us rather unsatisfactory, namely those dealing with controlled access military zones, as I mentioned, interim orders and intelligence gathering.

Concerning controlled access military zones, we regret that the minister still retains discretionary power to intervene. It is still the minister who has the authority to designate controlled access military zones, the same minister who forgot to inform his government about the prisoners of war.

We find it rather odd and particularly dangerous to give the minister in charge discretionary power to designate controlled access military zones.

For instance, following the decision by the minister regarding taking prisoners during the recent events in Afghanistan, we believe that discretionary power should not be given to the minister alone.

We also worry about what will happen in Quebec. Contrary to what the hon. member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord would have us believe, we have never suggested in this House that the bill could extend to the whole Quebec territory.

He should read all the remarks my colleagues have made on Bill C-55. We are not suggesting that this bill could turn the entirety of Quebec into a controlled access military zone. But the hon. member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord must admit that certain areas, environments and lands could become military zones.

I have just listened to questions asked in this House about the Quebec national assembly. The member who mentioned the risk that the area around the national assembly be designated a controlled access military zone is not a Bloc Québécois member.

There is an undeniable danger, and all the more so because military zones are designated at the discretion of the minister, and nothing in the bill provides that the approval of the Quebec government is needed. Therefore, Quebec's approval is not always required for the designation of controlled access military zones in Quebec.

● (1310)

As I said before, not only are a lot of powers in the hands of a single man, pursuant to the discretionary power stipulated in the bill before the House, but there is nothing to ensure that provinces will be consulted when such zones are established.

In areas not under federal jurisdiction and where the designated area is not on crown lands but somewhere in Quebec, we would like the government of Quebec and the rest of the provinces to give their approval beforehand.

The discretionary power to determine the size of these military zones has not changed much. It is still left to the discretion of the minister.

Bills C-42 and C-55 have something in common. The criteria for the designation of these military zones are again left at the discretion of the minister. That is rather worrisome.

Another matter of concern, and maybe the most important aspect of the bill that I will address, is that the government will not allow any action for damage by reason only of the designation of a controlled access military zone or the implementation of measures to enforce the designation.

Since the Speaker is indicating that I only have two minutes left, I will conclude.

This is a serious issue. The Privacy Commissioner told us so. He said, and I quote "Some practices are similar to those that exist in totalitarian states".

I shall therefore table an amendment to the amendment to the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-55, seconded by the hon. member for Laval Centre.

I move:

The amendment be modified by adding after the word "principles" the following:

"that violate human rights and freedoms, which have been denounced by the Privacy Commissioner and are".

I am therefore pleased to table this amendment to the amendment.

I close with my wishes for a thorough reflection on this, and for the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord to come on side with the arguments of the Bloc Québécois in order to lend this bill greater transparency and greater protection for the public.

● (1315)

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair has considered the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosemont—Petite-Patrie and has found it to be in order.

Therefore, the new motion reads as follows:

That this House declines to give second reading to Bill C-55, an act to amend certain acts of Canada, and to enact measures for implementing the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, in order to enhance public safety, since the Bill reflects several principles that violate human rights and freedoms, which have been denounced by the Privacy Commissioner and are unrelated to transport and government operations, rendering it impractical for the Standing Committee on Transport and Government Operations to properly consider it.

The debate will proceed on the amendment to the amendment. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to express my views on the tragic events that made so many victims from 1914 to 1925, when the Ottoman Empire collapsed, and that so deeply affected the

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: We are presently on Bill C-55. We just had a subamendment tabled by the member for Rosemont—Petite-Patrie. I believe the hon. member is referring to another matter that will be debated later this day.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to return to the House and speak to the amendment to the amendment put forward by the member for Rosemont—Petite-Patrie. This amendment alone sums up well the concerns those of us on this side of the House have about Bill C-55. These concerns are shared by many people outside this House and even by our colleagues across the way.

I will not comment further on the fact that the Liberal member for Mount Royal has himself expressed very serious reservations about the potential threat to human rights and freedoms represented by Bill C-55.

As I said, for a Liberal colleague to dare to ignore the rigid party line on this issue must certainly set off a few warning bells for us and cause even greater concern.

But, before going any further, I wish to take a few moments to comment on the remarks made by the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, who supposedly came to the House to support Bill C-55 and who, once again, could not resist spewing his venom on other parliamentarians, this time the Bloc Québécois members in particular.

As everyone knows, insults are the weapons of the weak. And the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord has not been without quite a stock of them during his long political career. The Progressive Conservative, Independent, Liberal member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord has often used this means of arguing his point of view. He has built up a long list of insults, and I am going to refresh our memory with some of them now just to show how consistent the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord has been. Here are a few gems. On November 29, 1999, he said:

Yes, people are tired of the constitutional debate, but they certainly need a break from the provocation carried on for the past 30 years by the leaders of the Liberal Party of Canada.

On March 20, 2000, not all that long ago, the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord said:

How does one go about getting rid of a Prime Minister who, not just in the case of Human Resources Development Canada, but in the case of the budget, is determined to interfere in all sectors of provincial jurisdiction?

How? Probably by joining his ranks. Perhaps the best way of getting rid of a Prime Minister is from inside the tent. If I were the Prime Minister of Canada, I would be asking myself some very serious questions and I would also be worried.

On the topic of federal-provincial relations, he said on April 7, 2000, and I quote:

The federal government sees itself as the father of all provinces, which it views as big municipalities. It is contemptuous.

On poverty, he stated on March 20, 2000:

In the seven years since the Liberals took office, poverty in families and child poverty have gone up 50%.

On November 30, 1998, he said:

I see that the government does not know where to start in the fight against poverty.

On the constitutional debate, still referring to his good friend, the Prime Minister of Canada, he stated on December 15, 1999:

He is the one who cooked up that procedure one night at the Chateau Laurier, a concerted effort by the federal government and nine Canadian provinces to crush Quebec, to marginalize it, to strong-arm it.

So, when they talk of the charter of rights and freedoms, the 20th anniversary of which was celebrated on April 17, the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord forgets to remind us of what he said in 1999 about the terrible night of the long knives.

• (1320)

Hon. Paul DeVillers: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member's speech is very interesting. However, I believe that there is a rule of relevance in this House and I am asking the Chair to enforce it.

• (1325)

The Deputy Speaker: We do have a rule of relevance. It is a very generous rule that many members do stretch sometimes in their introduction.

They eventually come back to the relevant subject, but they must be given a certain latitude. It is just like an elastic. The hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that I managed to get the Secretary of State for Amateur Sport out of his lethargy.

I would remind him that, when I spoke earlier, I made a connection between the charter of rights and freedoms, the 20th anniversary of which the members across the way were celebrating a few days ago, and the fact that Bill C-55 threatens this same charter of rights and freedoms. You will also remember, Mr. Speaker, that I mentioned in my previous remarks that, in connection with the charter of rights and freedoms, some have a tendency to forget to mention the shameful events surrounding the unilateral patriation of the constitution, a view that was obviously shared by the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord when he stated, on December 15, 1999, "He [the Prime Minister] was also, along with Mr. Trudeau, behind the unilateral patriation of the constitution in 1982, despite the near unanimity of the national assembly against it".

I will go even further. Regarding the unfair and revolting Bill C-20, the so-called clarity bill, the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, at a time when he had more spine, stated, on February 22, 2000:

The Liberals absolutely do not want to consult the public to find out what it thinks of this measure...Arrogance, contempt and indifference toward the House of Commons and toward all Canadians are now part of a behaviour that is beginning to spread throughout this government.

On March 20, he said:

—the wondrous Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs—

I hope that he has since patched things up with him.

—found a means for getting a bill passed for the sole purpose of disgusting everybody in Quebec and showing the rest of the country "Here we are teaching Quebecers a lesson, here we are putting them in their place".

It did not take him long to change his tune, because only a few months later, he became a Liberal member. It appears as though he liked being taught a lesson, and now he seems to want to teach Quebecers a lesson himself.

I could go on and read pages and pages more like this, but I do not want to unduly embarrass my colleague from Chicoutimi—Le Fjord. I would like to provide my colleague the Secretary of State for Amateur Sport with an opportunity to return to his coma, and all my other colleagues a few moments to focus on Bill C-55, currently before the House.

In my earlier remarks, I talked about the very serious concerns raised by Bill C-55 in terms of respect for the human rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Quebec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms and, more recently, by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

For example, when the Minister of Defence is given the authority to designate, on his own, security zones, the size of which is not defined, around military establishments or equipment, when we think of the powers that are given to cabinet members and even to bureaucrats—people who are not accountable under the principle of ministerial responsibility, which the Patriotes fought for in 1837-1838 and won since we have this responsible government today—that constitutes a very serious violation of democratic freedoms.

As I was saying earlier, the same applies to personal information regarding air travelers to which CSIS and the RCMP will have access. This bill raises very serious concerns.

I urge all members of the House, including Liberal members who share our views but who cannot speak up because of the very hermetic, monolithic and strict party line imposed by the Liberal Party, to make their views known and to encourage the government to go back to the drawing board, as it did with Bill C-42, and come up with a bill that is much more acceptable than this one in terms of respect for rights and freedoms.

•(1330)

The Deputy Speaker: I want to thank the member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes for adhering to the rule of relevance.

It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

ARMENIAN PEOPLE

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ) moved:

That this House recognize the Armenian genocide of 1915 and condemn this act as a crime against humanity.

She said: Mr. Speaker, over the next hour we will debate the following motion:

That this House recognize the Armenian genocide of 1915 and condemn this act as a crime against humanity.

As members must surely be aware, a large and vibrant Armenian community has been established for decades in Quebec and Canada. Most of its members have parents or grand-parents who survived their people's genocide, which occurred at the time of the fall of the Ottoman empire, between 1915 and 1920. Over one million

Private Members' Business

Armenians were killed because of their ethnic origin. Yet Canada has never recognized that genocide. It prefers to refer to it as a tragedy. Why is the Canadian government so overcautious?

We can only speculate. Maybe the Armenian diaspora living in Canada is not large enough. Yet there are over 100,000 Armenians living in Canada, with 60,000 of them established in Montreal and Laval, and the rest of them living in the Toronto area.

The word genocide, which is central to this motion, was used for the first time by the Polish jurist, Raphael Lemkin, in 1943. Here is how he defined the word:

By "genocide" we mean the destruction of a nation or an ethnic group...In general, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation. It means, rather, a co-ordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves.

The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, unanimously adopted in 1948 by the United Nations general assembly and ratified by Turkey, defines the legal rules. Thus, the UN definition of genocide reads as follows:

Deliberately inflicting on a national, ethnical, racial or religious group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part.

On August 29, 1985, the Armenian genocide was recognized by the United Nations Sub-Committee on Human Rights.

But the federal government's position remains an exercise in rhetoric. Since 1993, it has referred to tragic events instead of genocide. It would be unfortunate if this government refused to officially recognize the Armenian genocide because of significant economic interests in Turkey, such as the sale of Candu reactors.

Since the Liberals came to power in 1993, the members of the House have addressed the issue of the recognition of the Armenian genocide on a number of occasions. It is increasingly obvious that the people of Quebec and Canada recognize this chapter of our common history, and it is important that the House assume its moral and civil responsibility by recognizing it also.

Since 1993, six petitions coming from different areas of Canada and Quebec and asking for the recognition of the genocide were presented. These petitions show that, as citizens of Quebec, of Canada and of the world, we are all concerned about the Armenian genocide.

Many motions, introduced by hon. members, have drawn the attention of the House to this issue. On April 23, 1996, the hon. member for Ahuntsic moved, during a Bloc Québécois opposition day, that the House recognize, on the occasion of the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide that took place on April 24, 1915, the week of April 20 to 27 of each year as the week to commemorate man's inhumanity to man.

Unfortunately, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre amended the motion by changing the word genocide for the word tragedy. The motion as amended was adopted, which clearly demonstrates the Liberals' inability to recognize reality.

Private Members' Business

Since then, parliamentarians on both sides of the House presented motions on the genocide. All of them were not deemed votable. But this in no way alters the gut feeling we have that we must continue to demand that the Armenian genocide be recognized as such, in the interests of the Armenian people and of our duty to recognize and respect the truth.

Did the Armenian genocide really happen? Although some people deny it, internationally recognized historians whose reputation is well established have confirmed that the events that occurred between 1915 and 1920 do in fact constitute a genocide.

Approximately two million Armenians lived in Anatolia, near the Russian border, and many were scattered all over the Ottoman Empire. After war was declared in 1914, Armenian units fought next to the Russians in the Caucasus, which constituted a threat for the Turks.

Armenians were considered as enemies within by the authorities, following the intercommunity conflicts of April 20, 1915.

• (1335)

Armed aggression by the Turks against the Armenians caused 18 deaths among the Turks. The uprising gave them the perfect excuse for the night raids, pillage and mass murders that happened five days later on the western border.

On April 25, at dusk, they set out to arrest hundreds of Armenian journalists, artists, intellectuals, lawyers, professionals, business people and clerics who were taken away and shot. During the two following years, close to one million innocent defenseless Armenians were killed or died from cold or sickness, in camps or in the Syrian desert where they had been deported. That represented half of the entire pre-1914 population.

The chief of police of Constantinople, Bedri Bey, had planned the operation for the night of April 24 to 25. His objective was clear: to get rid of the Armenian elite. That night and the following days, 600 persons were thrown in prison and were unable to alert the international community about the massacre that was taking place.

The internationally acclaimed British historian Arnold Toynbee says that about two out of three Armenians living in the Ottoman empire were killed or died during deportation. The official Ottoman census showed that, in 1914, 1,295,000 Armenians lived in the Ottoman Republic and, in 1919, the Turkish minister of the interior himself admitted that the number of deaths was 800,000. Nowadays, Toynbee's figure is the one we recognize.

The Armenian genocide actually took place. It was deliberately orchestrated and planned by a government that, by way of a legislation dated May 27, 1915, authorized the deportation of Armenians, thereby endorsing, insidiously however, the massacre of more than one million people. This deportation was a legal cover, and the death orders were given secretly.

The final destination of the deportees' long journey being the Deir ez-Zor desert in Syria, not the green banks of the Euphrates, how is it possible not to recognize that the specific goal of this deportation, moreover under these climatic conditions, was the final solution, that is, death?

Apparently, on August 22, 1939, when announcing to the military leaders meeting in Obersalzberg that he was about to invade Poland, Adolph Hitler stated that after all, nobody remembered the extermination of the Armenians. This statement of the dictator shows that things that go unsaid, even the most horrendous, do not exist.

Is it really surprising, then, to see, 20 years later, that some members of the German mission in Constantinople, after having advised the Turkish authorities on the deportation of the Armenians in 1915, applied the final solution to the Jews?

Ever since genocide was recognized as a crime against humanity, some fear that the term "genocide" may have become misused and abused to describe crimes that do not tally with the definition. But what is the real situation? Most experts on the crimes against humanity agree that in the 20th century, there have been three or even four genocides.

The first one was of course the Armenian genocide. The second one was the Holocaust. The third happened in Rwanda, where it is estimated that 800,000 moderate Tutsis and Hutus were killed in 1994. And the last is in reference to the events in Bosnia, where the pattern of massacres was likened to a genocide without being officially recognized as such.

Each case, as specified in the definition of genocide, involves the notion of "deliberately inflicting on a national, ethnic, racial or religious group conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction, in whole or in part".

Since its inception, the Bloc Québécois has always officially recognized the Armenian genocide and promoted its recognition in the House of Commons. The Quebec national assembly and the Ontario legislature also recognized and condemned it a long time ago.

Canada is lagging behind in this issue. Many states do recognize the Armenian genocide. In the United States, the states of New York, Massachusetts, Delaware and California have recognized it.

• (1340)

Many other democratic jurisdictions, including Lebanon, Greece, Russia, Bulgaria, Belgian and Cyprus, took a stand on this matter. They all recognized the Armenian genocide.

It is the same for New South Wales in Australia, Italy, Uruguay, Argentina and Sweden. Interestingly, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and the European parliament both recognized the Armenian genocide. Just over a year ago, on January 18, 2001, the French national assembly did the same. It is our duty, as parliamentarians, to show political and social courage.

Besides the political recognition by these states and international organizations, I have to mention the following statement, which Pope John Paul II made on November 27, 2000. The message is pretty clear. Among other things, he said:

The extermination of a million and a half Armenians, generally considered genocide, and the annihilation of thousands more under a totalitarian regime are tragedies which must still live on in the memories of the present generation.

On June 10, 1999, the member for Halton, in a statement to the House on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, set out our government's position on this genocide. He said:

We remember the calamity afflicted on the Armenian people in 1915. This tragedy was committed with the intent to destroy a national group in which hundreds of thousands of Armenians were subject to atrocities which included massive deportations and massacres.

Of course, a genocide is a tragedy, but so is an earthquake, the September 11 attack or a famine. The definition given in that statement by the hon. member for Halton fully reflects that of a genocide according to the UN definition, but it avoids the ignominious word.

Here is further proof that this government is sitting on the fence by choosing meaningless words to avoid the reality, while making believe that it is sympathetic to this cause. Here is an excerpt from a letter the Armenian community received from the Prime Minister on April 24, 2001.

I am honoured to extend my sincere greetings to all those participating in the activities commemorating the 86th anniversary of the calamity suffered by the Armenian community... Let us thus be reminded how important it is to work together to eliminate intolerance and fanaticism wherever it appears.

"Calamity", "tragedy", the government certainly had time, over a period of 87 years, to consult a dictionary of synonyms to use an emphatic term to replace the only word that truly reflects the reality: "genocide". The true calamity is the attitude of a government that chooses to erase from history the first genocide of the 20th century.

While it is important to work together to eliminate intolerance, as wished by the Prime Minister, I would suggest to him that his government should avoid using meaningless terms, so as to give back their full dignity to the descendants of these victims.

Denying the word will not erase the memory of a people marked in its very identity. Denying the genocide strengthens among Armenians the feeling of injustice to their ancestors. It kills the hope of recognition by others and, more importantly, it gives support to the idea that the genocide is just a myth. Is this how the Prime Minister thinks he is working to "eliminate intolerance and fanaticism wherever it appears"? Or is he himself, with this double language, taking part in the cleansing of History? Will Canada continue to condone this war crime for a long time?

In light of this government's lack of action, how not to believe that diplomatic representations based on economic considerations could have a bearing? How can one explain the fact that many European countries had the courage to take such action?

It is interesting to see that there is a surprising trend in the statistics on trade between Turkey and those countries which have recognized the genocide. For most of the countries like Belgium, France, Russia, Argentina and even Greece, bilateral trade has increased since they have recognized the genocide. For example, Greece recognized it in 1996 and, in 1997, the value of its bilateral trade almost doubled.

Turkey and Canada enjoy friendly relations, which would certainly not be jeopardized if Canada were to recognize the reality of Armenian history. Today's Turkey is not the former Ottoman empire.

Private Members' Business

The genocide was perpetrated by the Ottoman empire, before the republic came into being. It is impossible to hold the current regimes responsible for that, unless the Turkish state itself admits its own responsibility.

• (1345)

Silence is a crime that trivializes the collective memory. To escape this unfortunate facility, which would take the focus away from the historical events, the Armenians in Canada and Quebec commemorate April 24. We owe it to them to acknowledge their history, since it is also our own.

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for sharing her views concerning the events of 1914 to 1925, during the closing years of the Ottoman empire, which claimed so many victims and had such a devastating impact on the Armenian people and other peoples in the region.

As hon. members are aware, this was a period of history when so many atrocities were committed and many people suffered. Millions were forcibly displaced, causing much suffering and many deaths.

On a number of occasions, our government has compassionately expressed its sincere sympathy for the sufferings of the Armenian people at that time. I would like to quote an excerpt from a personal message from the Prime Minister to the Canadian Armenian community on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the Armenian tragedy of 1915.

Canada recognizes and deplores the fact that a great number of Armenians were killed during the wars which marked the end of the Ottoman empire and extends its sympathy to the Armenian Community. Following the war, numerous displaced Armenians came to Canada and their contribution, as well as that of their descendants, has greatly enriched Canadian society. It is my hope that the memories of the past will serve to remind us of the importance of tolerance and respect for the diversity of our people

I would also like to remind hon. members that this House passed a motion during the 1996 debate on the Armenian tragedy, recognizing the week of April 20 to April 27 each year as a week of remembrance of the inhumanity of people toward one another.

As hon. members are also aware, after in-depth consultations, the position of the Government of Canada toward these events was set out by the hon. member for Halton on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, in a statement on June 10, 1999 before the House.

I would also remind hon. members of the response given by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the House this past April 18, to a question by our colleague, the hon. member for Brampton Centre. The minister said the following:

As he will recall, the government and the Prime Minister on many occasions have expressed the sympathy of our government and our people for the tragedy that occurred to the Armenian people with the collapse of the Ottoman Empire.

It is very clear, from all these statements, that we share the remembrance of these painful times and attach great importance to ensuring that remembrance of this human tragedy remains in our collective memory and that future generations know of it.

Private Members' Business

Canada has always been a land of hope for the millions of immigrants who have settled here and who will continue to do so in a spirit of renewal and reconciliation. Our diversity remains one of our country's great assets. It is this diversity which helps us not only to forge economic, political and cultural ties with the rest of the world, but also to project and promote our ideals and our values, such as tolerance, respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

We are all working hard to make sure that these values are reflected in the work of international organizations and in the mechanisms created in order to prevent a recurrence of the horrors of the past and to protect human rights.

● (1350)

We can speak with considerable credibility in international forums, such as the United Nations and OSCE, about the potential for persons of different nationalities and cultures to live together in peace and security.

In the same vein, how could we fail to mention the recent 20th anniversary of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms? This is another example of the importance we attach as a nation to the protection of human rights.

Canada has consistently supported the development of international instruments to promote and protect human rights and the rule of law. We are particularly proud of the leadership role played by Canada in promoting important international initiatives such as the Ottawa convention and the International Criminal Court.

I would also like to say a few words about the importance Canada attaches to establishing productive, in-depth, positive bilateral relations with all countries in the region, including Turkey and Armenia.

A stable and prosperous region, where reconciliation has triumphed and where mutual trust reigns, will lead to positive developments which will have an impact outside the immediate borders of the countries concerned, for the benefit of all, including Canada.

In conclusion, the tragic events of 1915 remind us that today more than ever it is important to encourage tolerance and reconciliation between peoples so that past tragedies, such as the one which so devastated the Armenian community, will never recur.

I would add that we must also look to the future, for what happened in the past must not be an obstacle to reconciliation, peace and prosperity.

[*English*]

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance):
Mr. Speaker, I commend the member for having moved the motion.

The 20th century was the bloodiest in human history, characterized by the mass slaughter of innocents based solely on their race, religion or ethnicity on an unprecedented scale. What Pope John Paul II has called the century of tears saw the deaths of millions of Ukrainians at the hands of Stalin, the Shoah in which six million European Jews were exterminated by Hitler, the killing fields of Cambodia, and more recent tragedies in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia.

The first modern genocide was the attempted mass extermination of Armenians in the former Ottoman empire, which began in April 1915. The Armenian genocide was very much a modern 20th century genocide made possible by the ideology of nationalism and the technology of mass warfare. The Ottoman empire had seen coexistence between different ethnic and religious minorities for many centuries but it was also an absolutist empire which became in the 19th century a cauldron of nationalist discontents.

In 1908 the young Turks movement seized power and transformed the Ottoman empire into a constitutional state. At first this change was welcomed by the empire's ethnic minorities, but their attempts to achieve autonomy led to nationalists on the Committee on Unity and Progress seizing power in 1912.

Turkish nationalists saw the presence of Armenians as a challenge to their desire to build an ethnically pure Turkish state on the Anatolian peninsula and to pursue a pan-Turkish empire in Central Asia. The loss of Ottoman territories in the Balkans to the Russians made the young Turks even more nationalist in their orientation.

Furthermore the young Turks led the Ottoman empire into an alliance with Germany against Russia in the first world war. The presence of over two million Christian Armenians between Muslim Turkey and Orthodox Christian Russia seemed like a potential internal threat.

With the outbreak of war, the young Turks decided to take action to solve what they called the Armenian question once and for all by a systematic policy of deportations and ultimately, mass slaughter; in a word, by genocide.

Young Armenian men like those in the rest of the empire were conscripted en masse into the Turkish army. Through the fall and winter of 1914 Armenians fought bravely on the front, even while at home anti-Armenian pogroms were being carried out by the young Turks' secret service and irregular units called *chetes*.

Starting in February 1915 Armenian troops were segregated into unarmed labour battalions to end the possibility of armed resistance. That same month Talaat Pasha, the interior minister, told the German ambassador that Turkey intended to use the cover of war to settle the Armenian question once and for all.

In March 1915 mass deportation of Armenians from the town of Zeitun to the deserts of central Turkey and Syria began. Local Armenians supported the Russian army taking a particular town, which then gave the government the pretext to begin mass deportations and slaughter on an unprecedented scale in history.

On April 24 and April 25 in Constantinople and elsewhere, some 650 Armenian religious leaders, intellectuals, politicians and businesspeople, in other words the entire leadership of the Armenian community, were arrested, were deported or were murdered in the following months. Meanwhile ordinary Armenians in Constantinople were butchered in the streets and in their homes. Orders went out by telegraph to begin mass deportations of Armenians on a precise and scheduled timetable co-ordinated by the secret service.

The massacres followed a common pattern. The Armenians in a community were rounded up. It was announced that they would be deported. By the hundreds and thousands they were then marched, often barefoot and without food, into the deserts. Many died on the long marches. Finally they were herded into concentration camps, where they starved or died of thirst in the burning sun. On the Black Sea Armenians were often loaded onto barges and drowned. Over the next year and in further massacres after the war in 1922, some 1.5 million Armenians were killed.

There is no question that this was genocide, the first true genocide of the 20th century. Indeed the United Nations War Crimes Commission in 1948 said that the Armenian genocide was “precisely one of the types of acts which the modern term crimes against humanity is intended to cover as a precedent for the Nuremberg tribunals”.

The International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide passed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948 stated that acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnic, racial or religious group as such constitute genocide. The legal scholar who coined the term genocide, Rafael Lemkin, said that it applied to what the Turks did to the Armenians and the Germans did to the Jews.

It is hard to grasp the systematic slaughter of one million people, so let me focus on one tragedy: the slaughter of Armenian Catholics in the town of Mardin in June 1915. Their bishop, Ignatius Maloyan, was beatified by Pope John Paul II last October at a ceremony that I was privileged to attend in Rome.

● (1355)

On April 30, 1915 Turkish soldiers surrounded the Armenian catholic church in Mardin, falsely accusing the church of hiding arms. On June 3 Turkish soldiers dragged Bishop Maloyan in chains to court with 27 of his colleagues. A kangaroo court was held on charges of arms smuggling. During the trial the chief of police asked the bishop to convert to Islam. He said he would never betray his faith. The chief hit him on the head with the rear of his pistol and ordered him put in jail. The bishop was beaten savagely by soldiers crying out “Lord have mercy on me” with each blow. After they had finished beating him, the soldiers extracted his toenails.

On June 10 the soldiers gathered the bishop along with 446 other Armenian prisoners and marched them into the desert in a convoy. The bishop encouraged his parishioners to remain firm in their faith. They prayed together and the bishop celebrated the Eucharist with a single piece of bread.

After a two hour walk, hungry, naked and chained, the soldiers attacked the prisoners and killed them before the bishop's eyes. Finally they came for him. The police chief asked Maloyan again to convert to Islam. The bishop answered “I have told you I shall live and die for the sake of my faith and religion. I take pride in the Cross of my God and Lord”. The chief drew his pistol and shot Maloyan.

I relate this story for two reasons, to put a human face on the tragedy and to remind the House that the Armenian people are one of the oldest Christian peoples in the world having converted to Christianity in 300 A.D. and mainly through the Orthodox tradition

Private Members' Business

have maintained it against tremendous challenges, the greatest of which was the genocide of 1915.

Consider these words of some of the contemporary witnesses to these events. The U.S. ambassador to the Ottoman empire, Henry Morgenthau, said:

When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversation with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact.... I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

More devastating perhaps is the statement from Count Wolff-Meternich, German ambassador to the Ottoman empire in a July 1916 cable to his chancellor:

In its attempt to carry out its purpose to resolve the Armenian question by the destruction of the Armenian race, the Turkish government has refused to be deterred neither by our representations, nor by those of the American embassy, nor by the delegate of the Pope, nor by the threats of the allied powers, nor in deference to the public opinion of the west representing one-half of the world.

● (1400)

[*Translation*]

These massacres were not happening secretly: the world knew about these terrible events at the time.

Some will question how useful it is to dig up such long buried memories and suggest that supporting this motion would only complicate our relationship with the Turks, our allies within NATO.

In fact, we must honour modern Turkey. It has proven to be a loyal friend of Canada, the United States and Western Europe. It is a democracy that is quickly moving toward an aggressive market economy. It has been able to resist threats from both Muslim fundamentalism and military dictatorship.

But it is precisely because Turkey is a democracy and an ally that wants to have an even closer relationship with Canada and the rest of the western world that we must respectfully ask it to take responsibility for this sad chapter of its history.

Germany spent hundreds of millions of dollars compensating individuals for the Holocaust and two generations educating its children about the horrible genocide against European Jews. It is now Turkey's turn to own up to its past.

[*English*]

Furthermore, the world has a responsibility to remember the horrific events of the Armenian genocide as we remember the six million Jews killed by the national socialists, the 100 million killed by the communist regimes of Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, Pol Pot and others. The 20th century brought a terrible new reality to human history, the reality of genocide. What we saw in the killing fields of Cambodia, the jungles of Rwanda and the mountains of Kosovo had its origins in the Armenian towns and villages of eastern Turkey in 1915. Hitler himself remarked to his SS officers in Poland to continue their massacres of Jews because, after all “who today speaks of the Armenians?”

Private Members' Business

Let me close by saying that to better understand the past century and to guarantee that its wars and genocide are not repeated, historians need to reintroduce the Armenian genocide into historical consciousness and demonstrate the historical similarities between the genocide and the Holocaust. Any less would deny future generations the knowledge they need to make sure that the horrors of the past are not repeated.

Let us hope the government will accept this motion and that Canada can join many other civilized countries in commemorating this terrible beginning to the tragedies of the 20th century.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is not necessarily a pleasure but it is extremely important to rise to speak to Motion No. 482 brought forward by the hon. member for Laval Centre. The motion reads:

That this House recognize the Armenian genocide of 1915 and condemn this act as a crime against humanity.

Before I go on to debate I will ask for the unanimous consent of the House to make the motion votable.

● (1405)

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for South Shore have the unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, it is important that all motions and private member's bills be votable. If they were we would have fewer of them and would spend more time on them. It is not because I support or do not support Motion No. 482 that I ask for it to be votable. It is because all motions should be votable. Members could then stand and vote and be accounted for.

I am not a historical revisionist. I do not know if we can correct the mistakes of the past. However we can prevent ourselves from committing the same acts in the future. That is what the discussion and debate should be about.

The sensitivity of the issue cannot be emphasized enough. The suffering of the Armenians at the hands of the Turks is an historical fact. It goes without discussion and without having to lay the burden of proof. The issue is this: Is it important to recognize it today and continue to let the wounds of the past bleed in the future? It is time we allowed the wounds to heal and let people move on with their lives. This should be done with regard to many issues and not only this one.

We learned a number of lessons from World War I and World War II. Our enemies in World War II are now some of our best trading partners. We sit on international joint commissions with people we met 50 years ago on the battlefield. Surely the rest of the world can find a way to do the same thing.

If we brought up every grievance, every massacre and every crime committed against another race of people we would never get to the end of the list. Man is not a perfect creature. Crimes have been committed against humanity time and time again. However it is the role of parliament to deal with the issue? I am not denying the importance of the issue to many people. However there are other issues we should be dealing with.

We had this discussion earlier regarding national drinking water standards. We could go on and on about the issues not being addressed by the government. I am not saying this is a frivolous or deleterious motion. I am questioning whether it is the role or job of parliament to make a decision about a crime committed 85 years ago.

After 85 years surely there should be a way for people of Armenian or Turkish heritage to put aside the wrongs of the past and worry about how we will live together in the future. I do not know what that way will be. However I do not know how addressing this motion in the Parliament of Canada will contribute to the healing. We may simply be inflaming the issue and contributing to something else altogether.

It is not always important to lay blame. Sometimes it cannot be done. It is important to find a way for not only Armenians and Turks but all Canadians to live together. Let us take a lesson from what happened and not make the same mistake again.

● (1410)

Let us not spend all of our time in the House of Commons trying to right the wrongs of the past and, quite frankly, trying to right the wrongs that occurred on another continent. We have the second and third generations of some of those Armenian families living in Canada. We have the second and third generations of some of those Turkish families living in Canada. Our own ancestors fought wars in the British Isles and there are still people fighting wars between Britain and Ireland. Only now are they starting to be extinguished.

My own ancestors came from Scotland because they lost the war with the British. Surely that should not cause me to hate all the British. Surely we are beyond that. Who was right and who was wrong in the highland clearances does not change the fact that they occurred, nor should it change how I look upon someone in the future. Quite frankly, it is not the sins of our fathers that we need to be concerned with but how we live our lives and how we contribute to society.

For those reasons, I certainly did ask, and it was refused, to have the bill made votable because I think all bills should be votable. However, also for those reasons it would not be a motion that I would tend to support, not because I believe the motion is not important to a lot of individuals but because I do not think that is the role of the Parliament of Canada.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that the members would use up the whole hour allocated to private members' business, but seeing that nobody else was asking to speak, I had to get up and say a few words. I would first like to thank and congratulate my colleague from Laval Centre for raising this important issue in the House once again.

Unlike what the previous speaker said, however, I believe that it is most important that parliament take a stand on such an issue. Not that we should rewrite history or think we can rewrite history, not that we can rectify history. We simply want to recognize what happened.

Private Members' Business

As my colleague from Laval Centre was saying, if history is not recognized, it does not exist. There is nothing more dramatic in the collective memory of a people than when the great moments of its history, happy or tragic, are considered as non events, as never having occurred.

I am in a particularly good position to say this. As everybody knows, a short while ago I submitted a motion to the House. No later than last Friday, I have submitted to the House a new motion asking that a tragic moment of our history be recognized.

As my colleague, the member for Laval Centre, mentioned earlier, the Armenian genocide may well seem like a distant even that took place at the gateway to Asia, and therefore it may seem far removed from us and we may not feel that it affects us much, if at all. However, this is not the case. First, many Canadians are of Armenian descent, and by recognizing the Armenian genocide, this in no way reflects badly on Canadians of Turkish descent, since, as my colleague from Laval Centre said, the Republic of Turkey is not responsible for the former empire, the Ottoman empire.

Obviously, we are concerned because of Canadians of Armenian descent. Incidentally, I have the pleasure of employing here on the hill, a Quebecer of Armenian descent. Which goes to prove that each and every one of us in our respective communities is affected by this issue.

As citizens of this planet, which is getting smaller and smaller as a result of globalization and improved communications, we have a responsibility vis-à-vis the history of humanity. We must record these tragic events that did occur, if but to ensure that human memory strives to avoid a recurrence of them.

I will come back for a few moments to a specific issue. I certainly would not want to give the impression that I am trying to branch off the debate on this fundamental issue of the Armenian genocide to another issue that seems just as fundamental. I simply want to indicate how greatly I am affected by the issue brought to our attention by my colleague from Laval Centre.

I am a Quebecer of Acadian descent. I am proud of my roots, but there is another major, fundamental, undeniable historical event, the deportation, which caused the extermination or disappearance—if I can put it that way—of more than half of the Acadian population at the time. This event is still considered to some extent, in the eyes of history, as a non-event.

● (1415)

It is a non-event, because it has never been officially recognized. No one has taken responsibility for this tragedy. In fact, for a long time, Acadians took the blame or felt they had to take the blame for this, as if they were responsible for what they were subjected to in 1755.

To come back to the issue before the House today, I would like to say that we should not suggest, as some people tend to do about the deportation of the Acadians, that there were reasons for such a horrendous event. Nothing can justify the inhuman and degrading experience Armenians had to go through in 1915 and in the following months.

This is the latest attempt to ensure that this parliament, just like the Quebec National Assembly, the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and several European parliaments, does what history and fundamental justice require from us, which is to recognize the Armenian genocide for what it was.

Ever since it took office in 1994, the government has used lots of euphemisms to avoid talking about a genocide. Let us find the political courage—which is what our constituents expect from us—to call a spade a spade.

There certainly was a tragedy, a disaster. However, since the definition set out by the government which, as pointed out by my colleague from Laval-Centre, is the exact replica of that definition by the United Nations of what is now called a genocide—because this disaster, this tragedy in light of the definition put forward by the government and the UN actually is a genocide—why do we not call it just that?

Mr. Speaker, I urge you once again to ask unanimous consent to make this motion, brought forward by my colleague from Laval Centre, a votable item.

● (1420)

The Deputy Speaker: Does the member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that close to some 700,000 Armenians were killed or died of starvation and disease while being relocated during the first world war in eastern Anatolia. It is also a fact that more than 2 million Turks and Muslims were massacred in eastern Anatolia at the turn of the 20th century and during the first world war by Armenian revolutionary bands acting in co-operation with the Russians who were the Ottoman Empire's enemy.

What happened in eastern Anatolia during the first world war were tragic events from which lessons should be learned, for all of us here today and for the future, so that similar incidents of such ultra-nationalism that result in the total uprooting and devastation of any community around the world is not allowed to occur again.

The world has heard a lot about the Armenian losses due to the tireless efforts of Armenian individuals who in some cases it is sad to say have resorted to terrorism. The Turks recognize the Armenian deaths and they also acknowledge the suffering that took place in eastern Anatolia so many years ago.

Private Members' Business

What the Turks so strenuously object to is the Armenian activists' one sided portrayal of the tragic events to the world community and labelling them as genocide using in some cases distortion or exaggeration of facts to further their political agenda of obtaining money and land from Turkey. While doing so Armenians ignore the death and massacre of more than twice as many Turks at the hands of the Armenian revolutionary bands and the Russians whom they were helping during the first world war.

The Armenian accusations or allegations were not countered in North America and Europe until the 1980s because there were no significant populations outside Turkey until then. Armenians were unopposed in terms of the viewpoint of history they depicted to the North American public. Therefore others around the world did not have that understanding of another point of view on things.

Now that world opinion is becoming aware of the Armenian massacres of the Turkish and Muslim population, Armenian activists accuse anybody who questions their version of the events as attempting to rewrite history.

No Armenian publication or conference ever mentions the massacres of the Turkish and Muslim population by the Armenian revolutionary bands and terrorist organizations such as Hunchak and Dashnaksutiun. In the kinds of genocide that Armenians claim, the alleged perpetrators ended up having ironically more dead than the victims, some 2 million Turks and Muslims.

After the first world war the Ottoman capital was under allied occupation and all state archives were under the control of the British authorities in Istanbul. As a result of constant accusations by Armenian individuals the British finally decided to transport more than 140 Ottoman high officials and cabinet members to Malta for a trial; almost like an anticipation of the Nuremberg trials.

The prisoners were held in Malta for 30 months while the British, French and the Americans searched feverishly for evidence. If there were any credible witnesses or evidence regarding the alleged Armenian massacres they should have been found in that period of time.

However, as a matter of fact, no evidence could be found in Paris, Istanbul or Anatolia to support the charge that the Ottomans had planned a mass slaughter of the Armenians. This is not at all to deny that very tragically and even horrifically large numbers of people were killed. I guess some would maybe question, and I am not the one who has a perfect knowledge of this, that it should be called a genocide.

The British high commission was unable to forward any legal evidence to London. There was nothing in the British archives that corroborated the accusations of the Armenians. I guess at the end of the day these individuals had to be released. Even though there had been those with utmost zeal trying to bring it forward, no evidence was produced.

I stand here today saying that we should move on, that we would not necessarily benefit a whole lot by looking back when there is a

differing point of view here. Horrific events were perpetrated on the Armenians but also upon the Turks by these Armenian bands. I stand before the House today not having a final, settled, and determined conclusion about the matter. However I want there to be a more serious look at some of the other atrocities that were perpetrated upon the 2 million Turkish people in those days.

I am appealing for some balance in looking at some of the evidence and information. I am not convinced there is a reason and benefit in declaring an Armenian genocide, such that we would benefit in a big way from that in the future.

• (1425)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond by first thanking my colleagues who have spoken to the motion before the House, whatever their views might have been.

The fact that we have different viewpoints clearly indicates that the time has come for this parliament to take a strong stand on this issue. If we had to wait for unanimity, we would get to vote on very few issues. Parliament is where decisions are made.

It is most unfortunate that the unanimous consent which was requested twice was not given. In my mind, that is miscarriage of democracy. Since September 11, democracy has been miscarried a few times in this House, which has ordinary Canadians and political analysts in Canada and around the world a bit worried.

Today, we were given the opportunity to demonstrate our values and the significance we give to history, and to say how despicable we find those well-orchestrated plans to eradicate a whole nation.

Of course, a people can be eradicated in very subtle ways. I will not go into this today, but one thing is clear, the events that took place between 1915 and 1920 nearly eradicated the Armenian people.

However, the Armenian people, because it has suffered so much, was incapable of recovering. Indeed, one only has to look at the numbers of Armenian artists who make us proud in Quebec and Canada because they have become integrated into our culture.

Finally, I would like to invite hon. members to go to see the latest movie by Atom Egoyan, an Armenian filmmaker, who has won many prizes for his work. It deals with the Armenian genocide. By watching this film, many of us will have a better understanding of what the destruction of a society means.

The Deputy Speaker: The period provided for consideration of private members' business has now expired. Since the motion has not been selected as a votable item, the item is dropped from the order paper.

It being 2.29 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.30 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. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. PIERRE BRIEN

HON. RALPH GOODALE

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

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
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bagnell, Larry	Yukon	Yukon	Lib.
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	CA
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
Bélaïr, Réginald, The Acting Speaker	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, Hon. Maurizio, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	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
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour and Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CA
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	PC
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, Hon. Gerry, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	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 National Revenue	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Quebec	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Quebec	Ind.
Carroll, Aileen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	Nova Scotia	PC
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 Justice and Attorney General of Canada	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	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Clark, Right Hon. Joe	Calgary Centre	Alberta	PC
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	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	Etobicoke North	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	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CA
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Hon. Paul, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Hon. Herb, Minister of Natural Resources	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		Newfoundland and Labrador	PC
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la- Chaudière	Quebec	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
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	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	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, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay—Boundary— Okanagan	British Columbia	CA
Graham, Hon. Bill, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	CA
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	CA
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency— Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CA

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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		Newfoundland and Labrador	PC
Herron, John	St. John's West		
	Fundy—Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	CA
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	CA
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
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CA
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, The Deputy Speaker	Stormont—Dundas— Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Hon. Gar, Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)	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.
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
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	CA
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CA
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Macklin, Paul Harold, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve, Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations	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, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	Quebec	BQ
Marciel, Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Quebec	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Manitoba	Ind. Cons.
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 and Labrador	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	British Columbia	CA
McCallum, Hon. John, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	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 Health	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	British Columbia	CA
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	British Columbia	CA
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, Beaches—East York	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.
Normand, Hon. Gilbert	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for 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, Hon. Stephen, Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Hon. Rey, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	Manitoba	CA
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Ind.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)	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	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim	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, Leader of the Opposition	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	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Industry	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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	CA
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 Fisheries and Oceans	West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	CA
Tirabassi, Tony	Niagara Centre	Ontario	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
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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Whelan, Hon. Susan, Minister for International Cooperation	Essex.....	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford.....	British Columbia	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver.....	British Columbia	CA
Wilfert, Bryon, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance.	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 - Progressive Conservative Party; 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 (25)		
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
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	CA
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton Centre-East	CA
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	CA
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 (Asia-Pacific)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Health	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	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CA
Dhaliwal, Hon. Herb, Minister of Natural Resources	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	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	CA

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	CA
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CA
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	CA
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	CA
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	CA
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	CA
Moore, James	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	CA
Owen, Hon. Stephen, Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Peschisolido, Joe	Richmond	Lib.
Reynolds, John, Leader of the Opposition	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	CA
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	CA
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	CA
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	CA
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	CA
MANITOBA (13)		
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	CA
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Ind. Cons.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Hon. Rey, Minister of Veterans Affairs	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 and Secretary of State (Multi-culturalism) (Status of Women)	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
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
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (5)		
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	PC
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.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Cuzner, Rodger	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Lib.
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
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 Fisheries and Oceans	West Nova	Lib.
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
ONTARIO (102)		
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.
Bélaire, Réginald, The Acting Speaker	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of National Revenue	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	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Hon. Paul, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	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, Hon. Bill, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	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, The Deputy Speaker	Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Hon. Gar, Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)	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, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Northumberland	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve, Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations	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, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
McCallum, Hon. John, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	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.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Milliken, Hon. Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis	Toronto—Danforth	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Beaches—East York	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 for 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	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 Industry	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, Hon. Susan, Minister for International Cooperation	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	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.
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
QUEBEC (73)		
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
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	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	Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-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, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	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
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.
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	BQ
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	BQ
Marcil, Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Lib.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonnette	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)	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	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, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Wascana	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Lib.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Ind.
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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Yelich, Lynne	Blackstrap	CA

YUKON (1)

Bagnell, Larry	Yukon	Lib.
----------------------	-------------	------

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of May 3, 2002 — 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	Richard Marceau	Brian Pallister	(16)
G�rard Binet	John Finlay	Inky Mark	Beno�t Serr�	
Serge Cardin	John Godfrey	Pat Martin	Guy St-Julien	
Jean-Guy Carignan				

Associate Members

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

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 Roger Gallaway John Harvard	Loyola Hearn Betty Hinton Wendy Lill	Caroline St-Hilaire Chuck Strahl 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 Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Richard Harris John Herron Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Rahim Jaffer Dale Johnston Gerald Keddy Jason Kenney	Stan Keyes Robert Lanctôt Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Preston Manning Richard Marceau Serge Marcil 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 Hélène Scherrer Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Darrel Stinson Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Vic Toews Suzanne Tremblay Maurice Vellacott Elsie Wayne Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich
---	--	--	---

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SPORT

Chair:	Dennis Mills	Vice-Chair:		
Rodger Cuzner Cheryl Gallant	John Harvard Loyola Hearn	Robert Lanctôt Serge Marcil	Dick Proctor Hélène Scherrer	(9)

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs:

Diane Ablonczy
Jerry Pickard

Mark Assad
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
John Godfrey

Art Hanger
Steve Mahoney
Inky Mark

Anita Neville
David Price
Stéphan Tremblay

Tony Valeri
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
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
Paul Forseth
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	John Herron	Gary Lunn	Andy Savoy
Bernard Bigras	Gar Knutson	Karen Redman	Hélène Scherrer
Joe Comartin	Rick Laliberte	Julian Reed	Alan Tonks
Marcel Gagnon			

(16)

Associate Members

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

FINANCE**Chair:**

Sue Barnes

Vice-Chairs:Nick Discepola
Richard HarrisCarolyn Bennett
Scott Brison
Roy Cullen
Albina GuarnieriRahim Jaffer
Sophia Leung
Yvan Loubier
Grant McNallyMaria Minna
Shawn Murphy
Lorne Nystrom
Charlie PensonPauline Picard
Gary Pillitteri
Bryon Wilfert

(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
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Hedy Fry
Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Gilles-A. Perron
Joe PeschisolidoJames 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
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 G�rard Asselin Andr� 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:	Jean Augustine	Vice-Chairs:	Stockwell Day Bernard Patry	
Sarkis Assadourian	John Duncan	Francine Lalonde	Deepak Obhrai	(18)
George Baker	John Harvard	Diane Marleau	Pierre Paquette	
Aileen Carroll	Marlene Jennings	Keith Martin	Svend Robinson	
Bill Casey	Stan Keyes	Pat O'Brien		

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair:	Mac Harb	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Casey	Mark Eyking	Pierre Paquette	Bob Speller	(9)
Rick Casson	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 MerrifieldAndré Bachand
Diane Bourgeois
Jeannot Castonguay
Brenda ChamberlainStan Dromisky
James Lunney
Réal MénardHélène Scherrer
Judy Sgro
Carol SkeltonBob Speller
Yolande Thibeault
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(16)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
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 DoyleJohn Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Hedy Fry
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 JafferDale Johnston
Gerald 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 PeschisolidoPauline Picard
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
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:	Monte Solberg Diane St-Jacques	
Eugène Bellemare	Raymonde Folco	Serge Marcil	Larry Spencer	(18)
Paul Crête	Monique Guay	Joe McGuire	Greg Thompson	
Libby Davies	Tony Ianno	Anita Neville	Alan Tonks	
Reed Elley	Gurbax Malhi	Werner Schmidt		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	Brian Pallister
Diane Ablonczy	Ken Epp	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Jim Pankiw
Peter Adams	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gerald Keddy	Charlie Penson
Rob Anders	Paul Forseth	Jason Kenney	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Christiane Gagnon	Robert Lanctôt	Scott Reid
André Bachand	Marcel Gagnon	Wendy Lill	John Reynolds
Roy Bailey	Cheryl Gallant	Gary Lunn	Gerry Ritz
Carolyn Bennett	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	James Lunney	Jean-Yves Roy
Leon Benoit	John Godfrey	Peter MacKay	Carol Skelton
Rick Borotsik	Yvon Godin	Preston Manning	Kevin Sorenson
Diane Bourgeois	Peter Goldring	Richard Marceau	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitreuz	Jim Gouk	Inky Mark	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Keith Martin	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Pat Martin	Tony Tirabassi
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Philip Mayfield	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Larry McCormick	Stéphan Tremblay
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	Grant McNally	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	John Herron	Réal Ménard	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Joe Clark	Grant Hill	Val Meredith	Elsie Wayne
John Cummins	Jay Hill	Rob Merrifield	Randy White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Howard Hilstrom	Bob Mills	Ted White
Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton	James Moore	John Williams
Norman Doyle	Rahim Jaffer	Deepak Obhrai	Lynne Yelich
Antoine Dubé			

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Carolyn Bennett	Vice-Chair:		
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Raymonde Folco	Wendy Lill	Greg Thompson	(9)
Reed Elley	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Anita Neville	Tony Tirabassi	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

Chair:	John Godfrey	Vice-Chair:		
Libby Davies	Anita Neville	Diane St-Jacques	Tony Tirabassi	(9)
Monique Guay	Larry Spencer	Greg Thompson	Alan Tonks	

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: Walt Lastewka

Vice-Chairs: Dan McTeague
James Rajotte

Larry Bagnell
Stéphane Bergeron
Scott Brison
Bev Desjarlais

Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold

Serge Marcil
Andy Savoy
Brent St. Denis

Paddy Torsney
Joseph Volpe
Susan Whelan

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Mauril Bélanger
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Pierre Brien
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers

Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
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
Dale Johnston

Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette

Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
Dick Proctor
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:	Derek Lee	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Blaikie	Lynn Myers	Kevin Sorenson	Pierrette Venne	(11)
Marlene Jennings	David Pratt	Vic Toews	Bryon Wilfert	
Peter MacKay	Geoff Regan			

LIAISON

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	Walt Lastewka	
Peter Adams	Raymond Bonin	Gurmant Grewal	Judi Longfield	(19)
Jean Augustine	Bonnie Brown	Charles Hubbard	David Pratt	
Sue Barnes	Charles Caccia	Ovid Jackson	Andy Scott	
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Clifford Lincoln	John Williams	
Carolyn Bennett				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Reed Elley	Walt Lastewka	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Ken Epp	James Lunney	Scott Reid
Reg Alcock	Brian Fitzpatrick	Peter MacKay	John Reynolds
Rob Anders	Paul Forseth	Steve Mahoney	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Cheryl Gallant	Preston Manning	Jacques Saada
Jean Augustine	Yvon Godin	Keith Martin	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Jim Gouk	Rob Merrifield	Monte Solberg
Bill Blaikie	Michel Guimond	Bob Mills	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitkreuz	Art Hanger	Dennis Mills	Larry Spencer
Pierre Brien	Mac Harb	James Moore	Diane St-Jacques
Andy Burton	Richard Harris	Lorne Nystrom	Paul Steckle
Chuck Cadman	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Darrel Stinson
Murray Calder	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Yolande Thibeault
Rick Casson	Howard Hilstrom	Jim Pankiw	Myron Thompson
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	Denis Paradis	Vic Toews
John Cummins	Rahim Jaffer	Charlie Penson	Maurice Vellacott
Libby Davies	Dale Johnston	Joe Peschisolido	Tom Wappel
Stockwell Day	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Beth Phinney	Randy White
Nick Discepola	Jason Kenney	David Price	Ted White
John Duncan	Karen Kraft Sloan	Marcel Proulx	Lynne Yelich

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	Walt Lastewka	
Mauril Bélanger	Charles Hubbard			(4)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	Walt Lastewka	
Mauril Bélanger	Clifford Lincoln	Judi Longfield	John Williams	(7)
Bonnie Brown				

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:	David Pratt	Vice-Chairs:	Leon Benoit David Price	
Rob Anders Claude Bachand Colleen Beaumier Stan Dromisky	Cheryl Gallant 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 Roy Bailey Stéphane Bergeron Rick Borotsik Garry Breitreuz 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 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
--	--	--	---

SUB-COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:	Colleen Beaumier	Vice-Chair:		
Roy Bailey Dan McTeague	Louis Plamondon Carmen Provenzano	Peter Stoffer Elsie Wayne	Bob Wood	(8)

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Peter Adams	Vice-Chairs:	Dale Johnston Jacques Saada	
Rick Borotsik	Yvon Godin	Paul Harold Macklin	John Reynolds	(16)
Garry Breitkreuz	Michel Guimond	Carolyn Parrish	John Richardson	
Pierre Brien	Joe Jordan	Geoff Regan	Tony Tirabassi	
Marlene Catterall				

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Marcel Proulx	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Blaikie	Michel Guimond	Val Meredith	Tony Tirabassi	(6)
Rick Borotsik				

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY CALENDAR

Chair:	Marlene Catterall	Vice-Chair:		
Garry Breitkreuz	Pierre Brien	Yvon Godin	Jay Hill	(5)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

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

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMBATING CORRUPTION

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

TRANSPORT AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair:	Ovid Jackson	Vice-Chairs:	James Moore Marcel Proulx	
Reg Alcock	Bev Desjarlais	André Harvey	Gerry Ritz	(16)
Gerry Byrne	Norman Doyle	Mario Laframboise	Alex Shepherd	
John Cannis	Jim Gouk	Ghislain Lebel	Paul Szabo	
Joe Comuzzi				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	Joe Peschisolido
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Dick Proctor
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dominic LeBlanc	Scott Reid
G�rard Asselin	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	John Reynolds
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	Peter Goldring	Serge Marcil	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitreuz	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	Bernard Patry	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Charles Hubbard	Charlie Penson	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	Hedy Fry	Derek Lee	Jacques Saada	(13)
Bernard Bigras	Mac Harb	R�al M�nard	Kevin Sorenson	
Libby Davies	Dominic LeBlanc			

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Carolyn Bennett
Vivienne Poy

Joint Vice-Chair: Deborah Grey

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Jane Marie Cordy

Donald Oliver

Mauril Bélanger
Robert Bertrand
Rick Borotsik
Marlene Catterall
Ken Epp
Marcel Gagnon
Grant Hill

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

(20)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
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
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
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
Darrel Stinson
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
Jean-Robert Gauthier
Viola Léger

Jean-Claude Rivest
Raymond Setlakwe

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

Peter Goldring
John Herron
Jason Kenney
Raymond Lavigne
Dan McTeague
Benoît Sauvageau

(22)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitkreuz
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
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

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 Chairs: Gurmant Grewal
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair: Tom Wappel

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Bill Casey
Christopher Henderson
Mobina Jaffer

Noël Kinsella
Wilfred Moore
Greg Thompson

Sue Barnes
Paul Bonwick
Pierre Brien
Jean-Guy Carignan
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Michel Guimond
Gar Knutson

Derek Lee
Paul Harold Macklin
Lynn Myers
Lorne Nystrom
Scott Reid
Greg Thompson
Ted White

(24)

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
Jim Gouk
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
Robert Lanctôt
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
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
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
Hon. David Collenette	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. John Manley	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations
Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
Hon. Art Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Health
Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Industry
Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Solicitor General of Canada
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
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 Public Works and Government Services
Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour and Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
Hon. Robert Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Denis Coderre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Robert Thibault	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Minister of Veterans Affairs
Hon. Bill Graham	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Susan Whelan	Minister for International Cooperation
Hon. Gerry Byrne	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
Hon. Paul DeVillers	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Gar Knutson	Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)
Hon. Denis Paradis	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)
Hon. Claude Drouin	Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. John McCallum	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
Hon. Stephen Owen	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)

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. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Ms. Sarmite Bulte	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Steve Mahoney	to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations
Mr. Bryon Wilfert	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. John O'Reilly	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Lynn Myers	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Alex Shepherd	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Paul Harold Macklin	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Ms. Raymonde Folco	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Bill Matthews	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Pat O'Brien	to the Minister for International Trade
Mr. Paul Szabo	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Mr. Larry McCormick	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Mr. Benoît Serré	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. John Finlay	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Ms. Sophia Leung	to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Mark Assad	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Carmen Provenzano	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Minister for International Cooperation

CONTENTS

Friday, May 3, 2002

Business of the House

The Deputy Speaker 11161

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Public Safety Act, 2002

Bill C-55. Second reading 11161
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral 11161
Ms. Meredith 11163
Ms. Davies 11164
Mr. Gouk 11165

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Youth Orchestra Festival

Mr. LeBlanc 11166

Hockey

Mr. Fitzpatrick 11166

The Netherlands

Mr. O'Reilly 11166

Diabetes Awareness

Ms. Karetak-Lindell 11166

Multiculturalism

Mr. Tirabassi 11166

The Netherlands

Mrs. Gallant 11167

Charter of Rights and Freedoms

Mr. Assad 11167

Bell Walk for Kids

Ms. Dalphond-Guiral 11167

Multiculturalism

Mr. Richardson 11167

Woodrow Lloyd

Mr. Proctor 11167

Transparency International

Mr. Wilfert 11167

Premier of Ontario

Mr. Herron 11168

Cultural Communities

Mr. Harvey 11168

Church of the Nativity

Mr. Kenney 11168

Asian Heritage Month

Ms. Leung 11168

World Press Freedom Day

Mr. Desrochers 11169

Government Expenditures

Mr. Penson 11169

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Trade

Mr. Reynolds 11169
Mr. Rock 11169
Mr. Reynolds 11169
Mr. Rock 11169
Mr. Reynolds 11169
Mr. Rock 11170

Agriculture

Mr. Penson 11170
Mr. Vanclief 11170
Mr. Penson 11170
Mr. Vanclief 11170

Softwood Lumber

Ms. St-Hilaire 11170
Mr. Rock 11170
Ms. St-Hilaire 11170
Mr. Rock 11170
Mr. Bergeron 11170
Mr. Rock 11171
Mr. Bergeron 11171
Mr. Rock 11171
Mrs. Desjarlais 11171
Mr. Rock 11171
Ms. Davies 11171
Mr. Rock 11171

Agriculture

Mr. Borotsik 11171
Mr. Vanclief 11171
Mr. Borotsik 11171
Mr. Vanclief 11172

Lumber Industry

Mrs. Hinton 11172
Mr. Rock 11172
Mrs. Hinton 11172
Mr. Rock 11172

Urban Affairs

Mr. Guimond 11172
Mr. Collenette 11172
Mr. Guimond 11172
Mr. Collenette 11172

Agriculture

Mr. Pallister 11172
Mr. Vanclief 11173
Mr. Pallister 11173
Mr. Anderson (Victoria) 11173

Immigration

Ms. Dalphond-Guiral 11173
Mr. Coderre 11173
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral 11173

Mr. Coderre	11173
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency	
Mr. Gouk	11173
Mr. MacAulay	11173
Mr. Gouk	11173
Mr. Coderre	11174
Canada-U.S. Border	
Mr. Bryden	11174
Mr. Jordan	11174
Agriculture	
Mr. Proctor	11174
Mr. Vanclief	11174
Health	
Ms. Davies	11174
Mrs. Stewart	11174
Softwood Lumber	
Mr. Keddy	11174
Mr. Rock	11174
Mr. Keddy	11175
Mr. Rock	11175
Microbreweries	
Mr. Kenney	11175
Mr. Wilfert	11175
Mr. Kenney	11175
Mr. Wilfert	11175
The Environment	
Mr. Bigras	11175
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	11175
Mr. Bigras	11175
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	11175
Agriculture	
Mr. Fitzpatrick	11176
Mr. Vanclief	11176
Mr. Fitzpatrick	11176
Mr. Vanclief	11176
Africa	
Mr. Reed	11176
Ms. Whelan (Essex)	11176
Agriculture	
Mr. Vellacott	11176
Mr. Vanclief	11176
Mr. Vellacott	11176
Mr. Vanclief	11176
Auto Industry	
Mr. Perron	11177
Mr. Rock	11177
Communications Canada	
Mr. Murphy	11177
Mr. Boudria	11177
Leadership Campaigns	
Mr. Rajotte	11177
Mr. Rock	11177

École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe	
Mr. Loubier	11177
Mr. Vanclief	11177
Agriculture	
Mr. Proctor	11177
Mr. Vanclief	11178
Public Works and Government Services	
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	11178
Mr. Boudria	11178
Presence in Gallery	
The Deputy Speaker	11178

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Harvey	11178
Committees of the House	
Fisheries and Oceans	
M. LeBlanc	11178
Income Tax Act	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	11178
Bill C-461. Introduction and first reading	11178
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	11178
Petitions	
CRTC	
Ms. Meredith	11178
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Harvey	11179
Request for Emergency Debate	
Canada-U.S. Relations	
Mr. Reynolds	11179
Speaker's Ruling	

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Public Safety Act, 2002	
Bill C-55. Second reading	11179
Mr. Gouk	11179
Mr. Bergeron	11180
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	11181
Ms. Carroll	11182
Mr. Keddy	11182
Mr. Harvey	11184
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	11185
Mr. Bigras	11186
Sub-amendment	11187
Ms. Carroll	11187
Mr. Bergeron	11188

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Armenian People	
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	11189
Motion	11189
Ms. Carroll	11191

Mr. Kenney.....	11192
Mr. Keddy.....	11194
Mr. Bergeron.....	11194
Mr. Vellacott.....	11195

Ms. Dalphond-Guiral.....	11196
--------------------------	-------

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**