



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 025 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, October 31, 1997

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 31, 1997

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1000)

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. David M. Collette (for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved that Bill C-16, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Interpretation Act (powers to arrest and enter dwellings), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the motion to refer Bill C-16, the powers to enter dwellings to arrest act, to the justice committee for second reading of that bill in this House.

Bill C-16 will enable peace officers to enter dwellings for the purposes of arrest in a manner which conforms to constitutional requirements. The bill essentially creates a warrant scheme by which peace officers may obtain judicial authorization before entering a dwelling to arrest someone. The bill also sets out certain circumstances under which such warrants or authorizations are not required.

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

As we all know, on May 22, 1997, the Supreme Court of Canada rendered a decision which has a significant impact on the way police forces may exercise their power of arrest.

It is a matter of determining whether, under common law, an arrest can take place in a dwelling house with no prior judicial intervention. In the Queen v. Feeney decision, the five majority judges ruled that, because of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, police forces must first secure a warrant for entry to carry out an arrest in a dwelling house.

[*English*]

Given that the Criminal Code does not specifically provide a mechanism for obtaining judicial authorization prior to entering a dwelling for the purpose of arrest, a majority of the Supreme Court of Canada in R. v. Feeney suggested that such a provision be read in pending the appropriate legislative changes. It is to that invitation that Parliament is asked to respond today.

[*Translation*]

I can assure you that the judicial uncertainty caused by the decision in the Feeney case was of great concern to law enforcement authorities across Canada. In fact, provinces and territories responded to this decision by proposing temporary and singularly different solutions to enable police forces to perform their duties as best they could while taking into account the new requirements of the Canadian charter.

As requested by the attorneys general of British Columbia, Alberta, Canada, Ontario and Quebec in the days following the decision in the Feeney case, the Supreme Court of Canada granted a stay of proceedings for six months from the date of the decision on application of the Feeney decision. Consequently, unless the stay is extended, any amendment to the Criminal Code should be made by November 1997 at the latest to prevent a legislative vacuum after that date.

The Minister of Justice is prepared to co-operate with the hon. members of this House, on both sides of the floor I might add, to meet the deadline set by the Supreme Court of Canada.

The Minister of Justice believes that Bill C-16 contains a system to obtain entry warrants which, on the one hand, is designed to serve the interests of those responsible for law enforcement by giving police forces the power to enter dwelling houses with or without an arrest warrant and, on the other hand, respects the privacy of individuals in their dwelling houses, as guaranteed under the charter.

Members of the public and law enforcement officials could argue that the bill does not go far enough by not giving police officers the same powers of entry and arrest they had before, I repeat before, the Feeney decision.

[*English*]

However, given that Feeney was decided on constitutional grounds, it would not be possible to restore the common law power

Government Orders

to enter a dwelling to arrest. To put it plainly, the court has ruled that the privacy interests must be balanced against the interests of the state to arrest in a dwelling house and that balancing of interests must be done by a judge. If the legal framework is flexible enough, there should be a way to balance those competing interests without jeopardizing the safety of Canadians. Bill C-16 does just that.

At the other end of the spectrum, some people would argue that the supreme court has suggested that in all cases the police would have to obtain an arrest warrant which would be accompanied by an authorization to enter the dwelling. From this perspective the police would have to formally charge someone before obtaining an authorization to enter. We do not think that this is needed in order to satisfy the constitutional requirements imposed by the supreme court.

• (1010)

What is constitutionally mandated is that an impartial arbitrator decide whether the entry on private premises should be permitted in order to effect an arrest.

In the view of the Minister of Justice, requiring that someone be charged before a warrant for entry can be issued would result in a rigid and ineffective warrant scheme which would frustrate the proper administration of justice in this country.

[*Translation*]

The Minister of Justice believes the legislation strikes a proper balance. Under the bill, the police could obtain the judicial authorization to enter a dwelling to arrest a person, without having to formally charge this person.

In other words, the bill will afford the police as much flexibility as possible, given the limits imposed by the charter.

[*English*]

In fact the bill is the product of extensive consultations with interested parties such as the provincial attorneys general, the RCMP, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the Canadian Association of Police and the Canadian Bar Association.

The legislation contains a realistic compromise between positions that either lack necessary flexibility or are constitutionally flawed.

I would like to take this opportunity to review the different features of this legislation.

[*Translation*]

The bill primarily seeks to provide a legislative system under which the police can request the judicial authorization to enter dwellings to make an arrest. The system provides that such an authorization is required in the three situations listed below.

First, when an arrest warrant has already been issued, a police officer can request a warrant to enter a dwelling to make an arrest.

Second, when no arrest warrant has been issued, a police officer can request a warrant to enter a dwelling to make an arrest, provided he has convinced a judge or a justice of the peace that there are grounds to make an arrest without a warrant, as provided under section 495 of the Criminal Code.

Third, if a police officer is requesting a warrant for the arrest of a specific person, he can, at the same time, ask the judge or the justice of the peace to authorize, in the warrant, the police to enter a dwelling, particularly if the officer believes the person for whom the warrant is issued is in that dwelling or will be found in it. The authorization will be granted if, when the arrest warrant is later executed, the police officer has reasonable grounds to believe that the person for whom the warrant is issued is in that dwelling.

[*English*]

The bill also addresses exigent circumstances as an exception to the need for an authorization to enter. It is not always possible for the police to obtain a judicial authorization prior to entering a dwelling for the purposes of arrest or apprehension.

In *Feeney*, the majority of the Supreme Court of Canada acknowledged this fact and reaffirmed the common law power of entry in situations of hot pursuit.

Given that the court clearly recognized that hot pursuit is an exception to the requirement that there be a warrant for entry, this legislation does not address this issue which has been dealt with conclusively by the Supreme Court of Canada. The question of what other situations would justify an exemption from the requirement of prior judicial authorization was left open by the supreme court.

This legislation, therefore, contains an non-exhaustive definition of certain exigent circumstances under which entry into a dwelling for the purposes of arrest or apprehension would be allowed in the absence of prior judicial authorization.

• (1015)

The Minister of Justice believes it is important that parliament expresses itself on what exigent circumstances would justify the state entering a dwelling house without a warrant for entry to effect an arrest.

Entry would be expressly allowed in the absence of a warrant where the police have reasonable grounds to suspect that entry into the dwelling is necessary to prevent imminent bodily harm or death. The integrity of a human being is a value sufficiently important that the state can intervene without getting prior judicial authorization to enter.

Entry would likewise be expressly allowed where the police have reasonable grounds to believe that evidence relating to the commission of an indictable offence is present in the dwelling and where that entry is necessary to prevent the imminent destruction of such evidence. We stress it is evidence that will be destroyed, not merely information or intelligence to which the state would like to have access, if the arrest is not effected before a warrant of entry can be obtained.

The legislation also contains provisions concerning consequential amendments. In particular it contains a proposal to amend the Interpretation Act to extend the scheme set out in the Criminal Code to arrests or apprehensions made pursuant to other federal statutes. This is needed because the Feeney decision is concerned with the balancing of interests in cases of arrests in dwelling houses which extends well beyond the application of the Criminal Code.

Other federal legislation provides for arrests on the basis of warrants issued pursuant to the particular legislation. There is a need to remedy the problem caused by the Feeney decision of the supreme court. The proposed amendment to the Interpretation Act extends the Criminal Code regime to these statutes.

[*Translation*]

Finally, the legislation includes a preamble which states its purpose, and which clearly establishes that the bill is not meant to limit the power to enter granted to police under other acts or under common law.

[*English*]

Given the constitutional limitations set out in Feeney and in other Supreme Court of Canada decisions concerning privacy rights, the Minister of Justice believes the legislation represents a way of ensuring that the appropriate balancing of interests can take place without jeopardizing the safety of Canadians and the proper administration of justice.

The bill creates tools that will enhance the privacy rights of Canadians while providing law enforcement officers with the kind of flexibility needed to do their difficult task.

In closing, the Minister of Justice encourages all hon. members of the House to support the bill. I look forward to working with hon. members to make sure we meet the deadline the supreme court has set.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the justice minister should have intervened with the Supreme Court of Canada to request a suspension of the decision or the application of the decision. The justice minister should have asked for a reasonable suspension in terms of time so we would not have to ram the bill through and we would be able to call witnesses

Government Orders

from both sides of the equation and fully flesh out all aspects of the bill.

It has been a trademark of the justice department to bring in bills against a deadline that has denied members of the House an opportunity to fully express their views and concerns on such bills, to have witnesses appear before the standing committee, to determine the constitutionality of all aspects of the bill, and to satisfy members on both sides that the bill would do what the government and the people of the country want.

• (1020)

At the beginning of debate on Bill C-16 I point out that it is unfortunate our new justice minister seems to be following in the footsteps of the former justice minister when it comes to bills such as Bill C-45 that was brought in against a deadline. We on this side certainly remember that had Bill C-45 been brought in on time it may have stopped the likes of Olson from getting his full court press before a judge and jury.

It was brought in against a deadline, exactly as this bill is being brought in against a deadline. We have to hurry it through to meet the deadline of the November 22. Otherwise, as the officials who briefed the news media and ourselves yesterday pointed out, it could cause very serious concerns and an extension. That cost would have to be requested from the Supreme Court of Canada.

I point to the approach and the modus operandi the government is using which are unsuitable to the parliamentary system. We ought to have an unrushed opportunity to examine the bill carefully. I am hoping we will have time to do so and that the bill will reach the other place in time for the deadline.

I repeat that it should have been the justice minister and not the attorney general from British Columbia that intervened with the Supreme Court of Canada requesting the suspension. Why not make it 8 months or 10 months? Why not make it sufficiently long enough so that we would have the time to express our concerns and examine the bill carefully?

We support the bill but we decry the supreme court decision which made the bill necessary. The Feeney decision undermines the traditional powers of the police. The bill is designed to deal with a decision that undermines the traditional tools and powers of the police to investigate crime, bring perpetrators of crime into the courts and to justice, and thereby create and maintain the safety of society.

Now let us look at the Feeney decision. It is an horrendous decision when it comes to the impact it has had upon law enforcement. What happened? An 84 year old man was beaten to death. At the scene of the crime the police officer found blood spattered all over the place and had reason to believe that blood

Government Orders

would be on the assailant. What did he do? In his investigation he approached the residence of Mr. Feeney, knocked on the door and there was no answer. He opened the door, did not kick it in, and found Mr. Finny lying on the bed, his shirt covered in blood.

Judge Sopinka, speaking and writing on behalf of the majority, said that it was an unlawful entry, an unlawful arrest and therefore all evidence gathered as a result was not admissible in court.

What did that mean? That decision of the five Canadians sitting in the Supreme Court of Canada, according to the legal opinions we have heard, will allow the man to walk free.

What does this say to the people of Canada with regard to their faith in our courts and our justice system? What does it say to the people who live in that community? What are they saying and how do they feel about the decision rendered by five people sitting in judgment who are there to protect the rights and safety of society?

We always look for a reasonable balance. I noticed that in the supreme court decision article 1 of the Constitution, the override clause, was not used. It was not even mentioned. I wonder why. In the decision the majority said that in general Mr. Feeney's privacy interest in the dwelling house outweighs the interest of the police.

• (1025)

What does "outweighs the interest of the police" mean? What interests do the police have if not our interest and the interest of society? It is the interest of the police but it means the interest of the safety of society. What are the jobs, sworn duties and responsibilities of the police? They are to protect society. How? It is by gathering evidence sufficient to warrant an arrest for a full and fair hearing before a court of competent jurisdiction.

When the majority in this case says that in general Mr. Feeney's privacy interest in his dwelling house outweighs the interests of the police, it is really saying it outweighs the interests of society.

What is the interest of society in a case like this? According to the Supreme Court of Canada what do the police do if they knock on the door and there is no answer? They spend hours surrounding the place like they did in the Kitimat case after this decision, and five hours later when the warrant to enter finally arrives they find that the suspect has gone. This is what the bill attempts to deal with.

That decision means the police may now have to obtain a warrant to enter, a warrant to arrest in certain circumstances and a warrant to search. If the police have a warrant to enter but not to search, they can gather whatever evidence is obvious before them, but they cannot search the attic, the basement or the rooms beyond

their vision. They can only gather the evidence that is obvious before them. They will have to go through this rigmarole.

In the bill is the authority for telewarrants. What is a telewarrant? A police officer phones a justice of the peace or a judge in the middle of the night and says "I am Constable Joe Blow and I need a warrant. Here are the facts". Given the attitude of supreme court expressed in this decision, will a telewarrant system stand a charter challenge? Not a hope.

I am speaking in the best interest of the safety of society. Should we not consider that article 1 of the charter, which states that the rights of the individual can be overridden if the interest of society is an overriding concern, should be applied and can be applied? Are we to ignore that? I saw no mention in the decision of the supreme court of the override clause. Perhaps for some reason or other the supreme court considered it was not applicable.

Let us take a look at the dissenting opinion that was written by Madam L'Heureux-Dubé. What did she say? What did the supreme court judges say? They said the entry was legal. They said the arrest was legal. They said the gathering of all the evidence was legal.

Had one more justice agreed we would not be here today and we would not need this bill. The common law tools and powers of peace officers prior to the Feeney decision would still be in force. The police would have the tools to move as quickly and as expeditiously as possible to protect society against someone who brutally murdered an 84 year old man.

• (1030)

Yes, we will support this bill. We want to hear witnesses. We want to understand the fullness of the bill. The main thrust of the bill everyone will support. We have to do something to deal with the Feeney decision which was brought down by the Supreme Court of Canada.

However, when we examine bills there are always details that we want to ensure are included. We want to understand the bill so that all members from all parties can make recommendations and bring forward amendments which they think will strengthen it.

We must restore these tools for the police so that they can maintain safety within our society and deal with those who are a threat to society, particularly individuals like Mr. Feeney. This man was convicted of murdering an 84-year old man and he is on the loose. According to legal opinions he will continue to be on the loose because they are saying that the evidence gathered after the arrest is not admissible in court.

What does Madam Justice L'Heureux-Dubé say about it? It is very interesting what she said about the decision to deny the

admissibility of that evidence, even though it is DNA evidence. She said that the police should be commended, not rebuked, for their actions. She said:

—perhaps it is time to recall that public respect and confidence in the justice system lies not only in protection against police abuse, but also in the system's capacity to uncover the truth and ensure that, at the end of the day, it is more likely than not that justice will have been done.

Let us ask that question. Let us apply that test to the Feeney case. What have we got?

We have evidence cast out which conclusively in the lower courts convicted Feeney for the murder of an 84-year old senior citizen.

I stand with Madam Justice L'Heureux-Dubé. She is expressing the common sense of the vast majority of Canadians.

When that police officer entered the trailer, what did he do that hurt anyone? What did he do that was not an act in the defence of the safety of society? What did he do that was outrageous in the discharge of his duties and responsibilities to protect the community in which he lived and served? What did he do? I do not see anything that he did which was horrendous or wrong or a deviation from normal police practices, established on the basis of common sense.

This bill was designed over the summer. It has been introduced too late. It may not meet the deadline.

In the bill there is not a definition of hot pursuit. They are saying that the police could have entered that place if they were in hot pursuit. What does that mean?

During the briefing yesterday, Stephen Bindman from the Ottawa *Citizen* asked more than once why is there not in this bill a definition of hot pursuit so that police officers would know where they stand. Why is it not in the Criminal Code? That is a fair question. It is not there.

What is the difference between hot pursuit and fresh pursuit? We do not know. The police do not know. Is there a precedent? Is there a legal precedent that will guide them? We do not know.

Inasmuch as we do not place it in the law, and we do not create legislation to explain what hot pursuit and fresh pursuit mean, we are leaving it up to the courts to decide. The Supreme Court of Canada will have to decide what hot pursuit is.

• (1035)

There is case law that deals with hot pursuit, but why not put it in the Criminal Code? Why not legislate it so that we are telling the courts what we the people believe hot pursuit and fresh pursuit mean? What we the people want is police officers to have the tools to protect us from people like Mr. Feeney and others who will attack people, commit assaults, murders, rapes and so on.

Government Orders

This decision of the Supreme Court of Canada has reduced the safety of society by placing a greater burden on our police officers.

The bill attempts to get around that or at least provides a legal avenue to continue to allow police officers to enter dwellings but not without another burden on them. They are going to have to wait in order to get a search warrant unless there is hot pursuit.

They may have to get a warrant to arrest as well as to enter the premises. As I indicated earlier, if they want to search the entire building they may have to get a third warrant to do that very thing.

This may all sound well, fine and nice in an ivory tower but what about these remote conditions as in northern B. C. where this incident took place? What about some of these other areas where tele-warrants are impossible? What about that?

We are going to support this bill but we want it fleshed out. We want hear people from both sides, those who oppose the opinion and the decision of the supreme court that brought about the bill. We want to hear those who support it. We want to understand as much as possible whether this bill truly strikes a balance that the decision on the Feeney case by the Supreme Court of Canada has demanded.

Those are some of my concerns. Those are some of my thoughts. I guess that my greatest concern is that we in this House should not pass legislation that leaves interpretation open to the courts. We should be telling the courts what we want done by the legislation that we pass and it should not be open ended. If it is open ended we are going to be back over and over again to deal with this kind of situation where the Supreme Court of Canada decides. Instead of the elected representatives of the people acting in the best interest of the people we are going to have the courts deciding really what is the law.

We are hearing it over and over again and we heard it yesterday during the briefing that it is not the elected representatives of the people who are making the law. It is nine unelected people in the Supreme Court of Canada who are doing that for us. The warning was clear yesterday that we must stand on guard over this particular issue.

I point out that during July of this year an Angus Reid poll indicated that over 50% of Canadians have little faith in our courts, not in just our justice system. I could understand if they said it about the overall justice system. We know how they feel about the YOA, the faint hope clause and all these ridiculous situations that have been created by our law and our justice system. I could understand if the majority had lost faith in just the justice system but that is not the case in this poll. They have lost faith in our courts.

What does that mean? They have lost faith in the decisions being made by our judges. This is the question that went through my

Government Orders

mind as soon as I read the Feeney case. Does the decision by the Supreme Court of Canada enhance or reduce the faith the people of Canada have in our courts and in our justice system?

I know what the answer would be if we go back to the scene of the crime and ask the neighbours of the victim of Mr. Feeney what they think this decision has done in terms of enhancing or reducing their faith in our court system and in the decisions our judges are making.

• (1040)

This is a very troubling matter and it lies at the heart of this whole bill and the decisions made by the Supreme Court of Canada.

If we read the decisions and the case law from the Supreme Court of Canada with regard to the absolute need to ensure that all that can be done is done to maintain the faith and the trust of Canadians in our courts and our judicial system, we will see why there is need for alarm and concern. These kinds of decisions make it more difficult for the police to protect us, our families and our children.

We have no alternative but to support this bill and to fight to restore the powers and the tools which the police lost to a certain extent. To a large extent the old common law tools that they had are gone. Why? The Supreme Court of Canada says in general the individual's privacy, Mr. Feeney's privacy interest in his dwelling house outweighs the interest of the police, the interest of society, the safety of society. That is why we are here debating this bill.

The government will receive support from members from all parties for this bill. I suggest that all members better stand on guard to protect the balance that we need between the right of the individual and the right of members of society to adequate police protection, protection from the courts and protection from the administration of our justice system.

This is the alarm bell which is ringing. We had better be very careful in the way in which we design our laws so that we are telling the courts what we want done on behalf of the Canadian people and not have the courts do that for us.

We leave opened ended things like hot pursuit. This is what Stephen Bindman was talking about. Why leave it in doubt? Why do we not tell the courts what we think on behalf of the Canadian people what hot pursuit means? Where do fresh and hot pursuit begin and end? Is it fresh pursuit? Is it hotter than hot pursuit or is it the other way around? We do not know. Do the police know? They should be able to open the Criminal Code and see their authority. But they do not have that.

There are some areas in the bill on which we will be asking not only the justice officials to give us their opinion but also some of the witnesses who are players on both sides of the issue in courts of law.

I conclude my remarks by reiterating that I am of the sincere opinion that it is unfortunate that this bill had to be brought forward in the first place. I stand with Madam L'Heureux-Dubé in supporting our police officers in their need for reasonable tools to do their job.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by saying that I am happy to hear my colleague from the Reform Party say that when there are vital issues a society must address, the decisions must be made by the democratically elected representatives of the people, and not by nine unelected individuals. I felt I have to point out this little fact.

We are discussing something that is very important, and that is the balance between, on the one hand, the authority of the state, in this case the powers that a society gives its police officers, and, on the other hand, the rights and freedoms of individuals.

• (1045)

I must say that I am somewhat disappointed that the government took so much time to introduce this bill, because the Supreme Court has set a deadline, which is November 22. When we are discussing such an important issue as the balance between individual rights and freedoms and the powers of the state, it seems to me that we should be doing so in a calm, collected, and comprehensive manner.

What is important here, and what the bill is trying to do—I will come back to this later—is to clarify the rules for police officers. Yesterday, a highly skilled crown attorney told me that this Supreme Court judgment, the Feeney case, had the effect of tying the hands of police officers because they no longer knew the rules governing their powers. The bill attempts to clarify these rules.

I wish to highlight the issues involved in this bill. The bill proposed by the Minister of Justice deals with an important value in our present society: respect for privacy. In fact, as the Supreme Court pointed out, arrests made in private dwellings must be carried out with respect for individual rights, and especially the right to be secure against unreasonable search or seizure, which is protected under section 8 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The importance of the right to privacy and to protection of one's property is neither new nor unique. In fact, a British ruling in common law, which forms the basis of our criminal law dating back to 1604, almost 400 years ago, describes the importance of the

right to privacy in the following manner: "A man's home is his castle". The protection of privacy in our society dates back more than 400 years.

In this same judgment, called the Semayne case, a limit is imposed however on the concept of inviolable castles. In other words, it is not because an individual is in a house that the power of the state stops at the door. It goes on to say: "In all cases where the King is involved, the Sheriff can, if the doors are not open, use force to gain entry into the house in order to arrest the person or to execute the King's judicial instrument."

So, even in those days, society recognized that an individual's rights and freedoms with respect to privacy could be curtailed when the public interest and safety demanded it. It therefore comes down to a question of balance, as I said in my introduction.

But if the state can give itself the authority to act in the sphere of individuals' private affairs, the intrusion must respect the rules laid down by law, whether that law be the common law, statutes or the charter. These standards were analyzed by the supreme court in the well known Feeney decision, which I will now look at.

What were the facts in this case? First of all, Mr. Feeney was suspected of murdering one Frank Boyle. After collecting evidence, the police went to Feeney's dwelling, knocked on the door and said "Police, open up". There was no response. The police therefore entered Feeney's dwelling, went over to him and touched him to wake him up. Feeney was thus arrested without a warrant and evidence was seized. He was tried and found guilty of second degree murder. He appealed on the grounds of violation of section 8 of the charter, the section against unreasonable search or seizure, and section 10 which provides for the right to counsel.

What were the applicable laws? First of all, there was the common law, on which our criminal law is based. This is an issue with which our courts were already familiar. There was the Eccles case in 1975, which dealt with the right to make an arrest in a dwelling following forcible entry.

• (1050)

The supreme court at the time ruled as follows "Entry can be made against the will of the householder only if (a) there are reasonable and probable grounds for the belief that the person sought is within the premises and (b) proper announcement is made prior to entry". This is the basic test in Canada, the first truly important ruling by the supreme court on this issue.

Then, eleven years later, in 1986, came the Landry case. The supreme court stipulated that the police may enter a dwelling without permission to make an arrest without a warrant if the conditions of Eccles and section 495 of the Criminal Code are met. That section reads as follows "A peace officer may arrest without warrant (a) a person who has committed an indictable offence or who, on reasonable grounds, he believes has committed or is about

Government Orders

to commit an indictable offence—" That is what is called the objective criterion because what is stated is that there are reasonable grounds to believe. That is subjective.

In 1990, the supreme court came up with a more objective criterion and added a final condition. In order for an arrest without warrant to be legal, there must be reasonable and probable grounds to make that arrest. No longer is it just "reasonable grounds to believe", what the police officer himself or herself thinks, but a reasonable person looking calmly at the situation would also have to agree to. There are, therefore, two criteria: subjective and objective.

If we include the criteria in jurisprudence, we could summarize the rules of common law as follows. An arrest without warrant made after forced entry of private property is legal under common law if: (a) the police officer making the arrest has grounds to believe that the person sought is indeed present there; (b) a standard statement is made; (c) the police officer believes he or she has reasonable grounds for making the arrest; and (d) there are reasonable and probable grounds to make the arrest—the objective criterion.

There is not just common law, however. Now we have the charter of rights and freedoms. The right to privacy has become very important in Canada since the arrival of the charter. As I said earlier, section 8 is now enshrined in the Constitution through the charter. Legislation cannot therefore infringe this section in the same way as the protection offered by common law.

In Hunter, 1984, the supreme court decided that searches and seizures were permitted only with authorization, that is, a warrant, from an independent legal body, which had considered the reasonable grounds of the projected search or seizure.

If we look at the criteria in Hunter and the other cases relating to section 8 of the charter, we conclude the following. Under section 8 of the charter, searches conducted without warrant in areas where the occupant has a reasonable expectation of privacy are unreasonable. The party conducting the search must prove that it is reasonable. A reasonable search must meet the following conditions: (a) it must be permitted under the law; (b) the law must not be unreasonable of itself and (c) it must be conducted in a reasonable manner.

The arrest in this particular case was illegal, because the conditions for making an arrest without warrant under section 495 of the Criminal Code were not met and because the police can make arrests without warrant in a private home only in exceptional circumstances.

What did the court say in Feeney at the time? "The police did not subjectively believe that there were reasonable and probable grounds for arresting the appellant before making forcible entry, without a warrant, into the house where he was sleeping. Besides the effect of the charter on the conditions required for arrest

S. O. 31

without a warrant in a residence, the absence of subjective belief in the existence of reasonable grounds indicated that the police could not have arrested the appellant legally under section 495 of the Criminal Code even if he had been in a public place”.

• (1055)

What effect did this have? It came as a bombshell as I said earlier. Police officers said “Wait a minute, what are we supposed to do now?” The government decided to introduce this bill to clarify the rules and help police officers do their work, which, let us not forget, is essential in our society.

Bill C-16 essentially introduces three changes. First, to enable peace officers to obtain judicial authorization to enter dwelling houses, and this follows on the heels, so to speak, of the jurisprudence in *Hunter and Feeney*. Second, to enable peace officers to enter dwelling houses without prior authorization in exigent circumstances and where provincial or federal legislation or common law authorize entry. Third, to amend the Interpretation Act.

The key clause of the bill states that a warrant to arrest or apprehend will authorize entry in a dwelling house by a peace officer if the judge or justice is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the person named in the warrant for arrest is present in the dwelling house. This is the subjective criterion. The peace officer can execute the warrant only if he himself has grounds to believe that the person to be apprehended is there.

Section 529.1 enables a judge or justice to issue a warrant to enter a dwelling house described in the warrant—note that it must be the dwelling house described—to carry out an arrest with or without an arrest warrant.

However, there are exigent circumstances, as mentioned by other members. When time is of the essence, it is not possible to go and to get a warrant.

Clause 529.3 of the bill allows a peace officer to enter a dwelling house without a warrant, if the conditions under section 529 or 529.1 exist, that is if he has reasonable grounds to do so, and if, by reason of exigent circumstances, it is necessary to do so. An attempt is made to define “exigent circumstances”:

a) reasonable grounds to suspect—”

This is important. We are not talking about “reasonable grounds to believe”, but “reasonable grounds to suspect”. Time will tell whether the definition will pass the constitutionality test. The issue has to be raised.

—that entry into the dwelling-house is necessary to prevent imminent bodily harm or death to any person. Exigent circumstances also include circumstances in which there are reasonable grounds to believe—

This is a higher criterion

—that evidence is present and that entry is necessary to prevent the imminent destruction of that evidence.

These are the exigent circumstances, as defined in the bill.

Clause 529.4 of Bill C-16 deals with the issue of omitting to make a prior announcement of the entry. In the *Feeney* case, the supreme court stated that a peace officer was required to announce himself before entering a dwelling-house. However, the Supreme Court also pointed out in the *Eccles* case that this obligation could be waived in case of an emergency. This is the case of battering a door down.

It could be argued that the exceptions listed in clause 529 reflect the case law. It is the case with regard to battering a door down.

I will stop here for now, because the House will now proceed to statements by members. I will resume after oral question period. Mr. Speaker, you may proceed, and I will resume later on.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member will have approximately 25 minutes remaining. As it is now 11 o'clock, we will now proceed to statements by members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, November 1, 1997 marks the 50th anniversary of the Canadian Wildlife Service of Environment Canada.

The Canadian Wildlife Service, together with its many partners, plays a key role in conserving Canada's natural heritage. Its 50-year history includes numerous achievements such as the research into the effects of toxic chemicals in the Great Lakes that led to Canada's DDT ban; the implementation of the North American waterfowl and management plan, a model for habitat conservation with projects across the continent that have brought millions of hectares under protection; and the national wildlife areas and migratory bird sanctuaries that protect over 11 million hectares of land. The list of achievements goes on.

• (1100)

The Canadian Wildlife Service helps to protect a resource for which Canadians care deeply. Images of Canada's diverse varieties of wildlife adorn our flags and our currency. These symbols are recognized around the world, as is the Canadian Wildlife Service. For the past half century the Canadian Wildlife Service has worked to protect Canada's natural legacy for future generations.

I salute these men and women who have been and continue to be pioneers in Canadian wildlife conservation.

* * *

REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): "Lest we forget". Mr. Speaker, on November 11 these words will echo throughout this land as we respectfully recognize our veterans and war dead.

Sadly, during the rest of the year some do forget. But not the Maple Grove Memorial Club in Yarmouth, Nova Scotia. This club encourages students to respect and learn about our veterans' great sacrifices for Canada. These extraordinary young Canadians attend parades, visit veterans in hospitals and seniors' homes and promote national unity.

Next week is veterans week. I proudly salute Canada's war veterans but I also give honourable mention to the Maple Grove Memorial Club and teacher, Joe Bishara. They have not forgotten.

* * *

THE MINT

Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the minister for government works on his announcement yesterday that a new plating facility will be built in Winnipeg adjacent to the Mint.

This \$30 million project will create between 100 and 130 construction jobs and 30 permanent jobs as the Mint brings online a process which they have invented and patented for plating coins. This allows the Mint to be more competitive around the world and will save some \$9.5 million a year in annual operating costs.

It is a win for Winnipeg. It is a win for the Mint. It is a win for Canada. I thank the minister for his hard work in bringing this project to completion.

* * *

[Translation]

CLERICS OF ST. VIATEUR AND SISTERS OF THE HOLY CROSS

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 150th anniversary of the arrival in Quebec of two religious communities from France, the Clerics of St. Viateur and the Sisters of the Holy Cross.

To speak of the Clerics of St. Viateur is to speak of their schools and colleges in Quebec and in Canada: Saint-Nicolas d'Ahuntsic, Rigaud, Joliette, Berthierville, Matane, Roberval and Lachute in Quebec; Embrun in Ontario; Otterburn and Saint-Pierre-Joly in

S. O. 31

Manitoba, and the list goes on. It is to speak of Father Georges Lindsay, director and founder of the famous summer festival in Lanaudière; of Léo Bonneville, my old teacher, and director and founder of the movie magazine *Séquence*.

The Sisters of the Holy Cross set up their first congregation in Ville-Saint-Laurent. They provided instruction at all levels, particularly to young girls in the Collège classique Basile-Moreau.

In my riding, they taught at Lachute, Brownsburg, Sainte-Scholastique, Saint-Augustin and Saint-Hermas. I pay tribute today to these educational pioneers, and to my former teachers.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the week, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration published her immigration plan for the year 1998.

Entitled "A Stronger Canada", this document calls for an increase in immigration levels for the coming years, showing that Canada is a friendly nation and proud of the contribution of the cultural communities seeking to settle here.

We must welcome the efforts of the Canadian government which is providing in this way for an important contribution to the future of our country. There is no doubt that the interests of the whole Canadian population are well represented through such a generous and appropriate policy at this time in Canadian history.

* * *

[English]

ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, October marks the first ever national environmental illness month. This month has been dedicated to raising awareness of illness caused by environmental factors.

Over 15% of Canadians are affected by disorders related to the environment. Illnesses such as allergies, asthma, migraines and some childhood behaviour disorders have all been linked to environmental factors. Low cost, effective remedies exist. Through education, treatment and prevention these illnesses can be eliminated.

The Environmental Illness Society of Canada and its president Judith Spence have worked tirelessly to educate Canadians on the factors related to this acquired illness.

● (1105)

It is everyone's right to be healthy. The connection between health and the environment should not go unrecognized.

S. O. 31

I applaud the efforts of the Environmental Illness Society of Canada and I commend it for its commitment to bringing this important health issue to light.

* * *

AND THE WINNER IS—

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the leadership horse race is about to begin.

And they're off.

The Minister of Finance takes an early lead with aggressive posturing on all fronts, followed by the Minister of Health, the Marlboro man, close behind.

Sluggish out of the gate is the Minister of Canadian Heritage, obviously hampered by her unproductive habit of trying to run while busily wrapping herself in the flag.

As they near the first turn it is still the finance minister out in front, starting to labour now under his heavy-handed handling of the pension issue, while the Marlboro man has fallen way back in the pack, taking far too much time plastering cigarette ads all over his saddle bags.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage is struggling with the government hope chest, starting to fade as she pauses to increase government grants in all directions.

As they enter the backstretch the Minister of Finance is going to the whip, thrashing his pension pony about the head and ears. The youngsters in the crowd are starting to boo loudly and the minister has lost his concentration, failing to steer his portfolio with the same steady hand he was once famous for.

The minister of heritage has dropped completely out of sight, busily looking for ways to explain to pilots that closing down airports is a good way to improve safety.

The Marlboro man has seen his leadership chances go up in smoke.

The horse race is not even over, but the Canadian taxpayers know that in this race nobody gets a payout.

* * *

BANKING

Ms. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Bank of Montreal, the Royal Bank and the National Bank, three of Canada's largest financial institutions, deserve public recognition for a job well done. They have increased the numbers of loans granted to small and medium size businesses to fully one-third of all loans granted in the last quarter.

As we know, small business loans have traditionally been the most difficult to acquire. Banks have always considered small businesses extremely high risk. In the past, up to 80% of small businesses have failed in their first five years of operation.

Consequently, established banks prefer the safe investment of large business. Small businesses, however, account for our most rapidly growing employment sector.

A 1995 industry committee report encouraged all banks to reach the one-third ratio for lending to small businesses.

Congratulations to Montreal, Royal and the National Bank of Canada. They are willing to do the paperwork and the in depth investigation required to safely invest in exciting new small businesses all over the country.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise today to inform this House of the creation of a new line designated 1-976-CATASTROPHE.

With the support of impartial and non-partisan organizations such as the Quebec Committee of Canada, this new parapsychic counselling service is designed for people who want further information on delirium anti-separatum, the equivalent in Canadian political circles of the mad cow disease in Great Britain.

Featured this week are the predictions of our funky astrologists Michel Demers and Marcel Côté, who state that the rest of Canada is so bent on suicide and is so undemocratic that it wants to force Quebec to declare its sovereignty unilaterally, whereas everyone knows that common sense will lead to a mutually beneficial partnership agreement.

Next week on the 1-976-CATASTROPHE line, you will learn that after a yes for the sovereignty of Quebec, federalists will prevent the earth from turning and the sun from shining on Quebec.

Call now.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN BUSHPLANE HERITAGE CENTRE

Mr. Carmen Provenzano (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a world class heritage facility in my riding of Sault Ste. Marie. The Canadian Bushplane Heritage Centre, located along the picturesque St. Mary's River, is a one of a kind museum that preserves this country's colourful bush-piloting tradition.

The centre's most recent project is restoring three antique bushplanes in an effort to recreate the golden age of bush piloting.

Under the capable direction of President Ken Lajambe, a dedicated team of staff and volunteers operates the museum to the delight of thousands of visitors each year. In fact, one well known newspaper columnist has named it the best museum in Canada.

I invite all members and those watching these proceedings to make Sault Ste. Marie and the Canadian Bushplane Heritage Centre a must stop on their next trip to northern Ontario.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this Hallowe'en the mood on Parliament Hill is eerie, to say the least. The cabinet is huddled around the Ouija board trying to find a friendly spirit who will agree with the new gas tax. It is frightening.

• (1110)

This government is not at all shy about taxes. It figures if there is a problem it will just conjure up a potion and place a tax spell on Canadians.

That is the Liberals' answer to things that go bang in the night—tax law-abiding Canadians like duck hunters. The criminals are howling at the full moon over this tax. The Prime Minister is even taking credit for the Conservatives' hated GST. He says that the GST is a wonderful tax. He brought the hated tax back to life and gave it personality, like Frankenstein. The next trick is no treat for small businesses whose life's blood will be drained with the new CPP tax hike.

This Hallowe'en Canadians will not rest in peace while plagued by the finance minister, who from this day forward will be known as Count Taxula.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 1993 we inherited a \$42 billion Conservative deficit. By next year the budget will be balanced.

What does this mean for Canadians? It means we can relieve some of the burden off the shoulders of our children and grandchildren by paying down the debt. It means we can start to reinvest in those areas of economic and social policies that mean so much to Canadians like job creation, education and health.

If the forecasters are right, it has placed Canada in the enviable position of leading the G-7 countries in growth. It has created an environment for jobs. There have been a million created during our first mandate, and over one-quarter million this year alone, and young people are filling more jobs than they have filled in nearly a decade.

That is a record to be proud of. In sum, we have put an end to crushing interest rates, we have slain the deficit and have begun to pay down the debt. More important, jobs and hope are being restored to Canadians.

The deficit fight is best measured by its human factor. Numbers are abstract, jobs are real. What a difference four years makes.

S. O. 31

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, gas company profits are up. The profits of Petro-Canada and Imperial Oil tripled in the last quarter by 103%, Shell Canada by 129%, Suncor by 152%.

As we know, Canadians have been concerned about high gas prices at the pumps for some time. We know that when prices of gas go up it affects negatively the whole economy. The federal government's position and that of its oil company friends is "Don't worry, be happy".

Canadians are not happy when they are being gouged at the pumps. At this time of trick or treat Canadians are being tricked at the pumps by high prices while oil companies have been treating themselves to record profits.

When will the government stand up for Canadians instead of oil companies who contribute so much to Liberal Party election campaigns?

* * *

[Translation]

LINGUISTIC SCHOOL BOARDS

Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the members of the parliamentary committee responsible for examining the bilateral constitutional amendment to facilitate the creation of linguistic school boards had the pleasure of welcoming the Quebec ministers of intergovernmental affairs and of education as witnesses.

Their purpose for appearing was to reiterate their unequivocal support for this bill and to explain the reasoning behind the creation of two systems, one French and one English, and the importance of consolidating these resources.

[English]

There is a strong consensus for this undertaking across Quebec which has been in the making over the past three decades. We are an evolving a flexible federation able to modernize ourselves, thereby reflecting our diversity in multicultural and multiracial reality. Co-operation between the federal and provincial governments always serves the best interests of Canadians and that of course includes all Quebecers.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, the collapse of the Newfoundland cod fishery has had a devastating effect on the Newfoundland economy. However, many fishermen are trying to stay afloat in the industry by fishing other species.

Oral Questions

One fishery that is being developed as a supplementary effort is our seal fishery.

However, when I turned on the TV last night I found that the International Fund for Animal Welfare is running ads back to back condemning that fishery. Needless to say it is causing damage to our marketing efforts in North America and Europe.

The federal government regulates the seal fishery. I call on the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to take measures to counter that ad campaign and thereby safeguard the efforts of those who are still trying to make a living from the sea.

* * *

THE DEFICIT

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the finance minister announced that the final deficit for 1996-97 was \$8.9 billion. This is down almost \$20 billion from the previous year and is the largest year over year improvement in Canadian history. However restoring health to Canada's finances is not an end in itself. It has always been this government's goal to build a strong economy and a strong society which provide Canadians with opportunity and security.

• (1115)

As our nation enters this new economic era full of challenges and choices, it is vital that we hear from Canadians about their priorities, values and expectations. As chair of the Standing Committee on Finance, I encourage Canadians to participate in the town hall meetings being held by their local members of Parliament. Your views are important to our committee. Let them be heard.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, you can check in *Hansard*. This fall we have asked this government literally 50 times to clarify its position on Kyoto. We have given it lots of opportunity. We think it is a fair question. We just want an answer. That is why we have had to ask the question 50 times. After all, every other G-7 nation has already released its position on greenhouse gas emissions and the countdown to Kyoto is on. It will take place 31 days from now.

My question for the Prime Minister is this. What are those Liberal targets and how much are they going to cost Canadians?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has stated very clearly that our position will be before the public and the world before the Kyoto meeting. We want to continue and complete our consultations with the provinces before we finalize our position.

We want to make it clear that our approach is to negotiate fully but for a good deal for Canadians that will take into account the needs of every part of the country. Unlike the Reform Party, we will have a position. All we hear from the Reform Party are questions and suggestions but as yet nobody in this country can say—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Fraser Valley.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The reason the Liberals cannot answer the 50 questions is because of the process they are using to cook up this deal. They are developing a position in secret. There has been no public discussion on it. They refuse to wait for all the provinces to sign on to the deal and they have actually already committed to signing the deal in Kyoto when the treaty has not even been written yet.

This kind of process did not work when we went through our constitutional fixing process. Why does the Prime Minister think Canadians will agree to this environmental Meech Lake process?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. member why the Reform Party has abandoned its principled position where it says that the party believes that environmental considerations must carry equal weight with economic, social and technical considerations. What happened to the Reform principles? Have Reformers abandoned these principles? Is the position of the Reform Party nothing more than what was done by the tongue troopers in the Reform leader's office when they muzzled the Reform critic and said that anything he says is nothing more than a dopey mental hiccup?

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, for a government that is supposed to govern, the answers get weaker every day. Every day this government fudges the answer is another day that taxpayers worry about what position this government is cooking up behind the doors. Studies by the conference board say that the Kyoto deal could cost the average Canadian thousands of dollars per year. The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers warns that it could cost a lot at the gas pumps.

So I ask again, and please just give us an answer. Canadians cannot wait for the Prime Minister to settle all these internal cabinet struggles. How much is this Kyoto deal going to cost the average Canadian?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fearmongering is being created here by the Reform Party. All Reformers are doing is talking about taxes. They ignore all the other means available to deal with this problem without having to slow down the economy. Why does the Reform Party fail to adopt a

Oral Questions

position which recognizes threats and costs to human health, to the economy of western Canada, to future generations? Do Reformers not care about their children and grandchildren?

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister has been here for a few decades so he should know by now that the opposition asks the questions and the government is supposed to answer them.

When the finance minister was in opposition, he boasted that the Liberals would cut carbon emissions to 1988 levels by the year 2000. But now the man who was then a radical environment critic is silent about the Kyoto deal. So my question for the government is this. With all the talk of taxes in the air, why has the finance minister been silent about the Kyoto tax attack?

• (1120)

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are working on this as a team, unlike the Reform Party. The member for Kelowna questioned whether there is a problem, he questioned the science. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that there is a problem, but he does not like the process we are using to follow up on it. And their critic is muzzled by the tongue troopers in the Reform leader's office and is accused of being nothing more than a dopey mental hiccup.

Yes, the Reform members can ask questions. However they claim to be the next government in waiting and as such they have a responsibility to state their position.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, the government was supposed to be responsible and we are not getting any answers. The people who watch this are not stupid. They know a partisan evasion like that when they see one.

It was the finance minister who wrote the Liberals' 1993 red book which promised carbon cuts even bigger than those being proposed at Kyoto, but he has not said a word publicly about the Kyoto deal yet.

My question for the government is, what has the finance minister said privately about the Kyoto tax attack? On which side of the cabinet squabble does he stand?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. member's question, we know that although his party celebrated its 10th anniversary this week—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Herb Gray: Mr. Speaker, they can applaud now because they know that 10 years from now they will not be here at all.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development, who is responsible for employment insurance.

Two important figures clearly stand out in this dossier. In 1997, there were 35% more people unemployed than in 1989, and yet there are 33% fewer employment insurance recipients.

Will the minister finally admit that his reform has gone much too far, and that it deprives the unemployed of the minimum income they require to support their families?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our employment insurance reform was necessary, and all Canadians agree totally with it.

The situation was such that our system was totally unsuited to today's labour market. We therefore had to carry out an extremely significant reform, a courageous one, and what I can tell you is that we are following this reform very closely in order to ensure that it continues to serve Canadians well.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister is showing his flagrant and unacceptable disdain for the unemployed, for those who cannot make their money last until the end of the month, who are unable to make ends meet to feed their families.

How, in light of the figures released yesterday morning, can the minister be proud of his reform, when only 36% of the unemployed draw benefits, the surplus in his employment insurance fund is up to \$12 billion, and two-thirds of the unemployed are going hungry?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the opposition party obviously has an excessive attachment to a system from the past, a system which encouraged dependency on government funds.

Our reform focuses on active return-to-work measures. If we look at the concrete situation instead of just using big words, it will be seen that welfare figures in Quebec have not gone up since our reform, despite what they keep saying on that side of the House.

*Oral Questions***POVERTY**

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

A few weeks ago, anti-poverty groups gave a cry of alarm. Even the women in the Saint-Michel district, in the riding of the Minister of Human Resources Development, took to the streets in protest against increasing poverty.

When will the minister finally realize that these senseless cuts to employment insurance are simply increasing poverty?

• (1125)

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is very aware of the poverty. I, for one, am proud to represent a Montreal riding that is dealing with poverty. It makes me very aware of the situation, because I am there every Friday afternoon. I see and experience this poverty with my constituents.

This is why our government made it a priority in the last budget to increase the child tax credit by \$850 million effective January 1998 and why we will double this amount in the next term to help low income families.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us take a specific example.

Let us look at the case of Louise from Montreal. She worked as a clerk for five years. Her employment insurance cheque was cut by 27% because she took an unpaid three-month leave to look after her sick mother.

What is the minister's response to Louise's situation?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can respond to Louise's problem with the solution we found for the problem of Yolande, Huguette and Maryse, who were not covered by the old system because much of the part time work in our economy is done by women. The fact that the current system is based on hours resolves the problem of many women who work part time.

Women are now covered from the first hour and not just after a number of weeks, which they could not accumulate in the past.

* * *

[English]

TRADE

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

Over the last little while we have been trying to get an answer from the Minister for International Trade as to whether or not Canada is seeking at the MAI negotiations to achieve a set of binding and enforceable core labour and environmental standards. The minister has been unwilling to give us a straight answer on this. Can he give us a straight answer on this today? If he is not willing to do so, will he at least tell us why he is not willing to give us an answer? Canadians deserve to know what the Canadian government position is, or why it is not willing to tell us.

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since assuming this portfolio the member knows that we have certainly provided as much information as possible.

The member has been briefed. His party has been briefed. All the trade critics have been briefed. We have sent packages to members of Parliament. We have been answering on the floor of the House in terms of the highest standards for both environment and labour, and the other key issues in the MAI discussions.

The member also has to recognize and let Canadians know that obviously, we as one of the 29 countries have to respect the process as well as respect the fact that we are also consulting with provincial governments who obviously share jurisdiction.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, other countries are on record as seeking binding, enforceable labour and environmental standards at the negotiations. Why is it that the Canadian government is unwilling to join other governments, the government of the U.K. and social democratic governments in Europe, in seeking these kinds of binding and enforceable standards?

The minister talks about high standards and low standards. We want to know if he is seeking binding and enforceable. Will he use the words binding and enforceable, and whether he is against them or for them? We want to know the answer to that question.

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member says that the Government of Canada's position is that it is unwilling to commit to the very issues that he is talking about. That is the wrong assumption.

I said to the member there is no Canadian and no political party in this House that wants a lower degradation for our environment or lower standards of workers rights.

The question on the matter is that this is a negotiation with 29 countries. Canada is pushing for the highest standards. It is a situation that is evolving and we have to rally a consensus. That is exactly what we will do, despite how high he jumps or how low—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Sherbrooke.

FISHERIES

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question to the government is on the Pacific salmon dispute between Canada and the United States.

The government will know that the principle of equity in this treaty is a key principle, as is the principle of conservation. I would like to know from the government whether or not it will ask envoys Ruckelshaus and Strangway to make recommendations to governments on ways where they could include a dispute settlement mechanism and also propose options for a binding mechanism as a way of ending the impasse on the equity principle?

• (1130)

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, under the terms of reference that we negotiated with the Americans to establish the special envoy process, they can recommend anything they want. If they, on the basis of their consultations, are able to find the support for a variety of measures, including dispute resolution, of course the governments of both Canada and the United States would want to respond.

The mandate of the envoys is totally open to include anything the hon. member wants to suggest to them.

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC): Mr. Speaker, with all respect, the minister's answer is a good indication of what is wrong with the government's position on this. It does not seem to want to give any political direction. In fact, yesterday it met with the envoys and we learned nothing as a result of that meeting. Nothing new is on the table.

I would like to know when this government is going to show some backbone for the families on the west coast of British Columbia suffering in this dispute. Will it, yes or no, ask the envoys for an interim report when they will meet the prime minister and President Clinton around the APEC meetings? When will the government show some backbone on behalf of British Columbians and not be like Reformers and not care?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the high state of agitation of the hon. member simply shows a total misunderstanding of how to get a solution.

What we are working on is to be based on the agreement of those directly affected. He has waved his arms about the need to respond to the fishing communities on the west coast. That is what we are doing. We are giving them the empowerment to help make those solutions to come to those issues. We are working on the grass-roots, bottom up thing, not the top down elitist approach the hon. leader of the Conservative Party wants.

Oral Questions

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the defence minister, in referring to a lack of disclosure about a missile incident, said the following: "If there was any injury to person or property then of course it would be made public". On September 7, 1995 Canadian Vandoos in Croatia set fire to their own mess in an apparent attempt to cover up a theft of some video equipment. Property was stolen and damaged. Why was the public never informed?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 1995 is long before I became minister of defence. I do not know about back then but nowadays we do provide maximum amount of information to the public. There are obviously a lot of incidents that occur in a military the size of ours that are of no public interest.

However, where there is any damage to person or property information is in fact provided.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the information and investigation in this particular incident have been ongoing. There appears to be no total conclusion to it. I think this minister, along with his predecessor, should be very much aware of what has happened.

I have in my possession documents received through access to information. They outline a series of events between September 7 and September 9 which indicates stolen property and certainly reflects an aspect of arson taking place there.

I remind the minister again, property was stolen and damaged. Why were no criminal charges laid? According to the minister—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. Minister of National Defence.

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they are really scraping the bottom of the barrel here. They are going back several years. If the hon. member wants to provide the information I will be happy to have it looked into and we will get him an answer.

* * *

[Translation]

CLOSING OF BC MINE

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Today is the last day of work at the BC mine in Thetford Mines. Tomorrow morning, 300 workers will be without jobs. One worker

Oral Questions

put it this way: "This evening, I'll be getting out my old clothes. I don't even get severance pay or government assistance".

Can the minister give us an update on the situation since his meeting with the workers last Wednesday?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are obviously very concerned about the situation of these workers who, some of them after many, many years with the mine, are losing their jobs now that it is closing.

This is why my department met, at the end of September, with both the employer and worker representatives, and quickly and efficiently set up \$2.5 to \$3 million in active measures to help them re-enter the job market.

I met with representatives of the workers last Wednesday and they told me that the application under the POWA program being requested by the Bloc Québécois was not what they wanted.

• (1135)

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the minister is abandoning these workers to their fate, condemning them to poverty when their employment insurance benefits run out?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have set up a certain number of active measures to help them re-enter the job market and there is a transitional job creation fund to help revitalize the job market.

We are going to do everything we can to allow these workers to really give it their best, because we do not think we should underestimate individuals who are still able to make a significant contribution to the regional economy.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when this House opened the prime minister made a commitment to Canadians that he would not rule out the possibility of consulting with the people of Quebec on the Calgary declaration.

Will the prime minister let Canadians know how the consultation process is going in Quebec?

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada considers the Calgary declaration to be a significant step forward in dealing with the situation of Canadian unity. It is a provincial initiative taken by the provinces. Each of the provinces, save Quebec, has been working toward setting up the consultation.

With respect to Quebec the Government of Canada has not taken a position on consulting the Quebec people, but that is an option.

[Translation]

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has made a commitment before this Parliament to look at the possibility of submitting the Calgary declaration to the people of Quebec.

He made that commitment more than a month ago. Does the Prime Minister now have any concrete plans for consultations in Quebec?

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have just said that at this time the government, the Prime Minister has no concrete plans, but that there are still possibilities.

* * *

ASBESTOS INDUSTRY

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of International Trade.

More than a month ago now, the Quebec government, the three central labour bodies and the leaders of the asbestos industry joined forces to call upon the federal government to file a complaint with the WTO concerning the banning of asbestos in France.

When does the minister intend to file a complaint with the World Trade Organization in order to come to the assistance of the 2,000 workers in the asbestos industry?

[English]

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member will know the federal government has taken a leadership role on the asbestos file. Not only have we made representation to the French and British governments as well as other European governments, we have also organized the recent international conference, together with the Government of Quebec as well as industry in the asbestos file.

As well, the member should know that before and after the premier's trip to France his direction through his officials to us was not to entertain the possibility of going to the WTO at that time.

[Translation]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that there is a danger of England's following the example of France in banning asbestos on its territory.

What does the minister intend to do to prevent England from following France's example?

[English]

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the prime minister during his trip to Great Britain

raised that issue in a forceful way with his counterpart, Prime Minister Blair. I met with the high commissioner for Great Britain in Canada a few weeks ago. We have also sent technical information and invited representatives of Great Britain and the secretary of state for health from France to visit Canada to ascertain on an export basis the kinds of information we have. We have been very forceful on this file.

At the same time, we always entertain the possibilities of going to the World Trade Organization to make—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

* * *

TAIWAN

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, China is coming to the APEC summit meeting in Vancouver next month.

• (1140)

Taiwan, a democratic nation and a friend of Canada's, has been refused by this government participation in the APEC summit in Vancouver next month.

Why has Taiwan been refused participation in this important economic summit?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the statement of the hon. member is not accurate. Taiwan will be participating in the APEC conference.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this government is coddling China. It has not said anything about the gross human rights abuses that are going on there and it has repeatedly prevented Taiwan from integrating with Canada.

I ask, once again, whether this government is getting its marching orders from Beijing or whether we have an independent foreign policy.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have both an independent and an effective foreign policy. The key is to make it work.

I take some exception to the hon. member's premise. The fact of the matter is we have raised human rights issues continually with Chinese leaders and we have actually succeeded in getting an agreement with the Chinese to have an ongoing annual dialogue on human rights where we have an opportunity, unlike most countries, to engage them directly on a number of human rights matters. I believe we will achieve success in that dialogue.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

As it is not subject to import controls, the oil, sugar and butter mixture is being imported in huge quantities. This will mean losses in 1997-98 of \$50 million for Canadian dairy producers, and the figure is going to increase.

Could the Minister of Agriculture tell us when he will act to put a quick stop to this situation, which is costing the Quebec and Canadian dairy industry dearly?

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there will be some action this afternoon at 2 o'clock when I meet with the national executive of the Dairy Farmers of Canada to discuss this issue. This is not the first time that I will have met with it.

Discussions are being held on this matter with the finance department, with international trade, with Revenue Canada and with the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food. We will work to the best of our ability with the dairy industry on this matter.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice.

Why is it that our courts do not accept the devastating and traumatic impact of sexual assault and rape on the lives of young victims?

Our Ontario community is outraged that such crimes can be treated so leniently, as in the sentence in the recent Stuckless case where he received two years for multiple child assaults.

How can such lightweight sentencing possibly protect our young and provide deterrence and how will the Minister of Justice fix this shortcoming in our sentencing system?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I, along with all members of this House, I am sure, would like to extend my sympathies to the family and friends of Martin Kruze. He led a very difficult life and he was a very brave man to bring forth this issue.

Oral Questions

At the moment the indictable offence of sexual assault has a maximum sentence of 10 years and one of aggravated assault has a maximum sentence of life imprisonment.

It is not the laws. The laws are there. It is the application of the laws.

This matter is also the subject of an appeal at the moment.

* * *

CIDA

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, accountability and transparency are lacking in CIDA's policies and performance.

In 1994 CIDA recommended that an aid effectiveness advisory committee with members from inside and outside CIDA be set up. That was over three years ago.

Can the government tell us why this committee has not been established and how long this party will continue to take political advantage of CIDA?

Mrs. Claudette Bradshaw (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question under advisement, I will inform the minister of it, and we will ensure that the question is answered.

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians want accountability within the system. The Canadian auditor general's office has trained over 120 auditors from 45 countries. CIDA has never used them except once and it exposed that the money was not used for the intended purpose.

• (1145)

Could the minister tell Canadians why those auditors are not being used by CIDA?

Mrs. Claudette Bradshaw (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I assure the member that as soon as the minister is back on Monday morning we will have an answer for him.

* * *

SENIORS BENEFITS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The Canada pension plan is one important component of retirement income. Others are the old age pension and the GIS. They are both tied together and they are both scheduled for change.

In light of that, why has the government not tabled legislation on the seniors benefit which will replace the old age pension so that in fairness Canadians and Parliament can deal with the whole package

at the same time? Or, is the minister simply saying to us that when seniors return from his house this Hallowe'en night they had better check their apples for razor blades?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thought the question was directed to my colleague in the finance department.

Before the finance committee the other day we had a long discussion on the merits of CPP reform. We were looking into a number of aspects. I think we are doing very well.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that was the weakest answer I have heard in this Parliament.

When will the government table legislation on the seniors benefit so we can deal with the whole package? The seniors benefit and the CPP are interlinked. The CPP provides about 25% of retirement income and is based on a universal old age pension.

The government wants to continue to try to abolish the universal old age pension. Is it afraid to table legislation because it is under pressure from senior citizens?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): It is absolutely to the contrary, Mr. Speaker. We are very pleased with the package we have been able to introduce because it will bring a benefit to 75% of seniors. Ninety per cent of single senior women will benefit under the package. It is one we are proud of. It is one that is sustainable.

We feel it is a fair package. We are looking forward to bringing forth legislation in a timely manner so that all Canadians can come to the same conclusion we have adopted.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, the government has allowed an interception salmon fishery on the east and the west coasts of Canada. We are now facing an immediate stock crisis on both coasts. At this time of crisis why is the government following through with a divestiture of the Nova Scotian salmon hatcheries?

These hatcheries support Nova Scotian salmon threatened by the very interception fishery the government allows.

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been well known for some time that the Government of Canada would divest the fish hatcheries. We have done that after talking with the fishing communities.

In most cases fish hatcheries have been sustained by developing a partnership in some cases with provincial government and in some cases with fishery associations.

We are looking to the future in terms of continuing to utilize hatcheries and keep them operating through those kinds of partnership agreements.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, because of acid rain many of the salmon rivers in southwestern Nova Scotia no longer support a run of multi-sea winter salmon in Nova Scotia.

The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has said many times in the House that his department is responsible for conservation. Is the Department of Fisheries and Oceans now denying that responsibility?

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the government has moved forward in terms of getting its financial books in order we have had to make cutbacks in certain areas.

Conservation does remain a priority of the federal government in terms of the fishery. We have been able to do things in a fiscally responsible manner, maintain conservation and ensure that the hatcheries are there for the future because of the arrangements we have been able to work out.

* * *

• (1150)

CIDA

Mr. Bill Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for to the parliamentary secretary to the minister responsible for CIDA.

Despite international humanitarian aid to North Korea, the North Korean people are starving under the world's most repressive regime.

Canadians want to know what the situation is in North Korea and what steps Canada is taking to provide aid in keeping with its tradition as a key supplier of humanitarian food aid.

Mrs. Claudette Bradshaw (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is an unfortunate situation. Canada has already provided over \$10 million worth of Canadian wheat, lentils and fish to help feed the people of North Korea.

However, the harvest in North Korea is likely to be very bad again this year due to drought. The world food program is now assessing the current harvest and the food needs of North Korea for the coming year.

When the precise needs are known we will determine what further contribution Canada should make to address this ongoing humanitarian—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for West Nova.

Oral Questions

PAY EQUITY

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, the waiting game continues for thousands of low paid female public servants across the country. Despite the heavy handed tactics of the chief negotiator, Mary Eberts, the Liberal government's high priced hired gun, negotiations have apparently resumed between the Public Service Alliance of Canada and Treasury Board.

In light of the government's so-called commitment to pay equity, will the President of the Treasury Board clear the air and commit to a negotiated settlement with public servants that is fair to all parties?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this question has been addressed quite a number of times. I think the position of the government is well known.

The government has increased its offer by \$500 million in the last eight months. We have demonstrated time and again that we would like to have a negotiated settlement as soon as possible.

* * *

CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE

Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. Innovative centres of excellence were designed to encourage co-operation among industry, universities and colleges.

Could the minister advise the House whether these centres have been successful at achieving their aims?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the network of centres of excellence is a unique Canadian development. It has succeeded in creating in the 14 networks established across Canada networks of 1,000 researchers, 48 universities, 405 companies and 175 other organizations including 1,400 students, 500 post doctoral fellows, 1,200 research and technical staff. It has generated spin-offs in a variety of industrial sectors, as well as created an opportunity to retain the best Canadian researchers in Canada.

* * *

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-68 is in a mess. Four provinces and two territories are challenging it in court. Four provincial governments are refusing to administer the firearms portion of it. They are saying that if the federal government wants to charge and lock up farmers and ranchers for failing to register their firearms, it can but they will not do it. The costs are escalating and the government is not meeting its deadline.

Oral Questions

Will the justice minister simply withdraw the firearms portion of the bill?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the position of the Reform Party and the position of the government on this issue are very evident. The answer is no.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

At the Beijing Women's Conference, the Government of Canada promised to provide funding for the APEC Women's Conference. With less than three weeks remaining before the conference, no funds have been provided by the government.

Will the minister agree to honour the commitment made and to ensure the money will be there so that they do not have to cancel as the aboriginal group had to withdraw from the conference for lack of funding?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have provided funding for the people's summit. How they distribute the money is totally within their mandate and their jurisdiction.

* * *

• (1155)

[Translation]

CLOSURE OF BC MINE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The minister said this morning that the union did not want POWA in the case of the asbestos mine. In a letter sent yesterday, October 30, the president of the union said, and I quote:

POWA in whatever form—amended, improved, destandardized—to repeat various adjectives used by various people, would no doubt meet our workers' expectations.

Is the minister prepared or is he not to act on what the workers want?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I met workers' representatives on Wednesday afternoon and they told me very clearly in my office, looking me squarely in the eye, that POWA did not interest them.

So do not go asking me to give them something they have said they do not want. I have not yet seen yesterday's letter. I will consider it when I receive it. If the union prefers to deal with the

Bloc Québécois rather than me, that is fine. They will see what sort of service they get.

* * *

[English]

CUSTOMS ACT

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the solicitor general tabled a bill that will give customs officers the power to detain and arrest persons for Criminal Code offences.

In light of the fact that we have over 100 million border crossings per year, does the Minister of National Revenue really believe the bill will result in safer Canadian communities? If so, how?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Bill C-18 was introduced in the House. It will provide additional powers to our customs officers.

I am confident the bill will be supported by all members of the House because it provides powers to the customs officers to detain and arrest people who may be involved in criminalities such as impaired driving, child abduction, possession of stolen goods, or people who may have arrests outstanding.

This is another important initiative for the government on improving public safety and building safe homes and safe streets. I am very proud of what the government has done.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development, who the other night came before the Standing Committee on Finance with his colleague, the Minister of Finance.

For the first time, the Minister of Finance admitted before the committee that the government was using the EI fund to reduce the Canadian government deficit. The minister has a responsibility regarding this fund.

I would like to know why he lets his government use the employment insurance money belonging to the workers to reduce the Canadian deficit.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Finance recognized the other day is that we have a very responsible attitude toward the EI fund.

You will recall that, in the government of which the Conservative leader was a member, a \$2 billion surplus in the EI fund suddenly turned into a \$6 billion deficit. As a result, the govern-

Privilege

ment then in power had to raise premiums by 30% at the height of the recession, thus creating more unemployment. [Translation]

We have a different and much more responsible approach.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Earlier this week the Chinese government eliminated Hong Kong laws which guaranteed freedom of association for workers. While Wei Jing Sheng remains in prison human rights are trampled in Tibet and elsewhere and China continues its Neanderthal policies on Taiwan.

I have a question for the minister. Especially given Canada's shameful abstention on China at the UN Human Rights Commission, will the minister condemn the recent suppression of workers rights in Hong Kong? Will he ensure the House the Prime Minister will raise with the President of China the appalling human rights situation in China?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again the hon. member's information is wrong. We did not abstain. We in fact voted for the resolution on China. He should correct his history.

As I explained earlier in the House, we have established a very distinctive arrangement now with the Chinese to engage in an ongoing dialogue on human rights on a regular basis. Through that mechanism we have now been able to engage them on the question of political prisoners.

• (1200)

We have raised questions on Tibet in Hong Kong. In fact, we are now investing directly in programs in China to improve the legal system to help women and to try to improve the acceptance of the NGOs—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): On that note, we will bring question period to a close.

* * *

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I wish to draw to members' attention the presence in the gallery of Mr. Tom Spencer, member of the European Parliament.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

PRIVILEGE

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I seek the unanimous consent of the House to table a letter addressed to the Minister of Human Resources Development, because the minister misled the House.

The Minister of Human Resources Development received a letter from the union, which wants to put in writing the content of the discussions. So as to avoid any misunderstanding, the union put in writing what was discussed when they met with the minister. The two sides did talk about an improved POWA. The letter was addressed to the minister, who misled the House.

I seek the unanimous consent of the House to table the letter addressed to Mr. Pettigrew.

Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. member opposite, I think first of all that accusing the minister of misleading the House is unparliamentary—I see that the Minister of Human Resources Development is in the House, so he may want to take part in the debate.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is going too far. The member for Rimouski—Mitis may very well have a letter dated October 30 and addressed to me, but I can assure you that I never misled the House when I said I had not yet read that letter.

There is a limit to making such claims. The member claims I misled the House, but I want to make it clear that I did not do so in any way.

The member for Rimouski—Mitis should apologize for what she just said.

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC): Mr. Speaker, I can perhaps help shed some light on the debate, to move things ahead.

The member, on a question of privilege or a point of order, is asking that a letter sent to the minister be tabled. I am certain the minister has no objection whatsoever to the letter being made public, in the interests of transparency for all members of the House, which will help us to proceed with the debate.

An hon. member: That is another matter.

Hon. Jean J. Charest: No, it is not. The member is saying that that is another matter, but it is the crux of the matter.

Unanimous consent is being sought. On behalf of the members of my party, I offer that consent. That is the first question asked of the House, the question to which we must reply.

Government Orders

After what the minister has just told us, I can hardly see him objecting to tabling the letter after unanimous consent. That would be a complete contradiction.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Order. The hon. member for Rimouski—Mitis is requesting unanimous consent to table a letter. Does the member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member may table the letter.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1205)

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-269, an act to amend the Criminal Code (no parole when imprisoned for life).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to reintroduce this private member's bill. It amends certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to life imprisonment. It will eliminate any provision for early parole, early release or parole eligibility for a criminal who is sentenced to life.

For the families of victims, knowing that the offender will never walk the streets again as a free person will bring a sense of relief and an element of closure to a sad chapter in their lives.

My bill sends a clear message to murders that if you take the life of another, you will be locked away for the remainder of your natural life. Life will mean life.

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

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion: That Bill C-16, an Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Interpretation Act (powers to arrest and enter dwellings), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Charlesbourg has about 25 minutes left to finish his speech.

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, don't worry, I will not take anywhere near the 25 minutes I have left. I will continue the debate from where I left off before the brief interruption.

After a brief overview of the key clauses in the bill in question, Bill C-16, it is now important to state that we have certain reservations about the bill in question.

It will, first of all, be necessary to discuss the "discretionary" powers assigned to peace officers in relation to the reasonable and probable grounds to believe. There is a need for a thorough discussion of this aspect.

We also want to listen—we do not want to be rushed by the government—and we want to give both sides a chance to be heard. As I said a while ago, but it bears repeating now, this is a fundamental debate on the balance between individual rights and freedoms on the one hand and the powers of the state on the other. It is a debate that needs to be carried out in a leisurely and thorough manner. We want to hear the proponents of both sides, those in favour of this bill and those opposed to it, with the reasons for their positions. It will also be very important to hear from the men and women who will have to put this bill into application, or in other words from the police officers across Canada.

Given the respect the Bloc Québécois holds for privacy, given the duty the state has to respond to situations that require it to intervene in the private sphere of individuals in order to protect the public interest, and given as well that the action of the state is subordinate to the rules set out in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and more specifically section 8 in this case, given the importance of the amendments proposed to improve the administration of justice, given the Supreme Court judgment in the Feeney case, and the examination of precedents in the matter, and given that the amendments proposed seem—I use that word advisedly, as this will need verifying—to respond to the requirements of the jurisprudence, we in the Bloc Québécois declare that we are in favour of Bill C-16. That is the end of my statement.

Government Orders

• (1210)

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to discuss Bill C-16 and to express the views of the New Democratic Party.

I would like to echo some of the comments which have been made to date about the haste with which this bill is being pushed through the House of Commons. I will speak to some specific concerns about that in a moment, but this is not a very effective way to achieve law reform and, in particular, criminal law reform because of the concerns Canadians have, quite rightly, of their sense of security in their homes and in their communities.

I want to congratulate the parliamentary secretary for setting out clearly the provisions of Bill C-16. Those who were watching and those who will read the proceedings will not be left in any doubt exactly what the government is attempting to do.

The bill is a response to the ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Feeney case. The proposed amendments to the Criminal Code would enable the police to obtain a warrant from a judge to enter a private home to arrest or apprehend a person. Also the legislation is intended to clarify that authorization from a judge is not needed in urgent circumstances where it is not practical to obtain a warrant.

In the Feeney case the Supreme Court ruled that in order to protect the privacy rights of Canadians under the charter, police must obtain a warrant before they enter a private home to arrest or apprehend someone. Of course, the ruling caused concern among the police across Canada and victims' organizations, concerns that perhaps public safety was being put at risk in certain circumstances as a consequence of the delay which was being suggested by the Supreme Court of Canada in order to obtain a warrant to enter the premises.

Considerable concerns were voiced in the law enforcement community across Canada, as well as by the many Canadians who are concerned about their security.

Generally, police officers obtain a warrant authorizing entry before they enter a private home to arrest someone. This legislation is intended to provide procedures to obtain such a warrant. It also allows the police to obtain a warrant by telephone or by any other means of telecommunication where presenting themselves to a judge is simply not possible.

It also makes the obtaining of warrants more straightforward, somewhat easier, and will be particularly useful, the government contends, for those working in remote locations or when it would not be possible to both monitor a suspect and appear before a judge to apply for the warrant to enter.

It will not have any effect on the common law which permits police and other peace officers to enter private homes to arrest a suspect when they are in hot pursuit of that suspect.

The question that arises is whether this legislation strikes a reasonable balance between the powers available to the police to protect our safety and the privacy rights of Canadians. The government, of course, contends that it does. We will have to wait to see what the Supreme Court of Canada decides on that particular matter.

It does pose another problem, which is generated by rushing this legislation through the House with insufficient time to consider these provisions.

I was interested to hear the Reform Party praise the attorney general of British Columbia who led the way in successfully applying to the Supreme Court of Canada to suspend its judgment for six months so that Parliament could respond and so that the uncertainty within the law enforcement community could be addressed. It is a rare day indeed when the Reform Party commends the attorney general of British Columbia for anything. I want to note the Reform Party did that.

• (1215)

This legislation is before us as a result of the Feeney case. It is close to the deadline. I believe November 22 is the deadline for this legislation to be implemented in accordance with the recommendation of the Supreme Court of Canada. As has been said many times, it does not give members very much time or opportunity to look into the specific provisions to see whether the legislation answers the concerns raised by the Supreme Court of Canada. It gives little time to look into whether this legislation is a response which will enable the police forces across Canada to do their jobs effectively.

We know that from time to time the Supreme Court of Canada has taken the point that the old way of doing things prior to the charter is no longer appropriate, bearing in mind the contents of the charter. This is one of those examples. It serves to remind us that it would be better if the government took a more holistic and complete approach to criminal law reform. It could look through a number of the issues which the supreme court and other courts have raised with regard to the application of criminal law in the light of the charter of rights and freedoms.

The police association has raised some concerns about this legislation, among others. These concerns could have been dealt with had we had more time to consider the provisions of the legislation in depth. The police have concerns with regard to the statutory authorization of entry at the time of the warrant issue. As we know, it is not always possible to be fully cognizant of where somebody who has escaped from prison or a halfway house might be. Yet it is clearly in the public interest that such persons be

Government Orders

apprehended as quickly as possible. It deserves to be considered in more detail how this legislation affects that possibility.

We also know there is some concern about failure in the legislation to define exigent circumstances. When is it appropriate for the police to respond in the old way based upon an urgent situation in which they have no choice but to go and apprehend immediately? With uncertainty, the police will not always know what their responsibilities are or how best to protect the public safety in certain circumstances.

It might also have been better to have included in the preamble provisions which would make it clear the government's response should there be a section 1 argument under the charter presented to the legislation.

There are some other provisions that could have been addressed in a more comprehensive review of the legislation in committee if this bill had been put forward a little earlier than it has been. Clearly we have to respond to the Feeney case and the Supreme Court of Canada's suggestions that Parliament act. The government has acted with Bill C-16. As has been mentioned, there is all party support for this response to the supreme court.

I merely want to point out that if we had this legislation in a more timely way, we could have had more opportunity to resolve whatever potential difficulties there might be. Those concerns have been voiced by police associations across the country which have the responsibility for enforcing this legislation and for protecting Canadians in their homes and in their communities.

There are aspects of criminal law reform that can only be done in a piecemeal way. We do not have a full view of the future. We cannot guess what the Supreme Court of Canada might consider needs to be addressed as a result of the charter affecting our criminal law.

• (1220)

As Canadians we deserve a more cohesive, more fully informed, more forward looking approach to criminal law reform than we have had in either this or the last Parliament. It is possible to predict in many respects, and it is possible to see what the Supreme Court of Canada has said we should do.

It would be better for all of us if the government took criminal law reform more seriously and did it in a more complete way.

That being said, we will support this legislation.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party to speak to a bill introduced in the House to amend the Criminal Code and the Interpretation Act, specifically referring to the powers of arrest to enter into a dwelling house.

A key objective of Bill C-16 is to provide police across the country with the power to enter a home and effect an arrest of an individual. This came about as a result of *The Queen v. Feeney* case in the Supreme Court of Canada on May 22, 1997. In the delivery of the decision in *The Queen v. Feeney* the court ruled that as a general rule police require a warrant to enter a private dwelling to effect an arrest.

This decision overturned a longstanding existing string of case law that did not require police to obtain a warrant to enter a home in arresting an individual if that police officer had reasonable and probable grounds to effect that arrest or, prior to entering the home, indicated in the presence of the accused that the authority and reason for entry was part of the normal process.

The Supreme Court of Canada found that in this situation the privacy of Canadians under the charter was not adequately protected.

The charter has been given broad interpretation by our courts and in this instance the police have been curtailed in their ability to carry out their duties as it refers to arrest. No doubt this ruling causes great concern among the police community and victims' organizations that public safety may be put at risk in certain circumstances as a consequence of the delay required to obtain a warrant.

Many members have spoken concerning this bill. I listened with great interest to the comments of the opposition parties as well as the government. There are various perspectives that have significant bearing on the issue.

One of the concerns I have is the issue of hot pursuit in a situation where a person suspected of a serious criminal offence is being pursued into a residence or business and the ability of police officers to carry out their duties by effecting an arrest. There are also concerns that tie into that with respect to the preservation of evidence and the overall issue of protection of the public through preventive measures that police officers are charged with in their daily duties.

The attorney general of British Columbia joined with other provinces and the federal government and successfully applied to the Supreme Court of Canada to suspend the judgment that was issued in *Feeney* for a period of six months to give Parliament the time needed to address the effects of this ruling and to fill the void left by *The Queen v. Feeney*.

In the meantime, police feel they are in limbo on this issue and are anxiously awaiting definitive direction and action to be taken by the government.

Today we are looking at the government's response to the supreme court decision. I acknowledge in essence—and I want to put this clearly on the record—that it is a positive position the government has taken on this decision. It is the government's attempt to fill the gap left by *The Queen v. Feeney* case. However I

want to put comments forward with respect to the bill and I say again that I support it in principle.

• (1225)

The Feeney decision could not be left to stand, lest effective law enforcement, including the arresting of individuals committing crimes would be jeopardized with the existing situation were it left as it is.

Before going into the substantive effect of the bill, I would point out to the House and to the government, with the greatest respect, one of my concerns. The government's response was somewhat slow to the situation and the timeframe that was allotted by the supreme court. Six months is certainly sufficient time to respond. Obviously the country went through a federal election in that time but the business of the day has to be carried out regardless of the fact that the country is going through an election. I would suggest that a matter that is certainly of significant importance to the law enforcement community could be addressed within that time period.

In a press release dated October 30, 1997, the Minister of Justice is quoted as saying that the bill "strikes a reasonable balance between the powers available to the police to protect their safety and the privacy rights of Canadians".

I am pleased to hear this pronouncement and this assessment by the minister regarding the legislation. However considering the fundamental implications of Bill C-16, and those implications on the rights of individual Canadians, I hope that the minister will take into account the need for the justice committee to properly and openly discuss the impact of the bill. All indications are that this will be moving to the justice committee this week. I am encouraged by that.

To be quite frank, I am unsure that this House has enough time left, with 11 sitting days, both to pass the legislation and fulfil the commitment to Canadians to act thoughtfully and responsibly with their best interests in mind. However, we are used to working under pressure in trying to respond quickly and I am pleased to say that we are going to endeavour to do this with the time allotment we have.

It is my position that this bill should be carefully studied at the committee level. That is why I raise the issue of delay. I know that the minister and her officials are prepared to hear the response of the opposition parties as well as witnesses at the justice committee level.

Those witnesses I would suggest will include the Canadian Police Association, bar associations throughout the country and crown prosecutors who will be given an opportunity to testify and give their very important and insightful views on the bill and their suggestions on how this bill might be further tightened up.

Government Orders

This is the time and the place to fix this bill and draft legislation that is going to effectively fill the gap left by Feeney and we should try to get it right the first time.

In order for the standing committee on justice to do all of this, the time issue is a factor and I hope we will be successful in our efforts to respond before the deadline of November 22.

By having tabled the bill today and with the debate on second reading, it would be easy to demonstrate to the supreme court that Parliament has already started serious study with respect to the work that has to be done. A suspension could be requested if required and there is precedent for this. It has happened in the past. We may have to make this request should the justice committee have insufficient time or the witnesses not be permitted sufficient time to speak to this issue.

I want to turn briefly to the bill and its objectives. What does this bill do and what should it do? Without any doubt, and I think it is common ground, the first objective should be to help to protect and serve the community. We also have to recognize that the police officers, the rank and file, the individuals with the badges that are on the beat, have to be given assistance when it comes to effecting arrest and carrying out their duties.

Does Bill C-16 do all this? Does it accomplish this and can it be improved? Again, these are questions that members of the justice committee and hopefully those bringing forward testimony are going to help us answer.

• (1230)

I had an opportunity to be involved in a number of cases that included search warrants and individual rights, and the balance that must be struck between the protection of the public and those individual rights was always at issue. Certainly any piece of legislation that addresses issues of arrest where police officers are entering into private dwellings or places of business to effect arrest has to be viewed in a very, very serious light.

Businesses of course enjoy a different degree of privacy than a private dwelling. Certainly the police, as in many of the situations they face on a daily basis, have to be entrusted with the greatest of discretion. We can never ever ignore the fact that police officers are looking for direction from the Criminal Code of Canada and those legislators who have input into the process.

The specific concerns I raised at the outset surrounding hot pursuit are issues which I hope will be the subject of lively discussion at the committee level.

Domestic violence and the need for all police agencies to address this will be better served when the issue is completely ironed out. Police officers are called upon daily to intervene in issues of domestic violence. They must be given the utmost support and assistance if they are to effectively combat this very, very serious problem in our country.

Government Orders

Drug searches are another area where the bill will have an impact. Police officers are facing an epidemic of rampant drug use throughout the country. They must be given the discretion to enter into a dwelling house or areas where drugs are suspected to be housed.

Police are always working in a pressure filled environment and there is more and more attention drawn to police and the job they are entrusted with. In my experience I have seen police exercise very good judgment and act responsibly and lawfully in the majority of instances.

Having said that, the principles that underscore the bill are sound. At present, police officers throughout the country are working under a system which is somewhat cumbersome and ineffective without a substantive position being put forward in the Criminal Code. Some of the proposals in this bill would certainly clarify it and would help the police do their job more expeditiously and would give them the knowledge that they are acting on solid ground.

I would suggest however that the bill needs to be amended or at least tinkered with in some areas. This would include when police officers are seeking an arrest warrant and the authorization to enter into a dwelling house and their ability to tell a judge about a specific residence they want to enter to effect an arrest. This information is not always available. Again it ties into the immediacy of the situation where they may be in pursuit or they may be faced with an emergency situation where they have to act immediately to prevent further injury, to prevent hiding or disposing of evidence. This is something the bill does not address effectively.

True, I certainly acknowledge that it is possible at times to speculate where a suspect may be, but this information is not always predictable. Surely in the public interest the apprehension of a suspected criminal where the police have reasonable and probable grounds to believe that an offence has been committed outweighs the concerns about entering a hideout or a safe house where the criminal may be harbouring the proceeds of crime, drugs or weapons that may have been involved in the offence of which he is accused.

Another concern I have is with respect to the resources available to police officers when it comes to effecting a search warrant. There is really no mention whatsoever in the bill about the availability of justices of the peace or judges with respect to the issuance of such warrants. This I would suggest is a glaring omission. Without the resources it is really nothing more than lip service. If we have a very specific procedure in place as to how a search warrant can be obtained but we do not have the justices or the judges available to sign those warrants and allow the police officers to carry them out, then all is for naught.

• (1235)

Another concern that does arise from the decision itself, and an attempt has been made by Bill C-16 to address it, is the further definition of exigent circumstances which is the language that is used in the majority decision of Feeney. It is not clear, I would suggest, to this point what those exigent circumstances would include. The police I think are looking for further clarification on this.

True to form as in all legislation there are going to be challenges. Certainly the government cannot simply be responsive to the fact that this is going to be challenged and therefore try to anticipate every single charter challenge that may arise but clarification is needed on that definition.

Another point with respect to the listing of multiple dwellings within a search warrant and entry authorizations, the Interpretation Act seems to infer that singular means plural and vice versa within that act as the wording is set out in the current bill. I would suggest that there is still some vagueness surrounding the language as it pertains to multiple listings for residences or hideouts where a suspected criminal may be staking out.

In conclusion, I do want to say that we in the Conservative Party are supportive of this bill. I would also like to indicate that the Minister of Justice has done the right thing in responding in a timely fashion in this sitting of the House, keeping in mind my earlier remarks with respect to the work that has been done thus far to see that the bill is brought to fruition in the House. There is some concern I have in that regard.

The federal government obviously has a huge obligation when it comes to the Criminal Code of Canada. The Minister of Justice is certainly the top dog when it comes to effecting change within the Criminal Code.

I look forward to the opportunity of having a direct impact on the final draft of this bill. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to seeing Bill C-16 through to its final conclusion which will hopefully be put forward in a way that it is going to be very effective in ensuring that police officers are permitted to do their job and to help keep the streets in this country safe and sound.

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Dewdney—Alouette.

I have been in this place a short while and in that time I am amazed at how it operates. Yesterday the minister tabled legislation in response to a supreme court decision of last May. It took the Department of Justice with all of its resources over five months to prepare a response. Members of Parliament are then provided a day in order to review that response, comprehend the ramifications and

attempt a rational comment. No wonder the Canadian public often question proceedings in this place. It may also explain why the courts have been so eager to challenge our legislative power in this country.

Just a few short years ago the courts limited themselves to interpreting the law and they now seem to be making it. It used to be that this placed made the law.

During the last Parliament the former Minister of Justice was known for legislating by panic. He often left mere days to pass essential legislation. I expected more, and Canadians expected more from our present Minister of Justice. As many members of the Liberal backbench have been quoted as saying, the unelected bureaucrats from the PMO really make all the decisions.

Perhaps the Minister of Justice does not control her own agenda and she has been forced to play these political games whereby legislation is introduced with unreasonable timeframes resulting in inadequate review and consultation. We can only hope this government has at least the decency to refer this legislation to committee and then provide sufficient opportunity for proper review and presentation of all concerns.

With respect to the bill, I appreciate that it is almost entirely a reaction to the Feeney case, but I question whether this legislation will address the next case like Feeney. The majority decision of Feeney held that the police did not have reasonable and probable grounds to arrest Mr. Feeney prior to entry into his abode.

• (1240)

So I ask this question. How will a formal process of obtaining a warrant to enter a dwelling make an arrest be obtainable if there are not the grounds to make that arrest? Many critics have sided with the minority position but the fact remains that the majority decided it was wrong for the police to gain entry to the dwelling without a warrant in those circumstances.

The second point concerns the bureaucracy we are placing upon police officers. I have had reason to spend much time with the police in my community over the past few years. I make it a point every few months to ride along with them for a full weekend night shift. If citizens only knew what goes on in their streets while they are snuggled away in their beds.

Perhaps more judges and legislators should do the same before rendering bonehead decisions or penning ill-conceived legislation. Maybe they would come to appreciate the situations faced by these men and women, the ever present threats and the instantaneous decisions required to keep our streets safe.

This legislation at least makes provisions for telewarrants. Not all police officers will be smothered by paperwork. Hopefully in those remote locations and in those circumstances where time is

Government Orders

important, the advantages of the telephone will assist our already overworked and understaffed enforcement personnel.

I have not had any experience with telewarrants but I hope they will work as well as anticipated. I cannot help but wonder whether justices of the peace would not be more hesitant to authorize warrants over the telephone rather than when a police officer with proper documentation appears personally.

We should also wonder just how available justices of the peace will be in the wee hours of the morning when our police are out protecting the public and require these dwelling arrest warrants. I would like to hear more evidence of how telewarrants work in practice.

In any case, as a result of this legislation the police now have to be concerned about obtaining proper authorization to enter a dwelling to make an arrest. They quite likely may also have to obtain separate authorization to search those premises. They could well have previously been required to obtain a basic arrest warrant. Is this not something, perhaps up to three warrants just to get an individual into our justice system. After spending all the time and effort to get the individual before the legal process, the police and our communities will continue to be astonished at how quickly the accused will be entitled to bail and release.

I also wonder whether the police will actually utilize these warrant provisions. When they obtain a warrant and enter a dwelling house there is no guarantee the individual will be there. Executing the warrant will likely provide notice of police interest toward that individual. It will provide notice that the accused should attempt to disappear in many cases. In some cases the police will be endangered as desperate accused prepare to protect themselves against arrest.

I am further concerned that in many situations the police may decide to wait to apprehend to when the individual is outside the dwelling house. Of course such a delay in apprehension could result in more occurrences of crime by the individual. We can certainly see how our interest in protecting the rights of our criminals results in added responsibilities to our police and added attacks to our security.

Another issue to be raised concerns the status of other cases before the courts. We know that Feeney is the law as of the date of its decision. It is not clear whether other cases before the courts prior to Feeney will be ruled illegal arrests and evidence ruled inadmissible. It is not even clear whether cases since Feeney will be protected by this legislation.

For some reason I fully expect our present justice system will be just as eager to treat other offenders in the same way as Mr. Feeney, at least those who have committed their crimes and who have been dealt with by the police prior to the passing of this legislation.

Government Orders

Otherwise the bleeding hearts will cry that it is not fair that only Mr. Feeney obtained these lenient and controversial allowances.

As members of this place can appreciate, the supreme court raised some interesting new developments in our law. This bill is an attempt to react to those developments. They must be thoroughly and properly addressed. With respect, I wish to remind those listening that the Feeney case involved a vicious beating and death of an 85-year old man. The offender could well go free for this horrendous crime.

Any failures to properly address the inadequacies of our law could result in additional travesties of justice. It places a heavy burden on all of us in this place.

As I stated earlier I hope the government begins to see the light and provides proper opportunity to adequately address these shortcomings. This minister has gotten off to a poor start by leaving the bill to this late date and then starting to rush it through Parliament. We have three weeks until the date set by the supreme court to provide legislation and one of those weeks is a scheduled break week. I do not know if the public will ever understand this place and that is most unfortunate.

In conclusion, I have met with family members of the victim in the Feeney case. I doubt if there is anybody in this place who can even begin to comprehend how this decision has impacted on them. Just think of it, a convicted killer found covered in the blood of your loved one may walk away unpunished because the police were unable to wake him from a drunken stupor before entering his premises to make an arrest.

• (1245)

It is another classic example of how our justice system continues to revictimize. It is another example of how our justice system has been hijacked by those who view life from ivory towers, far above the realities of everyday Canadian life.

Is it any wonder that the majority of Canadians have lost faith in our courts?

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we will support Bill C-16. However, the fact that this bill must be brought forward is a symptom of bigger problems with the entire justice system, as my hon. colleague just mentioned.

We often hear the government saying that things are going well, that crime is down and that things are looking better. That is simply not the case.

In my previous capacity as a teacher, we had an acid test for the sign of a good teacher which was whether we would be willing to put our own child in a classroom with a particular teacher. If we were, then we knew that teacher was a good teacher.

The acid test for Canadians is the effectiveness of the justice system. Is this a case about which Canadians are going to say that is a fine finding and they can live with it? In the Feeney case it is obvious that is not the case.

I do not think that Canadians are feeling any safer today than in the past. There is a great deal of trouble with our justice system and Canadians are telling us that.

The travesty here is that Feeney will walk in this case. As my colleague from Crowfoot mentioned earlier, the community in which Feeney lives is certainly not feeling safer. Those people certainly do not feel that the justice system is working well in their area.

What is troubling in this case is the larger problem of the entire justice system. Madam Justice L'Heureux-Dubé, in her dissenting opinion in the Feeney case, stated that the warrantless arrest was justified given that a very violent murder had occurred, that the arrest was made in a field and that it was extremely impractical to obtain an arrest or search warrant. The arrest was in the midst of a fresh pursuit, which was continuous and direct, and there was reasonable fear that the killer would commit further violence. We believe this test should be applicable in all cases.

I would like to tell two short stories about some of my constituents who have told me about the problems they are encountering with the justice system.

One of the stories is about a man whose son, unfortunately, was one of the victims of Clifford Olson. He lives in my community of Maple Ridge, which is the largest city in my riding.

As a young man of 18 I lived in the community in which Olson prowled. That community was Coquitlam. In fact, that very summer I taught a Bible club in the apartment complex where Olson lived. One of Olson's victims was a young man of 18. I was 18. I know the fear that gripped my community when that man committed those heinous acts. It affected not only my community but the surrounding communities and our country as a whole.

I saw the pain and the anguish on a man's face whose life had been changed forever. Mr. Ray King talked to me just before the farcical trial which took place in Vancouver. He told me about all he had been through. His son had been lost. His son had been taken from him. It has ruined his entire life. For 15 years he has remained rather silent but now is starting to speak out for the victims of crime. He is asking for changes to be made to the justice system.

We cannot lose sight of victims. If we do we lose sight of what our justice system is about. It is about the protection of our society. It is about the protection of Canadians.

Government Orders

• (1250)

We saw the lack of foresight and vision when Bill C-45 was introduced by the government in 1996, only eight days before the end of the summer sitting. With further vision and further foresight in correcting the problems of the justice system this could have been brought forward sooner so that Mr. King and the other victims would not have had to go through what happened in Vancouver. They would not have to relive that pain and anguish. It certainly is a sign that there is some trouble with our system.

We support Bill C-16. We support our police. We support their being able to do their job, to have the tools to be able to do their job, to arrest criminals, to protect our society.

I will relate one more short story about one of my constituents who came to tell me his story about the problems he has encountered with the justice system. His father was brutally murdered by his own step-brother in the early 1980s. It was a terrible act, a heinous crime. The individual was convicted of first degree murder. This criminal has been streamed from maximum to medium to minimum security, and now Mr. McGillvary is faced with the fact that the person who committed this crime has been placed in an institution just 20 minutes away from his own home. This inmate, this criminal who committed this act, who had taken Mr. McGillvary's father from him, also threatened Mr. McGillvary's life. Yet now he is placed in an institution just 20 minutes away from his own home in a minimum security institution where there is a great chance he could get away.

There was a case in another minimum security institution setting five minutes from my house a few years back. Inmates left and committed a murder in Seattle. We would hope this is not a place people are going to leave from daily but the fear is there for Mr. McGillvary. He has been through the system to ask for changes. Understandably he is fearful, yet he has been offered counselling services to deal with his irrational fear. I do not see this as irrational. Not at all.

We apply the acid test to that case. What would we do if we were in Mr. McGillvary's case? We would be just as fearful. We ask who holds the keys to the criminal justice system. In Mr. McGillvary's case, he has been told that it would be a problem to transfer this inmate because the inmate could bring a court case against correctional services, a case which he would likely win.

Who holds the keys for where he is going to be? The justice system should have the opportunity to put an inmate where he is deemed to be best placed. We need a balance and the victims need to be remembered. While we support this bill, we point out that the government needs to listen to Canadians and their cries for a substantive overhaul of the criminal justice system, to provide a balance, to provide truth in sentencing, and to restore Canadians' faith in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member. I appreciated his remarks. It is important to remember that what precipitated the current debate and this legislation is a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Canadians need to ask the question of who holds the keys to the criminal justice system in this country. I submit that Parliament is the right institution to hold those keys and not the supreme court. While we respect the supreme court, its current method for appointing judges leaves the public no way of holding any of those justices accountable for the decisions they make. We know that at times there is the appearance that appointments are made on a political basis.

• (1255)

We certainly understand that we as elected parliamentarians are responsible and accountable to the people who send us here. We ultimately are the ones who make and pass the laws and we are, therefore, accountable to the people for the laws that we make, change or amend.

Does the member not agree that a big part of the problem with the Feeney decision is that of a situation where the public is going to have to live with the results of this absolutely unacceptable decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and yet the supreme court is not accountable?

Is there not something wrong with this picture and does it not need to be changed?

Mr. Grant McNally: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. colleague for Skeena for the question.

Yes, I would say that there is a definite problem with the system. We are charged by our electorate to make laws in this place. We are accountable to our constituents. However, when we see the application of law such as in this case, there is an imbalance. There should have been a common sense finding, but there was not. More and more Canadians are wondering why such an obvious case was found the way it was.

There is a body of unelected officials interpreting the law and making decisions on the law which more and more seem to be getting away from what the majority of Canadians would find to be reasonable answers. We need to overhaul the system and look at more accountable ways of appointing judges so that they would be held accountable for their decisions. We respect the supreme court, but in cases such as this we have to question the findings of such a decision.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the record is fairly complete here today in describing the background of the legislation. I want to acknowledge the anticipated co-operation of colleagues on all sides of the House to

Government Orders

dispose of the issue today and allow the matter to go to a committee where it can be treated with a bit more introspection.

However, I do want to address a particular issue. As a bit of a preamble, lot of MPs are curious about why from time to time we in the House have to revisit legislative areas because of decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada. It should not be a surprise. Since the charter was adopted as part of our Constitution we have had to adapt some of our laws to the guidance and interpretation of that court. It was inevitable that some of this was going to happen.

As one legislator, I wish that when the court deals with these things it would assess the impact of its decisions on criminal procedures on Canadian life. In this case, I gather it did not want to make the decision and then the government lawyers had to go back and ask for a stay of six months. We are now at the end of that six month window and we are attempting to correct that area of law.

I regret that the paradigms within which we must work to do this are set by the courts. I would rather we go back to square one and design a procedure that we all believed was appropriate and in compliance with the charter and fair to Canadians. We will probably have a chance to address some of those issues at the committee stage.

In the interests of brevity, I will get to the issue I want to discuss. As a result of this decision there is a gaping hole in the criminal procedure which applies to police entering private dwelling homes for the purpose of arresting someone or securing evidence.

• (1300)

Prior to this decision, before entering a dwelling home without a warrant for the purpose of executing an arrest peace officers had to have reasonable grounds to believe they could arrest someone in the home, someone they had the right to arrest. The person must have been guilty or believed to be guilty of an indictable offence.

In addition to the reasonable grounds peace officers would have to announce their entry: something equivalent to a knock on the door and a statement as to whom they were, followed by the entry. That was the way it was for almost 100 years based on what is called the Landry test. It seems to have worked relatively well.

I am wondering if the following scenario is proper. Let us say an individual is suspected of either a rape or a bank robbery. Three weeks later the victim spots the perpetrator. The person does not know his or her name but the perpetrator is spotted. The victim then goes to the police and says "I have seen the person who raped me" or "I have seen the person who robbed the bank".

The police officer under the old rules would have said "Let's go and get him" and if he is in a dwelling house he would have made entry. In this case the peace officer has to obtain a warrant if the

accused happens to be in a dwelling house even if it is not his own dwelling house.

The only difficulty is the warrant procedure we have just designed in the bill requires that the accused be identified by name. In my scenario we do not have a name. We have an identification. We know he is there but we do not know his name. Therefore we cannot get a warrant with the bill and the peace officer cannot go into the house. In theory the accused can sit there for 30 years while we figure out how we can get into the house.

It may be a problem with the legislation. We will have a chance to address it in due course. I am sure colleagues will co-operate as we address it. I will leave my further remarks on the legislation for committee stage.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Frank Boyle was murdered at Likely which is about one hour's drive, if one drives like heck and does not hit a deer, from Williams Lake where I live. It is on the Quesnel River flowing out of Quesnel Lake. It is an isolated community.

One of the large tasks I have as the member serving Cariboo—Chilcotin is initial telephone hookups, lines to where residents live so they can get on the telephone system.

The question I want to ask is about the telewarrants. I am glad the member raised the question of warrants. The legislation would probably work well in a city where the streets are laid out and the houses are identified. However, how would they work in areas where there are shacks, trailers and accommodations in the bush? People have lived for a long time in these areas. People in isolated circumstances are encouraged not to take the law into their own hands as they have had to do in the past because there have not been police resources or a means of communicating with the police.

How are telewarrants supposed to work when the police undertaking a legitimate investigation are unable to communicate with the justice of the peace, the judge or even their own headquarters in many instances because of isolation?

This seems to be another instance where the laws of our land are dividing rural and urban people. Does the member have a comment to make about telewarrants and their effectiveness in the type of circumstance that happened in Likely?

Mr. Derek Lee: Mr. Speaker, the member raises a good question. Obviously members at the committee stage will have to make sure the design and procedure work. The committee and the stakeholders will be consulting with the police community. Whether we are talking about telephone authorizations or telewarrants or whatever, we have to make sure when the bill leaves committee and comes back to the House we have a procedure or a mechanism that works and addresses the hon. member's question.

Government Orders

I am ready to go to work on it and I hope he is too.

• (1305)

Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak in support of Bill C-16.

Before doing so I would like to thank the Minister of Justice and the officials in her department for their swift and comprehensive leadership on this issue. I also thank the previous minister of justice for the bold leadership he demonstrated during our first mandate.

Our safe homes and safe streets agenda has been a tremendous success. Our accomplishments include sentencing reform, a new national system of screening child sex abusers, amendments to the Young Offenders Act and tighter controls on guns.

The approach of the Liberal government to justice issues has emphasized prevention. Prevention is the underlying philosophy. That is why we established the National Crime Prevention Council which continues to study what leads children into a life of crime and how to stop that pattern.

We have funded a national campaign against family violence. We have also improved peace bonds to make them more effective in keeping abusers away from women and children. To protect children from sexual exploitation we have brought in legislation to get tough on pimps and customers who prey on child prostitutes and prosecute Canadians who exploit child prostitutes in other countries.

Crime is not a simple issue. The Liberal approach avoids fear mongering and the kind of simplistic solutions we often hear in the House such as flogging petty criminals and throwing more and more people into expensive prisons for longer and longer sentences. That is why that policy is doomed to fail.

Let us move to why we are here today. The bill was introduced to correct a procedural flaw in our judicial system, a flaw that has been chipping away at section 8 of the charter. The section is one of the fundamental legal rights Canadians share that many people in other countries are still fighting for. It is the same right many people undertake when they wish to make their points. I remind hon. members that the section reads "Everyone has the right to be secure against unreasonable search and seizure".

The Feeney case presented the problem of whether Canadian police officers should have complete discretion to enter a premises simply because they are investigating an incident and then upon stumbling across incriminating evidence should be allowed to ignore section 8 of the charter and proceed with an arrest. The officer in the case did not believe he had reasonable and probable

grounds for the forcible entry. Therefore the court found the law inadequate to allow the police to do their job and to protect citizens privacy rights. I think there is a general consensus in the House on that background.

Our opponents may feel these claims are not strongly founded. However the bill will neither add to nor subtract from the powers of the police. The bill is designed to clarify the process so that the legal rights our opponents take for granted are protected.

Procedures will now be clear. A peace officer will be able to apply in person or by phone to a judge or justice for a warrant authorizing the peace officer to enter a private dwelling to arrest a person, if the judge or justice is satisfied that a warrant of arrest for that person exists and there are reasonable grounds to believe a person is in the dwelling, or authorizing the peace officer to enter a private dwelling to arrest a person whose identity is known or can be identified, if the judge or justice is satisfied there are reasonable grounds for an arrest and to believe the person is in the dwelling.

The proposed legislation would also allow the judge when issuing an arrest warrant to authorize entry into a specific dwelling if the judge is satisfied there are reasonable grounds to believe that the person subject to the arrest warrant is or will be inside.

After explaining this some people will say there will be instances when peace officers will not have enough time to get the warrant. We have provided for that. The bill will allow police officers to enter the private dwelling without a warrant in exigent or pressing circumstances where it is not feasible to obtain one. These would include but would not be limited to situations where there is a reasonable suspicion that entry is necessary to prevent bodily harm or death to anyone, or there are reasonable grounds to believe that entry is necessary to prevent imminent loss or destruction of evidence. In total the bill strikes the right balance between empowering police to do their jobs and protecting the fundamental right of the charter.

• (1310)

The government has consulted with provincial attorneys general, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the Canadian Association of Police and the Canadian Bar Association to prepare this legislation. I am pleased to see a broad consensus within the House to support the bill. For that I am truly thankful.

The government has been working tirelessly for safe homes and safe streets. We will continue to fight to preserve the rights of Canadians and to maintain the best justice system in the world.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for his comments. I have a question that relates directly to Mr. Feeney and the evidence.

Government Orders

Will the legislation provide for Mr. Feeney to be retried using the evidence that the supreme court has already thrown out, or will he go free because the evidence is not admissible in court?

There is no question in anybody's mind, particularly and likely, that Mr. Feeney is guilty as hell. The blood is on his hands. If that blood cannot be used in the subsequent court appearance, what good is it? Justice is being denied. Justice is not being served. The law must serve justice and not simply the legal system.

Will the government build in retroactive provisions so that Mr. Feeney can be tried, using the evidence that the police have already collected to convict him?

Mr. John Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the questions brought forward by the hon. member are sound. The place for him and members of his party to ask those questions is in debate in committee to see if those kinds of things can be worked through and a consensus can be brought forward. I think the recommendations are worth while.

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member.

As I have talked with Canadians over the past little while, it seems to me they have some sense there are three untouchables in our society over which they have very little control. Perhaps one would be the media. The second would be the banking system. The third would be the judiciary.

Does the hon. member have any thoughts on how we might be able to bring some kind of real reform to the judiciary that would make it more accountable to the people in general and somehow accountable to enforcing the law as passed in this Chamber?

The particular case that prompted this legislation is a case in point. It seems that somehow the judiciary has taken precedence over the laws of the land and Canadians do not have faith in it any more. We need to reverse that. Does the hon. member have any suggestions on how we might change that?

Mr. John Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the process has been so long established that it would require some deep and serious thought about approaching such amendments or changes in the judiciary.

Obviously I am not a lawyer and I am not legally trained. I think there could be a process if some members of Parliament come up with ideas substantiated with solid logic and support for change and have the support of the public of Canada.

At the moment I have no instant answers for the member.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes to debate the issue. I

want to make a few comments and will debate it more fully at third reading if I am given the opportunity.

• (1315)

I want to address a couple of the issues that have been brought before us on the amendment to the Criminal Code with respect to powers of arrest, to arrest and enter dwelling houses. I also want to comment on some of the statements made by members opposite.

One thing that has to be clear is that we are not talking about legalese and how it should be, we are talking about a law that affects the rights and protection of the citizens of Canada.

When we in the House start putting laws in place which will not withstand an interpretation by the courts, then we have a problem. The responsibility is not the courts. It is the responsibility of members of Parliament to make sure that we are very clear in how we put words into legislation, to make sure that we word legislation so it is not open to misinterpretation of our intent by the courts. Therefore, the onus is on this House to make sure that Bill C-16 is very clear in its intent to protect the Canadian public and not to allow the accused criminal to escape justice.

I heard the hon. member opposite say it is in committee that we should make sure that these changes, these rural versus urban concerns, are addressed. It is in committee that we have to address these other issues.

My experience is that committees are not always open to suggestions. They are not always open to suggestions saying we have to be clear, we have to be precise, we have to make sure that what we are saying is what the people of Canada are expecting to have written into the legislation. The onus is on us to go into these committees with an open mind, not based on party politics, to make sure that the end product is very clear.

We have seen it in other legislation that has come from this House in the previous Parliament. I use as an example alternative sentencing. Because we were not specific, although some wanted to be, for who these alternative sentences could be used, we see dangerous and serious offenders being released into society without any incarceration because we were not definite and clear in our intent.

I have great expectations that the 36th Parliament will be different, that it will allow real changes to legislation in committee to make sure that the end product is the best product. We have to make sure that the end product is not going to be questioned and challenged in the Supreme Court of Canada and sent back to us to correct matters that should have been changed first time around.

I am hopeful that the evidence which was decided was illegally gained can be used in the next court case. I am hopeful that the committee will ensure that the protection is there for the Canadian public. I am hopeful that the hon. members concerned about rural

people not having the same ability to have telephone warrants issued will be addressed in a meaningful and real way so that no Canadian citizen is denied the opportunity of the good that can come from this change in Bill C-16.

I want to impress on all members from all parties that Parliament should show a willingness in committee to have open and honest debate and be receptive to things which will improve legislation.

• (1320)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few things in general on this bill. It is very important to us as Canadians and as Reformers that our justice system do its work, that we have availability of evidence which I believe is the underlying premise of this bill, that evidence which is factual is admissible and that a member of the police force has the ability to do his work.

It is true that when we have an alleged offence we do not want to incorrectly incarcerate a person who is innocent. But at the same time we also want to make sure the person who is guilty is found guilty, is sentenced and is punished so that society is protected. It is very important for our courts to be correct, for our justice system to be correct: to vindicate the innocent, to most certainly convict the guilty. It is very important that we have a justice system that responds to that need.

We very strongly urge the government to take action. We sincerely hope the committee will do its work so the justice system our people are so concerned about can do its work and so we can restore a trust in it which people are now lacking.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words. I want to say them because I know how concerned are the people of Likely about what has happened to one of their neighbours, Mr. Boyle. There has been a travesty of justice. A man has been caught literally with blood on his hands and he has been freed. There is more than indignation in Likely and in the Cariboo—Chilcotin over what has happened.

A long time ago a lawyer told me that the legal system has nothing to do with justice, it has to do with keeping a refined set of rules. In this instance the rules have not served justice. It does not take a genius to know when justice has been denied. In this instance it has been. I call on this Parliament to consider the needs of justice and the needs of Canadians rather than to put the whole emphasis on the legal system and those who support it and operate it. Until we do this the legal system will be held in contempt and often the contempt which it deserves.

I call on Parliament and the justice committee that will be reviewing this legislation to keep in mind that our laws are there to protect the Canadian people. They are there to provide the tools to the police who give us that protection, to call people to account who have broken the law, who have done unjust deeds, who have hurt their fellow men, who have denied their fellow men the justice

they have a right to expect. We have to go beyond keeping rules. We have to keep in mind what is right.

Justice must be served. I would call on the government for the sake of Likely, for the sake of Mr. Boyle who lost his life, I call on Parliament to consider first of all the needs of Canadians as they seek justice and to seek to live their lives by a system that provides justice.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

• (1325)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe if you were to seek the consent of the House that there would be unanimous consent to see the clock as being 1.30 p.m. and the House could proceed to Private Members' Business, as the member is present and ready to begin.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): 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

[English]

ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.) moved that Bill C-217, an act to amend the Access to Information Act (disclosure of results of public opinion polls), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, most Canadians believe that this is the best country in the world in which to live. They are proud of the country in which we live. However, most of them would agree that the status quo is not acceptable. We cannot keep on doing things the way we have always done them. Now there is a demand across Canada for more open and accountable government.

Open government means a free flow of information between government and its citizens. It means government informs the

Private Members' Business

public, rather than manipulating them. Open government means that when tax dollars are used to commission polls about the thoughts and opinions of Canadians, then everyone has the right to access that information in a timely manner.

Canadians want to be able to access to these poll results in an easy manner, not in a manner in which they have to jump through a whole bunch of bureaucratic hoops and satisfy a whole bunch of requirements before accessing the information. If that is what has to happen, people will be discouraged from accessing poll results.

Unlike the Parliament of the Conservative Party which was very secretive, this Parliament has shown itself to be more willing to open up the process. This government believes there should be changes and that things will have to be changed to satisfy Canadians. As well, this government believes that Canadians should never have to face the situation, as happened in the Mulroney years, when the information commissioner had to take the prime minister to court in order to release information from publicly funded polls.

It will take a long time for Canadians to forget the reign of terror brought on by the Mulroney government and the secretive administration which existed then. I am sure this government does not want to have a repeat of that sort of regime. Of course, it does not want to leave those kinds of memories in the minds of Canadians.

There is no doubt in my mind that this kind of backroom government that was so common before must be changed and it must be changed quickly. The Canadian public will not accept any more of this sort of blind faith in politicians. Canadians have learned from experience that they cannot trust politicians who tell them "trust me".

Politicians who selectively release important information to manipulate the public, particularly when the public paid for those polls, is just not acceptable. To simply advance the ideas of the government through polling is just not acceptable.

• (1330)

We recently witnessed a perfect example of this sort of behaviour. On October 29 a *Globe and Mail* article by Hugh Windsor is an example of what Canadians will not accept.

I am going to quote from the article and talk about it because it was so timely that it was published just a couple of days ago. It really points to exactly what the bill is all about.

I will give a bit of background. This is with regard to the finance minister who we all know hates to be criticized and we know that he will go a long way in order to prevent criticism.

This issue relates to the harmonization of the GST and provincial taxes. He would not make any moves without conducting massive

numbers of polls and many focus group studies. This was paid for by the Canadian taxpayer. Then, of course, a number of people wanted to see the results of the polling and focus groups.

Another issue which arises from this is the fact that the minister also chose his political friends for this hundreds of thousands of dollars in polling that was done. David Herke, a former member of his leadership team, did most of the polling along with Elly Alboim, a former CBC journalist. After the polling and focus groups were finished, the minister said this cannot be made public.

The question Mr. Windsor asked very clearly in his article was how we can the opinions of the Canadian people on the topic of taxation and say that they should be state secrets. The minister is quoted as saying that this would be deemed injurious to conducting the Government of Canada and injurious to federal and provincial affairs. He also said that it would be materially injurious to financial interests, and he went on. Those were the grounds on which he said these polls could not be published.

The access to information commissioner said it was not a national threat to the country or to provincial relations. The minister then requested that the information be made public.

Just to show how far the finance minister would go, he hired his own lawyer to challenge the information commissioner on releasing polls that were paid for by the Canadian public. This blockage continued for 18 months. Finally, after his own lawyer advised him he cannot block these anymore, that if this goes to court he would lose, his lawyer advised him to release the information.

Now, 18 months after the polls which were paid for by the Canadian taxpayer were done, they were released. What did they contain that was so injurious? I will quote from the actual poll results:

[They] will be seen as a bribe and a waste of taxpayer's money if the reform is seen to be a political exercise unrelated to improving the tax system; the issue is political, not substantive; no evidence that people think the GST is in need of reform; the GST reform has no relief for consumers, it has a patchwork look and the appearance of more confusion for business and more bureaucracy; the GST commitment needs to be dealt with politically rather than substantively; the most effective method is likely to come clean now about the promise and the inability to fulfil it rather than pretend to have fulfilled it.

• (1335)

These are the claims that were made by the opposition parties in this House about the harmonized GST. Yet this minister took 18 months to hold this public polling in secret just because it was politically against what he was trying to do. Obviously if the taxpayer is going to pay for it then the taxpayer has the right to know about it. If a political party wants to do polling it certainly can keep it secret because it paid the bill.

Certainly the current government, as I have said, has not been as secretive as the previous one, but the whole red book concept of open government obviously is really being held to question now when we examine the actual facts.

I know we are going to hear from members across the way that there is no need for Bill C-217, that they really are not interested in blocking any poll results. However, what we are saying is that when any federal departments, boards or agencies commission polls paid for by the House they should be made public.

I have a lot of arguments that I think we will hear against the need for this bill. I do not think I have to go through all of them other than to simply say that many Liberal members in the House have stood up and said that results should be open and that the justice minister is going to fix the access to information. We have been promised since 1994 that there will be substantive changes to the access to information. Those have just not happened.

When we see a minister, as the example I have just described, doing that we can see just how old-fashioned and unwilling to change this government may have become.

Let us examine the Treasury Board changes which I can go through item by item. There are seven major items. I can provide that information to anyone who wants it. The key thing is that the headlines probably say it all, "Liberal poll rules are much like the Tories. Liberals will still allow polls to be kept secret". That does not go with the promise by the Liberals of an open government.

I am standing here today pleading with this government to allow these polls to be subject to access claims, that it be done in a reasonable manner, not 90 days but 15 days from the time the poll is commissioned if it is paid for by the public, that these polls then be presented to the Speaker of the House, that he then has the authority to release that information in due course, and then the public has the right to know what those results are.

That is the major part of the bill. Those are the reasons behind it. I think the government will be hard pressed to justify to those Canadians who are asking for accountability that a poll paid for by them should be kept secret.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, you caught me somewhat off guard, because I was expecting my Liberal colleague to speak. I am pleased to start.

The motion before the House today is quite interesting. It concerns one of Canada's principles, namely, democracy. A simple principle of democracy provides that the electorate through its

Private Members' Business

elected representatives must control the expenditures of the government. This is fundamental to democracy.

● (1340)

In the same vein, if taxpayers' money is spent, taxpayers are entitled to know how it was spent. This too is part of democratic control of government. It is a very simple matter, it is a matter of transparency.

We all know the role opinion polls play in our society. They play an important, some say too important, role. The fact is, their role is important because they provide not only qualitative information but quantitative information on very specific subjects. The government uses them to direct its policy, because all governments are influenced by opinion polls.

If what the government is trying to achieve through these polls is to give direction to this policy, the information collected should be shared with all elected representatives, who need to be "enlightened" too, because while the government must do a good job, the elected members of this House must be as "enlightened" as the government team across the way in order to perform their duties as parliamentarians.

This issue ties in with the problem of national unity, for we know what this government does with the polls it commissions in Quebec. It uses them to identify the fears and concerns of Quebecers. Not only was Quebec taxpayers' money used to identify their fears, but it was also used to develop Plan B and to turn the information gathered against the same Quebecers whose money was used to pay for these polls. That is utterly unacceptable. These poll results are used to add fuel to the scare campaign and pervert the democratic process.

We will recall that, two years ago yesterday, a referendum was held in Quebec. There were passionate, serious, yet healthy discussions around the issue. I think that, with a 93% rate of participation in this referendum, we were a model of democracy to the world. We are proud of this. We are often accused of acting outraged. Well, we are boasting now, and with good reason.

What has happened since the Quebec referendum? There was the federal government's scare campaign and Plan B. There was the diversion of democracy toward unelected officials. They said the sky was going to fall if Quebecers ever took their destiny into their own hands.

It is perfectly normal for Quebecers to know what they are paying for. Quebecers ought to know that the taxes they pay are used against their best interests. In a democracy, elected representatives should, as a minimum, monitor government expenditures and know what the government does with public funds.

If the government decides to spend millions of dollars on polls which are sometimes totally ludicrous, it should be pointed out in

Private Members' Business

the House to show that, fortunately, ridicule never killed anyone, otherwise there would not be many government members left.

The bottom line is that the government is using Quebeckers' own money to finance its fearmongering campaigns.

This is why the Bloc Quebecois will strongly and passionately support the motion tabled by the Reform member.

• (1345)

[*English*]

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in the debate this afternoon. I begin by acknowledging the hon. member from the government party who allowed me an opportunity to speak in order that I can return to my constituency this afternoon.

This is an interesting debate. There is absolutely no question that the government should and could do a lot more to let the sun shine in on the release of polling data that is paid for by the public. As the hon. member of the official opposition noted in his speech earlier, the Minister of Finance went to great lengths to hide the poll results on the goods and services tax of 1996, including the retention of a private lawyer to try to keep that information out of the public view. Clearly that kind of behaviour in a free and democratic society is totally unacceptable.

Our caucus is certainly supportive of change in this area. We also recognize and realize that we live in the real world. This private members' bill seems pretty utopian in its outlook. That is not surprising as it comes from a political party that is 10 years and one day old as I have read in the paper, but a party which is much older in terms of some of its views and attitudes. It is also a party that has consistently refused to run provincially.

In my home province of Saskatchewan, the Reform Party is cosy up to the Saskatchewan party, that ridiculous blend of Conservatives and Liberals. We see evidence of similar activity in the province of British Columbia. There is recognition and realization of why this is so.

The leader of the official opposition is clearly a student of political history. He knows what happened to his father's party, the Social Credit Party of Alberta. He knows what happened to the Social Credit Party of British Columbia and he knows what ultimately happened as a result of that to the federal Social Credit Party. When Peter Lougheed came into Alberta, the Social Credit Party disappeared. In this decade we have seen the demise of the B.C. Social Credit Party. I stand to be corrected but I believe there has not been a Social Credit member in this legislature since 1979.

The member from Stornoway does not want to see history repeat itself so he is not going to run the risk of having the Reform Party elected at the provincial or territorial level, thereby attempting to remain as pure as the driven snow. That is not the way we do it in

our caucus and our party. I am very proud to represent a party which runs candidates federally, provincially and sometimes municipally. As our party constitution states, if you are a member of the provincial or territorial New Democratic Party, you are automatically considered to be a member of the federal New Democratic Party.

I will refer to what we do in Saskatchewan. I will take a minute to set the scene. There is no question that in the 1980s the Devine government, probably the worst government in the history of our province if not Canada, had flagrantly abused the public polling situation, as the member noted about the Mulroney government. In 1993 the Government of Saskatchewan introduced some significant reforms. I want to go through them because they are legitimate. I hope the members on the government benches are listening because these are reasonable.

• (1350)

In Saskatchewan four times per year, once per quarter, the Government of Saskatchewan releases all polling information which has been completed for it during the previous quarter. The government has been doing this for the last four years. The information released includes all reports from polling companies, including both the questions asked and the responses made.

The material is released by the government and provided free of charge to the media and opposition parties, and I assume as well to the speaker of the legislature. The same information is available at a modest charge to other users, including interested individuals and corporations. The only material which is not released by the Government of Saskatchewan on its polling data includes that which refers to questions of market research, commercially and prices, in the case of crown corporations for example.

There is a lot more the federal government should be doing in the area of opening up the process and letting the sun shine in. There are some legitimate reasons why an appropriate or reasonable amount of time, 90 days, should exist before government polling is made public.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill C-217 which would amend the Access to Information Act in relation to disclosure of the results of public opinion polls.

I take offence to the hon. Reform member's contention that the PM's so-called friends are getting these contracts. Once again the Reform Party has proven its non-partisan and different way of doing things in this House.

I wish to make a general comment immediately which is that I firmly believe the Canadian people should be able to get easy access to government information with few limited and specific

exemptions. In my opinion easy access to most government information is a cornerstone of democracy.

The government supports the rights that Canadians have to access information about their government, except in certain specific cases where it is required for reasons of security intelligence, law enforcement and confidential commercial information received by the government from companies.

Indeed Canadians would not tolerate a government that did not give them easy access to most of its information. I believe an open government is essential to the trust that Canadians place in their government and to the preservation of the respect which members of the public give us as politicians representing them in this House.

I would like to talk about specific amendments to the Access to Information Act proposed in this bill. I will explain my concerns and my reservations regarding the bill.

[Translation]

In order to explain the concerns and reservations I have about this bill, I must describe the amendments being proposed to the Access to Information Act.

The amended act would require any department, branch, office, board, agency, commission, corporation or other body established by or pursuant to any Act of Parliament or established by or pursuant to any proclamation, order in council or other instrument made or issued by the Governor in Council or by those under his authority that commissioned a public opinion poll, to give notice thereof forthwith to the designated minister and to the Speaker of the House of Commons.

It seems to me that the amendment would apply to crown corporations, the Canada Labour Relations Board, the Canadian Human Rights Commission and various agencies of the federal government. But I could well be mistaken and that is precisely what worries me.

By defining the institutions affected by the proposed amendment as it does, this bill completely departs from the structure of the Access to Information Act. This act applies to the 140 odd government institutions listed in the schedule.

The purpose of this list is to identify clearly the agencies or bodies to which the act applies and thus exclude the others. Departing from this kind of designation risks creating uncertainty about whether the act applies to a given institution and opening the way for legal challenges to settle the matter.

● (1355)

The result of Bill C-217 could be that institutions that were not covered by the act until now, such as Canada Post, would now be included because of this particular amendment adding section 5.1. In short, I find it inappropriate to include in the same law two

Private Members' Business

procedures to determine to which institutions it applies, even if they are in two different parts.

[English]

There is another aspect of Bill C-217 which strikes me as problematic also from the legal point of view. The Access to Information Act currently creates a legislative scheme whereby a person can make a formal request for government information specified in the request and pay a small application fee. The information is then provided within a period of time specified in the act unless one or more of the limited and specific exemptions applies and the requester is denied access to some of the requested information.

My point in describing the process is to illustrate that the act does not oblige any department or minister to provide information to the public unless an access request has been received. This is because the act is not meant to replace existing ways of obtaining government information as specified in section 2 of the act. The act is an additional way of obtaining government information by means of a formal request.

Now, what would be the effect of Bill C-217? It would create an anomaly in the Access to Information Act creating an obligation for ministers to report to the House on results of public opinion polls, thereby doing away with the formal request for information scheme.

[Translation]

Even if we admit there is a case for creating a new system different from the one currently found in the Access to Information Act, I believe the proposed legislation could create another problem. The bill requires the minister to provide a report of the results of public opinion polls to the House of Commons or to the commissioner no later than 15 days after their completion. I think it can easily take longer than 15 days to analyze the results of a large scale public opinion poll.

[English]

I also have a problem with the requirement that every public opinion research contract be reported to the minister and to the Speaker of the House of Commons, and that reports be tabled in Parliament or with the information commissioner and published in *The Canada Gazette*. This would appear, in my opinion, to be overkill.

I am concerned with the definition of public opinion poll which I find extremely broad in the bill. It would include quantitative and qualitative research conducted among members of the public using a prepared questionnaire or interview schedule. A good proportion of this research would be very limited public interest.

Looking at the bill from a different point of view, my general position is that an existing piece of legislation should only be amended if there is a problem that needs to be fixed, and I stress that. I would even go further and say that the problem should be a significant one if there is to be a bill containing just one amend-

Private Members' Business

ment. If the problem is not particularly significant, although still valid, then I think the fixing of it should wait for a larger comprehensive review of the act. I am not sure that this amendment would fix a significant problem.

It is my understanding that the act already provides for access to public opinion polls. Section 4 of the act in fact provides that everyone has a right of access to any record under a government institution. In so far as opinion polls constitute such records, they are covered by the act.

If specific poll results are not disclosed to the public, it is because in specific circumstances a legitimate interest that competes with a presumption of access is invoked. It should be noted that the act performs a careful and complex balancing between a variety of interests and I am concerned that amending the act to address a specific and limited aspect of the act would disturb the various balances within the act at the moment.

[*Translation*]

It should be noted also that the courts have already ruled on the application of the Access to Information Act to public opinion polls. The Trial Division of the Federal Court has in fact made a ruling on the issue of disclosure of results of public opinion research in the case of the Information Commissioner v the Prime Minister, that dealt with a public opinion poll requested in relation to previous constitutional negotiations. The Court ordered disclosure of the information to the person who requested the documents, because it was not convinced that disclosure of the poll results would be prejudicial to the government.

In addition to section 4 of the act and the Federal Court decision, there is a third reason why I would ask what great problem this bill could help solve.

• (1400)

The Secretariat of the Treasury Board has issued guidelines for the disclosure of poll results by federal institutions. Broadly speaking, all departments are requested to make every effort to disclose the results of public opinion polls outside the formal framework of the Access to Information Act and its mechanisms.

[*English*]

That is not to say that the issue does not require examination. Indeed, the disclosure of public opinion polls is one of the issues being monitored by the Department of Justice at this moment in assessing the need for a review of the act.

I do not believe there is a need for Bill C-217. There is already a right of access to public opinion poll research under the current Access to Information Act. There is case law which provides

guidance to the government on disclosing such polls. There is a government policy on disclosing poll results.

In addition, this issue is being examined together with other issues related to the whole act.

Given all of this, I do not think it is appropriate or necessary to proceed with an ad hoc amendment on the specific issue of public opinion polls. In addition, I have problems with the fact that the bill would introduce significant new bureaucratic reporting requirements, deviating from the way the rest of the act defines government institutions, which potentially could apply to research of a very limited public interest.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak to my colleague's bill on access to information regarding polls.

It boils down to a very basic premise. If a poll is commissioned by public money, then there should be public access. It is very simple.

My colleague has also made the good point that if a political party commissions a poll, that is private. If private money is being used, then there should not be access to the poll. However, when taxpayer money is being used to commission a poll, then surely the public has the right to ask for the results.

We often hear about accountable government. We hear it particularly during election time. This government, which is supposedly accountable, is doing all that it can to suppress not only access to information regarding polling but also access to information in many other areas.

The key issue here is manipulation. When the finance minister can stall for months and months and suppress information obtained from a poll, that is manipulation. That is what we are trying to avoid.

Members of this House, regardless of their political stripe, must agree that this is wrong. We want to have free access right across the board. There is nothing clandestine about it. We are asking for open government.

This type of thing is creating cynicism among Canadians. They do not hold this place in esteem. We as politicians, collectively, are on the scale somewhere down below snake oil salesman because of public cynicism, and rightfully so in many cases.

Canadians pay their taxes. They do not mind paying taxes if they know the money is being spent well and if they can find out how the money is being spent. However, we are not allowed to discover that.

This government is unwilling to change. We often hear the prime minister talk about moving into the next millennium. Let us do that. Let us move this House ahead, and the other house for that matter, so that we can have a system of government that works for

Private Members' Business

Canadians. It does not work for Canadians when they have one hand tied behind their backs.

This is not the only private member's bill respecting access to information. At the latest count there are four. My colleague has presented this bill today. I have a bill respecting crown corporations. The government also has two bills relating to this subject. On both sides of the House there are concerns regarding access to information.

• (1405)

I was pleased to hear the comment from the member opposite saying that there may be a review. I think a review of the access act is long overdue.

The member also said that access to information is a cornerstone of democracy. If she really believes that, I hope we will open it up, not close it down.

I believe this to be a very good bill. As such, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House that this bill be deemed votable.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member from Nanaimo—Alberni has asked for unanimous consent to have this bill made votable. Is there unanimous consent?

An hon. member: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): There is not unanimous consent.

It is customary that the member who moved the bill have a further five minutes of debate.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, to sum up what we have heard, and it is a rather ominous thing that we have heard, we have deteriorated even further than we did in the last session into looking at the past, thinking we need more big government, more government control, less accessibility for the public, less accountability.

In 1994 on a similar type of bill a government member stood up and said "We are going to open up access to information and we are going to reform it and make it better. It is under review within the next 12 months and the justice minister will be coming up with new legislation within 12 months". That was in 1994.

Now the government members have the audacity to stand up and say "Some of these things are good and we have to open up government. However, it is under review so we will not support anything like this".

How long can they keep saying that? Going into the 21st century it is still going to be under review. I trust the Canadian public will put them under review very carefully in the year 2001 or before.

The government talks the talk. Some of the opposition parties talk the talk. It is very interesting that some of the opposition parties talk about changes and being accountable to people and yet most of their speeches sound like they come out of the 1960s.

I do not feel we have moved very far. We have a finance minister who conducts a poll, who has his former leadership member conduct that poll, a former membership of his team in 1990, for which hundreds of thousands of dollars of Canadian taxpayer money is paid. There is nothing wrong with that. He then proceeds to keep it secret for 18 months because it was politically unwise to put it forward. There were political reasons. He decides to make it public after his own lawyer said he could never win in court. Mulroney challenged the court and lost, and he even had some reasons. He said the minister is going to challenge it and but does not have any reasons at all other than political.

I see this as a very negative point. Obviously the government is not interested in accessibility and accountability in letting the taxpayers know what they are getting for their money.

In conclusion, that is the reason we came down here. We came here because we felt the status quo must be changed. The Canadian people feel it must be changed and the debate today has further confirmed why we have to change the way this place operates.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

• (1410)

It being 2.10 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.10 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

MR. STÉPHANE BERGERON

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

MR. RANDY WHITE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session – Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
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, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	Nova Scotia	PC
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caplan, Elinor	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	PC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	Quebec	PC
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	Ref.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac — Mégantic	Quebec	BQ
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Coderre, Denis	Bourassa	Quebec	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	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	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue	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
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or	Nova Scotia	NDP
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland	PC
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	New Brunswick	PC
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	Ref.
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	NDP
Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	West Kootenay — Okanagan	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Charleswood — Assiniboine	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	Quebec	PC
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	Manitoba	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Manitoba	Ref.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jones, Jim	Markham	Ontario	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Ontario	Lib.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	NDP
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leung, Sophia	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
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Labour	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie — Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	Nova Scotia	NDP
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Ref.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	PC
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	British Columbia	Ref.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Muise, Mark	West Nova	Nova Scotia	PC
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Ind.
Nystrom, Lorne	Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	Ref.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Saint—Eustache — Sainte— Thérèse	Quebec	BQ
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau — Saint—Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Kent — Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	Quebec	BQ
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	Newfoundland	PC
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	PC
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	Ref.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	British Columbia	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Westmount — Ville—Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Saada, Jacques	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Saint—Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma — Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	PC
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	Charlotte	New Brunswick	PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	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
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
VACANCY	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.—Liberal; Ref.—Reform Party of Canada; BQ—Bloc Québécois; NDP—New Democratic Party; PC—Progressive Conservative; Ind.—Independent.

Anyone wishing to communicate with House of Commons members is invited to communicate with either the Member's constituency or Parliament Hill offices.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	Ref.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Ref.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Ref.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
BRITISH COLUMBIA (32)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay—Columbia	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Victoria	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta—South Richmond	Ref.
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver South—Burnaby	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	Ref.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo—Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	West Kootenay—Okanagan	Ref.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan—Coquihalla	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	Ref.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	Ref.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	Ref.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	NDP
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	Ref.
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.
VACANCY	Port Moody—Coquitlam	
MANITOBA (14)		
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Charleswood—Assiniboine	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage—Lisgar	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique—Mactaquac	PC
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska—Restigouche	PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	Charlotte	PC
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC

NEWFOUNDLAND (7)

Baker, George S.	Gander—Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Matthews, Bill	Burin—St. George's	PC
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Lib.
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	PC

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)

Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
Karetak—Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.

NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or	NDP
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	NDP
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
Mancini, Peter	Sydney—Victoria	NDP
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Muise, Mark	West Nova	PC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP

ONTARIO (99)

Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton—Gloucester	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth—Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Elinor	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor—St. Clair	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce—Grey	Lib.
Jones, Jim	Markham	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont—Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York North	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview—Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark—Carleton	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo—Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South—Weston	Ind.
O'Brien, Pat	London—Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria—Haliburton	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Kent—Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean—Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Halton	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Perth—Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose—Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri—Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Labour	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Hillsborough	Lib.

QUEBEC (75)

Alarie, H��l��ne	Louis—H��bert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, G��rard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, Andr��	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint—Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, St��phane	Verch��res	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure—Gasp��—��les—de—la—Madeleine—Pabok	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	T��miscamingue	BQ
Canuel, Ren��	Matap��dia—Matane	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivi��re—des—Prairies	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	PC
Chr��tien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint—Maurice	Lib.
Chr��tien, Jean—Guy	Frontenac—M��gantic	BQ
Coderre, Denis	Bourassa	Lib.
Cr��te, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivi��re—du—Loup—T��miscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond—Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil—Papineau	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard—Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	PC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food) (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Saint-Eustache—Sainte-Thérèse	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	PC
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Saint-Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski—Mitis	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois—Salaberry	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	NDP
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Ref.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Ref.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	NDP
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Ref.
Nystrom, Lorne	Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Ref.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Ref.

YUKON (1)

Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP
---------------	-------	-----

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of October 31, 1997 — 1st Session, 36th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Guy St-Julien

Vice-Chairmen: John Finlay
Derrek Konrad

Claude Bachand
John Bryden
Ghislain Fournier
Louise Hardy

David Iftody
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy

Judi Longfield
Grant McNally
Lawrence O'Brien

Bernard Patry
Mike Scott
Bryon Wilfert

(16)

Associate Members

Cliff Breitreuz
René Canuel
Bill Casey

Pierre de Savoye
Gordon Earle

Reed Elley
Maurice Godin

Rick Laliberté
Maurice Vellacott

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: Joe McGuire

Vice-Chairmen: Murray Calder
Jay Hill

Hélène Alarie
Leon Benoit
Paul Bonwick
Rick Borotsik

Gerry Byrne
Jean-Guy Chrétien
Denis Coderre

John Harvard
Jake Hoepfner
Larry McCormick

Dick Proctor
Paul Steckle
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associate Members

Garry Breitreuz
Pierre Brien
Rick Casson
Odina Desrochers

Michelle Dockrill
Howard Hilstrom
Allan Kerpan

Réjean Lefebvre
Lorne Nystrom
Gilles Perron

John Solomon
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairmen: Jim Abbott
Mauril Bélanger

Paul Bonwick
Sarmite Bulte
John Godfrey
Joe Jordan

Wendy Lill
Eric Lowther
Dennis Mills

Mark Muise
Deepak Obhrai
Pat O'Brien

Jacques Saada
Caroline St-Hilaire
Suzanne Tremblay

(16)

Associate Members

André Bachand
Claude Bachand
Cliff Breitreuz
Pierre Brien

Antoine Dubé
Maurice Dumas
Gordon Earle
Christiane Gagnon

Monique Guay
Rick Laliberté
Francine Lalonde

Inky Mark
Louis Plamondon
Benoît Sauvageau

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: George Baker

Vice-Chairmen: Charles Hubbard
Gary Lunn

Yvan Bernier
John Duncan
Wayne Easter
Howard Hilstrom

Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gar Knutson
M. Sophia Leung

Bill Matthews
Lawrence O'Brien
Carmen Provenzano

Yves Rocheleau
Paul Steckle
Peter Stoffer

(16)

Associate Members

Gilles Bernier
René Canuel
Paul Forseth

Ghislain Fournier
Bill Gilmour

Philip Mayfield
Svend Robinson

Mike Scott
Angela Vautour

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

Vice-Chairs: Colleen Beaumier
Bob Mills

Sarkis Assadourian
Jean Augustine
Réginald Bélair
Scott Brison

John Cannis
Maud Debien
Gurmant Grewal
Ted McWhinney

Denis Paradis
Charlie Penson
Julian Reed
Svend Robinson

Benoît Sauvageau
Bob Speller
Daniel Turp

(18)

Associate Members

Claude Bachand
Sue Barnes
Eugene Bellemare
Bill Blaikie
Paul Bonwick
Claudette Bradshaw
Sarmite Bulte

Aileen Carroll
Raymonde Folco
Monique Guay
Joe Jordan
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
Gurbax Malhi

Richard Marceau
Keith Martin
Paul Mercier
Bob Nault
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Charlie Power

George Proud
Karen Redman
Nelson Riis
Jacques Saada
John Solomon
Pierrette Venne
Bryon Wilfert

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chairman: Bob Speller

Bill Blaikie
Scott Brison

Sarmite Bulte
Raymonde Folco

Robert Nault
Charlie Penson

Julian Reed
Benoît Sauvageau

(9)

HEALTH

Chair: Beth Phinney

Vice-Chairs: Elinor Caplan
Reed Elley

Carolyn Bennett
Aileen Carroll
Claude Drouin
Maurice Dumas

Grant Hill
Dan McTeague
Lynn Myers

Pauline Picard
Greg Thompson
Rose-Marie Ur

Maurice Vellacott
Joseph Volpe
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis

(16)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Libby Davies
Pierre de Savoye

Michelle Dockrill
Antoine Dubé
Christiane Gagnon

Sharon Hayes
John Herron
Keith Martin

Réal Ménard
Caroline St-Hilaire
Stéphan Tremblay

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chairman: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairs: Bonnie Brown
Dale Johnston

Diane Ablonczy	Brenda Chamberlain	Nick Discepola	Bob Nault	(18)
Rob Anders	Paul Crête	Jean Dubé	Stéphan Tremblay	
Carolyn Bennett	Libby Davies	Albina Guarnieri	Bryon Wilfert	
Claudette Bradshaw	Pierre de Savoye	Larry McCormick		

Associate Members

Yvan Bernier	Antoine Dubé	Wendy Lill	Lorne Nystrom
Pierre Brien	Reed Elley	Inky Mark	Yves Rocheleau
Jocelyne G. Bujold	Yvon Godin	Patrick Martin	Diane St-Jacques
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Sharon Hayes	Réal Ménard	Angela Vautour

INDUSTRY

Chair: Susan Whelan

Vice-Chairmen: Eugène Bellemare
Werner Schmidt

Chris Axworthy	Marlene Jennings	Eric Lowther	Janko Perić	(16)
Bonnie Brown	Francine Lalonde	Ian Murray	Charlie Power	
Antoine Dubé	Walt Lastewka	Jim Pankiw	Alex Shepherd	
Tony Ianno				

Associate Members

Hélène Alarie	Chuck Cadman	Philip Mayfield	Benoît Sauvageau
Bernard Bigras	Jean Dubé	Réal Ménard	John Solomon
Pierre Brien	Christiane Gagnon	Nelson Riis	Peter Stoffer
Jocelyne G. Bujold	Rahim Jaffer		

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Shaughnessy Cohen

Vice-Chairmen: Paul E. Forseth
John Maloney

Eleni Bakopanos	Nick Discepola	Peter MacKay	Richard Marceau	(16)
Michel Bellehumeur	Sheila Finestone	Gurbax Malhi	Jack Ramsay	
Garry Breitreuz	Derek Lee	Peter Mancini	Andrew Telegdi	
Paul DeVillers				

Associate Members

Cliff Breitreuz	Christiane Gagnon	Allan Kerpan	Svend Robinson
Pierre Brien	Michel Guimond	Keith Martin	Caroline St-Hilaire
Chuck Cadman	Louise Hardy	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Sharon Hayes	Mark Muise	Stéphan Tremblay
Pierre de Savoye	Howard Hilstrom		

LIAISON

Chairman: Bill Graham

Vice-Chair: Susan Whelan

Peter Adams	Ray Bonin	Derek Lee	Beth Phinney	(20)
Reg Alcock	Charles Caccia	Clifford Lincoln	Brent St. Denis	
George Baker	Shaughnessy Cohen	Gurbax Malhi	Guy St-Julien	
Robert Bertrand	Stan Dromisky	Joe McGuire	John Williams	
Maurizio Bevilacqua	Sheila Finestone			

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

Vice-Chairmen: Art Hanger
Bob Wood

Leon Benoit Hec Clouthier Maurice Godin Peter Goldring	Judi Longfield Pat O'Brien John O'Reilly	David Pratt David Price Dick Proctor	George Proud John Richardson Pierrette Venne	(16)
---	--	--	--	------

Associate Members

Pierre Brien Jim Hart	Peter Mancini Patrick Martin	Bob Mills Daniel Turp	Elsie Wayne
--------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------

NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chairman: Brent St. Denis

Vice-Chairmen: David Chatters
Ben Serré

Gérard Asselin Gilles Bernier Jocelyne G. Bujold Gerry Byrne	Roy Cullen Raymonde Folco Yvon Godin	Jim Gouk Ovid Jackson Jerry Pickard	Carmen Provenzano Darrel Stinson Bob Wood	(16)
---	--	---	---	------

Associate Members

Hélène Alarie Chris Axworthy Bernard Bigras Pierre Brien	René Canuel Jean-Guy Chrétien Ghislain Fournier Bill Gilmour	Gerald Keddy Derrek Konrad René Laurin Réjean Lefebvre	Gilles Perron Nelson Riis Angela Vautour
---	---	---	--

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chairman: Peter Adams

Vice-Chairs: Marlene Catterall
Chuck Strahl

George Baker Stéphane Bergeron Yvon Charbonneau Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Norman Doyle Ken Epp Mac Harb	Bob Kilger Rey Pagtakhan Carolyn Parrish	John Richardson John Solomon Randy White	(16)
--	-------------------------------------	--	--	------

Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur Bill Blaikie	Michelle Dockrill Jay Hill	René Laurin Bill Matthews	Réal Ménard Suzanne Tremblay
------------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chairman: Yvon Charbonneau

William Blaikie Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Normand E. Doyle	Ken Epp	Carolyn Parrish	(6)
--	------------------	---------	-----------------	-----

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: John Williams

Vice-Chairmen: Ivan Grose
Andrew Telegdi

Mark Assad	Odina Desrochers	René Laurin	Lynn Myers	(17)
André Bachand	Gurmant Grewal	Steve Mahoney	Lorne Nystrom	
Sue Barnes	Mac Harb	Philip Mayfield	Rey Pagtakhan	
Elinor Caplan	Jason Kenney			

Associate Members

Roy Bailey	Rick Casson	Antoine Dubé	Derrek Konrad
Garry Breitreuz	Bev Desjarlais	Michel Guimond	Gilles Perron
Jocelyne G. Bujold	Michelle Dockrill	Jim Jones	Peter Stoffer

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Roy Cullen
Lee Morrison

Roy Bailey	Bill Casey	Ivan Grose	Inky Mark	(16)
Gerry Byrne	Bev Desjarlais	Michel Guimond	Paul Mercier	
Murray Calder	Claude Drouin	Stan Keyes	Carolyn Parrish	
John Cannis				

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy	Pierre Brien	John Cummins	Rick Laliberté
Yvan Bernier	Paul Crête	Ghislain Fournier	Yves Rocheleau
Rick Borotsik			

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Co-Chairmen: Philippe D. Gigantès
Gurbax Malhi

Vice-Chairman: Philip Mayfield

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc	Richard J. Doyle	Marlene Catterall	Wendy Lill	(23)
Eymard G. Corbin	Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Hec Clouthier	Paul Mercier	
Mabel M. DeWare	Louis J. Robichaud	John Finlay	Louis Plamondon	
		Deborah Grey	David Price	
		Howard Hilstrom	Karen Redman	
		Jim Karygiannis	Jacques Saada	
		Raymond Lavigne	Brent St. Denis	

Associate Members

Libby Davies	Maurice Dumas
--------------	---------------

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Co-Chairs: Sen. Rose–Marie Losier–Cool
Sheila Finestone

Vice-Chairmen: Denis Coderre
Rahim Jaffer

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald A. Beaudoin
Jean–Robert Gauthier
Noël A. Kinsella
Jean–Claude Rivest

Fernand Robichaud
Louis J. Robichaud
Lucie Pépin
Jean–Maurice Simard

Sarkis Assadourian
Eugène Bellemare
Claudette Bradshaw
Cliff Breitzkreuz
John Godfrey
Yvon Godin
Bob Kilger

Ted McWhinney
Val Meredith
Denis Paradis
Louis Plamondon
Diane St–Jacques
Suzanne Tremblay

(25)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Lorne Nystrom

Angela Vautour

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Co-Chairs: Céline Hervieux–Payette
Derek Lee

Vice-Chairman: Ted White

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michael Cogger
Marisa Barth Ferretti
Normand Grimard
William M. Kelly

P. Derek Lewis
Léonce Mercier
Wilfred P. Moore

John Bryden
Bill Casey
Paul DeVillers
Ken Epp
Marlene Jennings
Gary Lunn
John Maloney
Richard Marceau

Inky Mark
John McKay
Ian Murray
Lorne Nystrom
Alex Shepherd
Caroline St–Hilaire
Tom Wappel

(25)

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy
Michel Bellehumeur

Michel Guimond

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE
THE QUEBEC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Co-Chairs: Sen. Lucie Pépin
 Denis Paradis

Representing the Senate:
 The Honourable Senators

Gérald A. Beaudoin, Fernand Robichaud
 Jerahmiel S. Grafstein Dalia Wood
 Thérèse Lavoie-Roux
 John Lynch-Staunton

Representing the House of Commons:

Reg Alcock
 Mauril Bélanger
 Gerry Byrne
 Paul DeVillers
 Nick Discepola
 Sheila Finestone
 Christiane Gagnon
 Yvon Godin

Peter Goldring
 Rahim Jaffer
 Marlene Jennings
 Réal Ménard
 Val Meredith
 David Price
 Paddy Torsney

(23)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Minister of Labour
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred Mifflin	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Don Boudria	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Alasdair Graham	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Andy Scott	Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
The Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Jim Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Andrew Mitchell	Secretary of State (Parks)
The Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food)(Fisheries and Oceans)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Wayne Easter	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Gerry Byrne	to Minister of Natural Resources
John Godfrey	to Minister of Canadian Heritage
Julian Reed	to Minister for International Trade
Walt Lastewka	to Minister of Industry
Claudette Bradshaw	to Minister for International Cooperation
Tony Valery	to Minister of Finance
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Eleni Bakopanos	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Brenda Chamberlain	to Minister of Labour
Karen Kraft Sloan	to Minister of the Environment
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
George Proud	to Minister of Veterans Affairs
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Peter Adams	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
John Harvard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada

CONTENTS

Friday, October 31, 1997

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code

Bill C-16, Second reading	1395
Mr. Collenette	1395
Ms. Bakopanos	1395
Mr. Ramsay	1397
Mr. Marceau	1400

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Canadian Wildlife Service

Mr. Steckle	1402
-------------------	------

Remembrance Day

Mr. Goldring	1403
--------------------	------

The Mint

Mr. Alcock	1403
------------------	------

Clerics of St. Viateur and Sisters of the Holy Cross

Mr. Dumas	1403
-----------------	------

Immigration

Mr. Assad	1403
-----------------	------

Environment

Mr. Harb	1403
----------------	------

And the Winner Is—

Mr. Strahl	1404
------------------	------

Banking

Ms. Parrish	1404
-------------------	------

Quebec Sovereignty

Mr. Godin (Châteauguay)	1404
-------------------------------	------

Canadian Bushplane Heritage Centre

Mr. Provenzano	1404
----------------------	------

Taxation

Mr. Hart	1405
----------------	------

Employment

Mr. Nault	1405
-----------------	------

Gasoline Prices

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	1405
--	------

Linguistic School Boards

Mrs. Finestone	1405
----------------------	------

Fisheries

Mr. Doyle	1405
-----------------	------

The Deficit

Mr. Bevilacqua	1406
----------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Environment

Mr. Strahl	1406
Mr. Gray	1406
Mr. Strahl	1406
Mr. Gray	1406
Mr. Strahl	1406

Mr. Gray	1406
Mr. Kenney	1407
Mr. Gray	1407
Mr. Kenney	1407
Mr. Gray	1407
Mr. Gray	1407

Employment Insurance

Mr. Crête	1407
Mr. Pettigrew	1407
Mr. Crête	1407
Mr. Pettigrew	1407

Poverty

Mr. Bigras	1408
Mr. Pettigrew	1408
Mr. Bigras	1408
Mr. Pettigrew	1408

Trade

Mr. Blaikie	1408
Mr. Marchi	1408
Mr. Blaikie	1408
Mr. Marchi	1408

Fisheries

Mr. Charest	1409
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	1409
Mr. Charest	1409
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	1409

National Defence

Mr. Hanger	1409
Mr. Eggleton	1409
Mr. Hanger	1409
Mr. Eggleton	1409

Closing of BC Mine

Mr. Desrochers	1409
Mr. Pettigrew	1410
Mr. Desrochers	1410
Mr. Pettigrew	1410

National Unity

Mr. Jaffer	1410
Mr. DeVillers	1410
Mr. Jaffer	1410
Mr. DeVillers	1410

Asbestos Industry

Mrs. Guay	1410
Mr. Marchi	1410
Mrs. Guay	1410
Mr. Marchi	1410

Taiwan

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	1411
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	1411
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	1411
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	1411

Dairy Industry

Mrs. Tremblay	1411
Mr. Vanclief	1411

Justice	
Mr. Lee	1411
Ms. Bakopanos	1411
CIDA	
Mr. Grewal	1412
Mrs. Bradshaw	1412
Mr. Grewal	1412
Mrs. Bradshaw	1412
Seniors Benefits	
Mr. Nystrom	1412
Mr. Pettigrew	1412
Mr. Nystrom	1412
Mr. Peterson	1412
Fisheries	
Mr. Keddy	1412
Mr. Easter	1412
Mr. Keddy	1413
Mr. Easter	1413
CIDA	
Mr. Graham	1413
Mrs. Bradshaw	1413
Pay Equity	
Mr. Muise	1413
Mr. Massé	1413
Centres of Excellence	
Mr. Murray	1413
Mr. Manley	1413
Gun Control	
Mr. Ramsay	1413
Ms. Bakopanos	1414
Foreign Affairs	
Ms. Hardy	1414
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	1414
Closure of BC Mine	
Mr. Crête	1414
Mr. Pettigrew	1414
Customs Act	
Mr. Dromisky	1414
Mr. Dhaliwal	1414
Employment Insurance Fund	
Mr. Charest	1414
Mr. Pettigrew	1414
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Robinson	1415
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	1415
Presence in the Gallery	
The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland)	1415

Privilege	
Oral Question Period	
Mrs. Tremblay	1415
Mr. Kilger	1415
Mr. Pettigrew	1415
Mr. Charest	1415

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Criminal Code	
Bill C-269. Introduction and first reading	1416
Mr. Hanger	1416
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1416

Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Adams	1416

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code	
Bill C-16. Second Reading	1416
Mr. Marceau	1416
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	1417
Mr. MacKay	1418
Mr. Cadman	1420
Mr. McNally	1422
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	1423
Mr. McNally	1423
Mr. Lee	1423
Mr. Mayfield	1424
Mr. Lee	1424
Mr. Richardson	1425
Mr. Mayfield	1425
Mr. Richardson	1426
Mr. Elley	1426
Mr. Richardson	1426
Ms. Meredith	1426
Mr. Epp	1427
Mr. Mayfield	1427
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)	1427
Mr. Kilger	1427

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Access to Information Act	
Bill C-217. Second reading	1427
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	1427
Mr. Marceau	1429
Mr. Proctor	1430
Ms. Bakopanos	1430
Mr. Gilmour	1432
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	1433

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :

<http://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 Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

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

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à :

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9