



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 117 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, November 22, 2001

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 22, 2001

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1000)

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

● (1005)

[*English*]

PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-42, an act to amend certain acts of Canada, and to enact measures for implementing the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, in order to enhance public safety.

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

* * *

AN ACT TO AMEND CERTAIN ACTS AND INSTRUMENTS AND TO REPEAL THE FISHERIES PRICES SUPPORT ACT

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-43, an act to amend certain acts and instruments and to repeal the Fisheries Prices Support Act.

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

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand this morning to sponsor the legislation entitled an act to amend certain acts of Canada and to enact measures for implementing the biological and toxin weapons convention in order to enhance public safety. In all, the bill involves 20 acts of parliament, 19 that will be amended and 1 that will be enacted.

The bill would be known as the public safety act and would promote and protect public safety and strengthen the government's

ability to improve the safety of Canadians. It is another step in the Canadian government's fight against terrorism.

[*Translation*]

Governments from everywhere had to act quickly and ensure they had the tools to protect the safety and security of their people after the tragic events of September 11. This is the second omnibus bill that, once enacted, will increase the security of Canadians.

[*English*]

In many cases the act brings forward amendments that were already being developed during normal reviews of these laws prior to September 11. As I have said on a number of occasions, this certainly is the case for the Aeronautics Act coming from my department. However, the attacks in the United States have result in normal reviews being accelerated to address the new security demands.

The public safety act adds features to much of the legislation which may be needed to prevent or respond to security issues. For example, those things that are being added include the clarification and, in some cases, the strengthening of existing aviation security authorities. The act would discourage unruly passengers, more commonly known as air rage, by making it an offence to engage in any behaviour that endangers the safety or security of a flight or persons on board an aircraft.

● (1010)

The act would require air carriers or those operating aviation reservation systems to provide basic information on specific passengers on flights when it is needed for security purposes.

The act would speed implementation of various security amendments already made to the Immigration Act.

The act would require licences for activities related to dangerous biological substances such as anthrax.

The act would deter irresponsible hoaxes that endanger the public or heighten public anxiety.

The act would establish tighter controls over explosives.

The act would provide for control over the export and transfer of sensitive technology.

The act would prevent unauthorized use or interference with national defence computer systems and the act would deter the proliferation of biological weapons.

Routine Proceedings

The government has responded quickly and effectively to the serious threats to our society. Transport Canada in particular has responded to the horrible events of September 11 by immediately closing Canadian air space and in the co-ordination of accepting of 226 diverted aircraft carrying more than 33,000 passengers.

The government announced a wide range of new measures to enhance the security of operations at Canadian airports. I have no hesitation in saying here today, given the evidence that I have received from travellers in the business community, that Canada's standards remain among the best in the world.

The Government of Canada provided a 90 day indemnity for third party war and terrorism liability for essential aviation service operators.

The government announced a \$160 million program to compensate Canadian air carriers and specialty air operators for losses resulting from the closure of Canadian air space.

The Government of Canada offered loan guarantees to assist Canada's major carriers.

Many of my colleagues in the House, including those on the Standing Committee on Transport and Government Operations, have been debating the issues of airport security, screening at airports and who will be responsible to monitor and cover these costs. This comes up quite frequently in question period, particularly yesterday.

I have always said that the priority after September 11 was to ensure that tougher airport security regulations were put in place and that they were enforced. However, I would like to reiterate to my colleagues that the very important issues that have been raised on how to deliver the services and how they are to be paid are the subject of cabinet debate. It is obvious this will have serious implications for the fiscal framework. Therefore, our decision will be rendered soon but not in today's legislation.

[Translation]

Since September 11, we have made decisive progress. The bill on public security is yet another commitment taken by the government to assure Canadians that we are taking the necessary measures to increase our country's security. This is the second of a number of steps that will follow.

[English]

The bill presents a package of legislative measures designed to protect Canadians from the horrors of terrorism. However, it is not an end in itself. We should not fool ourselves. The movement to combat terrorism will require a patient and sustained effort. What better challenge is there than to unite all of us who believe in a free and democratic society. That is what the government and parliament have been doing since the events of September 11. We have been united in our determination to stare down terrorism as it manifests itself around the world.

I have welcomed the constructive criticisms that have come from the opposition and from colleagues in our party over the last number of weeks. I would like to invite all members of the House, and particularly the opposition, to join with us in our efforts by continuing that constructive debate, that continuing consideration in

every facet of the legislation and to do our due diligence but to ensure that we have speedy passage.

• (1015)

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to know that the transport minister is ready and willing to accept constructive criticism because he will receive a great deal of it.

In the United States, Senator Ernest Hollings from South Carolina introduced back in September comprehensive airport and air security legislation. Inside of eight weeks that legislation was introduced in the senate, passed through the house of representatives, passed the United States senate, was signed by President Bush on Tuesday of this week and is now law in the United States.

It has been over 10 weeks since the terrorist attacks and this government is just now tabling airport security legislation in the House. The actual launch, frankly, was done rather poorly. The legislation will be noted more for what it does not have in it than what it does have. If we look at a comparison of what the Americans did relative to what the Canadian government has now proposed, it is astonishing how weak and hollow the legislation is.

The American legislation is broken down into four categories: security on flight decks; air marshals; airport security; and other provisions that are a hodgepodge of a whole bunch of regulatory changes that it thought to put in place. It should be noted that almost none of the changes that took place in the United States, which were done on a bipartisan basis and which were widely and well received by the air security industry on this continent, find themselves anywhere in this legislation.

The Americans have strengthened cockpit doors and prohibited access. The government has regulated but not mandated that. The Americans have allowed less than lethal weapons to be available to flight crews, but that is nowhere in this legislation. They have created the opportunity so that pilots may carry firearms. While the government may not support that, that provision is in law so that down the road, should things continue to escalate in the war on terrorism, it is prepared for that.

In the United States, qualified persons may help in the case of a crisis on a plane. It has given them the legal authority to do so. We do not have that power. It is not in this legislation. The United States has allowed for specific training for flight and cabin crews to deal with hijackers. It is not in this legislation.

The U.S. is putting air marshals on all high risk flights. That is not seen anywhere in this legislation. The government continues to drag its feet on the issue of air marshals even though more than 80% of Canadians support the idea. It has created a provision to expand the air marshal program to fly on more flights. Again, it is not in this legislation.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to airport security, all passengers, property, baggage, mail and cargo will now be screened in the United States. That provision is not in this legislation. All persons with access to aircraft, including foreign aircraft, must get security clearance unless they already have one. That is in the American legislation but not in this legislation.

The Americans have penalties for interfering with airport security screeners but it is not in this legislation. They have an aviation security co-ordination council that co-ordinates intelligence, security and criminal enforcement activities. That is now a law in the United States but is not in Canada's legislation.

The Americans have computer assisted passenger pre-screening system calls CAPPS, a comprehensive databank to allow for the screening of passengers and people who are potential threats, which is to say profiling of people who have been engaged in criminal activity in Canada and other countries. That is now law in the United States but is not in Canada's legislation.

Also now in law in the United States is that foreigners cannot learn to fly jets unless background checks are done first. That is not in Canada's legislation. Foreigners cannot buy, lease or charter an aircraft unless the background check is done. That is law in the United States but is not in Canada's legislation.

The federal government is obliged to test security and evaluate new and emerging technologies. That is law in the United States but is not in Canada's legislation. The United States also has a computer reservation system that has now secured new regulations to protect the software from any kind of hacking. That is law in the United States but is not in Canada's regulation.

The United States has comprehensive legislation which is very well thought out. When people travel to the United States now, as the transport minister and Canadians know, it is visible and obvious to the naked eye that comprehensive security measures have been taken at airports. As such, the ancillary benefit is that there is a boost in consumer confidence in the United States. It made a clear note to pass the legislation before today, which is the American Thanksgiving, so that people would have the confidence to fly.

We are approaching the Christmas season but this legislation will not be passed until well into 2002. That is not leadership on behalf of the transport minister. We need real measures.

● (1020)

This morning we had a briefing. It should be noted specifically in the legislation that a lot of the powers outlined by the transport minister are interim measures. The legislation is riddled with words like the minister may administer this, the minister may provide this and the minister may restrict this. These are not real powers given to the minister. These are not real new legislative tools that would be implemented.

“The government has responded quickly” was the quote the transport minister used. The fact is that over 10 weeks after the incident happened, we are just now getting legislation, legislation that is wimpy and legislation that will not encourage Canadians to fly more. These measures are half measures.

The government has failed to respond quickly. It has failed to act decisively. The legislation will go to the transport committee. I am looking forward to participating at committee to make sure there are real provisions for airport security, that we have comprehensive tools that are real, visible and permanently entrenched facets of airport security and that they are then put in power so Canadians will have confidence to fly again.

If the legislation passes as is, it will be seen for what it is; a wimpy piece of legislation that fails to do what Canadians want, which is to have the best security regime possible in this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill he introduced the Minister of Transport most candidly admitted that it was a vast undertaking, amending 19 laws and creating one new one, all with a concern for the safety of Canadians and Quebecers. No new direction for the government is given with the exception of the few changes made to the Aeronautics Act. The minister also said that this bill has been in the works for several years.

It is difficult. They are again trying to launch a vast security operation, to tell the Canadians and Quebecers watching “See how your nice government has decided to pass a bill amending 19 pieces of legislation, one that is intended to guarantee more safety in Canada”, whereas no new standard has been adopted.

When it comes down to it, what this government is really trying to validate is the creation of interim orders, so most of the laws being modified give the minister concerned the power to adopt interim orders, thus conferring increased powers upon him and his departmental staff.

I will read the changes made to the Department of Health act. They read:

The Minister may make an interim order that contains any provision that may be contained in a regulation under section 11, if the Minister believes that immediate action is required to deal with a significant risk, direct or indirect, to health or safety.

An interim order has effect from the time that it is made but ceases to have effect on the earlier of: 90 days after it is made, unless it is approved by the Governor in Council, the day on which it is repealed, the day on which a regulation under section 21 that has the same effect as the interim order comes into force, and one year after the interim order is made, or any shorter period that may be specified in the interim order.

This seems to announce the orientations for the Department of Health. It will make it possible for the government to manage, on a day to day basis, an orientation that it lacks. It is quite simply a means of getting around House procedures. It is a means of enabling a minister to make interim orders, and since a number of different acts are involved, so are a number of ministers.

Routine Proceedings

This is being done with the Aeronautics Act to give increased powers to the Minister of Transport. The Canadian Environmental Protection Act will be amended to give more powers to the Minister of the Environment. The Department of Health act will also be amended, as I just mentioned, and the Explosives Act, the Export and Import Permits Act, the Food and Drugs Act, the Hazardous Products Act, the Immigration Act, the National Defence Act, the National Energy Board Act, the Canadian Water Protection Act, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act, the Pest Control Products Act, the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act, the Quarantine Act, the Radiation Emitting Devices Act and the Canada Shipping Act.

All these acts will be amended significantly to include interim orders and to give greater powers to the minister responsible and to his officials, so as to not have to submit to this House regulations, amendments or bills for each one of these departments.

Again, there is no government direction except for the fact that the minister is including in the Aeronautics Act, and I am grateful to him for doing so, a provision on air rage. We appreciate that initiative. There are also identification requirements for all those who are responsible for passengers in the airline system. These people will need to have an identification procedure and comply with government requirements.

All that is proposed are increased powers for each of the ministers, so that they will, through interim orders, decide alone to set new standards and give new powers to their respective officials. This will probably allow the Minister of Health to validate the decisions of his officials, who, in the Apotex and Bayer case, made the wrong decision. When the minister has made an interim order granting powers to his officials, he will be able to say "It is not my fault, it is my officials' fault".

This is the harsh reality. There is no planning, no direction, except in the case of the Aeronautics Act and the National Defence Act, where very important amendments have been made, even to the definition of a state of emergency.

• (1025)

Until now, "emergency" has meant "war, invasion, riot or insurrection, real or apprehended". Now the words "armed conflict" are being added. It will now be possible to use the army in another role, that of armed conflicts. This raises questions, but those responsible are somewhat evasive as to what directions should be taken.

One thing is clear: clause 88 changes how things are done. Obviously when it came to authorizing the intervention of armed forces this was something the attorneys general of each of the provinces could requisition. Now this requisition could come from each of the provincial attorneys general or from governors general in council, but the minister will have a say.

Subject to such directions as the minister considers appropriate, the chief of the defence staff will be able to intervene. The Minister of National Defence will now have more powers. He will have a say in the case of requests from the governor general in council or, ultimately, the attorneys general of each of the provinces.

There will therefore be more interventions, more powers for each of the ministers. This is the direction in which the government is headed, without any plan. There are no new procedures. The government is not saying what exactly will be done and the Canadian Alliance member is quite right that security measures in airports have not been stepped up. There is no heightened security, other than the requirement that all companies responsible for passengers provide identification. Apart from that, we will have to rely on interim orders which could be issued by the minister from time to time and which will give increased powers to officials, without the approval of the House.

That is the harsh reality. Once again the government has decided to simply ignore the members of this House and give powers to ministers and their officials, probably so that the Minister of Health will have an out when something like the Apotex and Bayer affair happens.

[English]

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it was with some expectation and thanks that we saw a bill come before us regarding public safety. After the tragic events of September 11 many of us were left uneasy as to how to approach the issue. We want our citizens to still have the right to travel and the right to privacy. We do not want them to have their civil liberties totally stripped away. I am happy to say a number of the committees within the House of Commons have been working on the issue from the time they got back in September.

There is no question, as the minister stated, about the immediate response on September 11 by airports, airline officials and the communities that took in huge numbers of people who were left stranded. They did it gallantly. We all owe them great thanks because in spite of everything that happened after September 11 it came off rather smoothly in Canada.

It is disappointing that after the minister's hype about how the bill would show us where public safety is he has tabled a bill this morning with no meat and potatoes in it.

As my colleague from the Bloc mentioned, the bill would give a lot more powers to ministers and their directed officials. Does it tell us what the government would do for airport security? No, it does not. It mentions that the government would do something about cockpit doors and make sure there are charges for people if there is air rage and those kind of things.

There are some things in the bill. There is no question that the bill would affect a number of acts within parliament, and rightfully so. We recognize that it had to do that. We had to have something that would address bioterrorism and be able to stop terrorists from proceeding in this manner. There is no question we had to do it.

However the bill does not tell Canadians what would happen. I am disappointed because despite all the minister's hype in the last few days that is not there. That is what Canadians want to see. They want to know exactly what would happen.

Routine Proceedings

The transport committee has been hearing numerous witnesses over the past while. Almost every witness has said the key to fighting terrorism and stopping incidents like this from happening is profiling. What did we hear this morning? That is not even one of the major issues the government is dealing with. It was stated at the committee that the government does not understand or know enough about it. The minister will therefore dedicate \$750,000 to look at the security measures that are needed.

The security of our airports or other areas should not be left to the Minister of Transport or the Department of Transport. It is crucially important that the people who know the business of security, such as the justice department and the solicitor general's office, are should be dealing with security.

We heard time and again at the transport committee that there was not a working relationship between different jurisdictional officers at airports. There are security guards operating under the airlines. Airports hire security for their perimeters. Some places have RCMP and some have provincial police. Nobody seems to be in charge of the picture.

Does the bill do anything to address that? Does it tell Canadians what would happen? Does it ensure their confidence in the security of our airline industry? There is not a chance that it does. The people who know about security, profiling and how to fight terrorism should be looking after the security of our airports. That is the crucial point.

● (1030)

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I will start by thanking the departmental officials who gave us a briefing this morning. I think they did their best to give us an indepth briefing of the aspects of the bill they thought were important. They did a good job.

This is a reactive piece of legislation. The government feels it must have something on the books so it has put this legislation before us. It is a number of half measures. It does not deal with the serious issues about which Canadians have expressed concern and with which the committee has been dealing over the last number of weeks.

The bill has 96 pages and 125 clauses. It deals with 19 current acts and would introduce one new act, the biological and toxin weapons convention implementation act.

Most of the major amendments would apply to only a couple of acts. The first one, the Aeronautics Act, has a number of half measures dealing with public security. As my colleagues stated previously, the bill does not deal with the issues Canadians were expecting it to deal with. It would give a lot of regulation making abilities to the government and the minister without being specific as to what they are. The bill seems to be another step toward removing parliament from the mix.

The bill would not create a new agency to take over airport security. It would give the minister the ability to take these measures. It seems to be another bill that transfers a lot of responsibilities and decision making power to the minister and bureaucrats while taking it away from parliament and the committees.

The thing that stood out when I was reviewing and listening to the presentation is that the bill would take away the authority of the House to tax. It would give the minister the authority to appropriate who would pay for the measures that would be taken.

Although the explanation by the department was that the bill was intended to apply only to airports and airlines and not to the public, it would apply to the public. It does not state that the public is not included. In essence the bill would give the minister the ability to lay taxation on the Canadian public. It was my understanding that was parliament's role, not the role of the minister or the executive branch.

The bill would allow the transfer of information to the passenger lists of foreign countries. As one of my hon. colleagues mentioned, it would not allow Canada to participate in the CAPPs program, which is, as we heard in the committee, an important part of intelligence sharing to prevent terrorists from accessing Canadian planes.

Although CAPPs is in the development stage it concerns me that in coming up with a new piece of legislation Canada is not in the forefront of the issue. It concerns me that we are not an active participant in this international passenger pre-clearance profiling system that can be effective if everyone participates. I am disappointed there was not more of an effort to make sure legislation was there to allow Canada to be in the forefront of the process.

Not only does the bill deal with the Aeronautics Act, it deals with an awful lot of other acts, 19 in total. Some of what the bill would do is good. For the first time under the National Defence Act, and I am sure my colleague who is defence critic will be interested in this point, the government is taking measures to protect reservists and make sure they are able to maintain their jobs if called for duty. That has been a long time in coming. It is nice to see the government addressing that.

● (1035)

I am concerned about the looseness with which it deals with the military being able to establish military security zones to protect personnel, property or things that the military protects. There was some concern that this would allow the military or the government to use the military in this instance for G-8 and G-20 meetings. Parliamentary oversight is definitely lacking in this piece of legislation.

We must be careful when we start talking about giving the Minister of Transport, the Minister of National Defence or ministers of other departments certain authorities to react quickly to emergency situations. There is always a need to have a parliamentary oversight ability to ensure that when decisions are made there is some recourse. There should be some followup to ensure that if a decision is made, which in many cases is good for a year, parliament can challenge the government on how it handled the situation.

There is a lack of parliamentary oversight in the legislation which gives some outstanding authority to various ministers. I wish that the government would have seen the need to include parliamentary oversight. The coalition addressed that issue when it tabled a long term proposal that addressed this need. It called for the creation of a parliamentary oversight committee. The government would be well advised to consider that not only in this legislation but in Bill C-36 as well.

Points of Order

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSEABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.): I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee of Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources.

• (1040)

[English]

Pursuant to the order of reference of Tuesday, October 2, the committee has considered Bill C-27, an act respecting the long term management of nuclear fuel waste, and has agreed to report it with amendment.

I thank and commend all members of the committee from all sides of the House for the fine work they did.

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Hon. Andy Scott (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Thursday, October 18, the committee has considered Bill C-36, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Official Secrets Act, the Canada Evidence Act, the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act and other acts, and to enact measures respecting the registration of charities, in order to combat terrorism, and has agreed to report it with amendment.

I wish to thank the minister, her officials and officials from a number of departments who were involved in this process, committee members from all parties who participated most graciously in this exercise, members from the other house and their committee who informed our deliberations, witnesses who appeared in both places, the people in the ridings of all members who participated in this exercise, because it was a lengthy and a busy one, and, finally, the staff who supported the committee in a different kind of exercise and did it with great competence. We thank them all.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-415, an act to amend the Criminal Code (hate propaganda).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a bill this morning that would expand the definition of identifiable group under the provisions of the criminal code relating to hate propaganda to include any section of the public distinguished by sexual orientation.

The current provisions of the criminal code include reference to colour, race, religion and ethnic origin. The purpose of my amendment is to expand the protections of the hate propaganda provisions to include gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people to assist in protecting these groups against public incitement of hatred and violence.

The bill would assist in giving law enforcement officers at the border the power to stop people from crossing our border and coming into Canada to spread messages of hatred and homophobia.

Too many gay and lesbian people are victims of crimes based solely on their sexual orientation. Last weekend we saw the tragic death of Aaron Webster in Vancouver, a gay man who was clubbed to death in Stanley Park by gay bashers. This bill would send out a strong signal that Canada condemns all violence including violence directed at gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people.

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

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

BILL C-33

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to draw your attention and the attention of the House to the Journals of the House of Commons published this morning. Yesterday's Journals record that "A message was received from the Senate as follows", which ordered:

—That, notwithstanding Rule 63(1), the proceedings on Bill C-33, An Act respecting the water resources of Nunavut and the Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, which took place on Tuesday, November 6, 2001, be declared null and void; and

That a message be sent to the House of Commons informing that House of this decision and that the Senate attends any message that the House of Commons may have regarding this matter.

The Senate has drawn our attention to a serious defect in our records and the probity of the message that goes from this House to the other house of parliament. I draw your attention and the attention of other members to an excerpt from the Senate *Hansard* dated Wednesday, November 21, wherein the Hon. Fernand Robichaud, deputy leader of the government, states:

Honourable senators, with respect to the first item on the Order Paper under Government Business, the copy of the bill currently before us does not faithfully represent the bill passed by the House of Commons. In fact, the amendments passed in the House were omitted. As this is not a true copy, we cannot continue debate on this item as it appears before us.

This is a fairly serious matter, I would respectfully submit. Twice the bill was corrected and twice it was found to be deficient. If this was a rarity one could look the other way, but it is clear from the Senate message that there is now considerable concern about our records, and records, as the Chair would agree, must be pristine, concise and always accurate.

This must be seen in the context of the work facing the House with respect to 100 amendments presented in the justice committee on Bill C-36, the anti-terrorism bill that was just tabled in the House. When people are legislating in marathon sessions at three o'clock in the morning, we have a duty to know that the records will be accurate. If the government takes a decision to pursue such an action, we must ensure and be equally diligent in determining and ensuring that the resulting work is accurate and a reflection of the effort.

The Senate message is a serious warning. First, may I ask for assurances from the Speaker that no corrective action was taken or will be taken by officials to send a corrective message to the Senate until the House has clearly authorized such a message? Second, I want to reserve my ability to raise any question of privilege that may flow from this matter.

Finally, I would ask for unanimous consent to move the following motion, which would be seconded by the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester:

That the Message from the Senate concerning Bill C-33, An Act respecting the water resources of Nunavut and the Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

• (1045)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): As far as your point of order is concerned, I will take it under advisement. I will submit it to the Speaker who shall rule on it if it is necessary.

* * *

PETITIONS

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition concerning child pornography, which has been signed by a large number of Canadians including individuals from my own riding of Mississauga South.

If child pornography exists then a child must have been abused. The possession of child pornography is a criminal offence, but it has been continually challenged in the courts and even appealed to the supreme court. That is why the petitioners have raised this petition.

They pray that the House of Commons and the Government of Canada take all measures necessary to ensure that the possession of child pornography remains a serious criminal offence in Canada and that the police authorities be directed to give priority to enforcing this law for the protection of our children.

KIDNEY DISEASE

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of citizens of the general Peterborough area who are concerned about kidney disease.

The petitioners know that the national institute responsible for kidney research does fine work. They believe that a change in the name of that institute would make the work that it does even more effective and better known to the general public.

The House may know that at the present time the institute is called the Institute of Nutrition, Metabolism and Diabetes. The citizens of the Peterborough area believe the name would be more effective if the word kidney were included.

Routine Proceedings

They call upon parliament to encourage the Canadian Institutes of Health Research to explicitly include kidney research as one of the institutes in its system, to be named the institute of kidney and urinary tract diseases.

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present three petitions this morning. The first petition is signed by a number of residents of my constituency of Burnaby—Douglas. I want to single out the contribution of one constituent, Mary Balsevicius of North Burnaby.

The petition is on the subject of energy prices and notes that energy is an important natural resource that we have little control over. It points out concerns about energy price increases that have triggered rounds of inflation. The petition also raises concerns about the impact on Canadian households and businesses.

The petitioners call upon parliament to urge the government to set up an energy price commission to hold big oil companies accountable for the energy prices they charge Canadians.

• (1050)

FALUN GONG

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a second petition, signed by hundreds of residents of Ontario, Newfoundland and Quebec, on the subject of the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners.

The petitioners note that Falun Gong is a peaceful, slow motion exercise practice that focuses on truthfulness, compassion and tolerance and is enjoyed and respected in over 40 countries. They point out the persecution in China of Falun Gong practitioners.

The petitioners call upon parliament and the government to take immediate action to do far more to speak out against the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners.

TRADE

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my last petition deals with the subject of the free trade area of the Americas and the summit of the Americas.

The petitioners note that in a free and democratic society citizens should be able to peacefully protest and commit acts of civil disobedience to advocate their particular point of view.

They point out some concerns about what took place in Quebec City at the summit of the Americas and, in particular, the abuse of power by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police with gas and rubber bullets.

The petitioners call upon parliament to commission a public inquiry into the actions of the police and the federal government during the summit of the Americas held in Quebec City and to release all information regarding the extent of police and government action.

Government Orders

[Translation]

THE ACADIANS

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition containing 480 signatures of people of Acadia, Quebec and even the United States. This petition is related to Motion No. 241 now before the House.

The petitioners note that the advisory committee set up by the Société nationale des Acadiens, in its report presented on October 1, recommended, among other things, that the Société nationale des Acadiens continue its representations to have the historical wrongs that occurred during the deportation officially recognized by the British Crown, and the motion sponsored by all Acadian members of the House of Commons, regardless of their political affiliations.

They also note that Motion No. 241 enjoys a great deal of support within the Acadian community, both from individuals and from various organizations representing the Acadian community, municipalities and the Association des municipalités francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick.

They are asking the House of Commons to take all necessary measures to ensure that Motion No. 241 is finally adopted

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 67 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 67—**Mr. Jay Hill:**

On what days and at what times did the full cabinet meet between September 10 and September 17, 2001?

Mr. Joe Jordan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): There were no meetings of the full cabinet between September 10 and September 17, 2001.

* * *

[English]

STARRED QUESTIONS

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Starred Question No. 73. I ask that the question and the answer to Question No. 73 be printed in *Hansard* as if read.

[Text]

*Question No. 73—**Mr. Guy St-Julien:**

With regard to grants, contributions and/or loan guarantees made either by a Crown corporation, a department and/or an agency of the government to General Motors in Sainte-Thérèse, Quebec, for each fiscal year since 1965: (a) how many such grants, contributions and/or loan guarantees were made; (b) what was the source and value of each grant, contribution and/or loan guarantee; (c) on what dates were they issued; (d) what was the reason such assistance was provided; and (e) what is the present status of the grant, contribution and/or loan guarantee (whether repaid, partially paid, or unpaid, including the value of the repayment)?

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): I am informed as follows: Industry Canada—In 1987 the minister of regional industrial expansion, a predecessor department to Industry Canada, and the Quebec government provided a cost shared 50:50 30 year interest free loan to General Motors of Canada, GM, totalling \$220 million conditional on the upgrading of the Ste-Thérèse plant's paint facility and the awarding by GM of a new product mandate. The loan is repayable in April 2017, whether or not the plant's operations are maintained.

Transport Canada—1995-96 until September 2001, nil; 1964-65 to 1994-95, regrettably the information is not available. According to guidelines from the National Archives of Canada records related to grants and contributions must be kept for six years after which they may be disposed of.

Insofar as the other departments, agencies and crown corporations, they have reported no information on this question.

[English]

Mr. Geoff Regan: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement government orders will be extended tonight by 32 minutes.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FOREIGN MISSIONS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ACT

The House resumed from November 21 consideration of the motion that Bill C-35, an act to amend the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I rise again to talk about Bill C-35, which we spoke about last night. I appreciate your indulgence.

The fact of the matter is that I find it rather strange that we have this contradictory situation. The Minister of Transport has just introduced a bill increasing security and is spending a great deal of attention on focusing on enhancing security in the transport system, and as well we have Bill C-36 which increases police powers and creates new arrest powers for police, and here we are talking about Bill C-35 which expands immunity from our laws. It seems we are going one way with the two bills we are discussing today, and with Bill C-35 we are going in a completely different direction.

Government Orders

Bill C-35 is an act to amend the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act. Essentially it expands immunity far beyond anything we have ever done. Most Canadians think of diplomatic immunity as applying only to diplomats. The bill expands it much more broadly so that it is not just for diplomats. The bill expands it in a whole new definition of people who would qualify for immunity under our new laws.

I will quote from one newspaper, in which Greg Weston states about the bill that:

Under it, anyone showing up at international...[conferences]...that's delegates, officials, staff, families, bag-carriers, mistresses—would have diplomatic immunity to rape, steal, drive drunk and otherwise break Canadian laws with impunity, compliments of our national government.

The bill includes delegates, officials, staff, family, bag carriers, everyone, along with the diplomats, so it is no longer diplomatic immunity; it is immunity that covers everyone who attends an international conference in Canada. We think it is unnecessary and goes far beyond anything that is required.

The newspaper article continues with respect to how immunity would be determined. One foreign affairs official quoted in the newspaper states:

If we give (diplomatic) privileges and immunities for a meeting, then all of the participants we let in for that meeting will get it.

This direction is completely different from the one we have taken before with respect to diplomatic immunity. Diplomatic immunity was always provided in order to avoid harassment of diplomats and to ensure that the senior diplomats were protected from harassment by foreign governments, and in any case this does not happen in Canada, but now we have expanded it to a wide range of officials, assistants and staff so that they can come to Canada, break our civil and criminal laws and completely disregard the laws because they can claim immunity, even though it is far more than diplomatic immunity now.

It is so ironic that Bill C-36 is imposing new penalties on Canadians, giving police new powers and even creating new laws against Canadians at the very same time that we are debating Bill C-35 in the House, which is giving diplomatic immunity to a whole new range of people who attend meetings in Canada. It is completely contradictory and makes no sense.

Yesterday one of the government members suggested that we needed this very desperately so we could allow conferences like the upcoming G-8 conference in Alberta to be held. I disagree. We do not need this for that purpose. I do not think we have ever had a complaint. No one has ever said "I am not coming to Canada because I do not have diplomatic immunity. I am not coming to Canada because I cannot break civil laws and criminal laws and get away with it". We do not need this expansion of diplomatic immunity and we should not be doing it.

There is absolutely no transparency in the bill. It removes the accountability to parliament about who claims diplomatic immunity. There is no obligation for the Department of Foreign Affairs to tell Canadians or parliament or the foreign affairs committee who claims diplomatic immunity. There should be a clause in the bill which states that every year or twice a year or four times a year the government must come to the foreign affairs committee or to

parliament and present a report on who claimed diplomatic immunity and why.

Furthermore, it puts Canadians at further risk. Instead of tightening up security, the bill reduces security and increases the risk to Canadians. Not having an annual report creates an enhanced opportunity for repeat actions, such as the awful accident that took place on January 27 last year and to which we refer quite often.

• (1055)

In that case, a foreign diplomat had repeat offences but no one knew about it except the department. No one knew about it because there was no requirement for annual reporting. Had there been a requirement for annual reporting, this diplomat who had a series of offences would have been well known to the public, to the parliamentarians and to the foreign affairs committee. I am absolutely convinced that if this knowledge had been available he would not have had the opportunity to offend one more time. However, it was not available and he did offend one more time.

The bill does nothing to address that. The same thing could happen again without an amendment which requires an annual reporting. It just seems like such a common sense amendment and it is very disappointing that the government has refused this amendment. Many other amendments have been proposed and turned down. In fact, to the best of my knowledge all amendments were turned down even though many of them were sensible and were not intended to distort the bill or change the direction of it in any way, shape or form. They were common sense, thoughtful amendments but they were just turned down on principle.

The whole purpose of the bill is to avoid inappropriate harassment and we do not have any examples of that in Canada. We do not have any claims about inappropriate harassment against diplomats so I do not know why we are expanding this to cover more people. Even the people who are now covered have never complained, to the best of our knowledge. Staff members, assistants or officials have never said they would not come to Canada because Canada does not have immunity for them, and so what if they did say they were not coming to Canada if they did not have immunity? If they need immunity to avoid our laws and our criminal and civil actions we do not want them anyway. I do not know why we are expanding this immunity to cover all these new officials. Broadening the scope of coverage for diplomatic immunity really distorts it and creates more security risks for Canadians. It does not deal with it in an appropriate way.

Again, at the very least there should be an annual report about who claims diplomatic immunity in the country. There is not one, so in effect there could be diplomats who have a series of offences and claim diplomatic immunity time and time again. No one would ever know and the action that could be taken if parliament and public knew would not be. Again, let me say one more time that there should be an amendment for including annual reporting.

Government Orders

It is not all negative. We support some aspects of the bill. Certainly one is that the bill provides greater clarity for the role of the RCMP. In the international conferences I have been involved with there was a lot of confusion about who was in charge, about whether it was the local police, the provincial police, the RCMP or whatever. The bill makes it very clear that the RCMP is in charge of security at international conferences and that is a good thing. However, that was generated perhaps to some extent by the Hughes report on the APEC conference in Vancouver, which was such a fiasco. That report also suggested that there should be regulations to prevent politicians from interfering with the RCMP and there is no condition or clause in the bill that requires politicians to not interfere with the RCMP in the course of its duties. That was a recommendation by the Hughes report which was not addressed, so although the RCMP clearly is now in charge there is no restriction on politicians interfering with the RCMP while it is doing its job.

Another aspect of the bill our party does not like is that it further centralizes within the bureaucracy the power to allocate immunity from the law. For instance, special visitors now have to apply to the immigration minister's office to come to Canada if there is some concern about whether they qualify to come here. If there is some concern about whether or not they qualify for a visa they can apply to the minister of immigration. That will go with the enactment of this bill. They would apply through officials in the Department of Foreign Affairs, whose job is probably to encourage the international meeting to take place in the first place. They may not be objective or they may be overwhelmed with applications from people who are coming to these conventions. As the newspaper article says, if we give immunity to one we have to give immunity to all, as a Department of Foreign Affairs official was quoted as saying.

Again, instead of having the department of immigration, which has expertise in this field, examine these visas and applications, it will be locked in with the Department of Foreign Affairs, which is most anxious to see these conventions occur and be well attended. Perhaps its officials will not analyze these applications. The foreign affairs official said that if we give immunity to one we must give it to all. It does not bode well. It does not give us any level of comfort that these immunity conditions will be granted with the proper authority and the proper consideration. We think they may be given too broadly. Even though the bill is broad, they may be expanded under the licence provided by the bill.

• (1100)

Again, the amendment our party proposed would have required annual reporting. Had that been in place there is a really good chance that the accident on January 27 of this year would never have happened. The diplomat had a track record of offences but no one knew about it. No one knew about it because he claimed diplomatic immunity, so there was no record. The public and parliament did not know that the man was a repeat offender. Had there been a public accounting annually, quarterly or even twice a year, parliament would have known. The embassy certainly would have been uncomfortable knowing that one of their diplomats was publicly named over and over again for offences. I believe that if the embassy involved would not have sent the diplomat home we would have insisted that he go home. However, we did not know about it because there was no requirement to report to parliament. This condition is still the same. The same thing could happen again. There

could be a diplomat who is a repeat offender out there right now who we do not know about and never will know about. There is no requirement in the bill for an annual reporting on who applies for diplomatic immunity.

We hope that the minister will see the sense in this. It is interesting that Bill C-36 was amended by the attorney general to allow exactly what we are asking for in Bill C-35. The attorney general said that because of the opposition motions and the attention the opposition has put on this the government will have included in Bill C-36 a requirement for an annual report. This only happened two days ago, when she announced that the bill would be amended to include an annual report. Bill C-35 will still not have an annual report requirement, even though the same criteria and the same reasoning apply to Bill C-35. The government is going one way on one bill and another way on the other bill. There is no reason not to have annual reporting.

Another disconcerting part is the fact that the permission to come to Canada is transferred from the minister of immigration through special permits to the department. It is lumped in with many other aspects of the applications for the meetings.

These are our main concerns about the bill. Our party will not support the bill because of these very clear shortcomings. If the amendments were accepted we would probably support the bill, but instead of increasing security for Canadians it reduces it when everything else we are doing in the House is trying to increase security.

This morning the Minister of Transport tabled a bill to increase security regarding transport. The Minister of Finance said upcoming budget will focus totally on security. Bill C-36 is the anti-terrorism bill and is totally focused on security. Yet we have Bill C-35 in the middle, which expands immunity and allows people to avoid being held accountable under our civil and criminal laws. It is a complete contradiction to everything else the government is doing. Our party believes the bill should be sent back, as the amendment we are speaking to today refers to. The amendment asks that the bill be sent back to committee for reconsideration. Our party supports the amendment. If the bill goes back for reconsideration to the committee and is amended, then perhaps our party will change its position. If it does not, our party will not be supporting the bill.

• (1105)

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Cumberland—Colchester for his remarks. I would just like to follow up on some of them with a couple of questions.

Government Orders

He made the point that he did not see the reason why we needed to extend immunity to essentially foreign visitors to conventions. I wonder, though, whether he should consider the way Canada is perceived or the way these conventions are perceived by other countries. We have a situation now where difficulties occur when these conventions are organized. We have violence. We have protests that are out of control.

I wonder whether one of the reasons why it is necessary to extend immunity is that foreign visitors to these conventions may feel that they need this extra protection wherever they go in the world for these conventions. Perhaps they do not realize that Canada is a very orderly nation. We do obey the rule of law. Perhaps what they are seeking, on international terms, is legal protection. It is not just Canada they are worried about. It is other countries where these conventions may be held. Perhaps it is a perception thing that makes this necessary.

I would also very briefly like to point out the fear expressed by the member for Cumberland—Colchester that these people who get immunity will abuse it in the same sense that happened with the Russian diplomat with respect to drunk driving incidents. There is a difference because the immunity that is involved in the bill is only temporary. It is for people who are coming to the country for a few days for a convention and then leaving. It is not quite in the same category as diplomats who are here for years.

Are these fears that maybe the member for Cumberland—Colchester has somewhat overstated and perhaps not as serious as he might think they are?

• (1110)

Mr. Bill Casey: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's intervention. He has been a long standing supporter of access to information. I am sure he would support my amendment, if he had the chance to do so, to have an accounting once a year on who claimed diplomatic immunity under the new regulations.

To address his question, I do not see the connection between the violence in Canada at international meetings and protests that are out of control. I do not know how that affects the participants in the meeting unless they are involved in the violence, in which case, I do not think they should have immunity. If they come to Canada to protest for some reason and they do not obey our laws, then I do not think they should have immunity.

He mentioned the fact that they were here for a short term and it was short term immunity. If there is an accident or a crime that involves a death or an injury, it is still a death or an injury whether it is short term or long term.

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too listened to the remarks of my colleague from across the floor. I find a number of things rather disconcerting, but particularly it is his criticism of making the change from the Immigration Act of obtaining a certificate from the minister and bringing that under the ambit of the Department of Foreign Affairs.

The expert witness who dealt very specifically with that issue at committee made it very clear that he thought it was a very good amendment. It allowed for the same discretion that he as an expert

saw as requisite. It put it where it should be, which is within the Department of Foreign Affairs. In fact, it is not something that will be carelessly done but rather will be dealt with case by case and requires an order in council.

I have difficulty with his inability to see that. Perhaps he could share his insight.

Mr. Bill Casey: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intervention but the witness who made that comment was the government witness. Also according to the newspaper article by Greg Weston, which I am assuming is correct, he said that if we gave diplomatic privileges and immunities for a meeting, then all the participants that we let in for that meeting would get it.

This is different from the minister of immigration looking at an individual application and saying that this person does not qualify or that this is a person we do not want to have in Canada who has diplomatic immunity from our civil and criminal laws.

What this foreign official has said is that if one gets in, they all get in. That does not sound to me like the Department of Foreign Affairs, according to this foreign affairs official, will analyze individual applications as in the past when a minister issued a special ministerial permit. This is almost blanket coverage, according to this foreign affairs official who was quoted in the paper. If anybody is allowed into these meetings, then everybody in the delegation will be allowed in and that is my concern.

I do not believe that I am exaggerating or that any other aspect of my comments was not realistic or practical.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Cumberland—Colchester for the work he has done on this bill and for his remarks which were put in a very measured context of legitimate concerns. Sadly we have seen time and time again in this place that the government does not like any form of criticism, even constructive criticism.

When he referred to the bill, he encapsulated in his remarks the fact that individuals might be given this immunity in coming to a country and that much of the decision making as to who attended and who was the beneficiary of this immunity would be done by those attending these conferences. That is very much the focus of this particular bill.

I would suggest there is an implicit pressure on officials to ensure that the conference is a success and that individuals will be encouraged to attend. That puts equally in place an implicit pressure to ensure that this immunity is extended to encourage attendance and participation.

If the decision is being made by those who are very often involved and in charge of the organizing and will be left to bear the pressures and take responsibility for the success or failure of that conference, does this not again potentially politicize the decision making? Does this not leave those who are now vested with the power with a conflict of interest, in a sense, in making that decision and does it not remove the political accountability that would exist under the old system, where the minister would to make the decision and bear the fallout when that decision has been taken?

Government Orders

•(1115)

Mr. Bill Casey: Mr. Speaker, that is very much a part of our concern with the bill, that there was and is right now a very clear set of rules and a system that ensures that applicants who come to Canada are screened individually, one on one.

This transfers it to almost a group approval. As the member mentioned, it has almost been relayed to us as a tourism bill, to promote tourism and the ability of Canada to hold international events. However, if people are not coming to Canada because they cannot come with protection against breaking our laws, civil and criminal, then why do we want them in the first place?

I do not think people would say they would not go to a G-8 meeting in Canada because they could not break the laws and get away with it. I do not think they have ever come to a parliamentary meeting and said they would not go to Canada because they could not break the laws and get away with it.

We do not need this expanded immunity at this time especially. We should not have it. The government should remove it. As a matter of fact the last line from the newspaper article is complimentary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs. It says "Foreign Affairs Minister John Manley and his officials have recently been doing—"

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but you cannot refer to an member by his name. It is the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Bill Casey: Even if I am trying to give him a compliment, Mr. Speaker? The article states:

(The) Foreign Affairs Minister and his officials have recently been doing an admirable job cracking down on law-breaking diplomats. They should continue their good work by consigning this particular legislation to the nearest shredder.

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at the final stage of debate at third reading of Bill C-35 to speak on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democratic caucus and once again to oppose strongly the passage of the legislation.

[*Translation*]

I regret that the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Mercier at the report stage of this bill was rejected. That amendment was to delete clause 5 of the bill, a very dangerous provision.

[*English*]

However the House voted against the amendment of my colleague from Mercier and we are now at the point of reviewing the overall legislation.

I have to pick up on the comments of my colleague from Cumberland—Colchester. He asked quite eloquently why we even needed the legislation.

There are three major elements to the legislation. The first element which I want to touch upon is the issue of extending diplomatic immunity in a very sweeping way. We were told in committee that the reason for this was reciprocity and that we had to amend our legislation to extend, in a very dramatic way, immunity to people coming into Canada for a conference so that Canadians would be protected in other countries in similar circumstances. It might just be an informal conference between Canada and another country, but

anyone associated with the meeting would have full diplomatic immunity.

When I asked in committee for the proof or evidence that there was a problem for Canadians attending conferences in other countries, the government ministers were silent. They simply could not answer the question. I asked them to give us a single example of a circumstance in which we had a problem at an international conference as a result of the absence of the reciprocity they were trumpeting. It did not exist.

What is the underpinning for this extension of diplomatic immunity? The Liberals can argue that this will only be the case for a conference and that people will only be here for a few days. However I think Canadians are more and more concerned about the whole nature of the sweeping immunities given to those who are considered diplomats and others attending foreign conferences in Canada.

That is the first point I want to make. We categorically reject those provisions of the legislation that would extend even further the ambit of that diplomatic immunity. Rather what we should be doing is promoting far greater awareness, accountability and transparency in the area of the existing diplomatic immunities.

My colleague from Cumberland—Colchester has proposed an annual report of the extent upon which these immunities are being relied by diplomats in Canada. That is an important step but it is one which unfortunately the government has rejected.

The issue came to the fore a few months ago with the tragic death of an Ottawa woman who was out walking her dog with a friend. A drunken Russian diplomat ran into her and killed her. This was not the first time this diplomat had been involved in drunk driving. He had been warned before and sent back. Why did it take the death of an innocent woman who was out walking her dog before the government finally tightened up the provisions on drunk driving by diplomats in Ottawa?

It is shameful that the government did not tighten this up significantly before then. The first time diplomats are involved in that kind of disgraceful conduct of drunk driving or refusing to take a breathalyzer, they should be given the boot and kicked out of the country immediately under the provisions of the Canadian law. They should not be given more opportunities to break that law. That is our first concern. We do not accept the extension.

The second concern is with respect to the issue of the permits under the Immigration Act. This issue is a straightforward one. As it now stands, participants who wish to come to Canada to involve themselves in international conferences, and who have a criminal record which otherwise would render them inadmissible to Canada, are required to get a minister's permit to attend that conference.

What is the problem with that?. Why should that not continue to be the case? Any other person who wants to enter Canada, who has that kind of criminal record, is required to have a permit. The law has worked quite effectively so far. It has not barred anyone. The example the minister gave was Nelson Mandela. My recollection is that Nelson Mandela came to Canada with no difficulty whatsoever.

Government Orders

• (1120)

Why should there be one standard for those diplomats or international officials who come here to attend conferences and another standard for everybody else? I do not accept that and my colleagues in the New Democrat caucus do not accept that double standard.

A minister's permit is a minister's permit and it does not unduly inconvenience those who would participate in these conferences whatsoever. But surely, if an individual has been involved in serious criminal wrongdoing, we have a right to ask that the person apply, just as any other person would apply, for a permit to be able to participate in these international conferences. That is the second major element that we oppose in the bill.

The third and by far the most important and dangerous provision is clause 5. It is a new clause that extends unprecedented sweeping powers to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police with respect to the issue of security for international meetings in Canada.

We are told that all this is doing is just codifying existing law. If that is the case, the obvious question would be why do we need this statute at all if it is not broadening the powers but simply codifying the existing powers? We do not need it at all.

The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, on which I have the honour to sit, took what is not an unprecedented but what is an extraordinary step. After passing the bill on division, with all opposition parties opposing the bill, a couple of members on the Liberal side of the House actually abstained in the vote. That is almost unprecedented as well. After the bill was reported, the same committee that heard the evidence submitted a separate report to the House on the bill. It virtually never happens that a standing committee that deals with legislation feels the necessity to submit a strong report to the government asking it to hold on because the committee has grave concerns about the bill.

I will quote from the report. I think Canadians have a right to know just exactly how concerned all members, including government members, were about the provisions of the legislation. The report submitted to the House said that whereas the testimony of expert legal witnesses before the foreign affairs committee on Bill C-35 has dealt with the issue of article 5:

—and has raised serious concerns about the adequacy and interpretive clarity of the existing language in article 5, notably in regard to the provisions regarding the primary responsibility of the RCMP for taking measures, including the establishment of security perimeters that are appropriate and reasonable in the circumstances;

Whereas, notwithstanding the existing authority of peace officers under the common law, of the RCMP under the RCMP Act and under other statutory authority pertaining to the security of internationally protected persons, article 5 will for the first time in statute give the RCMP explicit powers to establish security perimeters for certain conferences of an international nature;

Whereas these codified RCMP powers may affect the rights and privileges of Canadian citizens in relation to such conferences;

Whereas the testimony heard by the committee strongly pointed towards the desirability of a broader review of the statutory authorities governing police powers in respect of future situations within Canada where security perimeters may be warranted;

The committee urges the government to take into account the legitimate concerns which have been expressed in regard to the drafting of article 5 of the bill.

That is a very strong signal from the foreign affairs committee that clause 5 in the bill, the heart of the bill in many respects, is not acceptable. When there is a unanimous report from the committee saying to look out, that there are some real reservations about the clause, instead of listening to that and voting to amend the bill by deleting that clause and sending the issue back to the government, what did the trained seals on the government side do? They stood up and voted against their own colleagues on the foreign affairs committee who said to watch out for that particular clause.

• (1125)

They said that rightly. We are looking at this bill in the context of other legislation, in particular in the context of Bill C-36, the government's proposed anti-terrorism legislation. It is very dangerous and draconian legislation. This week the Minister of Justice introduced some amendments to that bill, but it still falls far short of what is acceptable.

She did not touch the sections for example on the Official Secrets Act. She did not touch the sections on investigative hearings. She did not even subject them to sunset clauses. The definition of terrorist activity is still far too broad. Her so-called five year sunset clause in reality is a 10 year sunset clause because it can be extended by a simple majority vote in the House. That is not a sunset clause at all.

The fact is that the sun should never have risen on a number of the key provisions of that anti-terrorism bill. It is ironic that in the same week in which Nelson Mandela—

• (1130)

Ms. Aileen Carroll: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is my understanding, and certainly it is written in the House order for the day, that we should be discussing Bill C-35. I would ask that the hon. member constrain his remarks to that bill and perhaps look to another opportunity to discuss Bill C-36.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): It is much more a point of debate, but the hon. member for Burnaby—Douglas has certainly heard the message.

Mr. Svend Robinson: Mr. Speaker, it is a point of debate which I intend to ignore completely because it is irrelevant. The fact of the matter is we are talking about a bill that deals with police powers. It is very much relevant to look at the broader context in which these police powers are going to be exercised.

We have already seen the extent to which the police are abusing their existing powers and perhaps testing out the powers that they do not even have yet under Bill C-36. We have seen that in the context of Quebec City and the abuse of police power there. We saw it just last weekend in Ottawa where the police waded into a crowd of peaceful, non-violent protesters and singled people out for preventive detention. They sicced unleashed German shepherd dogs on innocent, non-violent, peaceful protesters. It was a disgrace. And this same government wants to give them more powers? I do not think so.

Government Orders

As I was saying before I was interrupted by the hon. member, it is ironic that this week as well the House of Commons joined in celebrating the extension of honorary citizenship to Nelson Mandela. Under the provisions of that same anti-terrorism legislation, Nelson Mandela would have been very likely branded as a terrorist and those Canadians who supported his struggle against apartheid would have been branded as terrorists as well.

[*Translation*]

As Michel C. Auger wrote recently in the *Journal de Montréal*,

The definition remains so broad that it still includes many unpopular or marginal political activities. One person's terrorist is another's freedom fighter.

Twenty years ago, the present Vice-President of the United States, Dick Cheney, voted in Congress in favour of Nelson Mandela's being considered a terrorist. Today, Mandela is an honorary citizen of Canada. Today, we also have a Canadian Alliance member who described Nelson Mandela as a terrorist.

What is certain is that anyone who is a citizen of Palestinian origin, for example, who comes from a troubled area, will now have much more difficulty even discussing the situation in his country.

[*English*]

That is the context within which we have to look at these sweeping new powers that are being requested by the RCMP in this bill. We heard eloquent evidence from a number of witnesses, including Bill Sloan, the president of the American Association of Jurists, and Professor Wesley Pue from the University of British Columbia law school on this issue.

Professor Pue raised deep concerns about the scope of clause 5, proposed section 10.1. He pointed out that there are two major problems with clause 2 around the issue of security perimeters. First of all he noted that the police are given the power to create security perimeters only at international conferences and second, there is absolutely no guidance given to police officers in determining what is appropriate and in which circumstances. When the RCMP erect a security perimeter, this affects a whole range of the rights of Canadians, such as the right of free movement within Canada, the right of assembly and the right of free expression.

[*Translation*]

On the subject of freedom of speech, I wish to denounce in the strongest terms possible the shameful treatment inflicted by Radio-Canada on journalist Normand Lester. I call upon the government to ask Radio-Canada to cancel his suspension. That is unacceptable in a democracy.

[*English*]

There are other fundamental rights as well: the right to enjoyment of property, the right to work, the right to go lawfully about one's daily life without interruption or harassment by the police.

As Professor Pue notes, a security perimeter affects all of these rights among others. How long will it last? Whose property rights can be derogated from under this security perimeter? Are police required to give notice to affected parties? What is the extent of the perimeter? How big would the perimeter be?

Alan Borovoy of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association has pointed out "to be minimally effective, a demonstration must be able to create an atmosphere of political and social tension for those whose decisions it is trying to influence. While it is appropriate to keep protesters far enough away so that they cannot physically intimidate, they must be sufficiently close in order to politically castigate". This legislation, Bill C-35, leaves wide open the question of whether indeed that will be the case.

For all of these reasons, because of the sweeping extension and unwarranted extension of diplomatic immunity, because of the removal of the provisions for ministerial orders in the case of those who would attend these international conferences who have criminal records, and finally and most important, because of the very dangerous extension of powers to the RCMP under clause 5 of the bill, my colleagues and I in the New Democratic Party will be voting against this bill at third reading.

● (1135)

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite suggested that Bill C-35 is going to extend immunities in a sweeping fashion to all kinds of classes of individuals coming to international conventions in Canada.

In my reading of the bill unless I am terribly mistaken the decision of extending the immunity rests with the governor in council. Therefore it is not something that is a sweeping power that is granted in the bill at all. The government will still have discretion to not extend this immunity except in those situations where it thinks it is appropriate.

Mr. Svend Robinson: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the bill does represent a significant extension because the definitions of international organization and international conference are such that it is going to apply to a whole range of meetings which are not covered under the existing provisions for diplomatic immunity. For that reason, clearly it represents a significant extension of that immunity.

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to my hon. colleague's comments. I was somewhat disheartened to see him slip into rhetoric and polemics because I frequently have found him to be more thoughtful and to apply perhaps a more intellectual analysis than I have had to listen to this morning. That is disappointing. I was not surprised by that kind of approach in yesterday's debate by an hon. member from across the way, but I would have held the bar higher for my hon. colleague this morning.

I make particular reference to his mention of clause 5 as being the heart of the bill. This is coming from someone with his background in international politics and his concept and understanding of the Vienna convention, at times totally lacking from the other member. I understand his preoccupation with police powers. As much as we have attempted to explain that this is a codification of common law, his past has given him a great fear of police powers. However that is not reflected in the normal Canadian and in the polls wherein Canadians have asked us to provide the security and to do so of course intelligently.

Government Orders

On matters with regard to immunities, because of his background which I have described, he is very cognizant of the fact that there are consular and there are diplomatic levels. Unlike the colleague to his left from Cumberland—Colchester who spoke earlier, this is not just a matter of throwing open the doors to every conceivable official who comes into the country allowing them immunities on that scale.

I ask him to respond to those two issues that I have raised and to do so free of the rhetoric.

Mr. Svend Robinson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does raise some important issues. With respect to police powers, she has suggested that perhaps it is because of my own background and my involvement at Quebec City that I am particularly sensitive to this.

The fact is I think more and more Canadians are asking questions about the abuse of police powers at these international conferences. Any Canadian who witnessed on television the scene of the German shepherd dog being sicced on a peaceful protestor who was lying prone on the ground had to be deeply troubled about what was happening.

Any Canadian who was aware of the fact that over 900 rubber bullets were fired in Quebec City and over 5,000 tear gas cannisters were used has to be troubled about the abuse of police power.

This morning on CBC radio I heard the story of a young woman who was having a meal in the Rideau Centre in Ottawa on the weekend. She had been involved in a peaceful, non-violent protest. She had a sign beside her while having her lunch. She was detained, arrested and questioned by the police.

When the hon. member says that the government is simply codifying the existing powers of the RCMP, she knows very well, as we heard from a number of witnesses, that is not the case. Professor Sloan and Professor Pue said that this was extending those powers.

I have to say that before we in any way codify those existing powers, we need to have an independent inquiry as to the abuse of those powers under the current provisions of the law, both in the context of the G-20 and in the context of Quebec City.

• (1140)

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the member's comments. As a long term member of parliament, I am guessing that he has probably been aware of or participated in hundreds of international meetings.

A government member recently said that we need the bill for the G-8 session in Alberta. I do not know what the consequences would be, but the inference was that if we did not have the bill in place the G-8 would not be successful in Alberta.

With all the experience the member has and all the conferences he has attended and participated in, has anyone to his knowledge ever said that he or she would not come to Canadian without diplomatic immunity from breaking the civil or criminal laws?

Mr. Svend Robinson: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. In fact, that is one of the questions I put to the witnesses in committee.

The short answer is, absolutely not. In fact, I have to ask the other question: How was it that the G-20 was able to go ahead in Ottawa

this past weekend just fine? Over 20 different countries participated, finance ministers, the heads of the central banks in those countries, and somehow it went ahead without the bill, yet we are told that we need the bill for the G-8.

I do not think the bill is necessary. The G-20 was able to function just fine without the legislation and I think the G-8 will be able to function just as effectively.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have a quick question with regard to what the hon. member said about police powers.

There seems to be quite a voice going throughout the country from people at the grassroots level saying that giving up privacy rights if it will achieve catching terrorists, et cetera, that a large percentage of the people are behind that kind of movement.

I gather from what the member said that he would not agree with the results of the polls that are being taken in that regard. I know privacy is a big issue with many people but apparently as high as 75% of Canadians have expressed the view that they are prepared to give up some of their privacy rights to fight terrorism. How does the hon. member respond to these people?

Mr. Svend Robinson: Mr. Speaker, the member for Wild Rose raises an important question. It is absolutely true. I have seen the same polls and there certainly is that indication.

However, if the hon. member, for example, were to go home and find out that he or his colleague from British Columbia had a wiretap on their phone because somebody suspected they were subversives, I suspect he might be a little cautious and want to know where the evidence was to back that up.

In the abstract, especially after September 11, when people are asked if they are prepared to give up a bit of their privacy in order to be more secure, most people would say that they absolutely are. That is a natural reaction.

However, I would say that it is precisely at times like this that we have to be most vigilant about our liberties. As Tom Berger wrote, those freedoms are very fragile.

I look back at the internment of Canadians of Japanese origin. I look back at the invocation of the War Measures Act. As the hon. member for Wild Rose said, in both those cases there was a huge majority of Canadians who said that it was the right thing to do.

If we govern just by opinion polls, sure we will get those decisions made, but it is important for there be very careful consideration, not just of opinion polls but of the long term impact of those kinds of violations of some of the most basic rights of Canadians.

• (1145)

Hon. Diane Marleau (Sudbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a longstanding member of the House as you yourself are. November 21 was the 13th anniversary of my first election to the House. It is also the anniversary for a number of other members in the House of Commons. I also had the opportunity of sitting as a member of the opposition for five years, and have now been in government since 1993.

Government Orders

Opposition members oppose everything. They are there to cause trouble and to exaggerate. I have been there and I know what is done in opposition. The difference is though that suddenly the opposition becomes the government and members have to be responsible and put forward legislation that is necessary at the time. That is what we have been trying to do since 1993, and I believe we have been doing it fairly successfully.

With regard to Bill C-35, we all know that Canada will be hosting the G-8 meeting next year. We do have a responsibility to clarify our authorities in statute to ensure that this event can be properly handled. There is no problem in looking at how things can be done better but that does not mean that we are granting new immunities.

I have sat here and listened to two previous speakers and I can say that there was gross exaggeration. We are not extending immunities. All these people would have come here either through a minister's permit or whatever.

What we are doing is ensuring that it is all done under the authority of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Bill C-35 does not affect the immunity of diplomats or consuls who are already accredited to embassies and consulates in Canada nor does it affect their families. Its primary focus is on international organizations and in that regard it does not expand the level of immunities which the law provides for representatives of foreign states to international organizations or to conferences of such organizations in Canada.

What the bill does ensure is that Canada can treat international organizations or conferences that are not created by treaty, such as the G-8 summit or the summit of the Americas, in the same way that we treat a conference by a body created by treaty. Here I will refer members to the UN and to la francophonie.

However that does not mean that there will be no screening of individuals. I will use la francophonie as an example. Canada asks each individual representative to give a list of their representatives who will be coming into the country. Those people are screened in the usual fashion, by going through CSIS and Immigration Canada. We do not automatically allow everybody into the country. With the falsehoods being stated here it is very important for us to set the record straight.

People will come into the country but only after they have been screened. This has always been the case, whether they come under ministerial permit or otherwise. These screening procedures are in place and there are regular consultations between the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, CSIS and the RCMP. None of that will be bypassed, nor should it be, nor do we want it to be. We are the government. We are responsible people. We do not want people in Canada who average Canadians would not want. This is not a blanket okay to let anybody in. I would be the first to say absolutely not if it were the case. Let us not exaggerate. It is just a better way of being able to handle certain conferences, such as the G-8 which is not a treaty organization.

● (1150)

We talk about diplomatic immunity. Diplomatic immunity is not a licence to commit crimes. The Vienna convention expressly obligates states and their diplomats to obey local laws. The vast majority of diplomats in Canada respect our laws. Everyone listening

here today should realize there are hundreds of good people living in Ottawa who follow the laws and with whom we work closely.

Let us not pretend there is a massive problem. There is not. There have been problems. We know of the tragic event involving Ms. Catherine MacLean and Ms. Catherine Doré. That was a terrible event. The person who committed the crime has been charged and we are awaiting his indictment.

That being said, the incident pointed to shortcomings. No one is perfect. It is important to note that we have taken steps to address the shortcomings that were in place before the incident. We all regret the incident and wish we could have done this before. Unfortunately we did not. Hindsight is always 20:20.

However at least I can say our Minister of Foreign Affairs has taken steps. I am told he has demanded quarterly reports with lists of foreign diplomats in Canada who are involved in criminal misconduct. It is important to state that. The Minister of Foreign Affairs said he wants to know every four months what has been happening so this kind of incident will not be repeated. He has also indicated that quarterly reports will be made available subject to appropriate privacy considerations following an access request. As with anything else we cannot just publish the names of individuals.

What is important is that the foreign affairs department will be on top of these situations. It is committed to ensuring accountability and proper examination and control of unacceptable behaviour by foreign representatives. As far as I know all embassies have been notified of this. Procedures are in place to take care of it. We will be as vigilant as members of the opposition. I thank them for that. It is important that we all work together in these cases. Not one of us, whether on this side of the House or that side, wants a repeat of what happened in the past.

I spoke about responsibility in terms of putting legislation forward. My colleague in the NDP spoke about a motion that was passed having to do with clause 5 and police powers in Bill C-35. Yes, there are concerns. We the Liberals on the committee who are the majority passed the motion. We want the solicitor general to come back and report to the House on our concerns regarding police powers within the next 150 days.

We did not do that lightly. We did it because we thought it was important. We want police to have the powers they need to deal with these international events. We are all concerned about the increased violence we have seen around these events. No one wants to see it continue. These events are good. There is dialogue. It is important that Canada participate, especially now in this century, because Canada is probably the first country that can show a face of multiculturalism.

Government Orders

•(1155)

We are the country that is most advanced in terms of dealing with different peoples from different parts of the world. We are populated by immigrants from everywhere. Some of us came a long time ago, some of us have grandparents who came, and some of us are more recent.

While we cannot purport to be perfect we have a way of dealing with new arrivals and making them feel comfortable. We have a way of accepting who they are and where they are from, celebrating our differences and working together.

As many members know, when we travel internationally people ask how Canada has done this. They are impressed by it. We need to continue to lead the world and show others how to live together and build a great country. This is something we have done and on which we need to continue to work. It is something in which we need to play a key role in a century where the migration of peoples means diverse populations must live together. They must all learn to live together as equals because it is the only way this globe will move forward. It is therefore important for Canada to be involved in these conferences.

Bill C-35 by and large is about housekeeping. There are a number of points. It would modernize the legislation to comply with Canada's existing commitments under international treaties and respond to important new developments in international law. It is necessary to correct deficiencies in the existing definition of international organization. That is what Bill C-35 would do. It would not create any new powers. It would simply enable us to deal with them in a similar fashion.

The bill contains amendments designed to provide clear statutory authority to support the security measures necessary for our police to fulfill Canada's international obligations. This is extremely important. Our police forces are very good. They must continue to work together. We have added an amendment to make sure they do. This is important because we need to rely on them more and more.

Does that mean we would give them carte blanche? No, it does not. They are not asking for that. They need to be allowed to do their job. They do their job well and must be allowed to continue to do so. By and large I have confidence that the different levels of policing will continue to behave in a way consistent with the makeup of our country and the kinds of meetings that go on in it.

We talk about people who march for different causes. There many of them. They have legitimate concerns and I want them to be heard. Unfortunately there are hooligans who use legitimate protest marches to do damage. Frankly they detract from the message being brought forward.

I would hope and beg that as much as possible we allow legitimate protestors to protest. However legitimate protestors must be careful they do not condone the kind of wilful damage that sometimes goes on at these conferences. I do not think any Canadian wants that.

•(1200)

As an MP I have had many protests in front of my office in Sudbury. I have no objection to that whatsoever. However over a number of years the protests have become somewhat more violent.

The last few times some of the protesters came into the office with drums and loudspeakers. The office is staffed by two people who are by themselves most of the time. They were absolutely terrified. They still are to this day. Whenever there is a new protest we are less likely to ask them to come in because they are afraid.

I often tell them people have the right to protest. They agree but wonder what good it is if protesters can come into the office and frighten people. They wonder why we would want to listen to them. My message to protesters is that they should beware. If they get carried away their message may be lost.

Bill C-35 is a necessary piece of legislation. As I said, we had concerns. We have brought forward amendments that would address those concerns. We have asked for a report. It is important for everyone to realize we want to be responsible. We want to have the proper legislation and tools to deal with these people.

However at no time do we want to let people into Canada who we feel will cause trouble. We will continue to insist on the screening that has always gone on. We will deny access to people on the lists whom we do not want in our country. It happens all the time. Maybe we do not hear about it but I have been there and it happens. Lists must be submitted and every person on the list is screened.

We should support this piece of legislation. Opposition members should support the legislation. However if they do not want to support it they should not exaggerate the things that are in it. What I have heard this morning is a total gross exaggeration. Frankly it is not responsible. We on the other hand must pass legislation that is responsible and that will work for us in Canada. That is what is important.

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will begin by congratulating you on your 13 years of service. I can understand how hard it must have been to get started. I appreciate the work you have done. However you may become anesthetized to what is happening because you are now in a position to protect what the government brings forward. I disagree with what you think the role of the opposition is.

The opposition's role is to nudge the government into seeing flaws in its legislation or, if necessary, drag it kicking and screaming into reality. That is what our job is on this side.

I disagree with many of the comments made by my colleague from Burnaby—Douglas today. However, Mr. Speaker, I agree with many of the comments made by you.

The problem we have over here is that there are many different pieces of the legislation. The part of concern to me is that it would expand the scope of diplomatic immunity. I have heard it denied on the other side of the House many times but that is in effect what the legislation is about.

Government Orders

Yesterday the member for Waterloo—Wellington and the member for Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford made comments regarding the presentation made by the member for Vancouver Island North. He outlined a number of things that have happened which were not made up or imagined. He talked about occurrences where diplomats in Canada have been involved in cases of rape, assault and drunk driving. He lined them all up. These are the things we have a concern with.

We are not being alarmist if we raise these things. If we have a law that does not protect Canadian citizens from these kinds of actions by people who are covered under the diplomatic section we are in a lot of trouble. We must be more vigilant about this.

I am not concerned about the portions of the bill that would give police additional powers. That is easy to control. I have absolute faith in the police to do what they are supposed to do. I do not agree with protesters who come here and smash windows, create violence and ruin it for the people who have a message they want to deliver to the country and the government. Non-violent protesters deserve to have a voice.

Could the hon. member tell me something that would ease my concerns about the expanded powers the bill would give to people who were not previously covered by diplomatic immunity? If she can do that perhaps I will be more assured about what the legislation is about.

• (1205)

Hon. Diane Marleau: Mr. Speaker, first, I agree with the member in terms of the role of the opposition. It is the opposition's job to criticize and sometimes yell and scream and do all sorts of things to attract attention. I did the same thing when I was sitting where the member is.

In 1993 when we won the election, I remember thinking, my goodness, now we have to do this thing. It was frightening. It was easy to sit over there and criticize, but it suddenly dawned on me that night that we had to be responsible and do it. It puts a certain responsibility on us here on this side to do things that those in opposition do not have to consider.

Let us talk about the Vienna convention. As much as anything else, the Vienna convention on diplomatic relations is there to protect Canadians abroad. It is very important that we have this convention. We would not want our Canadians representing Canada to be mistreated in other parts of the world. It is important that we have this and that we reciprocate.

That does not mean we have to accept the fact that sometimes people come into our country and commit crimes, obviously not. There are no guarantees and there can be no absolute guarantees to ensure that all of the people who come with immunities will obey the law at all times. When persons with immunity commit serious crimes, the Canadian government has one of the most stringent policies in the world. We seek waiver of immunity to prosecute the individual. Unfortunately we rarely get it, but we do seek it in every instance. Where the request for a waiver is refused, other sanctions, including expulsion from Canada, are taken.

However, what we have to understand is that this piece of legislation does not grant different immunities to this group of

people. They would have been granted these immunities by ministerial permit. They would still be allowed into the country for the period of that conference. We would still screen them in the same way. All it does is concentrate them in the same place, those treaty organizations, where they are dealt with. That is what it does. It does not change the level of immunity they would have had if we had left it the way it was. It just streamlines our way of dealing with it.

We are not intent on adding and expanding immunities. That is not what this does. We still screen each person on the list as it is submitted. The foreign affairs department and all the departments have a whole screening process. It is very important to remember that. We do not just admit everyone because they happen to want to come to a conference and claim to be with a particular group. They have to be part of the official list. All the names on the official list are screened, much as, by the way, what happens when we Canadians go to a conference. Our names have to be submitted in advance. Those countries screen the names in the same fashion we do. It is not something new. It is something that carries on, but it is a streamlining of the way we do it.

• (1210)

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for pointing out that she was elected 13 years ago yesterday. So was I, but the difference is that I was given a little vacation in 1993 and recycled in 1997 so I can be considered environmentally friendly.

I have two questions for the member. She said several times that those members are now in government so they must be responsible. I think that is a good philosophy, but is it not responsible to ask the government to do an annual accounting of who claimed diplomatic immunity in a given year? We have asked for it and the government has turned it down. I think that is a responsible attitude and approach. It would respect Canadians and would provide Canadians with the information to which they are entitled. It is open and transparent.

It is very important for the member to listen to my second question. She said there is no blanket coverage, but there was a public statement in a newspaper article written by Greg Weston. The statement can only be interpreted as saying that the bill would provide blanket coverage. The member should listen to this statement and if it is wrong, correct it. The statement is that under the bill anyone showing up at international conferences:

—that's delegates, officials, staff, families, bag-carriers—would have diplomatic immunity to rape, steal, drive drunk and otherwise break Canadian laws with impunity, compliments of our national government.

If that statement is not correct, it should be corrected. Would the member say specifically what is wrong with that statement?

Hon. Diane Marleau: First, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows the difference, having been elected to government in 1988 when I was elected to opposition. He now sits in opposition. He is very much experienced on both sides of the House and he does know how it operates.

Government Orders

He speaks about wanting a report once a year. The Minister of Foreign Affairs has demanded quarterly reports because he wants to know for sure. Barring privacy considerations, these things can be made public through access to information. It is important to know that it is not once a year that the minister has asked for reports but four times a year. He, as well as the government, has decided we do not want to take any chances that these things can fall by the wayside without notice. It is important to remember that.

The hon. member talks about Greg Weston. I do not know Greg Weston. All I can tell the hon. member is that I do not always believe everything that I see in the newspapers. I will tell you one thing in direct response to your question—

The Deputy Speaker: I just want to caution members, notwithstanding everyone's experience in the Chamber, to please direct comments and interventions through the Chair.

I remind the hon. member for Sudbury that she has two minutes left in her intervention.

Hon. Diane Marleau: Mr. Speaker, thank you for reminding me that I must pay attention to you, Sir. You as well were elected on the same day I was for the first time.

Let me remind the hon. member that the list of delegates is submitted, the delegates are vetted and then they are given permission to come to the country. It is not permission to come into the country to commit crimes and most of these people never do, so while it appears to be based on some truth, the reality is that people are not allowed to come into the country if they do not first of all pass this scrutiny.

• (1215)

The Deputy Speaker: I will allow the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester to make a very short intervention. I will ask the member for Sudbury to do likewise in the very little time I will permit.

Mr. Bill Casey: Mr. Speaker, the member brought up a good point. The minister has said he wants quarterly reports. If he feels it is justified for him to have quarterly reports, and it is just a commitment by this minister, why will the government not put it into legislation and obligate all future ministers of foreign affairs to make annual reports to parliament? If it is worth it for the minister, why not make it permanent?

Hon. Diane Marleau: Mr. Speaker, I happen to think that it is now there quarterly and that whether it is in legislation or not we will demand to get these reports every quarter regardless of who is in office. I think we should.

I do not think it is necessary to put it in legislation, but if at some point someone feels that is better, who knows, we may consider it.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, may I add my voice to that of my colleague and thank all those who were elected in 1988 for their sacrifice to the country. It is not a joke. It is honestly said.

Bill C-35 is a very important bill because it has wide ranging implications and ramifications for a number of issues, including foreign policy, diplomatic immunity, immigration, international organizations and such. In regard to the debate that has gone on so far, I want to say that the Vienna convention is necessary not only

to protect our diplomats in doing their jobs but to protect those who do the job internationally. However, it does not protect against individuals who hide behind diplomatic immunity and commit indictable offences.

The Vienna convention, in spirit if not in word, does not protect us against individuals who are willing to commit, as my colleague mentioned, murder, rape, theft and the destruction of private property, to knowingly do that and hide behind the Vienna convention and the diplomatic immunity that it affords. That is why we have concerns with the bill and the extension of that immunity.

What we would like to see is the government working with opposition parties to proffer an international solution. We would like to see that for those individuals who are criminals hiding under a diplomatic cloak there is an avenue through which they can be brought to justice, so that they are not immune from justice and above the law, so that indeed, under the common principles that we share as part of the international community, these individuals who do commit crimes, be it in Canada or in another country, be it our own diplomats or those from another nation, will be met with the common law that we share.

There are opportunities, as my colleague from the Progressive Conservative Party mentioned. One of the things that can be done is to have the crimes of those who acquire diplomatic immunity made public and transparent. Another option, perhaps under the Hague, is to have a group of two or three judges sent to a country where there are allegations of a diplomat committing an indictable offence. They would preside over a hearing and a court under common international law and the norms of international laws that the international community supports.

Why would we do that? It would ensure that individual diplomats would not be used as scapegoats or unfairly treated by the country in which they are working. It would ensure that their work would not be compromised by virtue of being used or set up by the leaders of the country they are working in. Yet it would provide the civilians of that country with protection against the small number of individuals like the Russian diplomat who killed a Canadian woman here in Ottawa while he was drunk. Now there is no protection from those individuals.

That is something the Minister of Foreign Affairs can take up. It is something he can bring up at the United Nations. I suggest to the government that there would be widespread support in the international community for ensuring that in regard to those people who are criminals hiding behind diplomatic immunity there is a fair and transparent avenue through which they can be brought to justice. That is what we are talking about. Indeed, if the minister would do that I am sure that he would find a great deal of support across party lines.

Government Orders

On the issue of immigration, we brought up the fact that a very small number of individuals coming into the country are criminals. Some of them do come to this country feigning refugee status. Our current system is not able to ensure that we have a steel sieve, as I call it, that enables true immigrants, law abiding immigrants and true refugees to enter Canada but keeps out those individuals who are criminals. We do not have that and my party has been asking for it for a very long time. Can it be done? Absolutely, but it requires a commitment on the part of the minister and the government.

• (1220)

We need appropriate checks and balances at the exit point from which they are coming. We need to differentiate between true and false refugees. We need proper background checks on individuals who are coming in through the usual immigration process.

Individuals who come to this country by plane claiming to be refugees and who do not have identification should be sent back home unless they have a very good excuse for why they do not have identification upon landing at places such as Pearson international airport.

Surely those individuals from other countries had identification when they boarded the plane. They could not have entered the plane without identification. Why do we accept individuals who claim refugee status and do not have any kind of identification? That should not be allowed, with very few exceptions.

I am sure the public would be flabbergasted to know that 40% of individuals claiming refugee status come from the United States. Why are we accepting individuals claiming refugee status who have been living in the United States? I raise this issue not because we are against individuals who claim refugee status but because we are trying to streamline the process so that people who are true refugees can get access into Canada.

The failure of the government to have an adequate refugee assessment policy hurts those individuals who are true refugees trying to get into Canada because either their lives are at stake or they are being persecuted. Above all else, we do a grave injustice to those individuals when we do not fix and get our house in order.

In my office, and I am sure in the offices of many of our colleagues, we are continually confronted by numerous individuals who would be superb immigrants to Canada and would make enormous contributions but numerous obstacles are put in their way. In fact many are sent home.

I am an immigrant and I am beyond being extraordinarily grateful for what Canada has given me. It breaks my heart to see individuals who can make effective contributions, who are working and can work but cannot stay in Canada after they have been here a while.

It is unbelievable that we have a system which does not allow these individuals to stay. Our country needs a larger immigrant population but needs to ensure that the population represents people who can make an effective contribution and integrate into Canadian society and that we truly allow real refugees into Canada.

Heaven knows there are enough of them in the world who need our embrace and protection. We must not allow individuals in who

are criminals, false refugees or economic refugees masquerading as refugees.

We are a party to a number of international organizations and we have been signatory to many international treaties. While the treaties are superb on paper they have not prevented numerous tragic, gross violations of the basic rights those treaties purport to support. I am talking about Sierra Leone, Liberia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Sudan, Zimbabwe, East Timor, Burma, and the list goes on. It is a serious problem that the treaties do not have any teeth as they are unable to back up what is on paper with effective action.

Our country needs to take a number of actions with the international community. It needs to assess and determine with our counterparts how to put teeth into these treaties. How can we ensure that treaties will be backed up by action, punitive if necessary, when they are not upheld? What is a piece of paper if there is no consequence to not adhering to it? That is a serious problem and that is the failure of many treaties that we have today.

• (1225)

Another thing we need to look at is how and why we are members of so many organizations. If our participation in an organization is effective then we should participate. We should at least ask whether or not our participation in an organization is worthy, whether that organization is effective, and whether the actions and responsibilities of that organization can be merged with another, thereby saving money, limited resources and indeed our effect.

Umpteen organizations work on the same types of issues all over the world all of the time. The problem is that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing and we do not get commitments from all the countries. We tend to have hodgepodge fractured activities, be it the environment or foreign policy.

If September 11 demonstrated anything it shone a bright light on our strengths but more so on our flaws. What it has shown is that we have been living in a bit of a Pollyannaish world over the last nine to ten years. We have been thinking that we were making enormous strides internationally, living up to our defence policy commitments internationally and doing very well economically.

The reality is that Canada has been punching far below its weight for a long time. No one, particularly the government, is looking at a critical analysis of defence, foreign policy, immigration and economic competitiveness which needs to be looked at if Canada is to be competitive internationally and do its part. The hard questions of Canada's role in the world are not being asked. Nor are they being answered other than with the usual rhetorical flourish.

We have to ask those tough questions. We have to find the answers and we have to act on them. Can we? Absolutely. We have an extraordinary wealth of talent within the House as well as across Canada. We have an extraordinary number of individuals that can make effective contributions to answering those questions.

Government Orders

One of the first things we need to do is to conduct a review of our defence and foreign affairs policies. The review of defence and foreign affairs policies must go hand in hand because defence is merely the arm of our foreign policy. If we do not know where we are going from a foreign policy perspective, we do not know where we are going from a defence perspective and we cannot arm and outfit our soldiers to meet our needs effectively.

Where is Canada's niche in the world? What can we do? Is it as a player as it was during and after World War II when it had the fourth largest military in the world? Or, is it to take the other extreme and completely back away from its international obligations and set up a wall around the country? I hope the latter is not the case. Somewhere in between is the balance that we have to strike. Somewhere in between are the effective questions that must be answered.

What is our role in the world? We need to ask ourselves what organizations we will participate in. What are our obligations under NATO? Will we live up to them? We must live up to our NATO obligations, but we also have an incredible role to play internationally in being a peacemaker in a new world order or a new foreign policy that makes the 21st century safer. We can strike while the iron is hot.

The reason I say that is that we have built a coalition. We are a member of a coalition to defeat terrorism. In the construction of this coalition we are partners with groups such as Pakistan, members of the Arab world and others that we had never imagined before. There is an opportunity to work with these groups to ameliorate some of the large challenges that exist today in the world such as Kashmir, Palestine, Israel and the divide between the west and the Arab world. All those issues must be addressed.

● (1230)

If we walk away from this coalition after the so-called war in Afghanistan is won, which is not the end of the issue of terrorism at all, we will have missed an unbelievable opportunity to make the world a safer place. Our country can play an extraordinary role in that for many reasons.

We do not have a history of colonialism. We are respected internationally as a fair player. We do not move the goalposts around in the middle of a game. We sit as a divide between the Far East and Europe, between the north and the south, between the United States and the rest of the world. That is a role and opportunity that no other country in the world has. Our Minister of Foreign Affairs, our government and the House can work together to address those challenges in a pragmatic way.

One of the things we need to do on the Kashmir situation is to set up a dialogue between President Musharraf and the prime minister of India. That can be done now in conjunction with the developments in Afghanistan.

We need to work with the Americans and put pressure on the Israeli government to recognize a Palestinian state. Israel must stop building new settlements in Palestinian territory. It must remove those settlements from Palestinian territory forthwith in an effective plan, much as it did in the Sinai when it was setting up a peace agreement with Egypt. Large settlements were removed. So it can be done.

Along with the international community we must say to the Palestinian authority that it must apprehend, arrest and ensure that Hamas, Islamic Jihad and other groups stop the killing of innocent Israeli civilians. The Palestinian authority must clean up its act. The corruption must be routed out. If it is not the economic taps should be turned off. We can enter into a dialogue and bring moderate Israelis and moderate Palestinians together to engage in economic and social co-operation.

We need to look at our economic situation. We have seen a significant slide in our dollar. The slide in our dollar represents many things, but one thing it represents is a tolerance to allow our competitiveness to be held artificially high by allowing our dollar to decline rather than dealing with the roots of competitiveness: education, a lower tax structure, the removal of rules and regulations, and others.

If those questions are addressed we will have an opportunity to ensure that Canada will become economically competitive once again. We owe this to Canadians. If we do not do this we will be left behind.

Unfortunately the government has chosen to paper over cracks and holes in the problems of our country rather than fill them in. It has not sought out the best minds and the best practices in our country and abroad to deal with our problems. If it did that then we would have a country to be proud of. We would have a country that was competitive economically and internationally. We would have a nation that could be at the table as a fair and equal player in the challenges facing us today and tomorrow.

● (1235)

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca when talking about refugees arriving here without proper documentation, took the opportunity of a debate on Bill C-35 to actually make comment on Bill C-11, the immigration bill that received royal assent two weeks ago. Since the hon. member has done that, with your permission Mr. Speaker, I would like to rebut his remarks on Bill C-11.

His proposition was that people who arrive in Canada by air who do not have proper identification or have no documentation whatsoever should be immediately turned around and sent back.

I would remind him that in the real world of people fleeing state terrorism, it is very difficult for genuine refugees to get proper documentation. They often travel on false documentation. When they arrive by aircraft, the people who make those false documents often encourage them to destroy that documentation.

What happens is when they land in Canada there is no documentation, false or otherwise, so their identity is in question. What now occurs is they are very carefully questioned to establish what their actual identity is and then they go through the process.

What is at issue is the abuse. Sometimes false refugees arrive and refuse to undergo the questioning that will determine their identity.

Government Orders

During the report stage of Bill C-11, I moved an amendment that was adopted by the House. The amendment determined that all those who refused to co-operate in determining their identity when they had false documentation or no documentation would be detained until deported.

The loophole was plugged at the same time that we, as a compassionate nation, still permit genuine refugees to arrive without proper documentation. If they co-operate they are landed.

When Bill C-11 went through third reading, the opposition party voted against it. So the very party that the member belongs to and who is criticizing the legislation of Bill C-11 that closed the loophole on improper refugees coming in and refusing to co-operate in disclosing their identity, voted against it.

Mr. Keith Martin: Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the member more that we need to be a compassionate society. We need to be compassionate, but we do not need to be a patsy. That is the difference.

Indeed, members of the Immigration and Refugee Board have said just this year that more than 90% of the individuals who come in front of the board claiming refugee status are actually economic refugees. In fact, one of them said that less than 1% were true refugees in the sense that they are defined in international conventions.

We want to ensure a system where true refugees are indeed allowed into Canada. If we do not allow in true refugees, but we allow in economic refugees, we are actually violating our international responsibilities. We are doing an enormous injustice to the vast number of people who do need our protection, who are true refugees and must be brought into Canada.

To deal with the facts again, 40% of the individuals claiming refugee status come from the United States and have been staying there. Why are we accepting as refugees in Canada people who have been living in the United States who are not allowed to stay there any more? Does that not seem simply passing strange?

I would totally agree with the hon. member that if individuals have to come to this country and they do not have any identification papers, there are circumstances that will account for it. We are completely in accordance with that.

What we do not agree with is when people get on planes, and most of the people claiming refugee status actually come by plane through Pearson International Airport or through Vancouver, and those individuals have documentation when they enter the plane but they destroy it when they leave the plane. That is a serious problem. The vast majority of those individuals are not true refugees.

I would suggest that the member speak to the minister of immigration and to the members on the Immigration and Refugee Board. Listen to what they have to say and act upon their constructive suggestions. That will enable us to have an immigration system that allows true refugees into Canada, not false ones.

• (1240)

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Burnaby—Douglas spent much of his time discussing Bill C-36, the terrorist

bill and now the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca has spent much of his time discussing Bill C-11, the immigration bill. However the bill we are discussing today is Bill C-35, an act to amend the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act.

This proclivity on the part of two members who usually exhibit some knowledge in foreign affairs to ignore the fact that we are debating at third reading stage Bill C-35, is beginning to impact negatively on my self-esteem. Not to sound petulant, but it is my job as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs to try to bring forward a particular bill. My difficulty is trying to get some members to focus on that bill.

That said, I will attempt to reach to the hon. member's strong background and suggest that his idea that we should move out of the Vienna conventions and into an international court, perhaps the international criminal court of the treaty of Rome which has not yet received near the number of ratifications to bring it into existence, is naive. I say that most honestly. The Vienna convention is already established. Many nations participate. To tear that down and begin again as the hon. member is suggesting is something that is almost impossible to commence.

Mr. Keith Martin: Mr. Speaker, I would not for a moment suggest tearing up the Vienna convention but what I would suggest is that we amend it.

The Vienna convention in the context of other international conventions particularly those governing human rights which would take precedence over the Vienna convention, does not protect an individual who commits indictable offences such as rape, assault or murder. They do not and should not. We must not allow a convention to be used and manipulated as a tool to hide and protect an individual who has committed a serious indictable offence in a country. I know the member understands that. I also know her commitment to the essence of the Vienna convention. I have no doubt she agrees with what I am saying.

The question is, how do we arrive at a situation where a convention is not going to stand in the way of justice? I would suggest that justice will prevail if we amend the Vienna convention and allow an impartial third party to investigate, hear and ultimately try individuals who are diplomats yet who have committed serious criminal acts in a foreign country. I believe an amendment to the Vienna convention would do just that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is my turn to speak on Bill C-35, which, my Liberal colleague reminds us, deals not with immigration or antiterrorist measures, but rather international meetings and foreign missions. This is what we are talking about now. We are now at third reading and realize that the government is refusing to withdraw clause 5. Most of my comments will focus on this.

Government Orders

Despite our voting in support of the principle of this bill at second reading, the fact that clause 5, which basically confers more powers to the RCMP, unrestricted powers, is being maintained, we do not believe it is appropriate to include powers for the RCMP in a bill that deals with the Department of Foreign Affairs. There are already provisions or powers granted to either the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General

It is somewhat strange to have measures dealing with powers conferred to the RCMP suddenly appear under the responsibility of the Department of Foreign Affairs. I have not researched the laws in other countries, but I am told that this is not the usual approach.

So one has to ask why, all of a sudden, RCMP powers, including the power of determining safety perimeters during international meetings, have to be included in a bill under the jurisdiction of the Department of Foreign Affairs. Apparently some of the government witnesses who testified before the committee—I was not present myself—have said themselves that for the next G-8 meeting in Alberta next June, there is no need at all to amend Bill C-35.

Since this is the only international meeting planned for now, one has to ask why? If it is not necessary for this meeting, which is only planned for June, why do it?

Everyone can hypothesize as to why. My own feeling is that the answer can be found in the effects of the unfortunate events of September 11 at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in the United States. One cannot help but feel sad and we do, but, at the same time, I believe that governments around the world must refrain from contributing to spreading panic needlessly by using these events to broaden the powers of the police. I am not taking aim at the police per se. Giving more powers to the police without giving them guidelines on their use is like giving a hot potato to my neighbour who might not know immediately how to handle it.

I do not want to impugn motives and say that in general the police do a poor job. However, occasionally they can make mistakes because of tiredness or for all sorts of other factors.

The Quebec City summit where the blame could be laid on both sides is a case in point. I am not here to applaud people who carry out acts of vandalism, but at the same time as a member of the standing committee on foreign affairs and human rights, where all year long and as events unfold we hear witnesses and observers testify that human rights are consistently being trampled, we at home should not be too free about giving increased powers to the RCMP. It could arrange to be less lenient. Then, we would have less freedom of speech. Again I must stress that we are not talking about the anti-terrorism bill neither are we discussing the changes to the Immigration Act.

• (1245)

We are discussing a bill intended to support the desire of the minister, of the Canadian government, to hold international meetings here. Unless, of course, no more are wanted. Judging by what the previous speaker just said, every time foreigners come here, we would have to take care.

On the other side of the coin, when we take part in international meetings outside the country, we have a right to expect a certain number of rules and guidelines relating to immunity and security,

because not many would go to an international meeting if told “In that country, the Geneva convention is not applied, nor the various other international conventions. It is not certain that there will really be security, and the agenda topics will be highly controversial. But feel free to go”.

I am pretty sure that no hon. members would go to international meetings if that were the case. We are, like it or not, fully into an era of globalization: communications, faster and faster air travel and so on. Whether we like or dislike globalization, it is here to stay. Increasingly, problems are international in nature.

At the same time, every nation wants to see its representatives address these questions. It is like politics. When I was younger and less interested in politics than my father was, he kept on telling me “You may not be interested in politics, but politics will be interested in you”.

I would say the same about international politics, about globalization; it will be interested in us. So we have no choice but to deal with it. This means taking part in foreign missions and receiving in our country international bodies that are organizing meetings here.

I forgot to say that I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Joliette, provided he arrives in time. If not, I have a pinch hitter lined up in the person of the hon. member for Lotbinière, who will step up to the plate as soon as I have finished my allotted ten minutes. I still have three minutes to find out who will be speaking next. I apologize for doing things this way, but I wanted to make sure I was following the parliamentary rules, since I am talking about respecting rules internationally. Needless to say, the rules here have to be respected as well.

Let us now talk about these three new provisions under clause 5. The first one is very direct and cannot be said to be engaging in excessive diplomacy, since it says:

10.1(1) The Royal Canadian Mounted Police has the primary responsibility to ensure the security for the proper functioning of any intergovernmental conference in which two or more states participate, that is attended by persons granted privileges and immunities under this Act and to which an order made or continued under this Act applies.

As for the other provisions, they relate to the first one and refer to security perimeters and all such issues.

Again, the rules governing diplomatic immunity do not apply to a refugee who wants to come to Canada. They are rules on temporary immunity that apply to someone who comes from abroad in the context of an international meeting. Of course, there are also ambassadors, consuls and consular staff who are here all year round.

This legislation will modernize and update what existed previously, but did not include some international meetings and non-governmental organizations that are present in Canada on a permanent basis and are entitled to be treated as international organizations, just as we expect our people, whether they are volunteers or have some other status, to be treated in the same fashion when they belong to international organizations abroad.

Government Orders

•(1250)

There is no reason to keep clause 5, which gives greater powers to the RCMP, particularly since these powers are not limited. The RCMP—or the mounted police as the Prime Minister would say—might not know what to do with these powers, since there are no controls. Some would interpret the act in their own way, which would sometimes be the proper way, sometimes the not so proper way, and sometimes the wrong way, because there are no controls.

The Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice already have powers under several acts.

Because of the new context resulting from the September 11 events, we would not want to see a tightening of rules bringing us closer to a police state. This is not what we want. I am not saying this is the case, but we must not take steps in that direction.

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remember well that colleagues opposite insisted in the House that we give more powers to the RCMP to fight biker gangs and organized crime.

An hon. member: This is not the same thing.

Mr. John Bryden: I wonder if it is the same thing in this case. This bill seeks to give more responsibilities to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police concerning perhaps violent protests at international meetings. I believe this is the same thing.

•(1255)

Mr. Antoine Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is not the same thing.

I hope that when international organizations want to take part in meetings, they do not use the services of people whom they know are members of organized crime.

When it comes to international meetings in Canada, what rules would the member or any other participant like to refer to? There should be some kind of code of conduct that other governments would have for him. We should always keep this in mind. What the member is suggesting is that countries that invite us are treating people from international organizations as if they were members of organized crime.

To do this would be excessive. I believe that organized crime must be controlled through the activities of the solicitor general and under the Criminal Code. We are examining a bill that deals with international organizations and foreign missions. Let us not confuse the issue. In my view, yielding to this temptation would lead to a police state.

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will remind members of the House that the Bloc Québécois voted in favour of Bill C-35 at second reading because we support the principle of modernizing the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act.

Since the last review of this act, which was in 1991, the world has changed a great deal. There is now a whole series of international organizations that have been created, but not through treaties, which are therefore not covered by the old act. Given that diplomatic relations have changed, with summits as an example, whether it be

the one in Quebec City or the APEC summit in Vancouver, it is important to broaden the definition of international organization and to ensure diplomats and foreign representatives who come here for this type of event are covered.

Nor did the old law cover missions here with international organizations. The International Civil Aviation Organization for example, with its head office in Montreal, has 40 different missions that are accredited with the organization, but that have not benefited from any status under the old law.

All of these provisions therefore, are extremely positive. We were quite surprised, at first, not to find any provisions to correct certain irregular situations, such as the incident in which a Russian diplomat used his diplomatic immunity to avoid answering for a crime related to an offence in which he hit a woman while driving his car in a state of intoxication. We were stunned that Bill C-35 contained nothing to correct this situation.

The explanation that was given by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and others during the committee hearings convinced us that introducing this type of provision in Bill C-35 would contravene the Vienna Convention. The directive issued by the minister to ensure that people who are considered *persona non grata* be removed, satisfies us.

From this perspective, Bill C-35 was a positive contribution to the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act and modernized it so that it would take into consideration new diplomatic relations and the new reality of these relations.

But the bill also includes clause 5. Since we supported the principle of modernizing the legislation, the hon. member for Mercier and I moved an amendment to remove this clause because, as I said, it is unclear, incomplete, dangerous and does not belong in this bill, since it is more a matter for the justice department than a foreign affairs issue.

Let me remind the House that clause 5 sets up a number of responsibilities for the RCMP. It purports to amend the foreign missions act so that the RCMP is the organization in charge of security of events, whereas it was traditionally responsible for the protection of individuals, foreign dignitaries in our land.

This is a very significant change. The RCMP could interfere with the work of other police forces, and it is not given any criteria. One witness who appeared before the committee stated that, if we want the RCMP to be the lead agency for security during international events, we should help it by establishing a series of criteria. Those in charge sometimes have to make snap decisions, and, if they do not have any criteria to go by, they might disregard fundamental rights.

•(1300)

This is all the more likely because this same clause 5 says:

—the Royal Canadian Mounted Police may take appropriate measures, including controlling, limiting or prohibiting access to any area to the extent and in a manner that is reasonable in the circumstances.

Government Orders

This institutionalizes the creation of security perimeters, such as the one in Quebec City, which were the exception. Why institutionalize a practice which is the exception in legislation on foreign missions? This is a very serious question. Particularly as the RCMP would make its own decisions about the measures that were appropriate in the circumstances.

The RCMP is not limited in any way in establishing these security perimeters. As I have already mentioned, a Montreal lawyer challenged the existence of the security perimeter in Quebec City, saying that it violated his freedom of expression and his freedom of movement. The judge ruled that, while it violated his rights, this was compensated for by the fact that the perimeter was necessary to ensure the safety of the dignitaries visiting Quebec City.

So the RCMP already has the authority to establish these security perimeters under existing legislation. Obviously, court challenges are always possible. It is up to the RCMP to demonstrate the need for and appropriateness of these security perimeters. Now, with clause 5, it will be able to establish them whenever it wishes, without being accountable to anyone.

Subsection (3) says:

The powers referred to in subsection (2)...shall not be read as affecting the powers that peace officers possess at common law or by virtue of any other federal or provincial Act or regulation.

On the one hand, we are told that the status quo will not do, because clause 5 must be included and, on the other, we are told that this will not in any way change the existing legislation. This is hard to believe. I think that this parliament would have done better to pass the amendment put forward by the member for Mercier and myself.

Besides I was happy to note that all opposition parties supported the amendment aimed at deleting clause 5. On the other hand government members, somewhat by principle, insisted on keeping clause 5. But, as we know, certain Liberal members are not comfortable with this clause because it could lead to infringement of rights. They are ill at ease because the provision is not where it should be. These changes should have been put in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, not in legislation dealing with foreign missions.

These Liberal members even tried to submit a recommendation in the committee report pointing out to the government the dangers presented by clause 5. But in the end, everything was watered down. We would have wished that these members, when the moment came to vote on our amendment, had voiced their concern by voting in favour of the amendment.

For those reasons, since clause 5 remains in Bill C-35, we will have to vote against the bill, all the more so since it comes with another legislation that will be discussed in the days ahead, Bill C-36, the anti-terrorism act.

I fully agree with the previous speaker. We are now witnessing in Canada a dangerous shift with regard to civil liberties and a strengthening of tools of repression that can lead to major drifts with which we do not want to be associated in any way.

●(1305)

[English]

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to Bill C-35 entitled an act to amend the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act.

The title of the bill of course does not very clearly delineate the purpose of the bill which essentially can be broken down into two parts. The first one relates to more clearly delineating the role of the RCMP in providing security measures when Canada hosts international events and conferences.

The problem with the bill is the aspect of it with regard to diplomatic immunity. Diplomatic immunity extends from the Vienna convention on diplomatic relations and it grants privileges and immunities to foreign representatives and members of international organizations. The bill would expand that immunity needlessly. It would expand it to delegates, to family members of officials and to staff. These would be people visiting our country for a few days to attend an international conference and they would have a licence to break whatever Canadian law they want while they are here. It makes no sense to expand that type of immunity to people who are temporary visitors to the country. Not only is there no need for it, there is no public interest in it. There has not even been a request from any foreign country or organization to expand the privileges of diplomatic immunity.

This really begs the question: Why is the government embarking on this venture when there is no appetite for it by the public? In fact, it is a cause for concern, especially in light of increased awareness and the need to clamp down on terrorists and criminals. Why would we be opening our doors to trouble? What this is, is an invitation to trouble.

The process that is set out in the bill would extend to the entire delegation that is coming from a given country to attend an international conference, so there is improper individual scrutiny. Individuals who would otherwise be barred from entering Canada could be given a special visa to enter our country and be exempt from our laws. Those special visitor visas would supercede the immigration minister's power to disallow potential visitors with criminal pasts from entering Canada.

The other inherent problem is that the bureaucrats in the Department of Foreign Affairs would be the ones making these decisions. Not only is the bill needlessly and irresponsibly empowering foreign affairs bureaucrats but it is potentially putting them in a conflict of interest. As the organizers of the event, they may have reasons for wanting specific individuals or groups to attend an international conference without regard to whether they have had a criminal past. I think it is very irresponsible to put that kind of power into the hands of those bureaucrats.

Government Orders

Furthermore, rather than expanding diplomatic immunity and creating a potential for trouble, the government should be focusing on the current loopholes in the immigration and refugee system that have been exploited by people with criminal pasts. In fact, in a five year period, I think 1993-98, 25,000 people who were issued deportation orders in Canada did not show up for their hearings and are on the loose in Canada. That is a great cause of concern. In light of that, why would the government be opening the door to further abuses of our laws by people who will be here for a very temporary period of time?

• (1310)

Over the past five years there have been 90 incidents of criminal misconduct by diplomats and their staff in Canada. We already have a problem. The government should be focusing on that instead of expanding the opportunity for more trouble.

The hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester, in the clause by clause stage at committee, proposed an amendment to the bill that would have required the annual reporting of anyone who claimed diplomatic immunity to be built into the legislation but the Liberal government voted against it. The member tried to reintroduce it in the House but was denied the opportunity to do so. What is even more disturbing is that this is yet another example of the Liberal government's tendency to hide information or not be as forthcoming as possible.

What possible harm could be done? The amendment proposed by the member for Cumberland—Colchester made good common sense. It would have given the House of Parliament and the Canadian public the right to know who had claimed diplomatic immunity. Not only was it common sense, it was responsible. It would have been a preventive measure, a method of monitoring warning signs so we could then bring pressure to bear on the embassy responsible for the individuals perpetrating the crimes. If this had been done perhaps the tragedy that occurred last January could have been prevented.

I am sure members are aware of the Russian diplomat who, by driving recklessly, killed a pedestrian. This caused a lot of public outrage. Even worse, that particular diplomat had a previous history of a series of criminal infractions. Had there been annual reporting of incidents of people who claimed diplomatic immunity, perhaps a tragedy like that could have been prevented.

This raises the point that when criminal acts are committed, there is usually a victim. We ought to be much more conscious and sympathetic to that. While there is a role for diplomatic immunity to be in place for foreign diplomats, it does not make any sense to extend that to delegates to a weekend convention or conference.

The Liberal government is actually enacting a double standard. On Bill C-36, the anti-terrorism bill, the committee passed an amendment for the annual reporting of incidents of preventive arrest and investigative hearings. If the solicitor general and the justice minister see the need for implementing a system of annual reporting of incidents within their legislation, why does the Minister of Foreign Affairs not see the benefit? It is a clear and obvious double standard.

My point is that there is a role for diplomatic immunity. However, as evidenced by these 90 incidents of criminal acts in the past five years by existing diplomats, we should be focusing on that. A system of annual reporting is one way to accomplish that. Perhaps there are other ways we could tighten this. The concept of diplomatic immunity, if anything, should perhaps be scaled back, re-examined or made more accountable. It certainly should not be expanded in such an irresponsible manner.

As I previously mentioned, there is a good aspect to the bill, which is to provide clear authority for the RCMP to fulfill their security requirements at international conferences. Following the APEC incident, it is obvious that there is a need for greater clarity in the role of the RCMP to provide security measures and to be independent from political interference from the Prime Minister's Office. The clear parameters for the RCMP is one good aspect of the bill but it is overshadowed by the very flawed and irresponsible concept of expanding diplomatic immunity to delegates, officials, staff and families who attend weekend international conferences in our country.

• (1315)

We do recognize the importance of the concept of immunity for diplomats in carrying out their work in countries around the world, particularly in countries that do not have the same degree of respect for democracy and human rights that Canada has. While there is a role for it, if we think about Canada and the degree of our democracy and of our legal code and our criminal code, why would we need to extend diplomatic immunity to people who are coming to our country to attend a conference?

The same would go for Canadians visiting other highly developed countries. If a Canadian delegate to a conference goes to England or to the United States, what would be the need for them to be granted diplomatic immunity while they were there? It would be nothing more than a licence or an invitation to break the laws of that country which are fair, reasonable laws.

The use of diplomatic immunity in the bill is becoming distorted by the Liberal government. The concept of diplomatic immunity is intended to protect foreign representatives from arbitrary harassment in the legal conduct of their affairs but not to be an invitation to commit crimes. The bill is even out of step with the government's own agenda. On the one hand the government has Bill C-36 which is seeking to improve security measures and increase police powers. At the same time it has Bill C-35 which is a complete contradiction of increasing security and an invitation to more criminal acts, inviting people and granting them diplomatic immunity if in other circumstances they would not even be allowed to enter our country. It does not make any sense.

Government Orders

It certainly once again raises the issue of priorities of the government. We have a health care system that is very dysfunctional right now. Waiting lists are unacceptably long for surgery and for seeing specialists; and the equipment, it is an underfunded system. Yet the government went ahead with its firearms registry. It has been willing to pump \$500 million so far, and that number is climbing every day, into a system to make hunters and farmers register their rifles but it is not willing to put that money into health care. While perhaps we do need to examine our transportation security measures, and the government is moving in that direction, at the same time it has this contradictory desire to expand diplomatic immunity to people who are not justified in having it.

Our country is faced with a \$579 billion national debt. The interest on servicing that debt is \$42 billion a year. This is highly irresponsible fiscal management. There is a complete lack of accountability on monitoring the expenditures of government departments. There are annual increases in taxes. And the government is bringing in a bill to expand diplomatic immunity.

There are all these problems. We have a crime problem. There is the fiscal situation in Canada with the low dollar and our struggling economy. Yet the priority of the government is to expand immunity to delegates to international conferences. It does not make any sense. It is contradictory to the government's own legislative agenda vis-à-vis the transportation security measures and the anti-terrorism measures. It is simply irresponsible.

I speak today in the most definitive terms in speaking against this legislation. The Minister of Foreign Affairs should take the bill, shred it and forget about it.

• (1320)

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure for me to listen quite attentively to the remarks of my hon. colleague from Saskatoon—Humboldt on Bill C-35. I could not agree more with the sentiment of his comments. He did highlight the one good thing about Bill C-35, that it deals with a clearer definition of the role of the RCMP when Canada is hosting international conferences. Certainly that is a valid issue to address.

We need only look back to last weekend in Ottawa and the G-20 summit and the violence that was committed by protesters here in our capital to note the importance of clarifying what the role of the security forces are when we host these conferences. As everyone knows we were not even slated to host that G-20 conference. It just shows us how often we are called upon to do things like that especially at this time because of the greater concern for terrorism.

As my colleague pointed out, it strikes me more than a little bit odd. Rightly or wrongly, Canada is perceived to be somewhat of a safe haven for terrorists and organized crime because of what I think is widely believed in the international community to be some pretty lax laws. Yet once again the government is moving in an area to allow more foreigners who visit our country to have diplomatic immunity from some of our laws.

What I especially find troubling is that this legislation once passed, and it is virtually certain that the government will crack the whip and all the government members will stand up and vote for it, will give diplomats immunity from taxes and duty on the importation of alcohol. That is especially troubling. That is clearly sending the

wrong message. It is sending the message that alcohol consumption, when someone is on a diplomatic mission to Canada, is quite acceptable. In fact, we are willing to help them with that by making them immune to any of the attributable taxes on alcohol. As my colleague said, especially in light of the tragedy last winter, I cannot believe the government is moving in that area.

There could be some argument put forward by the government for something like this if there were reciprocal agreements with some countries; in other words, if our delegates to a convention somewhere were to receive that. Oftentimes there are reciprocal agreements between nations in a wide variety of areas.

For our country to carte blanche give this blanket immunity to anyone that is going to land on our shore is a dangerous precedent. I have not heard a big hue and cry for it across the land or even from other countries. Perhaps the member would want to comment on the idea that at least there could be some argument put forward if it was specific to certain countries where there were reciprocal agreements negotiated. However, to just carte blanche bring in this blanket immunity is a dangerous precedent.

• (1325)

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I want to address a couple of the member's remarks.

He mentioned the G-20 summit recently held in Ottawa and the violent protesters. This is a dangerous trend we see developing. Quite frankly it is mostly a group of bad actors who are travelling to these things just for the sake of the thrill. They must find it thrilling. They are not achieving any political goal. They might claim to be making some kind of statement but the best political demonstration is a peaceful one. Those who vandalize property are nothing more than common thugs. That is what the demonstrators are.

I find it very disturbing. It is a good thing that the role of the RCMP is being clarified for the handling of that type of demonstrator. Anybody who wilfully damages property as an act of thuggery under the context of some type of political demonstration should be dealt with by a heavy hand because it is entirely inappropriate behaviour. A clear message should be sent to the demonstrators not only in Canada but elsewhere that they will not be tolerated.

We have a democracy. There are systems and processes in place of free speech and political activism. Resorting to violence is not acceptable.

The member also mentioned Canada becoming a safe haven for terrorists and terrorist organizations to conduct staging activities and fundraising. He used the words rightly or wrongly. I want to say that is rightly. A 1996 CSIS report warned the government of just that fact, that the loopholes in our immigration and refugee system allow criminals and terrorists to exploit our laws and abuse our country for evil purposes.

Government Orders

The Prime Minister's response shortly after the September 11 terrorist attacks was that we are responsible for people who come into our country and the Americans are responsible for those who go into theirs. In other words, if the Americans do not want terrorists who enter Canada to use it as a staging ground to attack the United States, they should be stopped at the Canada-U.S. border. It was an absolutely ridiculous, irresponsible statement that he made. It sends a very dangerous economic message to the congressmen in the United States because they are talking about increasing border security and controls at the Canada-U.S. border. It is our shores that we need to protect from criminals and terrorists, not a common border with the United States. That is crazy.

We should be looking at ways to free the border and to protect our common shores. I wanted to put that on the record in response to the member's statement.

With respect to the specific question about reciprocal agreements, as my hon. colleague rightly indicated, the legislation is setting a dangerous precedent. Reciprocal agreements would head in the same direction.

It would be irresponsible for Canada, as he said, to grant blanket immunity, to invite people here to essentially break the law and even exempt them from taxes on alcohol. There would be no need for Canadians to seek this immunity elsewhere. Reciprocal agreements would be a move in the wrong direction.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to find out why the government brought the bill to parliament, I asked several members if they were aware of any case where Canada was refused attendance by a foreign delegation or if anybody has ever said they would not come to Canada because our immunity laws are not satisfactory, that they could not break Canada's civil and criminal laws and get away with it and consequently would not attend a convention.

Is the member for Saskatoon—Humboldt aware of any case where a convention held in Canada was prevented from going ahead because people would not come because there would not be immunity? Is there any justification at all by delegations from other countries to refuse to come to Canada because we do not have the bill in force?

• (1330)

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any case of a complaint or refusal by another country to come to Canada because the delegates could not be exempt from our laws.

Just to indicate why we should not have the legislation and why we should not grant blanket immunity, any country that looked at our criminal code and said unless it would be exempt from the law its people would not be prepared to come, is not a country whose people we would want here. Common sense is sorely lacking on the Liberal benches.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière—L'Érable, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-35, a bill introduced by the federal government to modernize in various ways the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act.

It should be understood that the legislator had no other choice but to modernize the act since it dates back to 1991. Increasingly, society is changing; there is more talk about globalization. Over the past ten years, we have seen a range of organizations being created and meeting on a regular basis all over the world. This caused the Canadian government and the Minister of Foreign Affairs to look at this new phenomenon.

Among the various international organizations created during this period, there is the OSCE, the G-8—which will meet in Western Canada next year—, APEC, which met here in 1997. We all recall the unfortunate events which marred this international meeting held here.

One should also realize that this international phenomenon has triggered protests all over the world. We are living in a democratic universe, or at least we are fighting to keep it that way, and increasingly these large diplomatic events are attracting demonstrators who come to voice their disagreement about these international meetings.

Before getting further into the debate on Bill C-35, I would like to draw your attention to the way our Liberal colleagues are behaving in general, which is becoming increasingly obvious.

Since the September events, this government has tried very opportunistically to take advantage of the situation to set in motion a steam roller with, as a sole purpose, the trampling of every civic right and every gain for which we have fought so hard here in the Canadian Parliament over the past few years.

Last Tuesday night, I did not have the time to take part in the proceedings of the standing committee on justice but I was able to take 30 to 45 minutes to watch them on television. As for the behaviour of the government across the way, I must say that it is increasingly more undemocratic, and that was obvious that night. You should have seen how the chairman of the standing committee on justice was pushing through the amendments and also how the Liberal members ganged up and voted against every single amendment moved by our party, and this during the all important debate on Bill C-36.

In Bill C-35, even though this legislation is needed, here again, we are taking advantage of the attacks on New York and Washington. We are trying to give the police and RCMP officers powers they do not need. Our legal system already has all the powers it needs for dealing with these kinds of events.

• (1335)

It is clear again that the situation is being exploited and that the RCMP are being imposed everywhere they can be. They are not only being imposed, but they are being given the authority to rummage around in the personal lives of Canadians and Quebecers. Furthermore, these laws are so important that a time limit on them is out of the question. So we are moving toward the creation of a police state where they will have powers that will allow them to do whatever they want. I do not agree with that.

Government Orders

I do not know what has happened since September 11. There must have been bills on the back burner because, ever since, excessive security measures have been implemented anywhere Canadians might want to show their dissatisfaction with global and globalizing tendencies that they oppose. Where are we going with this government?

Today, we are debating Bill C-35. My colleagues and myself are against clause 5. We will, therefore, vote against Bill C-35, even though at the outset we were favourable to the basic principle. Members have also heard our views on Bill C-36.

This morning the Minister of Transport has done it again with yet another bill. Once again, this is a bill that reduces the powers of the public. He is going to give an unbelievable amount of leeway to our police forces. When the events of September 11 have been settled—one has to remain optimistic—at the rate things are going, what is the Canadian government going to do with this series of measures with no time limits that it has steamrollered through? We will need three to five years to get back to where we were after years of effort.

I would like to point out as well that other countries' laws are often said to be better. That is certain. Once again, during the debate on second reading, the Liberals claimed that this codification of the powers of the RCMP concerning the security perimeter was fully justified and was inspired by similar legislation in Australia and New Zealand.

The Australian legislation, passed by the state of Queensland, is temporary in nature, not permanent as the people over the way would have us believe. It addresses security perimeters for a specific event only. The same holds true for New Zealand. It was for the APEC summit in Auckland in 1999.

As well, the New Zealand legislation set limits on the size of the perimeter, and how long it could be in place. Bill C-35 has nothing of the like. Absolutely nothing. This government functions—and the hon. members will understand this example—like a NHL team suddenly demanding that the league change the rules. Instead of having three forwards and three defencemen, they want four players on defence and one on offence. That would not produce much of a game.

With the bills the government is presenting, and with Bill C-35, this means we are going to turn into a passive democracy rather than an active one.

● (1340)

[English]

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I have been studying further the legislation proposed in Bill C-35. Once the bill is passed and we extend the immunity to all sorts of individuals who attend an international gathering, conference, convention or whatever, what would happen to those individuals who committed a crime while in Canada? It would not have to be a horrendous crime, such as murder, or drunk driving causing death, or rape or something like that. It could be a white collar crime from which they financially benefited.

What would happen if those individuals turned around, as is often the case with foreigners who land on our shores, and requested asylum in Canada? Would that diplomatic immunity, which would

prevent them from being prosecuted for that crime, be extended if they stayed here? It is not very clear in the bill. I suspect lawyers might have a field day with that one as well.

This one of the instances that for the life of me I cannot understand why the government is doing this or what has possessed it to bring this forward, especially at a time when the symbolized freedom loving peoples of the western world are concerned about potential terrorists, those who would commit crimes, coming to our land. The timing of this is just unbelievable.

I pose that question to my hon. colleague from the Bloc who has just spoken.

[Translation]

Mr. Odina Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, that is a very complex and very hypothetical question. But, once again, we always have trouble understanding the real objectives behind legislation introduced by the government. We always have trouble understanding where it will lead. We always have trouble understanding what purpose the legislation will serve.

The problem raised by the member may be complex and hypothetical but it could arise. And we do not know how the government might handle it.

As I said earlier, we are about to give the police incredible powers but how they will use them is not clear. How can the police do their job clearly?

Because of all these laws, and particularly because of the historical context in which we now find ourselves, we should spend much more time debating these diplomatic, immigration, terrorism and transportation issues.

There is a sense of urgency across the way that I have trouble understanding. The government is in such a hurry to pass legislation that it is as though the world were going to stop turning after Christmas. But, later on, we will have to live with the consequences.

[English]

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I will ask my traditional question. I am still seeking to find the reason why the government brought this bill forward because I am assuming there must be one.

Is the member aware of people from any country who have said that they would not attend conferences or meetings in Canada, such as the G-8 or G-20, unless we expanded our immunity to include officials, families and assistants aside from the senior diplomats or that they themselves would not come if this immunity was not expanded?

● (1345)

[Translation]

Mr. Odina Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, obviously, I am not in a position to keep detailed track of all the requests to attend international meetings held in Canada.

S. O. 31

But the tolerance and openness for which our country has always been known was not in evidence last weekend. I do not know whether the images of demonstrations, of police conduct on the weekend, were shown throughout the world, but I can say that our image of tolerance was far from representative. Our image took a beating.

Under no circumstances should a legislature prevent people, who could represent added value, from attending an international meeting. It should certainly not be the case that legislation prevents people from coming here to do their job properly in a diplomatic context and particularly from trying to find solutions to the problems raised in these international meetings which these people are addressing.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Deputy Speaker: The vote has been deferred until next Tuesday at 3 p.m.

[Translation]

Mr. Jacques Saada: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I propose that we see the clock as 2 p.m.

* * *

[English]

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

The Deputy Speaker: It is my understanding that if I call the time any time after 3 o'clock obviously we would all lose out on question period. I do not think it is in anyone's best interest to do any such thing, but I will make the following suggestion. I suggest that we suspend the House to the call of the Chair at 2 p.m.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 1.49 p.m.)

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

HOUSING

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the weather grows colder many of us are already thinking about spending time with our loved ones during the upcoming holiday season. Unfortunately for thousands of Canadians the winter also brings on a season of fear and worry for those without a home and simply trying to survive on the street.

In response the federal government adopted a strategy to draw together the resources of local communities to develop unique solutions that address the needs of individual communities. In my own riding of Ottawa Centre the Minister of Labour who is responsible for homelessness initiatives has worked tirelessly to support partnerships between all levels of government, non-profit organizations and the private sector.

These combined efforts will go a long way to support transitional housing initiatives and help people move from shelters to independent living arrangements. By working together we can eliminate the root causes of homelessness in Canada.

* * *

UKRAINE

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it was 69 years ago that Stalin unleashed his fury against millions of innocent Ukrainians. This was a holocaust which is largely ignored, mostly forgotten and very seldom mentioned in what we call polite society. People want to put it away and forget that it happened.

What happened was that Stalin decided these people would be put away and that farmers would be collectivized. There were many who objected to having their property taken away and as a result they were systematically shot. Stalin brought in individuals whose job it was to exterminate these people. Many intellectuals were killed.

The number was not known, but with the archives in Russia now being opened it is confirmed that at least seven million Ukrainians thus died very sadly.

* * *

UKRAINE

Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to ask Canadians to mark November 24 as a day of remembrance for the more than seven million Ukrainians who were victims of the famine and genocide of 1932-33.

This famine was not a result of natural causes but was perpetrated by the communist leader of the time, Josef Stalin. In a move to force both farmers and peasants into collective farming Stalin increased the grain procurement quota for Ukraine by 44%, knowing that this would cause a grain shortage which would result in the inability of both farmers and peasants to feed themselves. Soviet law stated that no grain would be provided to Ukraine until the quota was met. This action resulted in over seven million Ukrainians dying.

On November 26, 1998, Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma issued a presidential decree designating every fourth Saturday of November as the National Day of Remembrance of the victims of this horrific act. This weekend on November 24 Canadians will join with millions of Ukrainians throughout the world to mark this terrible event.

It is my sincere hope as a Canadian of Ukrainian descent that the world will learn from this tragic episode in history and ensure that it will never happen again in the future.

* * *

PEACE

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from November 18 to November 25 YMCAs across Canada recognize peace week. Peace has many dimensions. It is not only the state of relationships among nations. We cannot expect to live in a world of peace if we are unable to live in peace with those close to us, even those who differ from us. The responsibility for peace begins with individuals in relationship with family and friends and extends to community life and national activities.

Two remarkable Kitchener residents have been honoured for their contributions to peace. Maureen Murphy received the Peace Medallion for her work in alternative dispute resolution. Maureen works with young offenders and their families to achieve a peaceful resolution and return the family to full functioning.

Through her work at the AR Kaufman Family YMCA, Donna Perk goes above and beyond to ensure the YMCA's youngest members feel welcome and part of a very special community.

I ask the House to join me in congratulating Maureen Murphy and Donna Perk for their achievements in peacebuilding.

* * *

• (1405)

AFGHANISTAN

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that on November 22 and 23 the Canadian government will support a conference organized by South Asia Partnership Canada.

The Afghanistan of Tomorrow Conference will bring together over 100 participants including Afghan Canadian community leaders, Afghan intellectuals, tribal leaders and Afghan women activists from Canada, the United States, Pakistan and Europe together with Canadian NGOs, humanitarian workers, students, parliamentarians, policy makers and government officials.

Participants at the two day conference will work to develop policy recommendations for long term peacebuilding strategies in Afghanistan that reflect Afghan solutions to Afghan problems.

This exciting conference is sponsored in part by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade human security program. Our time honoured role for which we are well known and respected throughout the world is one of peace and capacity building and expertise in this conference.

S. O. 31

WESTERN CANADA

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I recently attended the mid-term convention of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. Resolution No. 6 put forward by the RM of Sarnia stated that due to Saskatchewan having little input into our central Canadian political system and the fact that the current government seems not to care about the crisis in agriculture, the possibility of joining the United States should be investigated.

The motion was defeated by a small margin but its introduction certainly says something about the current state of life on the prairies. There is a prevailing feeling of alienation. This alienation is not self-imposed but caused by the example given by the government that anything east of Quebec or west of Ontario is of little consequence.

I am saddened that the government has chosen by its actions, and in most cases lack of action, to provoke such strong feelings of alienation.

* * *

VIOLENCE

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the International Day to End Violence Against Women is November 25. It is a day chosen as the anniversary of the brutal assassination of the Mirabal sisters in the Dominican Republic in the 1960s.

These three sisters known as the Unforgettable Butterflies were symbols of dignity and inspiration for their struggle for freedom and respect for human rights in the face of an oppressive regime. In their memory people come together around the world on November 25 to denounce gender violence in all its forms: domestic battery, rape and sexual harassment, state violence, torture and abuse of female political prisoners.

On November 25 all Canadians can mark this day and recommit to doing everything they can to end violence against all women everywhere.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CHAMBRE DE COMMERCE ET D'INDUSTRIE DE DRUMMOND

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Chambre de commerce et d'industrie de Drummond recently recognized area business people, highlighting the unflagging work of the women and men that make Drummondville businesses some of the best businesses in Quebec.

Armotec, owned by François Beaudoin, a sovereignist, won the Prix Distinction and the Napoléon award for exports. This kitchen hardware and furniture manufacturing business distinguished itself as one of 14 winning businesses.

Gilles Soucy, of the Soucy group, won the builder prize for 2001. From modest beginnings, Mr. Soucy now heads a number of parts and accessories companies for the recreational, commercial and military sectors.

S. O. 31

And the business person of the year award went to André Paquin, an associate of the firm Verrier Paquin Hébert.

I would like to congratulate all of the winners as well as the nominees for this year that is coming to a close. May they serve as examples to other entrepreneurs to inspire them in their pursuit of excellence.

* * *

SAARGUMMI COMPANY

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, with my colleague the Secretary of State for the Economic Development Agency of Canada, I visited SaarGummi Quebec, a company located in Magog that specializes in rubber joints used by the automotive industry.

We announced the creation of more than 800 jobs in addition to the 800 already existing jobs. GM has confirmed that they have awarded major contracts over a five year period.

SaarGummi is now the largest employer in Magog, and this does not take into account the indirect employment created and the economic spinoff for the region's suppliers.

This is a success that belongs to the people of the Eastern Townships. It reflects our economic vitality and the quality of our workforce.

Speaking of vitality, I would like to wish our deputy whip, the member for Brossard—La Prairie a very happy birthday.

* * *

•(1410)

[*English*]

NATIONAL WAR MEMORIAL

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, on this past November 11 Canadians turned out in record numbers to show their respect to those who paid the supreme sacrifice protecting our nation.

Just a few days later the government hosted the G-20 conference. There were legal protestors but as usual the hooligans showed up and they performed the lowest type of national disgrace we have ever witnessed. They defaced the National War Memorial and Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

To trample across the gravesite and write their slogans on the memorial was a display of insolence, contempt and, above all, an insult to Canadians who remember their loved ones. Citizens all across the country must speak out and clearly let it be known that we reject this type of behaviour and will not stand for people who abuse our freedoms that others have fought so dearly for.

* * *

YUKON

Mr. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank all parties in the House for their tremendous support of Yukon and the Yukon Act.

[*Translation*]

I would also like to say a few words on an important issue.

In the Yukon, there is a dynamic and productive francophone community. Over the past 20 years, that community has succeeded in slowing down assimilation and it is actually growing. It is an economic asset for the Yukon. Today, a few members of the Franco-Yukon community are with us. I welcome them here.

Along with their allies, francophones in the Yukon are building Canadian unity and contributing to the success of the coexistence of Canada's two official languages.

As regards health services, the Franco-Yukon community has been trying to be recognized by Health Canada since 1993.

It also wants the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to recognize it as a legitimate nordic people. Francophones in the Yukon are asking that their rights be clearly included in the new Yukon Act.

For the sake of Canadian unity, a sin of repetition is better than a sin of omission.

* * *

[*English*]

THE MEDIA

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for the most part journalists are professionals, but to suggest they have no personal opinions would be to say they are not people. Norman Lester is no more, no less.

When media workers start writing a story their experience is brought to bear so we are presented with the facts in an understandable, balanced and unbiased fashion. We want our professional journalists to know what is happening in the world. It makes for better stories and more accurate information. To say they should somehow abandon their rights to free expression because they work for a broadcaster would be wrong.

There is no indication that Norman Lester has ever been a biased journalist. I sincerely hope that the administrative review currently underway at Radio-Canada will look at Mr. Lester's professional work, not attempt to deal with what are appropriate opinions for journalists to hold on their own time.

I call on the government to introduce mandatory complaint mechanisms for all media so Canadians can complain about rampant biased journalism which currently exists. I also call on Radio-Canada to leave Mr. Lester's rights when he is off the job alone.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HERITAGE MINUTES

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, another famous journalist took an interest in the *Heritage Minutes*. At the end of the eighties, Patrick Watson was invited at a brainstorming session where Charles Bronfman made the following comment:

Oral Questions

If we can take one minute on television to convince people that Corn Flakes cereals, sanitary napkins or Cadillacs are interesting, could we not take a minute to convince Canadians that Canada is interesting?

The *Heritage Minutes* were born, with the objective of making people like Canada.

In 1988, Patrick Watson became the creative director and chief writer of the *Heritage Minutes*, which were funded by the CRB Foundation, Canada Post, Power Broadcasting, McDonald's, Canadian Airlines, the Weston Foundation, Bell Canada and the Government of Canada. In 1989, Mr. Watson was appointed President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, a position which he held until 1994, without ever stopping working on the *Heritage Minutes*.

So, when someone presents the official version of Canada's history on the CBC, he goes up the corporate ladder, like Patrick Watson.

* * *

• (1415)

THE CANADIAN FRANCOPHONIE

Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Équipe Francophonie 2001, a coalition of French-speaking and Acadian communities, is in Ottawa today.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind hon. members of the federal government's commitment to Canada's francophones.

To cite a few examples, along with the provinces and the territories, the federal government guarantees minority communities access to education in their language. It has helped the University of Ottawa to set up its Centre national de formation en santé. It has renewed its official language support programs and allocated additional funding to them. The Prime Minister has created a position responsible for co-ordinating everything relating to official languages.

One thing is certain; the Government of Canada is working hard for the preservation and expansion of the culture, traditions and language of Canada's 6.6 million francophones.

* * *

[*English*]

BILL C-42

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, while there are a few long overdue changes in Bill C-42 they are overshadowed by the continuation of the government's disturbing trend of making parliament irrelevant.

Much of the bill gives government ministers carte blanche to implement by regulation instead of passing legislation through parliament. For example, not only does the bill give the transport minister sole authority to decide what type of airport screening system there will be in Canada. He will decide how it is to be paid for.

For eight years the Liberal government has transferred one legislative authority after another to the executive branch of government. However if the Liberals plan on delegating parliament's

authority to impose taxes we might as well just close the doors and go home.

While the coalition has put forth proposals to increase parliamentary oversight, why do the Liberals continue to weaken the authority of the House?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AIRLINE SECURITY

Mr. Stockwell Day (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it has been three months since terrorists took jet passenger planes, turned them into deadly missiles and killed thousands of innocent citizens. Since then, Canadians have been asking for a few signs of confidence to restore security to airlines.

The government has finally tabled a bill. There are no clear steps of action, even on something as simple as providing air marshals. All Canadians remember is the minister saying he would rather see jet airliners shot down than providing air marshals on airlines.

Why will he not give a clear signal—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the hon. Leader of the Opposition rising today to make his point, but please, I ask him to not make false statements like that in the House of Commons.

The fact of the matter is, every aspect of aviation security is under review and has been under review since September. We have not precluded any measure. In fact on the particular issue of armed force on airplanes, which seems to titillate the member to no end, we have made those provisions for certain flights because the U.S. requested them to Washington Reagan airport.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, one flight to the United States. That is all he cares about? That is ridiculous.

[*Translation*]

Today's bill is nothing but an empty shell. There is nothing in it about putting sky marshals on board.

Can the Prime Minister explain why this bill has nothing concrete to offer in the way of improving travellers' safety and security?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is incredible. The Leader of the Opposition is a Calgary MP and makes weekly use of airline services.

All passengers are aware that we have stepped up security regulations throughout the country, because we have the best security in the world.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Mr. Stockwell Day (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, since September 11 Canadians have asked for a sign of confidence in airline security. They have only asked for a few things. Security on the airlines. They want to see some steps taken for fugitives from other countries on the airlines to have proper documents. There is no action on that one from the government. They want to see something on the ground in terms of increased security. There are no clear steps of action.

The government took these requests, it laboured over them and after all its supposed labour it produced a mouse. Why will the government not produce effective legislation to protect travellers on airlines?

• (1420)

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, something the Leader of the Opposition has overlooked is that the Aeronautics Act has given the powers traditionally to the Minister of Transport to put in the kind of regulations that all people feel necessary.

I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition this weekend to go home to Calgary and read the Aeronautics Act as it is. He will see that we have the power. We have used the power and that is why we have the best security system.

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if we had the best security in the world, we would not need this legislation.

The United States introduced eight weeks ago comprehensive security for airlines. In eight weeks it introduced, debated, amended and finally signed into law this past Tuesday comprehensive airline security legislation.

It took the government 11 weeks just to introduce this weak, bare bones, wimpy legislation that does next to nothing for airport security. Why did it take the government and the transport minister so long to deliver to Canadians so little?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I sat in the House earlier, after the hon. member made his statement. Of course I did not have the right of reply but I have it now.

He listed a whole range of things that he says the Americans have in their legislation that we do not have in ours. It is not in the bill because it is in the act as it stands. We have been ahead of the Americans. I would like him to get that and appreciate that.

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, CPC): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order. I know that some of the questions and answers generate a lot of enthusiasm but the Chair has to be able to hear the questions and so does the minister who has to give an answer. The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam has the floor. A little order, please.

Mr. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, if Canadians already have the list of regulations and requirements that I listed, the country will be really surprised to know that we have a comprehensive air marshals

program in this country. We do not. The United States does. It has had it since 1968.

It is interesting to note, about three weeks ago the president of the United States asked if the transport minister would put air marshals on routes into Washington, D.C.'s Reagan airport and he said sure. Then over 80% of Canadians said that they want air marshals and he said no. Who is his master? Is he writing legislation for the president of the United States or is he writing it for Canadians?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's theory seems to be when in doubt, fall back on the whole question of air marshals.

He talked about cockpit door enforcement. We have the authority already and we have done it. The training of flight crews; we have the authority. The so-called air marshals; we have the authority because we have them on the flights to Washington already. The 100% screening; we have the authority. Secure access to aircraft; we have the authority. The penalties for interfering with screeners; we have the authority. Co-ordinated security; we have the solid links.

Why does the hon. member not read the act as it is and he will understand what is in it and what is not in it?

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, not only has the government not ensured the necessary balance between freedom and security in its anti-terrorism bill, but it has added to the democratic deficit with its public safety bill.

Without any debate in the House, ministers will be able to issue interim orders in a large number of areas if they feel that a security risk exists. Ministers will thus be conferring exceptional powers on unelected officials.

Will the Minister of Transport admit that, with his public safety bill, the government is getting ready to hijack democracy?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): That is not at all the case, Mr. Speaker. What we have in the bill right now is the groundwork for taking action in an urgent situation. I think that all Canadians want to see the government take effective action in an emergency.

There are provisions in the bill to protect the rights of parliament, to protect the rights of parliamentarians, and to protect the rights of Canadians as well.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised by the answer because the interim orders will be in effect for periods of three months to one year. This goes beyond the notion of emergency. At the same time, this is not nearly long enough for the scrutiny of regulations committee to see that they are not infringing the rights and freedoms of citizens unduly.

Will the minister therefore admit that interim orders will in fact, and not just in theory, be completely beyond the bounds of any parliamentary, any democratic, control?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in a situation of urgency and difficulty like we saw on September 11, Canadians want to know that their government can act. That is what Transport Canada did.

Transport Canada has the authority under the Aeronautics Act to close the skies, as did the FAA in the United States.

Where urgent regulations are made, there are safeguards. They must be gazetted. No one can be forced to pay a penalty or have harm come to them as a result of the measure not being gazetted. There are safeguards in the legislation.

• (1425)

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, usually, ministerial orders are checked for consistency with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. But in the public safety bill, the minister has removed this provision, with the result that there will no longer be such a check.

How can the government explain that a need for increased security in Canada means that there will no longer even be an effort to check whether ministerial delegation to officials is consistent with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I guarantee here in the House of Commons that all provisions of this bill are consistent with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is vital to Canadian democracy.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister can say whatever he wants but if he is not familiar with his bill, and that is his problem not ours.

Clause 11.1.4 of the bill—which he wrote, not me—, says that an order is exempt from the application of certain sections, including the one requiring it to be consistent with the charter.

When it is written down in black and white, I would prefer to believe the bill and what it says than a minister who says whatever comes into his head.

[English]

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the whole issue of regulatory power, not just for Transport Canada but for other departments, is so that the government can act in an urgent circumstance. I think Canadians would support that.

What Canadians also want is that their basic rights are protected under the charter and under other laws and that basic parliamentary procedures are followed.

If the hon. member reads the act carefully, he will see that all of that is there.

* * *

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, aid groups are desperately calling for help from the United Nations and specifically Canada to help get assistance to remote parts of Afghanistan. Over six million Afghan people are now in need. Aid

groups say the situation is getting worse. Lloyd Axworthy has said that Canada should be taking a lead role in taking over an airport in the country so flights may distribute aid.

What action is the government taking today to ensure that the aid gets to those who need it before the winter turns the situation into a disaster?

Hon. Maria Minna (Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we speak, we are working with people on the ground at all times. The world food program in fact is getting food into Afghanistan, about 100,000 tonnes just in the last couple of weeks. There is some difficulty in some areas in the northern part. There is food getting in from some of the various countries as well.

There is some difficulty with respect to security but food is getting in to different parts. We need to improve that.

* * *

*[Translation]***MINISTER OF CANADIAN HERITAGE**

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on November 15 during a visit to New Brunswick, the Minister of Canadian Heritage made a public statement that the strength of spirit of Acadians had allowed them to survive, despite the English and the church.

The minister has a very poor grasp of Acadian history. Acadians know very well that the church was of great assistance to their survival, with schools, hospitals and so on.

My question for the Minister of Canadian Heritage is simple: will she apologize to the church and take back her statement?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I come from an Acadian family from Nova Scotia, and what I said was that in the Guthro family, when it came time to receive an education in the French language, it was neither the church nor the government that helped. French was taught within the family, which is how the Acadian language and culture survived.

* * *

*[English]***ANTI-TERRORISM LEGISLATION**

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, under the government's new limitation on citizen rights, any judge reviewing any application can keep secret from the accused the reasons that person is called a terrorist. Sometimes that information may be provided by foreign governments whose democratic values are very different from ours, provided by China, by Russia, by Saudi Arabia.

Will the government table in parliament the specific criteria by which information from foreign states will be evaluated and the specific procedure by which the court will decide whether a Canadian citizen should be told why he or she is accused?

Oral Questions

•(1430)

Mr. Stephen Owen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the judges in superior courts and provincial courts in Canada have the responsibility to ensure that all accused before them have a fair trial. Where evidence is brought before a court that is deemed by the government under certificate of the solicitor general or otherwise to be highly sensitive, the judge will consider that evidence in private and decide whether it is necessary to go in summary form or not. If it is not and a fair trial cannot be maintained, then the accused will be dismissed.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, parliament has a right to defend the freedom of citizens. That right is denied by the government.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I know that hon. members are trying to be helpful but it is impossible to hear the right hon. member if we have this kind of help.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, the government's latest attacks on the rights of citizens lets a solicitor general decide who is called a terrorist. The only way a citizen can get off the list is to go to federal court.

Lawyers cost over \$200 an hour. These cases could drag on for months. The government has deep pockets. The PMO is already spending, so far, \$152,000 to hide the Prime Minister's record from an officer of this parliament.

At the very least, will the government table in parliament the criteria—

The Speaker: The hon. solicitor general.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have a process in place in order to put an individual or a group on a list. That information is provided by security intelligence, the RCMP or other departments. It is taken to cabinet. If an individual or a group is listed, it is a decision of the cabinet.

* * *

AIRLINE SECURITY

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, why would the Minister of Transport introduce a public safety bill that has no new provisions to screen baggage or cargo, that does nothing to prevent foreign nationals from leasing planes here, unlike in the U.S., and has no new penalties for interfering with airport security?

Could the minister explain how he can view his bill as a public safety bill when it does not meet the tenets of public safety?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again many of the criticisms that hon. members have on the bill actually are covered by the Aeronautics Act as it is. What I have said consistently is that we have been more concerned with ensuring that regulations are improved and enforced, and worrying about who does it and who pays for it at a later date, but that is under review. We are close to making a decision. That decision will be a very

costly one. It is one that the Minister of Finance must take into account in his financial planning.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister has missed an opportunity to instill public confidence in airline security. The bill fails to meet the basic criteria of public safety and is more concerned with increasing ministerial powers.

Why does the bill make so many provisions for interim measures? Surely public safety requires more than just a short term fix.

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I explained in an answer to the earlier question, the fact is that interim orders are required, not just for transport but for other departments, to deal with urgent situations. Ministers would have to obtain approval from the governor in council within 90 days after the order is made. The order would only be valid for one year. It would have to be published in the *Canada Gazette* within 23 days. Among other things, all this would be subject to judicial review.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the public safety bill provides that interim orders will not be verified beforehand, particularly in terms of their consistency with the enabling legislation.

How can the government justify exempting interim orders from a check to ensure they are consistent with the legislation?

What justification can there possibly be for taking this approach?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that provides protection, that makes improvements to legislation, not just to the Aeronautics Act, but also to other acts. It is a measure that is needed to protect Canadians.

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in exempting interim orders from the application of sections 3, 5 and 11 of the Statutory Instruments Act, is the government not opening the door to worse abuses and an unacceptable broadening of ministerial authority, under the pretext of increasing public safety?

•(1435)

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker, because we have a final appeal to the courts. That is the protection that exists in the system.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the solicitor general said that he would not discuss the specifics of the case regarding cop killer Clinton Suzack. Well I can discuss the specifics and tell the House that Joe MacDonald, the Ontario constable, was shot execution style in the back of his head, not once but twice after his leg had been broken and he was rendered helpless.

Oral Questions

I ask the solicitor general if, in his opinion, a cop killer should be in a medium security institution, a club fed of prison, so to speak, after serving six years of a life sentence, yes or no.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have thousands of individuals in institutions across the country and we have one of the best systems in the world.

However, I am aware of these concerns, as is the commissioner, and I can assure my hon. colleague that we are both looking into the situation.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that is no answer. Corrections Services Canada is an example of a failed policy here.

Yesterday the solicitor general said that the placement of criminals is not a decision made by politicians. However the solicitor general is not only a politician, he is Canada's top cop. Ultimately, he is responsible for the safety and security of all Canadians inasmuch as he is responsible for Correctional Service Canada. Therefore, not if but when Suzack walks away from this club fed and kills or injures again the solicitor general will be to blame.

I ask the solicitor general—

The Speaker: The hon. solicitor general.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we have thousands of individuals in institutions across the country. I, as the solicitor general, do not indicate whether an individual stays in a maximum, medium or minimum security institution. That decision is made by Correctional Service Canada. We can have our opinion but it makes the decision.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TERRORISM

Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the U.S. deputy secretary of defence said that there is evidence that Iraq continues to build chemical weapons—

Some hon. members: Oh, Oh!

The Speaker: Order, please. It is impossible for me to hear the hon. member because there is so much noise in the House today. I wonder why.

I hope we can now hear the questions of the hon. member for Mercier.

Ms. Francine Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the U.S. deputy secretary of defence said that there was evidence that Iraq continues to build chemical and nuclear weapons.

On Tuesday, the Prime Minister said in this House that military operations would not be extended to other areas unless there was evidence that such action was necessary. But he was talking about links between the attacks in New York City and Iraq.

Can the minister tell us if the recent comments of the U.S. deputy secretary of defence will change Canada's position regarding Iraq?

[*English*]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has long been known that Iraq has been attempting to develop weapons of mass destruction and has a sorry history with respect to them and the use of chemical and biological weapons even on its own people. We have sanctions against Iraq. Canada is part of implementing those sanctions against Iraq.

In terms of the operations that are presently going on against Afghanistan and any broadening of them beyond that, those decisions have yet to be made. The Prime Minister made that quite clear yesterday.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the fight against terrorism must not become a pretext to finish the gulf war and go after Iraq, at the risk of breaking the anti-terrorism coalition.

Considering the potential dangers and the possible abuse, should the Minister of Foreign Affairs not meet his U.S. counterpart to reiterate the position presented in this House?

[*English*]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been said right from the beginning by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, by myself and of course by the Prime Minister that this campaign against terrorism is one that will be many years in length and it will be multi-dimensional. It is not just a military campaign, in fact the military campaign in all cases will be the last resort.

There are many other ways. We need to cut off the funding. We need to cut off the recruitment. We need to bring these terrorist organizations down so they cease to be a threat to the people in the free world, particularly the people of our country and our neighbour to the south.

● (1440)

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say that we are all very proud of our soldiers who we may be sending to Afghanistan.

What we would like to know is how we are going to get them there and how we are going to get their equipment there. Yesterday the minister said that we did not need the Hercules aircraft to get them and their equipment there. He said that we could use the airbus instead.

Could the minister explain to us, if he possibly could, how we are going to get our military jeeps on an airbus?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the hon. member talk about having pride in the Canadian forces because it was a colleague of his who got up in the House earlier this week and took the name that our loyal troops gave to their mission, Operation Apollo, and called it operation appalling. That party is appalling. That party has no respect for the Canadian forces.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): What is appalling, Mr. Speaker, is that the government would in any way question the commitment of this party to our military.

Oral Questions

The government simply does not have enough planes to get our men and our equipment over to Afghanistan. That is a fact. How will he do it? Will he perhaps commandeer another ship like the *Katie*?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our troops and the light infantry battalion will be airlifted. We have never had a problem getting our troops into theatre before. They always get there. They are always among the first there.

There are other means, with our allies, that we can use to get our troops over there other than Hercules. Most of our Hercules can be ready to operate if we need them.

* * *

AFGHANISTAN

Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's time honoured role and expertise in peacekeeping and post-conflict reconstruction will be greatly needed in post-Taliban Afghanistan.

Could the Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific share with the House the significance of a two day conference taking place in Ottawa today?

Hon. Rey Pagtakhan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is right. The significance of this particular conference is enormous for the Afghan people and for humanity itself.

The Afghanistan Tomorrow conference, which I had the privilege of launching this morning, is aimed at developing a better understanding for Canada of the religious, social, economic and political dimensions in Afghanistan from the Afghan point of view by engaging relevant experts, as well, by developing the NGOs and the Canadian government strategies to develop alternatives for the reconstruction of Afghanistan.

* * *

HOUSING

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today municipalities across the country joined thousands of people in more than 20 communities in a national day of action on Canada's urgent housing needs.

There is a desperate call from the FCM and from housing groups as yet another winter approaches because it is clear that the funds being considered by the federal government for housing are not good enough. They are not even an adequate downpayment. It is time for a fully funded national housing strategy.

Will the minister commit to this or will he fail homeless Canadians again?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to confirm that we are honouring our commitment in the red book and the Speech from the Throne. I have already had a meeting with my colleagues, the provincial and territorial ministers of housing. I will be having another meeting on November 30, a week from now. I am very confident that we will have a national affordable housing policy in this country very soon.

REVENUE CANADA

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 90,000 Canadians have recently received letters from Revenue Canada telling them to reapply for the disability tax credit. It could cost between \$30 and \$120 to get a doctor to agree that they are still legally blind or still have Down's syndrome. This is harassment.

First the CPP disability program is made more restrictive and now the disability tax credit is under fire. Why is the government picking on our most vulnerable citizens? Will it order these harassing letters to be withdrawn? Will it offer these 90,000 Canadians a written apology? Will it commit to real consultation with disability groups on all tax issues?

• (1445)

Ms. Sophia Leung (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has always had the best of intentions for the disabled. We will certainly review the situation. In the meantime, we have a special sympathy and empathy for disabled groups.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, being wrongfully listed or wrongfully accused can cause irreparable harm to a person. Just ask Mohamed Attiah who, without a charge or even accusation, was fired from his job at the Chalk River atomic energy facility after being wrongfully accused of being involved in terrorist activities. This happened two months ago and there has been no explanation from the police or the nuclear agency that fired him. He has now launched a \$5.5 million lawsuit.

The minister has advised us that under the new bill, individuals can go to the federal court if they are denied access to information.

Could the parliamentary secretary tell us what other recourse exists for those who are wrongfully listed—

The Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Stephen Owen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-36 is comprehensive legislation. It deals with many aspects of matters going to court and people being listed against the threat of terrorism. We have never in our criminal law had a policy of compensation for people who are accused, prosecuted and acquitted.

However if public officials behave improperly or with negligence, then they can be liable for civil action. This could be the case in this situation.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, that member used to actually care about civil rights. He said that individuals can go to the federal court if they are wrongfully accused or wrongfully listed. On the other hand, we know that the government has unlimited resources and lawyers to defend its position. It can hide information under the new act.

Will the member tell us, if mistakes occur, and they will, how individuals will get their names off the list? How do they remove their names from the list?

Mr. Stephen Owen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is well aware that there is an opportunity to go before a federal court judge to have the matter reviewed and to be de-listed.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, what is really appalling is the Liberal government's mistreatment of our military.

Joint Task Force 2 has not left Canada for Afghanistan because, in the words of former British special air service member, Alan Bell, they are not outfitted for such a mission. Why does the government refuse to be forthright with the Canadian people about the JTF2 and its absence from Afghanistan?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the person who the member quotes has had no formal contact with the JTF2 and is therefore not in a position to accurately comment on the capabilities of the JTF2. It has the capabilities for any mission that the government would ask it to do.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we are not asking about capabilities. The British and the Australians regularly brief their parliaments. Canadians have a right to know that the JTF2, our domestic hostage rescue unit, has not left Canada.

Why is the government hiding the fact that Liberal cutbacks to the army means that the ground war on terrorism is being fought without Canada?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the head of central command of the coalition effort asked for the JTF2 troops. General Franks asked for the JTF2 troops and this government is making them available. They are highly qualified to do the kind of mission they have been asked to do. They are being offered because they have been asked by this government to do so.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AFGHANISTAN

Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with the Bonn meeting coming up, the personal representative of the UN secretary general said that it was very important that women be involved at the highest level in the political process leading to the rebuilding of Afghanistan.

Could the Minister of Foreign Affairs tell us what measures Canada has undertaken as a partner in the anti-terrorism coalition to ensure that Afghani women do indeed take part in the process?

•(1450)

[*English*]

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government and the Minister of Foreign Affairs are very cognizant of what the women of

Oral Questions

Afghanistan have gone through. It is a major priority on our part, as with other members of the coalition, to ensure their role and participation in a government that will follow the current hostilities.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the government intend to make a proposal that would tie a substantial part of the aid provided to rebuild Afghanistan to the development of infrastructures that would help improve the status of Afghani women?

[*English*]

Hon. Maria Minna (Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I should point out to the House that even before September 11, Canada was very involved in providing programs of education and rehabilitation for women in Afghanistan. We have spent some \$150 million over the last 10 years. We spent about \$28 million just in this year.

We will definitely be there working with the women and with all of the people of Afghanistan to help them with reconstruction and rehabilitation right after this.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, as the world focuses on Afghanistan, President Mugabe of Zimbabwe has been allowed to literally get away with murder. Canada and the Commonwealth made a commitment through the Abuja accords to halt this reign of terror but Mr. Mugabe has failed to keep up with his end of the bargain.

Will the Minister of Foreign Affairs ask the Commonwealth to suspend Zimbabwe's membership and ask for a freeze on his personal assets?

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister has attended, along with the hon. member, the conference dealing with these issues. They are being very carefully monitored. The situation is being assessed, and we are ready and prepared to respond when we feel all of that information is at hand.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the time is up. The evidence is patently in front of us. Thousands of people will be murdered or will die unless we as part of the international community act. In fact, Mr. Mugabe as we speak is brutalizing the black population through beatings, rape and murder. He is intimidating them to vote for him in the next election.

One again, will the minister also seek an international ban on travel by Mr. Mugabe and his ministers and also prevent them from continuing to jail—

Oral Questions

The Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, having mentioned at the outset how very cognizant we are of the very bad situation in Zimbabwe, the hon. member is well aware that what he has proposed in the way of sanctions, economic and political, will not function on a bilateral basis. Unless there is that kind of reaction, sanctions and that sort on an international basis, it simply will not be effective.

We are looking for an effective response.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

[English]

The second anti-terrorism omnibus bill tabled in the House today contains job protection and protection provisions for the military reservists. Could the minister please explain the provisions to the House?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many times we have called on the reserves to assist in such things as the ice storm, the Saguenay or the Red River floods. Of course a number of reservists also serve in our overseas peace-keeping missions.

They do so on a voluntary basis and therefore employer support is voluntary. However, if in this new security environment we should ever have to call them out on a mandatory basis because of a declared state of emergency, then we should give them job protection. I think most employers would give them their jobs back, but we want to make sure that the loyal reservists, who serve the country well, will be able to return to their employment.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food. Pulse crops have become a significant contributor to farm family incomes. The industry is an example of entrepreneurial spirit, as it was developed with almost no government money.

The government should be putting some money into this important industry. Pulse Canada has identified \$17 million to build pulse research and \$14 million annually as a complement to existing producer investment.

Will the minister immediately commit to making this \$31 million available to Pulse Canada?

• (1455)

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, some months ago I asked the department to evaluate how research was balanced within our department, and we are in the process of rebalancing the research. One of the groups that brought that to my attention was the pulse industry. I have met and discussed this with them on a number of occasions in the past.

The answer to the hon. member's question is, yes. We are and will be paying more attention to research in areas such as pulse.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we will take that as a guaranteed promise of \$31 million. I also have a question for the health minister.

The Pest Management Regulatory Agency allows chemical companies to charge western pulse growers twice as much for some pesticides as Ontario farmers. These same regulations even make it illegal to move these chemicals across provincial borders.

Why does the health minister continue to allow this disastrous agency the ability to restrict trade between provinces and to deny our farm families a chance to have the lowest input cost possible?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the pest management agency works with the advice of the community, the industry and farmers and producers to provide good, balanced protection for the health of Canadians while assisting people who produce food for our tables. I am proud of the work it does.

As to the detailed question the member asked, I will take it under consideration and provide him with a response when I have the details available.

* * *

[Translation]

TERRORISM

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the number of accidents involving scatter bombs in Afghanistan is growing, and it is civilians, children, who are being killed or mutilated by unexploded munitions, which constitute an on-going threat to the population.

Will the Minister of National Defence make a commitment to include scatter bombs in the Treaty on Anti-Personnel Landmines and to pressure the American government to get their soldiers to recover unexploded ordnance from scatter bombs, in order to make the Afghan territory safe?

[English]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, cleaning up any unexploded ordnance after a bombing is certainly something to which Canada subscribes. With respect to the bombing that is going on, every effort is being made to avoid civilians. Unfortunately civilians are hurt or killed in times such as this, but I know every effort is being made by our allies who are conducting the bombing, which we of course are not, to avoid civilian populations and to attack only the military, the Taliban and the al-Qaeda.

*Oral Questions***FISHERIES**

Mr. Shawn Murphy (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans with respect to the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in the high seas. What is the status? I am speaking about both ratification and implementation of the United Nations fisheries agreement on these issues.

Hon. Herb Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member because it is difficult to get a fisheries question these days.

I am happy to report to the House on something that we have been working on since 1995. We have learned that the 30th country has signed the United Nations fisheries agreement to make it effective December 11.

Those of us who worked on this know what a tremendous achievement this is for Canada and the international community to ensure that we can manage our fish stocks in international waters with conservation and rules and regulations that we can abide by. This is a great success for all Canadians.

* * *

ANTI-TERRORISM LEGISLATION

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, under Bill C-36 persons who believe they should not be on the terrorist list must ask the solicitor general to remove their names. If the solicitor general does not make a decision within 60 days, people must apply to the courts for redress.

Could the solicitor general assure the House that he will make his decision within 60 days so that innocent, wrongfully accused or wrongfully listed Canadians are not required to go to court to have their names removed?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure my hon. colleague that I would evaluate the situation and a decision would be made promptly.

* * *

● (1500)

HOUSING

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for housing says that he is going to honour his commitment in the red book on housing. He should turn the page because those commitments will not come even close to the 30,000 units that are needed each year. One critical need is with respect to the conditions in housing facing aboriginal people in the country.

Will the minister commit to a fully funded and reactivated urban aboriginal housing program and a self-management proposal that has been requested repeatedly by aboriginal organizations?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has committed of \$80 million to address remote housing in the country. I am working with my colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, to develop a program specific to aboriginal people.

[Translation]

TROIS-PISTOLES WHARF

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on October 19, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services told the community and economic stakeholders of the Basques area that the reconstruction of the wharf in Trois-Pistoles had to be classified as a priority by Transport Canada, and that he would inform his counterpart from Transport Canada of this fact within the next two weeks.

Can the minister assure the people of les Basques and the forty or so municipalities in the area that the reconstruction of the wharf will be announced shortly in order to guarantee the ferry service between Trois-Pistoles and Les Escoumins?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, I have discussed this issue with my colleague, the transport minister. Of course, given the circumstances, we will announce the results as soon as possible.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I had someone approach me who had the opportunity to make an international sale of barley. He approached the Canadian Wheat Board and was told by the board that it could not and would not supply him with the grain.

He then phoned an Ontario producer to buy the grain from him and was told he could buy it until the seller asked where he was from. When he said Saskatchewan he was told "I cannot not sell it to you because of the Canadian Wheat Board". This person lost the sale. The barley remains in Canada and agriculture suffers again.

Could the Canadian Wheat Board minister tell us when this ridiculous discrimination and unfairness faced by western Canadian producers will end?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, the Canadian Wheat Board is controlled by a 15 member board of directors, 10 of which are duly elected by western Canadian farmers themselves. The future of the Canadian Wheat Board is therefore in the hands of western Canadian farmers.

If the hon. gentleman wishes to refer the facts of this case to the Canadian Wheat Board, I will ensure that he gets a prompt reply. Every time we have traced down some of these mythical stories before, we have found they are in fact not true.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Pat Duncan, Premier of the Yukon Legislative Assembly, Minister of the Executive Council Office (responsible for Land Claims and Devolution) and Minister of Finance.

Points of Order

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: I would also like to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Pandeli Majko, Minister of Defence of the Republic of Albania.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

AMERICAN THANKSGIVING

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On behalf of you and all parliamentarians I extend to our American friends and in some cases relatives a happy and peaceful Thanksgiving Day, which happens to be today.

God bless America. May its freedom bell forever ring.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it being Thursday, I will ask what the House business is for the rest of today and next week.

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, the House will not sit tomorrow as is the usual courtesy to a political party holding a national convention, in this case the New Democratic Party.

Our business for next week is fairly straightforward. First, we will deal with report stage and third reading of Bill C-36, the anti-terrorism legislation. When this is completed we will turn to second reading of the public safety bill that was introduced earlier this day by the Minister of Transport.

On any days next week, particularly in the early part of the week, should the debate on any of these items end earlier in the day, it would be my intention, then, on Monday to call for report stage and third reading of Bill C-27, the nuclear safety bill and, if time permits, second reading of Bill C-43, the technical legislative amendments bill which I introduced earlier this day.

If debate collapses on or after Tuesday, it would also be my intention to add to the list that I have just made Bill C-35, the foreign missions bill, at third reading.

* * *

• (1505)

POINTS OF ORDER

BILL C-36

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. government House leader has just confirmed that the government will be calling Bill C-36 at report stage. It has come to my attention that the transcripts from the justice committee are not available.

This is of serious concern in that other members of the House, including members of the government who are not members of that

committee, have no ability to review and potentially prepare amendments to the bill. In fact the Chair will know that the deadline for the submission of amendments to the bill is 2 p.m. tomorrow.

Further adding to the difficulty is that the bill, as reported with amendment, is not currently available. In fact we are in the perverse situation where government officials have called opposition members' offices looking for the amendments so that they might have an opportunity to review these amendments.

This is an important issue for parliament. It is an important ability that all members of the House have in terms of their ability to prepare and amend government legislation. This bill, as the Chair and everyone here knows, is an extremely important piece of legislation. It is a bill to which the government itself presented over 100 amendments.

The evidence that was taken by the justice committee is currently not available to Canadians. Nor is it available to some members of the House. Until the evidence is published by the House, Canadians cannot find out the basis for which important decisions are being made. The people were represented but unable to make informed decisions or recommendations through their members of parliament when votes are to be taken on the bill.

I am asking the government House leader to agree to delay consideration of Bill C-36 until all the committee evidence is published or until it is made available to some. Certainly the bill, which is now placed on the table, should be available to all members of the House. Until it is, one can only be left with the conclusion that this bill, this process and this House of Commons is secret on an important piece of legislation involving anti-terrorism.

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am in a difficult position here. I cannot respond on behalf of the Chair or the clerks of committees in terms of preparing the documents. I trust that every effort will be made from the House side.

The Speaker is doing his job, with respect, as is the clerk.

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Hon. Don Boudria: I beg to disagree with those who claim otherwise, mainly the hon. member who is heckling now. I believe these officials will do their best to ensure that committee transcripts are made available as soon as possible. If any additional resources are required, I, together with the other House leaders, will take every measure necessary to make them available. We obviously cannot delay the passage of the legislation.

Mr. David Anderson: We have been waiting for two and a half months now.

Hon. Don Boudria: The hon. member is complaining that his own colleagues have delayed the bill in committee. That is unfortunate. I am sure he can take it up at caucus with them.

Speaker's Ruling

We intend on our side to do everything we can so that Canadians can be afforded the protection of the legislation. We will work together with other House leaders to make resources available. I am sorry to say we cannot delay report stage and third reading of the bill; it is just too important.

• (1510)

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite clear of the implication made by the government House leader and I ask the Speaker for direction.

If the material is not prepared and completed by 2 p.m. tomorrow, is it the Speaker's intention to allow the rules of the House to be breached, or is it the intention of the Speaker to enforce the rules of the House and to say that if the government does not meet the 2 p.m. deadline then this must pass into the next sitting day?

The Speaker: I cannot tell what the hon. member is referring to, which deadline is he talking about? If amendments are submitted by 2 p.m. obviously they are in order. I do not think there has been a request to table amendments later than that, that I have heard yet. I am not clear exactly what it is the right hon. member is asking.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for my lack of, may I say, clarity. The question is: if the amendments are not tabled by 2 p.m., what is the reaction of the Speaker in that case? What is the status of the House and what is the status of the bill?

The Speaker: The rules of the House are clear that amendments must be prepared and tabled with the legislative branch by 2 p.m. tomorrow. I am advised that the blues are now available. They were available as of 11.30 this morning. Those documents are now available to members.

I am also told that the reprint of the bill will be available at 4 o'clock this afternoon. It had 110 amendments, I believe, in the committee. It is being worked on as we speak and it will be available at 4 o'clock. Members will have that available and can draft amendments and submit them before 2 p.m. tomorrow. After 2 o'clock I presume that with consent members could introduce other amendments, but it is not for the Chair to prejudge that matter. We will wait to see what happens.

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague raises a very good point today. On behalf of our party I want to support the position that this is much too important a bill, where there has been great questioning of civil liberties for Canadians, for the Canadian public not to have an opportunity to respond.

Could we have assurances, if that information is not ready by 4 o'clock and is not available to Canadians, that there will be a delay in allowing the bill to proceed?

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you were quite clear when you indicated to us that the blues had been sent to hon. members' offices, so the point raised by the hon. member is now moot.

Additionally I am also informed that every member of the committee was sent the information by e-mail. I am also told, in addition to what Mr. Speaker has just told us, that the transcript is now on the Internet as of a little while ago. It appears that the entire point is now moot.

The Speaker: I do not think we will continue with the debate on this matter. The rules are clear. The government has indicated what it intends to call. If hon. members want to have a discussion about it, there are the usual channels for carrying on those discussions and I would invite them to continue the matter there.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now ready to rule on a point of order raised by the hon. member for St. Albert on Thursday, November 1, 2001, relating to two items in the supplementary estimates: vote 10 for \$50 million for the sustainable development technology fund under Environment Canada and vote 10 also for \$50 million for the sustainable development technology fund under Natural Resources Canada.

In his submission the hon. member for St. Albert argued that these votes should be ruled out of order for two reasons. First, in his view, the government expenditures of \$100 million funding related to the Canada Foundation for Sustainable Development Technology constituted a multi-year appropriation. Second, he contended that there had already been a transfer of money for these purposes without parliamentary approval.

In support of his position the member referred to the auditor general's observations in the Public Accounts of Canada 2000-01 tabled in the House on September 27, 2001, in which she expressed serious concerns with the events surrounding these grants.

• (1515)

[*Translation*]

I wish to thank the hon. member for St. Albert for raising this matter and I also want to acknowledge the contribution of the hon. government House leader on this subject.

At the outset, I want to draw the attention of the House not only to the seriousness of this question but also to its complexity. I ask the House to bear with me as I review the events which have led us to the current situation.

[*English*]

Let me begin with a chronology of events that may be helpful.

The initial announcement of funds to support sustainable development technology was made in the budget statement presented by the hon. Minister of Finance on February 28, 2000. The enabling legislation for that initiative, Bill C-46, an act to establish a foundation to fund sustainable development, died on the order paper at the dissolution of the 36th parliament.

At the beginning of this parliament on February 2, a new bill, Bill C-4 was introduced and given first reading.

Speaker's Ruling

Bill C-4 provides, in addition to the provisions of the original Bill C-46, that the government may designate a corporation already incorporated under part two of the Canada Corporations Act to continue as the Canadian Foundation for Sustainable Development Technology. A not for profit corporation of this type was established in March of this year. In early April, Natural Resources Canada and Environment Canada each granted \$25 million to this not for profit corporation using funds transferred from the treasury board contingencies vote for this year.

On June 14 Bill C-4, an act to establish a foundation to fund sustainable development technology, received royal assent. Thus Bill C-4 became law prior to the tabling of the supplementary estimates (A) so there need be no concern that an attempt is being made here to legislate through an appropriation.

The Chair can find no specific request under our supply process for authority to make the two payments for the corporation. In other words, neither the main estimates 2001-02 nor interim supply mention these particular grants. This is a significant fact and we will return to it later.

That being said, and this is a technical point but one of key importance, the money transferred to Natural Resources Canada and Environment Canada to make these payments was taken from the treasury board contingencies vote for this year, so there is no question of a multi-year appropriation in the case before us. That answers the hon. member for St. Albert's first concern.

However, we are still left to deal with the allegation that no approval has been given for the original expenditures in this case. I said a moment ago that I could find no authority for the original grants totalling \$50 million in either the main estimates 2001-02 or in interim supply. Let us then return to what is being requested in the supplementary estimates (A) 2001-02 tabled in the House on November 1.

At page 58 of the supplementary estimates, vote 10 under the environment department requests \$50 million for the sustainable development technology fund. A note indicates that funds in the amount of \$25 million were advanced from the treasury board contingencies vote to provide temporary funding for this program. A similar entry for the same program is listed at page 115 under vote 10 of the natural resources department. A total of \$100 million is therefore being sought for the sustainable development technology fund.

[Translation]

Two questions arise.

The first question is the confusion between the "Fund" as referred to in Supplementary Estimates and the "foundation" created by Bill C-4.

Neither Bill C-4 nor its predecessor, Bill C-46, mentions "Sustainable Development Technology Fund." Indeed, in speaking on second reading of Bill C-4, the hon. Minister of National Resources and Minister responsible for the Canada Wheat Board stated, and I quote the *Debates* of February 19th 2001, page 852, said:

In Budget 2000, we first announced the government's intention to establish a foundation with initial funding of \$100 million to stimulate the development and

demonstration of new environmental technologies, in particular climate change and clean air technologies. Bill C-4 delivers on that commitment from Budget 2000. It creates the organizational structure, the legal status and the modus operandi of the foundation.

On the basis of the minister's statement, I am led to conclude that what is being sought in the Supplementary Estimates (A) is funding for the Canada Sustainable Development Technology Foundation, established pursuant to Bill C-4. From a procedural point of view, such a request poses no difficulty.

However, the Supplementary Estimates do not identify the foundation as the recipient. Instead, the estimates refer only to a Sustainable Development Technology Fund.

• (1520)

[English]

The second question is the crux of the matter: what is the link, if any, between the \$100 million requested in supplementary estimates (A) for the foundation/fund and the \$50 million already paid to the not for profit corporation in April of this year?

As I have already mentioned in the chronology, notes in the supplementary estimates list the sustainable development technology fund as the recipient of a total of \$50 million in interim funding through the treasury board contingencies vote. However, these funds were paid to the pre-existing not-for-profit corporation, established under an altogether different legal authority, namely, the Canada Corporations Act, and not under Bill C-4 creating the foundation.

The Chair cannot see that the request for \$100 million funding relates in any way to the original grants made to the corporation using the legal authority of the Energy Efficiency Act and the Department of the Environment Act. Simply put, the \$100 million now being sought cannot be used both to fund the foundation and to refund the treasury board contingencies vote for \$50 million paid out earlier to the corporation.

[Translation]

Bourinot 4th edition at page 416 has this to say on the subject of supplementary estimates: "All these estimates are divided into votes or resolutions, which appropriate specified sums for services specially defined. They are arranged under separate heads of expenditure, so as to give the full information upon all matters contained therein".

*Speaker's Ruling**[English]*

The lack of clarity and transparency in this case must be of considerable concern to the Chair. Requests for funds in the estimates are tied to particular programs, previously approved by parliament. I have noted, of course, the auditor general's comment that she is satisfied that legal authority existed for these grants under the Energy Efficiency Act and the Department of the Environment Act. However, the concomitant authority under the supply process to make these payments has never been sought from parliament. That is the crux of the procedural difficulty raised by the hon. member for St. Albert and I must conclude that he is correct in his assessment of the situation, if not perhaps in the remedy he suggests.

In summary, then, the Chair has concluded that no authority has ever been sought from parliament for grants totalling \$50 million made to the corporation in April of this year and does not consider that the notes in the supplementary estimates (A) concerning the disbursement of these earlier monies are sufficient to be considered as a request for approval of those grants. In other words, the approval that is being sought in supplementary estimates (A) cannot be deemed to include tacit approval for the earlier \$50 million grant.

However, as there remains ample time for the government to take corrective action by making the appropriate request of parliament through the supplementary estimates process, the Chair need not comment further at this time. The supplementary estimates (A) for 2001-2002 can therefore proceed.

I wish to thank the hon. member for St. Albert for having drawn this matter to the attention of the House. I commend him for his vigilance in matters of supply. I especially appreciate his having raised it early enough to allow the Chair to examine closely a very complex issue and I hope my ruling has not confused hon. members.

BILL C-33

The Speaker: I am ready to deal with the point of order raised this morning by the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough concerning Bill C-33, an act respecting the water resources of Nunavut and the Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, passed by this House on November 2, and specifically concerning the message received from the Senate yesterday, November 21.

[Translation]

The message received yesterday from the Senate reads:

ORDERED: That, notwithstanding Rule 63(1), the proceedings on Bill C-33, an Act respecting the water resources of Nunavut and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, which took place on Tuesday, November 6, 2001, be declared null and void; and

That a message be sent to the House of Commons informing that House of this decision and that the Senate attends any message that the House of Commons may have regarding this matter.

● (1525)

[English]

I would like to thank the hon. member for raising this matter for it gives the Chair an opportunity to correct certain misinformation about this case.

The hon. member is correct when he says that deficiencies were identified in the parchments and reprints of the bill sent to the other place.

These errors were first identified by House of Commons officials, who immediately informed their counterparts in the other place of their findings. It is important to note that these errors were strictly administrative in nature and occurred after third reading was given to Bill C-33 in the House, so that at no time were the actual records of the House compromised.

It in no way affects any proceedings that took place on the bill in this Chamber or in committee and I can assure all hon. members that there is no defect in the records of the House regarding Bill C-33. These remain in the words of the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough “pristine, concise and accurate”.

The documents relating to Bill C-33 sent to the Senate were not accurate and the fact that they were not is the most unfortunate result of compounded human errors. When my officials discovered these regrettable errors, no substantive proceedings on the bill had yet occurred in the other place. On being briefed on the matter, I directed the clerk to communicate with his counterpart in the other place. I asked the Clerk of the House to take the necessary action to rectify the error and to ensure that the other House would have a correct and complete copy of Bill C-33. That was done yesterday. Such communication is part of the usual administrative procedures of parliament and in no way constitutes a message to the other place which requires an explicit decision of the House.

I understand that Bill C-33 has, earlier this afternoon, received first reading in the other place.

I once again thank the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough for his assiduous concern about the accuracy of House records. I trust this will allay his anxieties in this regard. I therefore consider this matter closed.

Mr. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that ruling and direction. I certainly commend you and your staff for the usual competence and wizardry in the procedure of this place.

I wish to continue with this issue regarding the availability of the transcripts of the justice committee. As of just moments ago, when checking the record which the hon. government House leader referred to as available on the Internet and available at blues, it shows quite clearly in a print off that there are no transcripts available as of November 1. That is three weeks and that is very important evidence.

The point is not that it is available to me as a member of the justice committee. It is that it is not available to other members who are not members of the committee who may wish to file amendments.

As well, it is now 3.30 p.m. and we still do not have a copy of Bill C-36 as amended. This is something of great concern, I would suggest, to all members who wish to ensure that Bill C-36 is properly dealt with and properly amended before it passes into law.

Privilege

The Speaker: The hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough has made statements about the transcripts of earlier meetings of the justice committee. I am sorry, I cannot comment on that. I have no additional information. We will certainly look into the matter.

With respect to the reprinted copy of the bill, it appears that the 4 o'clock deadline is not going to work. It will be probably tomorrow before the copy is ready but we are continuing to work on it. Given the large number of amendments obviously that is a matter of some difficulty.

• (1530)

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with what the House leader—

Mr. Peter MacKay: You were not accurate in your response.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

BILL C-42

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege with regard to Bill C-42, a bill that was tabled earlier today and debated during question period.

Like Bill C-36, Bill C-42 was drafted to address the security issues facing Canadians as a result of the attack on the United States on September 11. Once again the security of the very bills designed to protect the security of Canadians has been breached. The government indicated that the bill was not ready to be tabled in the House yesterday, yet its contents were leaked to the media.

There was an article in the *Globe and Mail* by Steven Chase and Campbell Clark which reports “the legislation will include stopgap immigration enforcement measures similar to ones contained in immigration Bill C-11, that will not be in effect until late spring 2002, government sources said”. The article goes on with details of the bill, quoting government sources.

This is also within the context of the fact that yesterday in question period we asked substantive questions of the government about the contents of the security bill. The government said it could not answer the questions and that it was going to be tabled tomorrow. At the same time that it was not answering our questions, it was answering questions from the *Globe and Mail* on the phone to meet its four o'clock deadline.

As with the cases of Bill C-15 and Bill C-36, the media received an extensive briefing before members were and before the bill was tabled. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice and her department were held in contempt of the House for leaking the contents of Bill C-15. The Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs is presently looking into the leak of Bill C-36. The deputy clerk of the privy council appeared before the committee this morning and reported on his investigation into the Bill C-36 case.

In your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on Bill C-15 you stated:

In preparing legislation, the government may wish to hold extensive consultations and such consultations may be held entirely at the government's discretion. However, with respect to material to be placed before parliament, the House must take precedence.

Not the *Globe and Mail*, the House.

The convention of the confidentiality of bills on notice is necessary, not only so that members themselves may be well informed, but also because of the pre-eminent role which the House plays and must play in the legislative affairs of the nation.

To deny to members information concerning business that is about to come before the House, while at the same time providing such information to the media that will likely be questioning members about that business, is a situation that the Chair cannot condone.

In this case it is clear that information concerning legislation...was given to members of the media without any effective measures to secure the rights of the House.

I have concluded that this constitutes a prima facie contempt of the House.

This matter was referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. The committee concluded:

The committee believes that the protocol of the Department of Justice whereby no briefings or briefing material should be provided with respect to a bill on notice until its introduction in the House of Commons should be adopted as a standard policy by all government departments. We believe that such a policy is respectful of the House of Commons and its members. It recognizes the legislative role of parliament, and is consistent with parliamentary privilege and the conventions of parliament.

The committee noted that the adoption of such a policy should not be viewed as preventing the provisions of courtesy copies of government bills on a confidential basis to opposition critics shortly before their introduction. The committee went on to state:

This incident highlights a concern shared by all members of the Committee: apparent departmental ignorance of or disrespect for the role of the House of Commons and its members. Even if the result is unintended, the House should not tolerate such ignorance within the government administration to undermine the perception of parliament's constitutional role in legislating. The rights of the House and its Members in this role are central to our constitutional and democratic government.

Finally, the committee heeded this warning:

Failure to adopt appropriate measures could lead to a reoccurrence of this problem, in which case the House would have to consider using its power in a more severe way.... The acceptance of an apology will not necessarily be considered a sufficient response.

Despite this warning, the government proceeded to leak the contents of Bill C-36 and yesterday it leaked the contents of Bill C-42.

On the privy council website it describes ministerial responsibility as:

Ministerial responsibility is a fundamental principle of the constitution.... This responsibility is honed by the ever present possibility that in particular circumstances ministers may be embarrassed, suffer loss of prestige weakening themselves and the government, jeopardize their standing with their colleagues and hence their political future, or even be forced to submit to public enquiry possibly resulting in censure and loss of office as a result of the way in which their power has been used.

We have already embarrassed the government with the Bill C-36 and Bill C-15 cases.

• (1535)

We have had a public inquiry through the work of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. We have had a minister censured and charged with contempt. The only thing left to do is to call for the minister's resignation.

It is time for action, not more studies and not more warnings. The minister should take responsibility for this action. Mr. Speaker, if you rule this to be a prima facie question of privilege, I am prepared to move the appropriate motion to that effect.

The Speaker: I would like to ask one point of clarification before I hear from the government House leader.

Could the hon. member indicate, is it the *Globe and Mail* story on which he is relying in support of this or is there some other evidence that he wishes to bring to the House?

Mr. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, there are in fact two stories. There is one story on the front page of the *Globe and Mail* above the fold written by Campbell Clark and Steven Chase and another article in the *National Post* written by Ian Jack, both of which quote government sources.

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe this time the hon. member does not have the story correct at all for a number of reasons which I intend to explain to the Chair and all members.

First, the member is conveniently mixing up the issue of Bill C-15 which was not the issue of a leak at all, as he knows. The issue involving Bill C-15 had to do with an administrative procedure used by officials for briefing the media. It was a form of briefing offered to the media ahead of MPs which was obviously wrong. It was corrected.

I issued instructions which are now in the public domain. As a matter of fact, this morning a briefing was offered to MPs and no briefing to the media. In any case, had one been offered to the media, it would have been no sooner than the one offered to members and only if they were locked up. I will get into the content of what was in the *Globe and Mail* in a minute.

That is the mistake, I will be generous, that the member makes when he compares this to Bill C-15.

I want to get into what the member alleges are leaks. There are a number of newspaper articles. I will quote a few of them. Part of the article says:

Today's new bill had been expected earlier but was delayed until today because it needed more work, Liberal House Leader Don Boudria told reporters.

Some secret that was that I revealed to the reporters so far. The reporter speculated that cabinet is debating whether to transfer the responsibility for airport security screening to a non-profit corporation or to local airport authorities. I will not say whether cabinet is or is not debating that, but regardless whether it is debating it or not, it is not in the bill.

Mr. James Moore: That is not the *Globe and Mail* story.

Hon. Don Boudria: That is the *Globe and Mail* story entitled, "Ottawa takes aim at bioterror; Second terrorism bill toughens penalties and loosens air passenger privacy rules", by Steven Chase and Campbell Clark with reports from Brian Laghi, Daniel Leblanc and Shawn McCarthy.

This is exactly the story to which I am referring. It goes on with a number of such speculated things, a couple of them which happen to

Privilege

be correct, I will admit that, particularly the one that says the bill deals with bioterrorism. That is the title of the bill. It would not be surprising that the bill dealt with that which was in the title. In terms of what would such bioterrorism measures include, Canada has signed a convention. It is all in a public convention and it is in the title of the bill.

The reporters are very smart but the one who concluded that what is in the title of the bill and what is in the international convention we signed, and he speculated that was in the bill, frankly that does not require rocket science. Most people could have speculated on that particular one.

Let us listen to some more. This time it is the *National Post* story:

Sources said the government is considering creating a new agency of government responsible for transport security, reporting to Transport Canada.

That is not in the bill at all. Let me read further. The *Ottawa Citizen* has a story by Rick Mofina. This is a real good one. It says:

On Monday, Parliament gave notice of a new bill entitled—

Mr. Speaker, you being the expert on parliamentary procedure that you are, how does parliament give notice of a bill? This mechanism does not exist. I as leader of the government in the House give notice of all government bills pursuant to authority given to me by cabinet. Parliament does not give notice of a bill. The article goes on to say:

Meanwhile, the global pact on germ warfare is under review at an ongoing conference concerning the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention, ratified by 144 countries, including Canada.

All of this was obvious to anyone who read the title of the bill that was presented in the House today, just in case somebody says, "Oh yes, but the bill was presented today, we did not know the title". I would bet that is what the hon. member who is heckling was going to say.

● (1540)

That was put on the notice paper, at the back of the order paper under the Roman numerals on the first page, two days ago. That is where that piece of brilliant information comes from.

I do not know where the evidence is of a leak this time. First, there has been an unfair comparison made with Bill C-15. Second, a whole pile of what I saw was factually inaccurate. Third, the little bit of it that was, was very easy to speculate on, such as reading the title of the bill which again is not rocket science.

The Speaker: The Chair will certainly take the matter under advisement.

I want to thank the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam and the government House leader for their interventions in this matter. I will review the statements hon. members have made. I will review the newspaper articles in question and get back to the House in due course.

*Private Members' Business***BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A little while ago, I attempted to rise to offer a relieving measure to the House in relation to Bill C-36, the anti-terrorism legislation. I realize that some of us have worked very hard and are tired. I intend to try again with this measure to see whether it will be helpful to the House.

I am told from informal conversations with the table officers that if the House were to unanimously agree to extend the time, provided it is reasonable and table officers and Mr. Speaker can carefully review report stage amendments, that we could alter the time of 2 p. m. tomorrow in order to assist hon. members. I have had no opportunity to consult other parties, but in order to be helpful to the House, I would like to seek unanimous consent to move the following motion. I move:

That the normal hour for filing report stage amendments be extended from 2 p.m. November 23 to 2 p.m. November 24.

This will give members more time, until Saturday, and hopefully this will accommodate them. I know everyone has worked hard and hopefully this will be—

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: We will say yes. We will show our goodwill but we are not going to give a big kiss. No one has to kiss us to say yes.

Hon. Don Boudria: Again, it is not I who wants to propose amendments. I am trying to do this for the benefit of opposition members and hopefully for the entire House.

The Speaker: Does the hon. government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Consultations took place between representatives of the various political parties, including House leaders.

In order to accommodate all members since, normally, private members' business would be at 5.30 p.m., and considering that some members may wish to take part in this important debate but did not have time to prepare adequately, and considering also the time now, I am seeking the unanimous consent of the House to have this order not be debated today, but be dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence and that the vote scheduled for Tuesday on that same order be postponed to an appropriate time, after the conclusion of the third hour of debate.

• (1545)

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is not the intention of the government to call any other item this day. I understand that the item before the House collapsed shortly before question period. That being the case, I would propose that you see the clock as being at 5.30 p.m. and we proceed to private members' business.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: For all intents and purposes, it being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

THE ACADIANS

The House resumed from October 3 consideration of the motion.

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, here we are in the last stretch of a passionate debate on Motion No. 241.

My colleague from Verchères—Les Patriotes explained that his own re-election, no more than that of other members of the Bloc Québécois, does not depend on the adoption or the defeat of this motion in the House. Similarly, it must be recognized that the fate of this motion will have no bearing whatsoever on the fate of Quebec as a sovereign state. Need I remind members that the Bloc Québécois ran no candidates in New Brunswick in the last federal election? So those who are looking for the motivation behind this motion by the member for Verchères—Les Patriotes should look elsewhere.

To eliminate any notion that this motion could be of a somewhat partisan nature, the member for Verchères—Les Patriotes indicated that he was prepared to accept that the name of the mover be changed. He even said that he was opened to the idea that the motion be amended by members from other parties so that it could become a multiparty motion. He even stated publicly that he wished the government would get involved in this initiative and that it could even lead it if it wished to do so. I can hardly imagine that, after all these concrete gestures showing the good faith of the member for Verchères—Les Patriotes, there are still people in this House who insist on saying that Motion No. 241 is of a partisan nature.

On September 26 of this year, Annie Racine, a reporter for *La Voie Acadienne*, said this about Motion No. 241: "I naively thought that the various parties worked together for the good of the nation. I believe there are some ideas that transcend political boundaries and that can be supported by all parties". I think that we must work for the betterment and the development of all communities, regardless of language and political affiliation.

One other element has attracted the interest of parliamentarians: what did the people directly concerned by this motion think? We have since had the answer to this question, as the Société nationale de l'Acadie tabled the advisory committee report on Motion No. 241 on October 2. Many parliamentarians were waiting precisely for that before taking a position. They wisely wanted to know the position of the Acadians and some wanted a strong consensus if they were going to give it support.

This House will be pleased to learn that, according to the report, only 3 of the 140 opinions from all over Acadia, the maritimes, Quebec, Ontario, the U.S. and France, were not in favour of the motion, whereas 129, or 92%, supported it, while 8 could not be placed in either category. This is an undeniable and indisputable consensus in favour of the motion we have before us. Moreover, the advisory committee presented a recommendation to the Société nationale de l'Acadie that leaves absolutely no trace of doubt. It reads as follows:

—that the motion be sponsored by the entire Acadian deputation in the House of Commons, regardless of political affiliation.

As a result, the parliamentarians of this House will be able to make fully informed decisions. The opinion of the Acadians is clear, and their recommendation is unequivocal.

In supporting Motion No. 241, parliament will be showing the great nobility of spirit of one who acknowledges his errors. Calling upon the British crown to officially recognize the wrongs done to the Acadian people is an affirmation of the desire to strengthen and improve ties between two peoples, beyond the collective historical wrongs.

Recent history has provided several examples of official apologies or regrets acknowledging wrongs committed in the past. Among these, the Canadian government has, and deserves great praise for doing so, made an official apology to the Italian Canadian and Japanese Canadian communities. Great Britain has done the same to the Maori people, and the U.S. government to Americans of Japanese origin. Thus this honourable gesture would not be establishing a precedent in Canadian history, and still less in world history. Support for Motion No. 241 is a contribution to the development of our historical conscience.

This request to the Canada's parliament fits in with other legislative measures of a similar nature that have recently been passed elsewhere on this continent. The states of Maine and Louisiana did not hesitate to pass resolutions on this, and Democrat Senator John Breaux is reportedly preparing to bring this up in the U. S. congress. How then can the Canadian Parliament, a democratic body where Acadia is represented, refuse to recognize a historic fact and its consequences?

As Rosella Melanson wrote in the *New Brunswick Telegraph Journal* of June 19:

• (1550)

[English]

Those who would refuse an apology cannot help but be seen as apologists for the deportation decision, and for the likes of Charles Lawrence, who—shortly before he was appointed governor of Nova Scotia, wrote to London about the Acadians: “As they possess the best and largest tracts of land in this province, it cannot be settled

Private Members' Business

with any effect while they remain in this situation...It would be much better...that they were away”...

[Translation]

Acadian society will want to go ahead with this motion and it will certainly have a bigger impact than expected.

In closing, I would like to quote the member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes who wrote:

In fact, only the Acadian people could come away more scarred if the motion is rejected, a situation that certain people would certainly consider a new snub and that would only serve to keep feelings of disillusion, distrust and bitterness alive.

At this point, I am pleased to table an amendment, supported by my colleague from Acadie—Bathurst. I move:

That the text of Motion No. 24 be amended by deleting the words “to present an official apology to the Acadian people for the wrongs done to them” and substituting therefor the words “to recognize officially the wrongs done to the Acadian people”.

The motion would therefore read:

That a humble Address be presented to Her Excellency praying that she will intercede with Her Majesty to cause the British Crown to recognize officially the wrongs done to the Acadian people in its name between 1755 and 1763.

This House has no more rational argument against Motion No. 241.

The Deputy Speaker: This motion being in order, debate will continue on the amendment.

[English]

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am actually quite pleased with the way today has worked out. I have the opportunity to speak to the motion from my hon. colleague for the Bloc. As someone who has had the opportunity to have three private members' motions before the House and to actually have a couple that were votable, I am pleased to have the chance to speak to the motion and recognize that private members bring specific issues, motions and bills to the House that never come from the government unless it is real push to do so. Government members bring them in as well because they know that is the only way some issues will ever be addressed.

When I was growing up and attending school, and I did finish high school, I was an excellent history student because I loved learning about Canada and Britain. I have to tell members that most of the history I learned about was Britain and a little bit about the U. S. Our books contained very little Canadian history. We learned mostly about colonial governments.

Although some Canadian history came into play, I found that as an adult with children in school that the Canadian history I had been taught was not accurate. My children were receiving the accurate history on events such as the Northwest Rebellion and Louis Riel. I had never been taught that Louis Riel was an elected legislative representative that the Government of Canada just did not like.

Private Members' Business

Having talked to my colleague for Acadie—Bathurst, I now know that the Acadians had their land taken away from them in much the same way as the land was taken away from the people in the Red River Valley and in areas of Saskatchewan. The government wanted the properties because it wanted the best lands. I do not think there is any question that there was a degree of racial motivation. It was a different culture, the languages were different and the English-French thing was going on even then. However the bottom line was that the government wanted the land and whatever it wanted it took. It felt it could treat that group of citizens badly because it could do anything it wanted to do.

However we cannot change history no matter how much my hon. colleague from across the way would like to. The hon. member who brought forth the motion wants the government to recognize that Louis Riel was mistreated and unfairly tried and convicted of treason, and he wants Louis Riel exonerated.

I know we cannot change history but we can recognize that wrongs were done and officially recognize them as such so that the people who were affected have the opportunity to heal. When one family or a group of people are treated badly and severely hurt, as were the Acadians, it is passed down from generation to generation. Many Acadians died and many never saw their families again. We might not hear about it every day, every month or every week but it is passed down from generation to generation. It is never allowed any healing or forgiveness.

When the Government of Canada refuses to officially recognize that the Acadian people were wronged what does that say about us? My colleague from across the way knows that it is important that Louis Riel be exonerated. He knows that.

•(1555)

How can he not see that it is extremely important that the Acadian people be officially recognized as having been wronged? Can there be any doubt in anyone's mind?

We do not all in our lives have time to read everything, see everything on the Internet or study every subject. We try to learn as much as we can but always in our lives we can continue learning. In a matter of minutes today numerous bits of information were pulled off the Internet for additional background on the subject. I urge Canadians to make a point of going online and finding information on le grand dérangement, the Acadian expulsion and deportation.

It was recorded in one of the newspapers of the time that:

We are now upon a great and noble scheme of sending the neutral French out of the Province who have always been secret enemies and have encouraged our savages to cut our throats. If we effect their expulsion it will be one of the greatest things that ever did the English in America.

The article went on to say “for by all accounts that part of the country they possess is as good a land as any in the world. We could get some for good English farmers”.

Is there no shame on the other side of the House that a whole group of citizens of Canada were treated badly? Do those members have no shame at all? What they should do is officially recognize that they were wrong.

I will touch on comments that have been made in the last week or so by ministers from the government. People have seen the comments as indicating that maybe the church was responsible or did not do much and should have done more. They suggest that if families really wanted to maintain their Acadian culture they should have been responsible for doing so.

I represent a riding with 32 first nations and have been to all those communities. No one knows more than I do, except for the people themselves, the suffering aboriginal people have gone through because of their treatment by the Government of Canada.

I refer specifically to the Dene people. The government decided, my gosh, not in 1745 but in 1955, to move a whole group of people and leave them to live off a garbage dump in Churchill, Manitoba. Is there any shame from the government about it? There is not a chance. Those people are struggling today to find their way.

The government has a history of doing things wrong. We cannot change history but we can acknowledge the mistakes and apologize for them. We must recognize officially that the way the Acadian people were treated was wrong. It was wrong to treat the Dene people like that. It was wrong to treat aboriginal people the way they have been treated over the years.

This is private member's business. It is not government legislation that would put the government under should it happen to pass. I encourage members in the House to take a stand and say that this needs to be acknowledged. It is absolutely unacceptable that the government would put pressure on members in the House to vote against this simply because the government has something against Quebec and the Bloc. This is not a Bloc issue. It is an issue of justice for a group of citizens within Canada. It is totally unacceptable to make it an issue between the Bloc and the Liberals. I hope members in the House do not fall into that trap.

•(1600)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I represent the riding of Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, and those two words are fraught with significance in the history of Acadia.

Beauséjour is the name of the fort where many Acadians were detained during the expulsion. Also in my riding is the village of Memramcook, where my father was born and where, last century, began what was called the Acadian Renaissance, when Acadians started going to Saint-Joseph College and building the modern Acadia I am proud to be part of.

I am proud to be an Acadian, proud of the courage shown by my ancestors, but most of all proud to be part of this new Acadia which, instead of brooding about the past, puts its faith in the future, a future made of sharing, dynamism and openness to the world.

Motion No. 241 would force us to change this attitude. It would bring us back to the 18th century and back on the warpath. The colonial wars issue would be raised again and old wounds would be re-opened.

We would ask the Queen to apologize for an action which she certainly did not sanction herself. Besides, we now know that the expulsion was mainly organized in North America.

In that sense, should we also ask for an apology from the American government, since the troops and the ships came from Boston and were chartered by William Shirley, then governor of Massachusetts?

Should we ask the government of Nova Scotia to apologize since Justice Belcher from that province was the one who signed the document approving the expulsion?

Should we ask the French government to apologize for not having provided the guns the Acadians asked the marquis de Vaudreuil for in 1758, when he was governor of New France in Quebec City?

It would be a nonsense to deny the fact that the expulsion was the most tragic event in Acadian history. But we overcame it. We all know that it is not possible to rewrite history. However, we can draw great lessons from it. The lesson we can draw today is one of generosity, sharing and cohabitation with our former enemies, who have become our compatriots.

Vengeance only breeds vengeance.

● (1605)

[English]

Acadians harbour no bitterness about our past, rather a serene determination to take our place in the ranks of Canadians who want to build an open, generous and bilingual country. Canada has given us that chance.

No one believed more in the rights of francophone minorities in Canada than the late Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Few people did more on the national stage to advance the interests of Acadians than did Mr. Trudeau. The late Prime Minister was right when he said in the House on June 29, 1984:

I do not think it is the purpose of a government to right the past. It cannot re-write history. It is our purpose to be just in our time...

[Translation]

I am proud of our artists such as Herménégilde Chiasson, who won the Governor General's Award two years ago. I am proud of our thinkers, our professionals, entrepreneurs, teachers, athletes, and workers who affirm their commitment to this future on a daily basis and who let Canada and the world know that we survived 1755 and that we do not want to return to the past.

The Government of Canada provides extraordinary support to the Acadian community. We know that there is no other solution than building a dynamic francophone community outside of Quebec that is proud of its origins. That is exactly what we are doing in Acadia today.

I agree with the member for Laval Centre that the debate on this must not be a partisan one. There are people who support this motion because of their personal convictions and I respect them, but I do not share their conclusions. Instead, I agree with my Acadian colleagues and the Conservative premier of New Brunswick who think we must look to the future instead of trying to revisit the past.

In 1955, during the 200th anniversary of the deportation, all the Acadian leaders and the Société nationale l'Assomption—now known as the Société nationale de l'Acadie—focused on the future in commemorating this tragic event from their past.

Private Members' Business

In an important speech on this very issue, Claude Bourque, a well-known reporter and writer concluded that, in 1955, the SNA ensured healing for all Acadians by forgiving those who organized the deportation.

At the time, the chief organizer of the festivities, Archbishop Adélarde Savoie, who would later become the rector of the Université de Moncton, said, and I quote:

Evoking this period should elicit the profound joy of resurrection rather than the overwhelming sorrow of annihilation. Acadians should feel no resentment or bitterness at such a time. This is the generous offer of Christian forgiveness and the expression of a firm desire to continue our forefathers' work on this beloved Earth and carry out to their fullest the designs of Providence.

The words spoken by Adélarde Savoie in 1955 are still relevant today, in 2001.

We do not need apologies to carry out the work that needs to be done. We do not need apologies to understand that Acadians are now mature enough to decide what they want to fight for and to live with the choices they make.

We do not need apologies. What we need are people respectful enough to understand that we no longer need to constantly relive our past.

Acadia's history is 400 years old. Our fight has been long and neverending. Only those who have lived under such circumstances can understand that our dignity is not based on apologies. It is based on the voice, the courage and the determination of all those who stayed behind and who fought and are still fighting for Acadia to continue to live not in the past, but in the present and, most importantly, in a future that holds so much promise

Long live Acadia and long live Canada.

● (1610)

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate my colleague from Beauséjour—Petitcodiac for his excellent speech. I would also like to express my sympathy for the Acadians.

[English]

A grave injustice was committed to the Acadian population in this country from 1755 to 1763. Some 13,000 Acadians were removed to places as far away as Georgia and Massachusetts for reasons that were only known at the time. The motion calls for redress. It calls for an apology by the British government for those actions that took place some 250 years ago.

I stand corrected. The motion has been amended and it calls for a statement of what took place at that time. The original motion asked for an apology. I would like to deal with that issue.

We have no problem whatsoever in expressing our deepest and gravest sympathy for what took place in those dark days some 250 years ago. We disapprove of it and deplore it. We will ensure with every bone in our body that it will never happen again on our soil. As the member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac mentioned, our sympathies go out to the Acadian population for what happened.

Private Members' Business

Acadians deserve our admiration for the manner in which they conducted themselves over the last 250 years. The Acadian population, with its rich culture and language, is some of the best of what this country has to offer. Acadians represent part of the great mosaic of Canada and represent an extremely important part of our nation.

Those who are separatists in the province of Quebec would do well to learn from the lessons of Acadian strength and dignity within Canada. Acadians are integral, essential, valued and honoured members of Canadian society. They are a group that has taught us much and continues to enrich Canada and Canadians from coast to coast. I say that as somebody from British Columbia.

The best way to redress past injustices is to invest in the future. It serves no purpose to look back hundreds of years in an effort to redress those injustices. However, it does justice to those who had atrocities committed against them. Today's society should learn from those injustices and act to ensure that they never ever happen again.

With our limited resources a wise and productive investment would be to use those resources to fight prejudice and discrimination and to ensure that past wrongs are neither repeated today nor in the future.

As was mentioned by the NDP member, I also want to bring to the attention of the House the plight of aboriginal people. Aboriginal people suffer grave injustices today within our communities. Rather than trying to redress past injustices, would it not be wiser to use the limited resources we have to upgrade, uplift and aid aboriginal people who occupy the lowest socioeconomic rungs in our society today? That would be a good use of our effort and our moneys, and a good way to build bridges between individuals.

We cannot live in the past. Some would seek to do that. Some groups find it attractive to dwell on past injustices as a way to build bridges within a group of individuals to hold them together. Is dwelling on past injustices not a shallow way of building bridges between people and holding a group together? Is it not nobler and more productive to look into the future and ask how we can build a better, safer future for all?

How can we build bridges of tolerance and understanding? How can we ensure that our culture and language thrive? I submit to the people who would seek to separate from Canada that the greatest strength the francophone population has today is to stay within Canada. The greatest protection for the French language and the francophone culture today is to stay within Canada.

• (1615)

To separate from our nation is probably the greatest threat to the French language and North American French culture today. Those who choose to split parts of Canada, particularly Quebec, away from the country would do well to heed that lesson.

My other point is about history. There is no consistency in the manner in which history is taught in our country today. It is often factually flawed. It is not taught enough in our schools. Jack Granatstein who was the curator of the Canadian War Museum has spoken eloquently time and time again of the importance of history in Canada and the flawed manner in which it is being taught across the nation.

We would do well to work with provincial ministers of education to develop a core curriculum of history that is consistent, based on facts and taught from coast to coast. How can we move forward or live today without knowing where we came from? We do a grave injustice to the students of our country and indeed all Canadians if we do not give them a firm grounding in our history.

Every year we say never again as we quite appropriately commemorate the genocide and injustices that took place during the Holocaust in Europe against Jews and other minorities. Yet we have not learned our lesson. As we speak, the same atrocities that took place in Europe during the Holocaust and against the Acadian population from 1755 to 1762 are taking place today.

Genocide is taking place. People are being taken off their lands and murdered, be it in Zimbabwe, Liberia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Burundi or Rwanda. This is happening time and time again as we speak. We wring our hands impotently and ask ourselves why we do not do something when blood is being shed. We have learned nothing from history.

There is one central point I will make in this speech. We must look at history. We must learn the lessons of history and we must act. Merely apologizing for what took place 50 or 250 years ago is not good enough. We do an injustice to those individuals if we do not learn from their tragedies, their plights and the atrocities committed against them. We must learn lessons, build solutions and act if we are to ensure such atrocities, brutality, human rights abuses and mass deportations do not occur again.

It is happening as we speak. We cannot allow it to continue to happen. I ask the government to work with the international community to redress past injustices. I ask the government to look into the future and build solutions in a multilateral way to prevent such injustices from occurring now and in the future.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my dear friend and colleague as well as the other members who have taken part in this debate.

[*English*]

The motion moved by my colleague from Verchères—Les-Patriotes is an important one which encapsulates a great deal of emotion for the people of Acadia.

The motion with the amendment would not infringe on the government, the British crown or the monarchy. It simply puts forward a very reasonable request to recognize the harm and the horror suffered by the Acadian people.

[*Translation*]

It is with pleasure that I rise in the House this afternoon to support the motion brought forward by my colleague from the Bloc Québécois, the member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes.

Private Members' Business

Some people may be surprised to see an anglophone from Nova Scotia speak in favour of this motion. After all, some people may have been tempted to see it as an insult to the British crown, the federal government or even English Canada.

However, in this third hour of debate on this motion, it is clear that it is simply not the case. This motion does not target the federal government and is not an insult to the crown. After all, the crown did apologize to certain people for similar acts committed in its name.

[English]

I support this motion. It is an official policy, a gesture we should give to the Acadian people for the wrongdoings done to them between 1755 and 1763. It is a statement of recognition of something that happened that is inextricably linked sadly to their history, and a proud history it is. It is simply an act that recognizes what was a horrific attempt at ethnic cleansing. A tragedy of this scale happening today would be horrifying and hard to comprehend.

I believe the mover of the motion recognizes this is not to set a precedent. This is not lending itself toward financial compensation or return of lands. Obviously this could potentially displace more people and cause further harm. However, we do recognize and feel that an apology is in order.

We feel that it is time to recognize this date that lives in infamy, of 1755 when the expulsion of the Acadians, le grand dérangement, occurred. Simply, it is time. It is time that we recognized this event which displaced somewhere between 6,000 and 10,000 individuals from their homes, separating families. Their homes, as everyone may or may not be aware, were burned. The dikes that they built that were a tribute to the backbreaking labour that was done by hand still stand today in the Bay of Fundy area near Grande Pré, Nova Scotia.

The Acadian population at its peak in 1749 was close to 12,000. Between the dates of 1749 and 1753, tensions between French and British people increased and a couple of thousand Acadians were caught in the middle. Fearing the worst, many of them left and fled to French territory, currently places such as Ile St. Jean in Prince Edward Island, Ile Royal in Cape Breton and other parts of Quebec.

The Seven Years War was about to begin and the British people did not want the possibility of French living in the territories to undermine these colonial wars. The fact is that the Acadian people did not want to support either side. They simply wanted to live their lives. They wanted to farm. They wanted to live a peaceful existence, which is exactly what they were doing. There were numerous requests made over the years but Acadians consistently and principally refused to sign an allegiance to either government. They only wanted to farm their lands.

Acadians had been in North America for such a time that they had ceased to even view themselves as French colonists. They developed their own language, their own culture. They were their own people, les Acadiens, a very proud people. They had virtually no ties to either government and would not be forced to take sides.

Yet in 1755, under British Governor Lawrence, the deportation occurred. People were rounded up. Families were separated. They were herded like cattle onto ships and taken away. Much of this is chronicled in the famous book published by Longfellow that speaks

of this horrific act. A statue still stands in Grand Pré, Nova Scotia, a statue that is in tribute to the Acadian people.

It is through these acts when they were deported; their homes as I mentioned were burned and it is thought that between 3,000 and 4,000 Acadians did not flee or did not get deported until 1755. However, many died of illness and many spent years roaming the land of North America searching for their lost loved ones. Most of the Acadians made their way out of the province. Many simply hid and were forced to again embark on this heartbreaking venture of trying to locate their families.

The deportation occurred along the eastern coast of North America. They were transported to Massachusetts, Georgia, many to Louisiana, Quebec and other parts of North America. They arrived unannounced, as Governor Lawrence did not inform the other colonies of their arrival. They faced many prejudices upon their arrival in their new places of existence. The English colonies did not want them. They felt they were too expensive to deal with. Thus Acadians were often at sea for long periods of time and endured immense suffering and hardship.

Some managed to evade the English and some made their way back to the French territories in Ile Royal and Ile St. Jean. Many came back to Nova Scotia. There are communities in Tracadie, Pomquet, Havre Boucher. There are certainly communities on the south shore of Nova Scotia where many Acadians still live today.

•(1625)

The hardship of Acadians, their sorrow, their struggle to return home, as I said, is chronicled in Longfellow's epic poem *Evangeline*.

The Acadians who were fortunate enough to complete the trek back to Nova Scotia could not return directly to the lands that they had once possessed. They were now being possessed by anglophones.

Even after years of war and even after the conflicts between the British and French had finally come to an end, the Acadians were abandoned. They were left to fend for themselves.

The lands that they were dispossessed of were occupied. Even though they were not rich lands, they were lands that their forefathers had worked. They were lands to which they felt emotionally attached. Their forefathers had shed their blood, sweat and tears on these lands, building these remarkable dikes that still exist to this day and stand as a tribute to their hard work and efforts. The land grants that were given to Acadians were generally located at the extremities of the province.

It is time that we deal with this historical event that occurred and address it. The particular motion, brought forward in very good faith and in a very comprehensive way gives us an opportunity to do that. It is a motion on which we will permit our members to vote freely. It is a motion of conscience. Certainly it is one that I would encourage all members, particularly the proud members of the House who share Acadian ancestry and many who have spoken to the bill, to support. It is a good motion.

Private Members' Business

[Translation]

Again, I congratulate my friend for his original motion. It is extraordinary. It is exceptional.

• (1630)

Mr. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like you to seek unanimous consent to allow two more members to speak to this motion, namely the member for Repentigny and myself.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the member for Ottawa—Vanier have the unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been further consultations among the political parties in trying to extend the time available to produce the report stage amendments. I move:

That notwithstanding any standing order, the time limit to give notice of report stage amendments be extended until Saturday 6 p.m.

This will add an extra four hours to what we had before.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the minister have the consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[Translation]

THE ACADIANS

The House resumed consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House during the last hour of debate on Motion No. 241, moved by the hon. member for Verchères—Les Patriotes and amended by the member for Laval Centre.

I also wish to acknowledge the presence on the Hill today of Équipe Francophonie 2001. This team is composed of about 70 French speaking Acadians from across Canada, who came here to meet members, ministers and senators and make them aware of their reality.

I recall that the ancestors of what would become the Acadian people were the first Europeans to settle in North America in 1604. As a matter of fact, Acadia will celebrate the 400th anniversary of its foundation in 2004.

Even though the hon. member does not wish to live in the past, I am convinced that he will be present in 2004, during the celebrations of the 400th anniversary of the foundation of Acadia and that he will be proud to take part in the festivities honouring the forefathers of the Acadian people. However, he will not be living in the past.

In the middle of the 18th century, Acadians were treated horribly by England who imposed one of the worst treatments that can be applied to a vanquished people, expulsion. The systematic deportation of French and Catholic subjects between 1755 and 1763 was organized and realized by the British authorities, in a savage and brutal way. Those are the facts.

Families were dispersed and many never could come back to their ancestral lands. The results of this expulsion can still be felt today and this event influences the way Acadians see themselves today.

Motion No. 241 does not ask us to rewrite history, as someone said earlier, but to simply acknowledge the harm done and the terrible consequences of those tragic events on the development of the Acadian society.

On June 7 last, Mr. Hector J. Cormier, author and editorial writer of the *Moniteur Acadien*, wrote the following about Motion No. 241:

There are some among us who will speak against this initiative.

We saw that earlier.

The main argument: avoid living in the past.

We also heard that earlier. He goes on:

It is smoke and mirrors. Acadians are undoubtedly living in the present. This does not mean that they do not recall the past. This argument was also used by the senior public servants who prevented us from learning our history. It was not only important that we ignore the past, but we also had to act as if nothing had happened.

Members of the House of Commons who have a chance to speak to motion No. 241 and who forget about party affiliation have been able to demonstrate on a number of occasions that they can speak with one voice when it is necessary. And it would not be the first time.

On several occasions, whether the motion was tabled by the Tories, the Alliance or the Liberals, we have obtained unanimous consent from the House, even if they are now trying to convince us that they cannot support the motion because it was tabled by a member from the Bloc Québécois and those are bad separatists. It is a dishonest way of refusing to support this motion.

A vast majority of Acadians are in favour of motion No. 241. Approximately 92% of them have said to be in favour of this motion before an advisory committee established by the Société nationale des Acadiens.

We know that all members of the House of Commons can unite on this issue, since they have done it in the past on other matters. Parliamentarians now have to make a choice: they either respect the wish clearly expressed by the various organizations representing the Acadian people and the overwhelming majority of those who participated in the proceedings of the advisory committee established by the Société nationale des Acadiens; or they refuse to recognize the prejudices endured by Acadians because of the 1775 events, and they accept the consequences of taking such a stand.

Private Members' Business

•(1635)

Nothing can change the minds of the hon. members who wish to oppose this totally legitimate motion.

All possible arguments used so far against it have been dismissed, not only by the MPs of the Bloc Québécois and other parties, but also by the respective Acadian communities of the members who wanted to divert this debate.

We have, for example, been accused of “paternalizing the debate”. I believe that today they are the ones doing this, offering as a little “goody”, pardon the expression, a little enticement to the Acadian communities, the acknowledgment of a holiday they already acknowledge. Then they accuse us of paternalism.

As for the matter of petty politics, my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes, has offered on a number of occasions to transfer his motion—and it is worthwhile for the Acadians to know this—to a Liberal MP, an Acadian MP, or to a member of another political party, such as the New Democratic Party. Each time, this was turned down.

It has been proposed that the motion be amended—provided it was not watered down too far—in accordance with the wishes of the Liberal Party. Each time, this was turned down.

We are accused of petty politicking on this motion. It is worth pointing out that several attempts were made to transfer this motion, or to make it acceptable to all hon. members. Each time, this was turned down.

As for the lack of consultation, my colleague has acknowledged that. There was perhaps a problem with consultation initially. Afterward, though, since 140 groups or individuals were consulted on the motion, and 92% of them supported it, it can be seen that there was consultation.

I would ask the Liberals whether they did any consultation to find out how many groups were in agreement with their position against the motion. The only argument that can continue to hold for the Liberals is a very weak one: the fact that it was presented by some “wicked sovereignists”, “separatists” as they call us. The Acadians will know how to pay them back for this in due course.

All of this has been debated and resolved. Now we must choose: either we accept to recognize the wrong or we refuse. We accept to right the wrong to Acadians, or the members who are supposed to represent their constituents in the House will have to shirk their responsibility of representing them in the House and say to them: “No, despite the fact that you have asked me to support motion No. 241, out of respect for my government, because I want to become a minister some day, or because I do not want to lose my minister's portfolio, I will have to vote against motion M-241”. That is how constituents will see it.

I am not trying to be mean, but some other people might say “Father knows best”. But that is not very nice, and I am nice, so I would never say this to another member.

I would like to read from an article written by the president of the Société des Acadiens et des Acadiennes du Nouveau-Brunswick,

published in *L'Acadie nouvelle* on October 29. The article states the following:

Acadians will not soon forget the steps that have been taken to garner the support of the Canadian government and the Acadian members in their efforts to obtain the apology they deserve from the British Crown following the deportation of 1755. Is it asking too much—

This message is aimed at the Liberal members who are Acadian. It goes on to state:

for you to reconsider the terms and the value of motion No. 241? This is a rendezvous with history that you must not miss. Voting against this motion because it was proposed by an opposition party is a red herring and may well be a strategic error that could backfire against the government.

This is what Jean-Guy Rioux, the president of the Société des Acadiens et des Acadiennes du Nouveau-Brunswick wrote.

We hope that in the end there will be an effort made by our Liberal Acadian colleagues and by all of the Liberal members to demonstrate goodwill by supporting this motion of such historical importance for the Acadian people.

•(1640)

[*English*]

Mr. Gerald Keddy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask for unanimous consent to add my name to the list of speakers since this is the last opportunity to speak on the bill.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give its consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I closely followed the three hours of debate on Motion No. 241. I must say from the outset that I agree with the comments of the hon. member for Churchill and the hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska, to the effect that it is not because a motion comes from the Bloc Québécois that we should oppose it.

I agree with their comments on this issue. I hope that members opposite will accept the fact whether I vote for or against the motion on Tuesday it will not be because it is presented by a Bloc Québécois member, but we will see at that time.

I would like to talk about the process relating to that motion because it is important to understand the context in which we will find ourselves on Tuesday.

The hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes tabled this motion after his name was drawn. The first hour of debate took place in the spring. At that time, we all recognized, including the hon. member, that consultations had not taken place, that the hon. member presented his motion without having really sought the support of the Acadian community.

I must congratulate the hon. member for the work he did during the summer. He visited Acadian communities, showed them his motion, invited them to discuss it and came back with some support. But let us not exaggerate. The hon. member for Repentigny talked about 92% but it is 92% of 140 respondents. We must keep things in perspective.

Private Members' Business

If the government were opposed to that motion, it failed in its duty by not going there during the summer and doing the same kind of work that the member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes did. The government did not do that. We must recognize that the member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes did go and get some support.

I also followed the second hour of debate on that motion. Some interesting arguments were put forward.

Finally, I also followed today's debate. I must say that I fully support the comments made by the hon. member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, who essentially said that the time for apologizing was over.

It is something personal and I have discussed the matter with Acadians over the last few weeks. However, I would much rather have liked to see a respect for what is happening now in Acadia, this keenness, this desire to go forward. Instead of asking for apologies or anything else, according to the proposed amendment, the Government of Canada, in cooperation with the Société nationale des Acadiens and its members, could invite the Queen to come celebrate the vitality of the Acadian community, maybe during the third Congrès mondial acadien that will be held in Grand Pré in 2004.

It would have been much better, much more subtle and much more elegant to proceed this way. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

The member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes will be concluding this debate. I suggest he give it some thought. Before we vote on the motion on Tuesday, there could perhaps be a way of getting the unanimous consent of the House to change the meaning of the motion, to make it more positive and more forward looking, which is what the Acadian community is telling us without any reservation. I think everybody agrees on that.

We will see what happens then. I hope the hon. member will have time to consider this option. I would readily support such a motion. However, I must point out that, even if the motion were to be amended, I am not sure it would pass when we have the recorded division next Tuesday. We will see how things turn out. I will wait for the closing comments of the member before deciding how I am going to vote on this issue.

Even if the motion, as amended, is not passed by the House, that will not mean that some kind of initiative would not be welcome. What I respect the most about the Acadian people, whether they are from New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia, is their vitality and their desire to move on.

I would like to suggest a couple of initiatives and I do hope that someone either from the government or the Department of Canadian Heritage is listening and will implement them.

First, I would like Acadian music performers to embark on a national and maybe even an international tour in 2004. They could include some of the artists we already know, like Angèle Arseneault, Edith Butler and Marie-Jo Thériault, and groups like "1755", Barachois and one of the new ones, Zéro Degré Celsius. There could also be a Canada-wide tour. Since 2004 will mark the 400th anniversary of the francophonie in Canada, it would be nice if the

Franco-Ontarian Festival here in Ottawa would have Acadia as a theme.

● (1645)

The same thing could be done in Manitoba, the Yukon and Vancouver in British Columbia, to promote the richness of this culture and artistic community, which manifests itself in several interesting and appealing ways. This is my first proposal.

My second proposal was made by a member of the other place. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if I can identify her. I will do it and you can reprimand me. Senator Losier-Cool recommended that the Government of Canada recognize the date of August 15 as Fête nationale des Acadiens et des Acadiennes. I agree with that.

As we do on June 24, we should recognize the symbolic value of August 15 for the Acadian community. We should do it somehow, not only in Acadia but also here in Ottawa, perhaps on Parliament Hill. It would be appropriate, according to the senator's proposal, to celebrate Acadia and not only in Acadia.

Third, I had the opportunity to go to Caraquet two years ago, on August 15, having heard about what is called the "Grand Tintamarre". I was told that people gathered in the streets to make noise. The local population is approximately 4,500 to 5,000 people. At 6 p.m. on that date, a good part of the street in front of city hall is closed and a crowd of 15,000 to 20,000 people, four times the local population, raise a ruckus for an hour or so. When I was there the mayor of Caraquet, the member for Acadie—Bathurst and Premier Lord were in the crowd.

At first, I must admit it was rather odd to see 15,000 or 20,000 people making so much noise with any and every possible instrument. But after a few minutes, you get involved. It becomes a collective release, a huge celebration. I would like to see such a thing on Parliament Hill. We make a lot of noise in this Chamber but this time it would be a different noise, a lively noise, reflecting the willingness to recognize, commend and encourage this Acadian community because, after all, it is ours.

Those are ideas I wished to present. My ideas are positive ones, and I am looking towards the future. I recognize the value of the comments made by my colleague who said that the time for apologies is over. I can understand that some members are clinging to that, preferring formal apologies. Personally, it is not an opinion that I share. And to then say that it is because the motion comes from a certain place, that is a type of argument I cannot accept. I hope my colleagues will realize it.

In my opinion, the initiative, whatever it might be, should have come from the Acadian community. I believe all members can agree on that.

My colleague, the member for Verchères—Les Patriotes, said he is ready to share his motion, to transfer it to another member, but only if it remains essentially the same. Perhaps he might be willing to see this in a more positive light. I hope he will accept this notion. I present it to him in good faith. I believe the House wishes to reflect the will of the Acadian people in this. It would be an honourable thing for him to do. I ask him to think about it.

I thank my colleagues for allowing me and my colleague from Repentigny to make these few comments.

• (1650)

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In the same spirit of co-operation that went into the decision to allow additional time so that the members for Ottawa—Vanier and Repentigny could speak, I would point out that there is only one more member who wishes to speak on this topic, the member for South Shore. Once again, I seek the unanimous consent of the House to allow him to speak.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 4.50 p.m., the period set aside for debate on this motion has expired.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Private Members' Business

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the order made on Tuesday, November 20, 2001, the recorded division is deferred until Tuesday, November 27, 2001, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

Pursuant to the order made on October 31, 2001, the House stands adjourned until Monday, November 26, 2001, at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24.

(The House adjourned at 4.53 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. DON BOUDRIA

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

MR. PIERRE BRIEN

MR. RICHARD HARRIS

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

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

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

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of November 22, 2001 — 1st Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

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

Associate Members

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

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Charles Hubbard

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

(16)

Associate Members

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

CANADIAN HERITAGE**Chair:** Clifford Lincoln**Vice-Chairs:**Jim Abbott
Dennis MillsPaul Bonwick
Sarmite Bulte
Rodger Cuzner
Claude DuplainChristiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Roger GallawayJohn Harvard
Betty Hinton
Wendy LillGrant McNally
Caroline St-Hilaire
Tony Tirabassi

(16)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Bill Blaikie
Rick Borotsik
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Libby Davies
Stockwell DayNorman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Stan KeyesRobert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Serge Marcil
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
Dick Proctor
James RajotteScott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Hélène Scherrer
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich**SPORT****Chair:** Dennis Mills**Vice-Chair:**Rodger Cuzner
Cheryl GallantJohn Harvard
Loyola HearnRobert Lanctôt
Serge MarcilDick Proctor
Hélène Scherrer

(9)

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs:

Paul Forseth
Steve Mahoney

Mark Assad
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
John Godfrey

Art Hanger
Inky Mark
Anita Neville

Jerry Pickard
David Price
Stéphan Tremblay

Tony Valeri
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

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

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

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

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

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

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

(16)

Associate Members

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

FINANCE**Chair:**

Maurizio Bevilacqua

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

(18)

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

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair:

Wayne Easter

Vice-Chairs:

John Cummins

Paul Steckle

Sarkis Assadourian
 Andy Burton
 Rodger Cuzner
 Georges Farrah

Loyola Hearn
 Dominic LeBlanc
 James Lunney

Bill Matthews
 Lawrence O'Brien
 Jean-Yves Roy

Peter Stoffer
 Suzanne Tremblay
 Tom Wappel

(16)

Associate Members

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

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

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

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

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

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

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

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

(16)

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

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Judi Longfield	Vice-Chairs:	Joe Peschisolido Diane St-Jacques	
Eugène Bellemare	Monique Guay	Serge Marcil	Larry Spencer	(18)
Paul Crête	Tony Ianno	Joe McGuire	Greg Thompson	
Libby Davies	Dale Johnston	Anita Neville	Alan Tonks	
Raymonde Folco	Gurbax Malhi	Carol Skelton		

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

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

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: Susan Whelan

Vice-Chairs: Walt Lastewka
Charlie Penson

Larry Bagnell
Stéphane Bergeron
Bev Desjarlais
Claude Drouin

Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Preston Manning
Dan McTeague

James Rajotte
Andy Savoy
Brent St. Denis

Chuck Strahl
Paddy Torsney
Joseph Volpe

(16)

Associate Members

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

Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton

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

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

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:	Derek Lee	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Blaikie	Lynn Myers	Kevin Sorenson	Pierrette Venne	(10)
Marlene Jennings	David Pratt	Vic Toews	Bryon Wilfert	
Peter MacKay				

LIAISON

Chair:	Bill Graham	Vice-Chair:	Susan Whelan	
Peter Adams	Bonnie Brown	Gurmant Grewal	Judi Longfield	(18)
Mauril Bélanger	Charles Caccia	Charles Hubbard	David Pratt	
Maurizio Bevilacqua	Wayne Easter	Ovid Jackson	Andy Scott	
Raymond Bonin	Joe Fontana	Clifford Lincoln	John Williams	

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS

Chair:	Bill Graham	Vice-Chair:		
Joe Fontana	Clifford Lincoln	John Williams		(4)

BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

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

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

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

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY CALENDAR

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

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

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

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMBATING CORRUPTION

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

TRANSPORT AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

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

Associate Members

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

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

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chair:
Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
John Bryden
Jane Marie Cordy

Donald Oliver
Vivienne Poy

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

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

(21)

Associate Members

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

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

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

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

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Mauril Bélanger
Shirley Maheu

Joint Vice-Chairs: Scott Reid
Yolande Thibeault

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Joan Fraser
Jean-Robert Gauthier
Laurier LaPierre

Viola Léger
Jean-Claude Rivest
Raymond Setlakwe

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

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

(24)

Associate Members

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

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

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

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

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Gurmant Grewal
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair: Tom Wappel

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

John Bryden
Sheila Finestone
Noël Kinsella

Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin

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

Gar Knutson
Derek Lee
Paul Harold Macklin
Lynn Myers
Lorne Nystrom
Jim Pankiw
Ted White

(23)

Associate Members

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

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

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

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

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panels of Chairman of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

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

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

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

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 22, 2001

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Regan	7411
Public Safety Act	
Mr. Collette	7411
Bill C-42. Introduction and first reading	7411
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	7411
An act to amend certain acts and instruments and to repeal the Fisheries Prices Support Act	
Mr. Boudria	7411
Bill C-43. Introduction and first reading	7411
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	7411
Public Safety	
Mr. Collette	7411
Mr. Moore	7412
Mr. Laframboise	7413
Mrs. Desjarlais	7414
Ms. Meredith	7415
Committees of the House	
Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources	
Mr. Bonin	7416
Justice and Human Rights	
Mr. Scott	7416
Criminal Code	
Mr. Robinson	7416
Bill C-415. Introduction and first reading	7416
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	7416
Points of Order	
Bill C-33	
Mr. MacKay	7416
Petitions	
Child Pornography	
Mr. Szabo	7417
Kidney Disease	
Mr. Adams	7417
Energy Prices	
Mr. Robinson	7417
Falun Gong	
Mr. Robinson	7417
Trade	
Mr. Robinson	7417
The Acadians	
Mr. Bergeron	7418
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Regan	7418

Starred Questions

Mr. Regan	7418
-----------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act	
Bill C-35. Third reading	7418
Mr. Casey	7418
Mr. Bryden	7420
Ms. Carroll	7421
Mr. MacKay	7421
Mr. Robinson	7422
Mr. Bryden	7424
Ms. Carroll	7424
Mr. Casey	7425
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7425
Ms. Marleau	7425
Mrs. Hinton	7427
Mr. Casey	7428
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7429
Mr. Bryden	7431
Ms. Carroll	7432
Mr. Dubé	7432
Mr. Bryden	7434
Mr. Paquette	7434
Mr. Pankiw	7435
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	7437
Mr. Casey	7438
Mr. Desrochers	7438
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	7439
Mr. Casey	7439
Mr. Kilger	7440
Division on Motion deferred	7440

Suspension of Sitting

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 1.49 p.m.) ..	7440
--	------

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Housing	
Mr. Harb	7440
Ukraine	
Mr. Epp	7440
Ukraine	
Mr. Lastewka	7440
Peace	
Mrs. Redman	7441
Afghanistan	
Ms. Augustine	7441
Western Canada	
Mrs. Skelton	7441

Violence	
Ms. Torsney	7441
Chambre de commerce et d'industrie de Drummond	
Mrs. Picard	7441
SaarGummi Company	
Mr. Paradis	7442
National War Memorial	
Mr. Bailey	7442
Yukon	
Mr. Bagnell	7442
The Media	
Ms. Lill	7442
Heritage Minutes	
Mr. Bergeron	7442
The Canadian Francophonie	
Mr. LeBlanc	7443
Bill C-42	
Ms. Meredith	7443

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Airline Security	
Mr. Day	7443
Mr. Collenette	7443
Mr. Day	7443
Mr. Collenette	7443
Mr. Day	7444
Mr. Collenette	7444
Mr. Moore	7444
Mr. Collenette	7444
Mr. Moore	7444
Mr. Collenette	7444
Mr. Duceppe	7444
Mr. Collenette	7444
Mr. Duceppe	7444
Mr. Collenette	7445
Mr. Gauthier	7445
Mr. Collenette	7445
Mr. Gauthier	7445
Mr. Collenette	7445
Afghanistan	
Mr. Godin	7445
Ms. Minna	7445
Minister of Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Godin	7445
Ms. Copps	7445
Anti-terrorism Legislation	
Mr. Clark	7445
Mr. Owen	7446
Mr. Clark	7446
Mr. MacAulay	7446
Airline Security	
Mr. Jaffer	7446
Mr. Collenette	7446

Mr. Jaffer	7446
Mr. Collenette	7446
Mr. Laframboise	7446
Mr. Collenette	7446
Mr. Laframboise	7446
Mr. Collenette	7446
Justice	
Mr. Sorenson	7446
Mr. MacAulay	7447
Mr. Sorenson	7447
Mr. MacAulay	7447
Terrorism	
Ms. Lalonde	7447
Mr. Eggleton	7447
Ms. Lalonde	7447
Mr. Eggleton	7447
Mr. Benoit	7447
Mr. Eggleton	7447
Mr. Benoit	7447
Mr. Eggleton	7448
Afghanistan	
Mrs. Parrish	7448
Mr. Pagtakhan	7448
Housing	
Ms. Davies	7448
Mr. Gagliano	7448
Revenue Canada	
Ms. Lill	7448
Ms. Leung	7448
Justice	
Mr. MacKay	7448
Mr. Owen	7448
Mr. MacKay	7448
Mr. Owen	7449
National Defence	
Mrs. Gallant	7449
Mr. Eggleton	7449
Mrs. Gallant	7449
Mr. Eggleton	7449
Afghanistan	
Ms. Bourgeois	7449
Ms. Carroll	7449
Ms. Bourgeois	7449
Ms. Minna	7449
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7449
Ms. Carroll	7449
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7449
Ms. Carroll	7450
National Defence	
Mr. Price	7450
Mr. Eggleton	7450

Agriculture	
Mr. Hilstrom	7450
Mr. Vanclief	7450
Mr. Hilstrom	7450
Mr. Rock	7450
Terrorism	
Ms. Guay	7450
Mr. Eggleton	7450
Fisheries	
Mr. Murphy	7451
Mr. Dhaliwal	7451
Anti-Terrorism Legislation	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	7451
Mr. MacAulay	7451
Housing	
Ms. Davies	7451
Mr. Gagliano	7451
Trois-Pistoles Wharf	
Mr. Crête	7451
Mr. Gagliano	7451
Agriculture	
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)	7451
Mr. Goodale	7451
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	7451
Points of Order	
American Thanksgiving	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	7452
Business of the House	
Mrs. Gallant	7452
Mr. Boudria	7452
Points of Order	
Bill C-36	
Mr. MacKay	7452

Mr. Boudria	7452
Mr. Clark	7453
Mrs. Desjarlais	7453
Supplementary Estimates—Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	7453
Privilege	
Bill C-42	
Mr. Moore	7456
Mr. Boudria	7457
Business of the House	
Mr. Boudria	7458
Motion	7458
(Motion agreed to)	7458

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

The Acadians	
Motion	7458
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	7458
Amendment	7459
Mrs. Desjarlais	7459
Mr. LeBlanc	7460
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7461
Mr. MacKay	7462
Business of the House	
Mr. Boudria	7464
Motion	7464
(Motion agreed to)	7464
The Acadians	
Motion	7464
Mr. Sauvageau	7464
Mr. Bélanger	7465
APPENDIX	

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :

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

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Communication Canada - Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

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

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

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