



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 148 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, February 25, 2002

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, February 25, 2002

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1100)

[*Translation*]

COMPETITION ACT

The House resumed from October 24 consideration of the motion that Bill C-248, an act to amend the Competition Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Serge Marcil (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-248, an act to amend the Competition Act.

I want to thank my colleague, the hon. member for Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, for his constant efforts on behalf of all Canadians to ensure that the objectives laid out in the purpose section of the Competition Act are fully achieved. In particular, he dealt with the role of the act in preserving and enhancing competition in order to ensure that small and medium size businesses get a fair opportunity to take part in the Canadian economy and to ensure that consumers get competitive prices and a choice in products.

The bill before us today addresses directly those objectives and the way gains in efficiency are dealt with in the review of merger transactions.

We have found that there is considerable support in the House for the principles of this bill, the purpose of which is to clarify the clause in the Competition Act concerning the argument of gains in efficiency. The bill stipulates that consumers should benefit from a merger which results in gains in efficiency but that these gains should not be used to justify a merger which will result in the creation or strengthening of a dominant market position.

This bill was triggered by the acquisition of ICG Propane by Superior Propane. The Competition Bureau challenged the merger because it would have created a monopoly in several local markets, particularly in rural and northern communities. The competition tribunal recognized that this would markedly reduce competition, and at the same time that the anti-competitive impact of the merger was offset by the gains in efficiency cited by Superior Propane, such as savings in delivery costs and the operation of client information centres.

It has been pointed out by several members just how contradictory it seems for an act of parliament aimed at encouraging competition for the benefit of consumers to be used to enable Superior Propane to establish a monopoly or semi-monopoly in several markets on the grounds of gains in efficiency.

We ought perhaps to examine more closely the underlying intention of Bill C-248. The bill would not allow gains in efficiency to be used to justify a merger or proposed merger which, and I quote:

—will result or is likely to result in the creation or strengthening of a dominant market position.

This is an attempt to disallow scenarios where a merger would result in a monopoly.

We must be cautious when making reference to businesses with a dominant market position. Dominance pertains to the situation of a competitor within a market, and not its behaviour. It is too tempting to make a connection between dominant and large, and between large and bad. Abuse is the exception, not the rule.

The Competition Bureau examines proposed mergers and attempts to predict future effects based on specific factors. It examines market share, concentration, existing competition, and accessibility of the markets in question to new competitors.

Dominance is not, in itself, a problem under the act. Let us not forget that anti-competitive behaviour is addressed separately under civil provisions. The Bureau does not oppose mergers merely on the conjecture that the merged entity might engage in anti-competitive behaviour. However, anti-competitive behaviour will most definitely be contested under civil provisions.

Our economy is not always able to sustain a great number of competitors. Such is our reality. This compels us to ask whether it is more important to have more competitors or more competition. There is a difference between the two.

Regardless of their size, competitors are always welcome to our markets, on the condition that they act fairly and respect the rules. A merger must not be prohibited on the grounds that it will create a bigger competitor. Size and success is a characteristic of a competitor; it does not mean that it is guilty of anything in terms of competitive behaviour.

Private Members' Business

•(1110)

The purpose of Canada's competition policy is to protect competition, rather than protecting individual competitors, in order to ensure for Canadians the many benefits that come from fair and healthy competition. Among these benefits are greater choice, lower prices, better service and increased innovation.

By now, those who are listening have probably concluded that this is a very complex subject. Efficiencies play an important role in assessing mergers. Our colleagues on the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology spent a great deal of time and effort in understanding how efficiencies are treated and assessed.

The issue now is one of timing. The Competition Tribunal finished its hearings in October 2001, and is now in the process of reviewing its decision based on the instructions given by the Federal Court of Appeal. The tribunal's upcoming ruling will outline clarifications on how to deal with gains in efficiency. However, it will be important to continue to examine the issue. Regardless of the tribunal's findings, I believe that we have heard convincing arguments for a full and careful analysis of this very complex question. The results may prove that the Competition Act requires clarification.

I would like to thank the hon. member for Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge for his tireless support in helping improve our Competition Act. He has once again highlighted the important and difficult issues involved in competition policy.

I would invite my fellow members to vote to have Bill C-248 referred to the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology for a more thorough examination.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to Bill C-248, an act to amend the Competition Act with respect to the efficiency defence on merger proposals.

This private member's bill seeks to clarify the Competition Tribunal's power to make or not make an order in the case of a merger when gains in efficiency are expected or when the merger would create or strengthen a dominant market position. While I appreciate the intent of the hon. member in bringing forward this bill, I have great misgivings about reactionary legislation.

As the member for Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge has told the House, Bill C-248 was drafted in reaction to the Superior Propane case, which is the first and only time the efficiencies defence was successfully proven at the tribunal. The competition commissioner appealed to the federal court, which ordered that the tribunal hear the case again. I understand we will have a final decision from the tribunal very shortly which should clarify this situation.

However, Bill C-248 seeks to change a law before we have heard the last word or the interpretation of the federal court. I have trouble with reactionary laws or amendments tinkering with existing legislation or laws that are designed to resolve a specific situation. This is not the way to make coherent legislation that will stand the test of time. I would rather see the process at the tribunal run its course. We need to hear from the tribunal before we seek to amend.

In other words, we need more case law in situations like this to understand the implications.

I want to look for a moment at the efficiencies defence as it was prescribed in the Competition Act. Section 96 specifies that a merger may be approved by the Competition Tribunal even if it substantially lessens or is likely to prevent competition within a specific market, trade or industry as long as those advocating the merger can prove that such a move would bring about or would likely bring about gains in efficiency that would be greater than those offset by the effects of any prevention or lessening of competition.

In other words, if two companies were set to merge and the efficiencies were such where both could survive or both could fail if there were no chance to merge, what would be the ultimate outcome of the merger? It seems to me that at least there would be one merged company providing a service that maybe no other company could offer if the merger were not allowed.

Section 96 further instructs the tribunal to consider whether gains in efficiencies will result in a significant increase in the real value of exports or a significant substitution of domestic products for imported products. The Competition Act is clear that a redistribution of income between two or more persons or groups cannot be considered an efficiency defence. In other words, if a proposed merger will benefit one person or group to the equal detriment of others, that cannot be considered an efficiency.

Bill C-248 would create two new subsections for section 96, subsections (4) and (5), to further instruct the tribunal on the consideration of efficiencies in a merger case. I would argue those instructions would muddy the waters and quite possibly stand merger review on its head.

Currently, when considering gains in efficiency, the tribunal does not discriminate between groups as long as one group does not benefit at the expense of another. That would be considered merely a redistribution of income.

However, proposed subsection (4) would require that the majority of benefits derived from gains in efficiency be passed on to customers and consumers. In addition to requiring the tribunal to favour consumer interest over producer interest, the amendment would also straitjacket producers into passing on the gains of a merger to customers in the form of lower prices only. Bill C-248 does not take improved services or quality into consideration. I suggest that is a narrowminded and misguided point of view.

Private Members' Business

Subsection (5) would disallow the efficiency defence entirely should the merger result in the creation or even the strengthening of a dominant market position. This would require the tribunal to discriminate against dominant players. We have a lot of industries where there are dominant players in Canada but that does not mean that there is no competition. In a country with a domestic market as small as Canada's, this may not make economic sense in a number of sectors.

What is even more worrisome is that Bill C-248 would enshrine in legislation outright discrimination against dominant players in the Competition Act. I do not believe that the dominant players in the market automatically are abusing their dominant market positions. This is presuming guilt before innocence. There is nothing inherently wrong with a dominant player in a market. However, subsection (5) could have the effect of preventing dominant players from emerging even if that is the best situation for the market.

It never ceases to amaze me how the Liberal government feels that some monopolies are in the national interest and some are not. Canadian ownership laws and other regulations specifically designed for the airline, banking, book retail industries and, I might add, the Canadian Wheat Board and many others, have prevented competition policy from dealing adequately with issues such as market power and monopoly. However I suppose it goes along with the way in which Liberals approach industrial policy: they like to pick winners and losers.

I would suggest that it is fairly easy to be a winner when the federal government is backing one's operation. We see industrial grants to certain industries favoured over others. No wonder these businesses are winning and able to compete in the world market when the Government of Canada is their banker.

Bill C-248 was designed for a specific scenario but it has a broad spectrum of implications. It implies that the purpose of the Competition Act is not to enhance real competition but regulate competition.

Canadians deserve real competition in the market not a regulated competition of a few industries under strict rules where others have no regulation at all.

I would say that we have been studying competition law for approximately two and a half years at committee. This is a very narrow group of specialists, as many people know. Most business goes on in Canada day in and day out not subject to competition law but normal business practices. I would say that this only applies to a very small sector of our economy.

Nonetheless I do think we need competition law but we cannot go along with this Liberal government's approach of thinking that it can have competition law to browbeat or beat industries over the head in the place of good policy that fosters a good economic situation in which companies can thrive and compete not only in Canada but internationally.

We need laws in place in this country, such as low taxes and lower regulation, that will allow companies to compete without tying one hand behind their backs. We need competition law that is reasonable and a government that recognizes a healthy business environment to accomplish the goal that we all want.

●(1125)

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on Bill C-248, an act to amend the Competition Act.

The bill has a couple of very important sections that we should talk about and highlight, one being proposed subsection 96(4), which states:

—gains in efficiency cannot offset the effects of a lessening or prevention of competition unless the majority of the benefits derived or to be derived from such gains in efficiency are being or are likely to be passed on to customers within a reasonable time in the form of lower prices.

That is a very important subsection.

Also, proposed subsection 96(5) states:

This section does not apply where, after the transaction has been completed, the merger or proposed merger, will result or is likely to result in the creation or strengthening of a dominant market position.

In layman's terms, proposed subsection 96(4) stresses that mergers resulting in a monopoly or near monopoly must ultimately be of benefit to the consumer. Proposed subsection 96(5) states that we should not approve a merger that in addition to creating the position of market dominance provides economic efficiencies to only the merged companies. In other words, monopolies can only be tolerated, and rightly so, if they are in the public interest.

My colleague from Fraser Valley spoke on this bill on October 24 and pointed out that one of the incidents that provoked the drafting of the bill was a merger in the propane industry in 1998, giving Superior Propane control over 70% of the Canadian propane market. The competition commissioner opposed the merger on behalf of consumers but the competition tribunal approved the merger because of efficiencies that would amount to roughly \$29 million over a 10 year period and would accrue to the merged companies.

The purpose of Bill C-248 is to force the tribunal to give more weight to consumer protection when making these decisions. Efficiencies, as we all know, are fine, but they have to play second fiddle to the right of consumers to enjoy the benefits of a highly competitive marketplace.

Private Members' Business

In North America we have mainly a private enterprise economy. We have a North American free trade agreement among Canada, the U.S. and Mexico. Monopolies are not something favoured in such an economic climate. There are those who feel free enterprise is based exclusively on self-interest, and to some extent that may be true, however, self-interest on the part of more than one person or company also breeds competition and competition is good for the consumer by decreasing prices for goods and services.

Monopolies may involve greater internal efficiencies but in the long run a monopoly that is well established has the tendency to keep prices for goods and services very high. The self-interest is still there and when it is unfettered by competition the consumer is almost always the one who will lose in that particular case.

Let us look at a more recent case. I remember that when I came here in 1997 my constituency was served by a two airline industry made up of Air Canada and Canadian Airlines International. As we are all very much aware, there was lively competition between the two airlines. The traveller benefited a great deal by getting better service, better frequency of service and much cheaper fares.

In short, the travelling public was serviced by an airline industry that actively sought out business. It is not 1997 any more; it is now 2002 and I know my constituency in St. John's is no longer serviced by an airline industry. It is now serviced by Air Canada, which has a virtual monopoly in the Atlantic region. Gone is the lively competition that we had in the airline industry. Up went the prices, down went the frequency of service and down went service, period.

A few years ago the Liberal government was faced with a tremendous upheaval in the airline industry. The nation's second largest airline, Canadian Airlines International, was in a great deal of trouble and the questions were these. Should Canadian be allowed to go bankrupt with the hope that someone would pick up the pieces? Can we find someone or some company that would build another national airline to operate in competition with Air Canada?

In the end, of course, the powers that be decided that Air Canada would be allowed to absorb Canadian, with the attendant pain in terms of job losses and service reduction. Canada now has one national airline. Yes, WestJet may still be alive, but the other newcomers have been chased off the block.

We need at least two national airlines in order to have a real airline industry. Instead, we are served, and I have to use that term served quite loosely, by a monopoly. Herein lies a role for the Government of Canada. It has to develop economic and transportation policies that are in the public interest, policies that encourage entrepreneurship in the airline industry. It has to develop competition laws that actually foster competition in the marketplace and discourage the formation of monopolies.

Bill C-248 helps in that it turns thumbs down on the creation of a monopoly that does not pass on its efficiencies to the customer. Bill C-248 should have been in force when Air Canada was trying to take over Canadian Airlines. It might have prevented the takeover altogether. The evidence so far certainly shows that air travellers have not received better service or lower fares as a result of any efficiencies arising from the merger of these two airlines.

I support the free enterprise system. I support a competitive marketplace. I support the thrust of the hon. member's bill. I request that it be forwarded to the appropriate standing committee for study and action.

Mr. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As you know, I have spoken to Bill C-248 and I thank all hon. colleagues for doing the same. I understand that there may be an opportunity for a few more minutes. Could I seek the indulgence of the House to make a few more comments before the House decides to deliberate?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dan McTeague: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank all my colleagues for giving me a few minutes. I will be brief.

First, I wish to congratulate the new Industry Minister, who is responsible for this file, as well as his new parliamentary secretary, who made a speech a few minutes ago.

• (1135)

[*English*]

Without belabouring the point, it has been stressed here enough that there is no doubt that the prime trigger for the changes in Bill C-248 and, prior to that in the previous parliament in Bill C-509, was indeed the Superior Propane case. About that there is no argument. I think that what is important for the House to understand is that it for the first time creates a precedent in law whereby someone may use the efficiencies defence to obtain a monopoly.

I need only give the initial judgment of August 30, 2000 to relay my point. After looking at this, the tribunal realized just how dangerous this takeover of Petro-Canada's ICG by Superior Propane would be when it said:

Although the Tribunal finds that the merger is likely to prevent competition in Atlantic Canada and lessen competition substantially in many local markets for national account customers, the majority...dismiss the application...on the grounds that the respondents have been successful in demonstrating their efficiency defence—

That sets not just a precedent but a very dangerous precedent. While I understand that the Supreme Court of Canada has said let us not deal with this and the federal court ordered the tribunal to revisit this issue, the effect of which is that the competition bureau has suspended part of its merger guidelines dealing with this because we are in sort of a no person's, no man's land on the bill, it is important for us to stress that the role of members of parliament will become extremely pivotal in doing our job: creating legislation.

We do not have rule made law in this country. It is for that reason that the bill is very timely. I have heard a couple of other comments from members suggesting that we should wait until the tribunal or whoever makes its decisions. I respectfully submit that we are the ones who create laws and we are the ones who will protect the interests of consumers to the extent that does not collide with other laws like, for instance, the constitution of this country and the Canadian charter of rights. I see no reason why those important pieces of our mosaic are not challenged. I cannot see why the parliament of this country, in particular beginning with the House of Commons, would not refer this matter to the committee.

I am pleased to see that the government and other parties will be doing so. I would not characterize the comments that we have made here as being somehow selective or, as one of my colleagues from the Alliance has suggested, very narrow minded. While I appreciate his concerns, I would also remind him that the very concerns that I have brought forward can be found in the Treaty of Rome, by which the competition bureau in that country operates on a set of assumptions very similar to what has been presented in Bill C-248. It states that it is clear that there is a limit for the defence under section 85 of the Treaty of Rome:

The limit of that use of the defence efficiencies argument is the elimination of competition. Even if parties can prove that an agreement would bring about high efficiency gains, these efficiencies are not able to justify the elimination of a competitor.

This is a very pivotal sector of our economy: heating. I do not wish to trivialize the importance of Superior Propane. As many people in the country know, last year a lot of people did without and had to turn their thermostats down. They are people who are listening today and people who are on fixed incomes, individuals who live in every single riding of the country. They now know that with this proposed legislation they would at least have some semblance of hope that there will be some meaningful competition.

That is not to say that companies cannot create some kind of efficiency by simply being the only player in town. Sure they can. We are simply saying that if they do that it has to be passed it on to the customers. There has to be a very real trade-off between having a monopoly or a near monopoly or a dangerous anti-competitive monopoly and the ability for that to flow through to customers or at least to consumers.

I am heartened to hear that other members will be supporting the bill. I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the industry committee who are now beginning to really sink their teeth into the issue of competition. This will fall at a very good time since our industry committee chair is now beginning to understand the issue of efficiencies, not only from the perspective that there are 200 economists and lawyers who have an opinion but in fact from the perspective that there are people in the House of Commons who have also developed a modicum of understanding of this very complex act. They are now realizing that if Canada wants to compete with its global partners, and I am sure that the members of the Alliance will agree with this, we should not have laws that are weaker than those of our American or other trading partners. We should have laws that, while showing similarities, differences and nuances between ourselves and the rest of the world, do not leave consumers in a situation where they are always paying the highest price for their own product.

Private Members' Business

Therefore I leave this with you, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr Speaker, I am very grateful for the time you have given me. I know you are aware of the energy situation in your riding. A few years ago, a Liberal committee on gas travelled to northern Ontario to express itself, study the situation and find the problems. I wish to acknowledge the effort you made with other members of parliament to create a great momentum in terms of changes to the Competition Act.

[*English*]

I believe we all agree with that. I will say to my colleagues that I look forward to at least the opportunity to have the bill discussed before a committee of the House that has some expertise. I have faith in the committee system and I think we can do this by ensuring that the bill is sent to that committee.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

An hon. member: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology.

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

Mr. Joe Jordan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would ask that we suspend the House until 12 p.m., at which time government orders could begin.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is it agreed that at the request of the parliamentary secretary the House stand adjourned until 12 p.m.?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11.36 a.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1200)

[English]

SPECIES AT RISK ACT

The House resumed from February 21 consideration of Bill C-5, an act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 2.

Mr. Larry Spencer (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak to the species at risk bill. We on this side of the House would be in favour of protecting the species, however we find it difficult to agree with some things the government wants to do. Therefore, we must speak in opposition to some of these, even though it is a great attempt to protect some of the species.

The Canadian Alliance submitted an amendment which would require that for a person to be found guilty of a criminal offence, the person must knowingly have done harm to an endangered species. This is not the case with this bill. We are concerned that someone could be charged with a criminal act even though he or she had no criminal intent or if it were an accident.

The bill would make it a criminal act to kill, harm or harass any one of the hundreds of endangered species or to interfere with their critical habit. We have a problem with that. There are problems recognizing all the different species and knowing where they are.

The fines would be very steep, even higher than for some intentional crimes that might be committed. For instance, a corporation could be fined \$1 million. An individual could be fined \$250,000 and could be imprisoned for up to five years on an indictable offence. However someone could commit such an offence without even knowing it or without intent. The bill does not require intent or reckless behaviour. It puts the burden of proof on people to prove due diligence.

I remember being in a hayfield of my father-in-law a few years ago. This hayfield happened to be next door to a prairie preserve. It was not located in Canada, rather it was located in the United States. As I came around for a second time with the mower, there was this fog of bumblebees. Without knowing it, I had crossed through their home. They were quite irritated about it, and rightly so, and they let me know it. That could have been quite a stinging experience, but I escaped and the bees were fine.

However in that same area there are prairie chickens, which are on the endangered list in Saskatchewan. I could just as easily, without knowing the difference, have mowed through a nest or killed an animal. That could happen in Saskatchewan. We have so many species that could easily be interfered with by a farmer in his normal operations, but to recognize them and know they are there is the big thing.

We expect farmers, ranchers and loggers to recognize these species when in fact some of them are so rarely seen that we have no way of recognizing them. We have the sage grouse, the barn owl, the aurora trout, the Atlantic salmon, the prairie lupine and the American water-willow. Not only do people have to recognize them, but they have to recognize their critical habitat as well. They have to know where they live there. They have to know if they live there part time and what time of the year they might go there or if it is a part of their cycle of life. They do not want to destroy their habitat.

Then I think about right in the middle of the city. I live in the beautiful city of Regina, which is part of the riding of Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre. We have some endangered species called the peregrine falcon which live on top of some of our high buildings. It is on the list from the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.

• (1205)

I was just envisioning what would happen if I was driving down the scenic Saskatchewan drive heading back from my riding. Just suppose a peregrine falcon decided that one of those nice white rabbits jumping along the railroad tracks might make a good lunch. It swoops down in front of my vehicle, I run over it or hit it, and accidentally kill a peregrine falcon. As I understand it, I could be charged in that accident for killing the peregrine falcon.

What about a sprague's pipit or the prairie loggerhead shrike? How would I know if I killed one? What if I were driving across my riding to see some of my distant ranchers, and as I drove through the prairies and wheat fields a swift fox ran across the road, only not quite swift enough? What if I struck it and killed or injured it? I would be in the middle of committing a crime.

What about a sage grouse or the burrowing owl? What if I was out in a field mowing or riding across the pasture in my four-wheel and I came across a burrowing owl quite by accident and killed it? Perhaps I mowed a certain area and only after I finished mowing it I discovered that I killed a burrowing owl? Not only did I kill the borrowing owl but I crushed its burrow. Then where would I be? I would be guilty of more than one crime without even knowing the owl was there.

I would need to recognize the greater prairie chicken, the piping clover, the mountain clover and the sage thrasher. I could go on and on if I got the complete list of all those animals, birds, plants, fish and frogs that I would need to recognize so I could protect them or protect myself from accidentally harming them.

We support the goals of protecting endangered species, but we also believe in protecting our honest citizens ensuring they are not susceptible to becoming instant criminals honestly.

I understand there have been 80 plus amendments brought forward to this legislation to improve it. Why are so few of these amendments, which would make such good improvements in such a simple way, continually rejected by the committee or by the government as a whole?

Government Orders

For instance, companies that operate huge areas of oil fields or forestry have to demonstrate due diligence over their operations of hundreds of thousands or millions of hectares. How can they control all the factors on their land? Yet they stand to be arrested if something happens to one of the species there.

The hon. Minister of the Environment has said

It's a legitimate matter for concern. The accident, the unwitting destruction...it is a concern, and we want to give the maximum protection we can to the legitimate and honest person who makes a mistake, who unwittingly does that.

My question is this. Why do we not simply write it into the legislation instead of leaving it up to them to have to prove their innocence in some other way?

The fear and the anger that will come from the general public and the mistrust of the government, will in fact end up harming the habitat and the existence of endangered species rather than helping them. No one wants to see that happen.

I urge the government to pay close attention to the average citizen out there who also needs protection, not just the species that are endangered.

• (1210)

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to participate in the debate however briefly.

I will address in a few words the concerns that my friend across the way has expressed about intent, painting a situation that is not real. The difficulty with which I would like to challenge him is this. If we were to introduce the kind of clause that he would like in the bill, we would find ourselves unable to prosecute virtually anything that takes place. There is a discretionary aspect. I am sure if my friend runs over a burrowing owl with a mower or a peregrine falcon with his car, there will be no chance of him being charged. He can rest easy with that.

I want to ensure that the landowners of Canada, rural Canadians are not forgotten in this debate. A lot of debate that takes place is at the urgings of well meaning urban Canada. Somehow rural Canada is in danger of getting the short end, so I want to speak for the country people in this land. These are the people I have had in mind throughout the entire deliberations of the standing committee. As a committee member I voted against several of the amendments that ultimately passed because I knew they jeopardized our good relations and working partnerships with rural Canadians.

Rural Canadians are the people who are already living the story behind the proposed act. These are the people, when all is said and done, who will make the act work. Critical habitat is often on the land of rural Canadians and we must never forget that. We should not forget that the co-operative approach, especially for rural Canadians, has already yielded success. Their stewardship actions for generations are living proof of their commitment. If we want to stop the destruction and degradation of habitat, we must do it together, not with the heavy hand of the law.

The bill is about co-operation among provinces, territories, private landowners, conservationists, local authorities, aboriginal people, farmers, fishermen, ranchers and voluntary organizations. I supported the standing committee amendment to include the protection of the critical habitat of extirpated species, species that still exist but

whose natural habitat is gone, and in addition, aquatic species and migratory birds, protected by the Migratory Birds Convention Act and the critical habitat regime within federal jurisdiction.

The federal government is best placed to offer this protection as it already does this kind of work under the Fisheries Act and Migratory Birds Convention Act. Canadians expect this to be the level of government that helps them protect these species. However I had to vote against other amendments that significantly undermined how we deliver this protection. I voted against the amendment that would require any person to obtain a permit or licence to engage in an activity that may adversely affect any part of the critical habitat of listed species under federal jurisdiction as soon as habitat is identified by scientists in action plans.

The new general prohibition runs contrary to everything for which Bill C-5 stands. It removes government accountability for decisions that may have social and economic impact. It removes the opportunity for Canadians to first try to protect habitat through voluntary stewardship action. It tries to coerce Canadians into compliance and relies on enforcement to protect species. It makes the legislation much more difficult for Canadians to understand because adversely affected critical habitat is a lot less obvious than destroying critical habitat.

• (1215)

In essence, it would destroy the co-operative and accountable approach of the bill and replace it with a coercive approach. In the long run this will not work. Laws will not protect species; people will. We must do all we can to help people protect species. We must remember that prohibitions are important as the backbone of legislation.

The first opportunity for all of us to succeed at protecting species and habitat is to work together as active stewards. Let us think outside the box of doing it because the law says so. Species and Canadians deserve our co-operation.

The bill is the third manifestation of legislation that has been in the works off and on for about eight years. On the positive side it has given us the opportunity to look at other legislation. We have found that command and control does not work.

The American legislation is nicely worded, but it has resulted in litigation to such an extent that I am sure the minister is asking himself where he wants to spend his budget. Does he want to spend it on litigation or on programs and recovery processes that will help to restore endangered species?

This is a new direction that the government has taken. I want to reassure those who are bound and determined to follow a command and control approach that there is a five year review clause in the bill that would allow us to look at the legislation and ask: what did we do right and what did we do wrong? How can we clean it up and make it work? Surely, that is a more progressive approach than simply coming down with a hammer on Canadians.

Government Orders

Maybe in five years we could show what Ducks Unlimited have done, what prairie farmers have done and what people in rural Canada have done. Perhaps by that time urban Canada will understand that the majority of endangered species are in the water and not on land. In that respect I want to tell everybody in urban Canada that every time they flush a toilet and every time industrial waste goes into the Great Lakes or water bodies of any kind, they have to bear equal responsibility. We want them to come along with us too.

We should get over the command and control idea and move into a co-operative spirit that will result in a positive future for endangered species.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to Bill C-5, the species at risk bill. We know it is a flawed bill that will require amendments. There are some 80 amendments right now.

I will begin by emphasizing that I, along with my Canadian Alliance colleagues, fully support increasing protection for endangered species and habitat. However as speakers from the government side have mentioned, the majority of this protection would be happening across the prairies and it would disregard the fact that houses and condominiums are being built across a lot of habitat in southern Ontario.

Does the government not understand that the bill should be applied across Canada? It had better look at some of the urban planning issues in regard to habitat for our wildlife and forget about applying it strictly to what it perceives as marginal prairie land that is the home for many Canadians.

Will the species at risk legislation as it is currently written give Canada's endangered species the support that they need to survive and flourish? Will Canadians who use the land get the necessary backing they need to protect our fragile environment? I do not think so and because of this both people and species at risk are threatened.

The main reason why the bill will fail to achieve its goal is the refusal of the federal Minister of the Environment to create an atmosphere where all stakeholders will work together to protect endangered species. There is a good example of this presently on the Canadian prairies where the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is enforcing what it believes to be fish habitat under section 35(1) of the Fisheries Act.

Years ago there was a man-made drain built to take excess water from some farmland. That drain eventually ended up connecting into Lake Manitoba. There are some minnow type fish species that are on the edge of this man-made drain and that drain cannot be cleaned out because DFO now says this is fish habitat. There is a limited amount of fish spawning in that waterway. DFO is applying this rule because it happens to have water in it for part of the year.

If DFO is an indication of the kind of co-operation between the government and local farmers and producers that is envisioned in the bill it is showing that this co-operation and assistance will not be forthcoming. DFO is now causing a massive resentment on the prairies by municipal officials who are fighting with tough budgets and trying to ensure a viable environment for economic activities of

our farmers and ranchers. Ranchers are having massive problems with DFO.

This is the whole point of the legislation and debate. There should be a co-operative effort between landowners and land users. Where there is a necessity of enhancing habitat or taking land out of production, 100% full compensation should be paid to that land user or landowner.

There is a lack of cooperation with individuals and municipal governments and the federal government is also failing to co-operate with the provinces.

The Minister of the Environment claims that his legislation is vastly different from the endangered species law in the United States. This is the U.S. law that prompted the shoot, shovel and shut-up response from many who found endangered species on their property. The U.S. law resulted in great hostility from both landowners infuriated with the loss of their lands and environmentalists exasperated at the slow progress of recovering species. It is an example of what will happen if teamwork is not achieved.

The new Canadian law would suffer from the same failure because the federal government is only paying lip service to ideas of co-operation and compensation.

● (1220)

For example, the fish catches of our inland fishery on Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg have been excellent over the years as a result of the management by Manitoba's natural resources and conservation ministries. DFO is coming in and we have a legitimate reason to be seriously concerned that the great work done with the fish species, their numbers and viability, could well be ruined by action taken by the federal government.

The government has told Canadians it would develop guidelines for compensation after the bill becomes law. The government says to just trust it. Because of many past decisions by Liberal governments that abused farmers and ranchers, they do not trust the government. We must have it in writing in the legislation to ensure that it is clear to everyone including the courts.

Rural Canadians feel as if the Liberal government has painted a target on their backs. The failed Liberal gun control is turning ordinary law abiding Canadians into criminals. The cruelty to animals bill before the House would threaten farmers and ranchers with costly harassment in the courts. The government's rush to support the Kyoto agreement threatens to dramatically push up costs to farmers. These attacks on the rural way of life are combined with the Liberal government's failure to protect farmers who are fighting against foreign subsidies and an ongoing national drought. They are virtually on their own with limited support from the federal government.

Government Orders

The list does not stop. Minister after minister in the government is putting policies and legislation in place that attack rural Canadians. The Liberals do not consider the needs of our agriculture sector and rural Canada when they draft legislation or regulations. For example, did the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans consider the cost to producers when he chose to enforce the habitat regulations on the prairies that protect fish-like common suckers that are breeding in man-made ditches? No he did not.

Last Monday in Stonewall, Manitoba, Mr. Bill Ridgeway told the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food that he lost approximately 25% of his crop for the last three years due to inadequate drainage that was caused by the fisheries regulations. In my own area, where my ranch is, we have lost close to 10,000 acres to flooded land that was farmed, grazed and had hay cut off it for the last 30-40 years. A simple ditch out to Lake Manitoba is all that is required. What is the problem? We cannot get approval or the money.

That is the other thing with this fisheries and oceans business. The problem is that when fisheries and oceans talks about having biologists doing studies and enhancing fish or protecting fish habitats it brings zero dollars. It does not bring one penny to the table. It is left up to the municipalities and the provincial government to do that. There has to be a financial commitment from the federal government if we are going to actually protect species as they should be protected. It cannot be left up to those who are unable to pay.

The federal government is asking a small group of strong Canadians but financially vulnerable Canadians to bear the burden of protecting species at risk. If the development of a fair system of compensation is not guaranteed I am concerned that these environmental frontline soldiers, once friends of nature, will be forced to back away from the species protection bill.

• (1225)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak once more at the report stage of Bill C-5, an act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada. Today, the debate is on amendment motions in Group No. 2.

The amendments are rather substantial. One hundred and thirty-eight amendments have been moved at the report stage by members of all opposition parties in the House, members of the Bloc Québécois, well as other political parties.

This being said, I want Quebecers to understand that it was not easy to bring this bill back to the House where it will be voted on. The legislation introduced in the previous parliament was Bill C-33. We have to wonder: when opposition parties move 138 amendments to a bill, there has to be a problem somewhere.

For Quebecers and especially for stakeholders in Quebec whom we are representing, and for the members of the Bloc Québécois, the very principle of Bill C-5 has been in question. Why? Because Quebec, in the area of species protection, passed the appropriate legislation at the right time. I would like to provide a brief historical overview.

In 1990, the Quebec government passed the act respecting threatened or vulnerable species, the act respecting the conservation and development of wildlife, and fishing regulations. These three legislative measures are designed to protect, among others, wildlife species at risk. So, the Quebec government had already made the effort to create a whole structure to protect wildlife. In this regard, I congratulate wildlife conservation officers who, for decades, have been responsible for implementing these regulations.

So, a protective structure was put in place in Quebec. Why? The question we must ask ourselves as Quebecers is why the federal government is proposing independent or different regulations or legislation. We must ask ourselves this important question, particularly in Quebec, because we took our responsibilities in 1990.

In 1996, there was even a federal-provincial accord, the Accord for the Protection of Species at Risk in Canada. This accord between provincial ministers of the environment and the federal government meant that now, we will have an accord on the protection of species at risk. In 1996, we did not need an act, but that never stopped the federal government.

Since 1996, it has been trying to impose an act that would supersede all provincial legislation. This is where the problem lies. The federal government is once again telling us "We will create a double safety net. In Quebec, you have your own provincial laws, your safety net, but we will have a federal act that will create a second safety net". I am sorry, but back home it is not a double safety net: it is overlapping in jurisdictions.

If the federal government felt that certain species transiting in Quebec on their international journeys are lesser known in our province and are thus at risk, it would have been so simple to ask the Quebec government to include them in its regulations on the protection of species at risk. Quebec has never refused to amend its list of protected species. It would have been so simple to ask the Quebec government to make changes to its regulations to include certain species.

This is not what the federal government chose to do. It decided to enact legislation that even provides for the creation of federal officers. In Quebec, we already have wildlife conservation officers who do some wonderful work, given their limited resources and the financial resources of the Quebec government.

• (1230)

Instead of negotiating an accord with the province and investing funds to upgrade the network for wildlife protection, instead of granting certain sums and new budgets to wildlife conservation officers in Quebec, the federal government chose to create positions for federal officers.

Government Orders

I repeat for all Quebecers who are listening that this is a double safety net; we call that duplication, we call that spending twice for the same thing. In order to improve the wildlife protection network, it would have been much simpler to give some additional amounts to the existing wildlife protection officers. That would have increased their effectiveness, they might have worked less overtime in high activity periods and might have recruited more help. No; instead, the federal government chose to create an independent network.

It is hard for Bloc Quebecois representatives not to propose a series of amendments to this bill. Naturally, we know these amendments will be rejected systematically by the Liberal majority, but it is good to have the opportunity to discuss this legislation once again. We think the issue was clearly defined in the federal-provincial accord, the Accord for the Protection of Species at Risk in Canada.

Today, the government is proposing a bill on the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada. The difference with the accord are probably the words wildlife and Canada. The government could very well have changed the accord by saying that it was the Accord for the protection of Species at Risk in Canada. All the provincial ministers of environment would have signed the new accord with the federal government.

The government could have had an accord on new budgets to be allocated to monitoring, instead of creating an independent network of federal officers. The government would have helped Quebec's conservation officers by increasing their salary, which would have allowed them to do a better job. Once again, I want to say that they are doing a great job. At some periods of the year, they have to work many extra hours because of limited budgets. However, the federal government has decided to create an independent network of federal officers. This is what we will have in the near future.

Moreover, we will have a duplication of legislation and new regulations that will force users once again to respect not only the *Loi sur la conservation* or the *Loi sur la mise en valeur de la faune*, which are in effect in Quebec, but also to abide by the new federal regulations.

We are being told that this is a double safety net, but it is not a double safety net for users. This is another instance of overlap and duplication. We already have wildlife conservation officers, and Quebec already enforces its own legislation.

As concerns the accord signed by the Quebec government in 1996, it could have been improved, and joint action by both governments was possible. It could also have been a good opportunity to set up a real compensation plan—even though it did not happen and it was even criticized by the Liberal majority—for crucial habitats of endangered species. If a property is affected, the owner would be entitled to decent compensation thanks to a sizable fund. This bill does not provide for any compensation fund.

The only interesting thing for landowners in Quebec and Canada would have been compensation for their land, if it contained a crucial habitat for the protection of an endangered species. We needed a real compensation plan to compensate any loss to landowners. If an owner is prohibited from using his land, he should get adequate compensation.

But it was not to be. In this case, just like in health care and education, the federal government will not pay. It passes legislation and sets standards, and it wants all Quebecers and Canadians to abide by them, but it never gives any money to improve wildlife protection or compensate landowners who could incur losses.

● (1235)

[*English*]

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will begin the debate by focusing on one item: We need co-operation and not confrontation with the provinces, farmers and ranchers. However in light of past examples demonstrated by the House I have great fears. On Thursday afternoon last week I addressed a group of people who had selected a topic for me called "Regulating agriculture: can farmers cope?" In each instance farmers were not properly dealt with but had to cope with regulations imposed from the top down.

I will tell the House an even bigger fish story than the one the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake told. Early one morning last summer the fax machine buzzed. The fax was from the Rural Municipality of Scott, about 20 miles northwest of Weyburn on the flat Soo Lines. The fax said the municipality was having trouble with the DFO. I thought wait a minute, not the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. I phoned and they told me to get up there. They had built a ditch years ago to help drain the land which drops about one to two feet every mile and finally makes up the headwaters to the Souris River. If any water runs down there this year it could probably be bailed out with a scoop.

The Department of Fisheries and Oceans did a study on the possibility of fish moving upstream. The rural municipality of Scott was billed \$42,000 for the study. In the bill DFO says we should trust them. We talk about visible and invisible minorities. The prairies would be the invisible minority. They are being billed \$42,000. The size of the fish or anything that looks like fish would not be enough to supply bait for the people downstream.

We need co-operation. I am sure the rural municipality would have co-operated but that is not the whole story. It was left with a bunch of regulations governing what it could do along the side of the ditch now and in the future.

We cannot preserve and protect endangered species without looking at the natural environment. The farmers south of Guelph told me on Thursday they could not cope with the provincial regulations. What about on the prairies? What about prairie towns such as the one I where was born? A creek goes through the town. It is called Long Creek. The creek makes its way to the southeast and ends up at the Boundary Dam in Estevan. If all the land 40 feet from the creek were declared habitat for endangered species about 20 to 30 farmers and ranchers would be cut off from the water supply for their cattle.

Government Orders

We must go through these things in a co-operative way. They cannot come from the top down.

● (1240)

I would like to read this:

The government must do more for property owners, farmers and others who feel their livelihoods or prosperity may be affected. It must not simply say "trust us". It must stipulate that a commitment to protecting endangered species would be cost effective and respect the economic interests of Canadians.

I could quote many others that I am really concerned about. We know that we cannot protect endangered species without protecting their habitats. The two go together. One can think historically about the passenger pigeons. Two things happened. They were good shooting as they were big birds, flew slowly and were easy prey to knock down. When settlement came and people settled the land, they destroyed the trees which provided the pigeons with habitat and food.

If we are going to set aside land for habitat for the endangered species, we must enter into agreements with the people involved.

Voluntary agreements, recovering strategies, action plans and management plans for the preservation of endangered species and their habitats are important. We on this side of the House, and certainly those on the environment committee, respect that. Clearly co-operative agreements between the government and the land-owners are the best way, and I might say they are the only way, to do just that.

The bill was written to allow the minister to enter into agreements with governments, environmental organizations and wildlife management boards, but it does not, I repeat it does not, specify the possibility of agreements with landowners and others who have an interest in the land. That is wrong. It is the wrong way to go. If we can enter into co-operative agreements with industry and the big players, we can also enter into co-operative agreements with those who are not such big players.

We presented an amendment that the minister had to give 30 days public notice. We would be in big trouble with a "trust us" approach. I have seen too many things happen on the prairies before my very eyes. There are so many things that I do not think we cannot proceed on the basis of "trust us".

There is a rapid demographic change. The number of rural people is going down, including in Ontario. We are going to become the endangered species pretty soon. Not too far from where I live, in Theodore Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota, a huge chunk of land has been protected for all time. They had to or it would have been completely destroyed.

In southwest Saskatchewan where my colleague from Cypress Hills—Grasslands comes from, Grasslands National Park has been established. Without any consultation, no grazing has been allowed. That has caused a real problem because the prairie land was meant to be grazed. As a result, most of the runoff does not penetrate the sides of the hills, which is necessary. Further, the deer and the antelope always grazed after others that had already grazed the land. They are having a tough time pawing away at the long grass which lays straight down.

I want to underline the following statement. Is it fair to convict people of a serious criminal offence when they may have had no idea that they were even coming close to committing one? We have to have a lot of co-operation. We made changes at committee. They have been slashed and I am disappointed. We cannot support the bill as it is right now.

● (1245)

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favour of the amendments put forward by my colleagues on the issues of federal-provincial jurisdiction and criminal intent. The hon. member for Lanark—Carleton, the hon. member for Lethbridge and the hon. member for Red Deer have moved amendments to address these issues.

I want to continue the theme raised by the member for Souris—Moose Mountain. If the past record of the federal government and its environmental efforts are any indication, this bill is a disaster waiting to happen.

When I was first elected in my riding, constituent after constituent and municipality after municipality in southeast Manitoba told me that the biggest threat to agriculture in that area was the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. I could not believe it. Fisheries and oceans is destroying drainage. Agricultural land is being destroyed. Costs are being added to the municipalities.

The reeve of the RM of Morris told me about the construction of the dyke around the town of Rosenort, a very progressive, hard working community in the flood plain in the Red River Valley. Doing an environmental assessment and looking at fish habitat in the middle of the plain added an extra \$200,000 to the study. I thought it was an isolated example. Constituent after constituent and municipality after municipality tell of the heavy-handed approach of the federal government in working with the province and the municipalities.

Last weekend I was in Kola, Manitoba which is in the Brandon—Souris constituency. It borders my colleague's riding of Souris—Moose Mountain. One can imagine how dry it is in these areas. Again I was told by constituents in the Kola area that the biggest threat to agriculture is the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. There is no co-operation with local authorities. It is destroying agriculture.

Along with the heavy-handed unco-operative approach of the department and the federal government in general, now there is this endangered species bill, and what do we see? We see a clear rejection in the bill of one of the most important legal principles in a just and democratic society. That is the requirement that there be mens rea or a guilty mind before one can be convicted of a criminal offence. Not only should the culpable person have to have physically committed the act, but there must have been an appropriate degree of criminal intent. That is fundamental to our system of justice.

Government Orders

Bill C-5 as it stands today provides for various offences in which there is a very low level of mens rea, certainly not the level of mens rea necessary or consistent with a free and democratic society. This makes many of the landowners and farmers in my riding very nervous.

There are hundreds of species at risk and it is not always easy to recognize them. Not only do farmers and landowners bear the financial burden of expropriation without compensation as the bill now allows, but they could face expensive, cumbersome criminal prosecutions. Indeed they could even be put at risk to private prosecutions. Farmers and landowners are having a very difficult time. They do not need this kind of heavy-handed legislation to address what is admittedly a serious and significant problem.

The bill makes criminals out of very inadvertent acts. We want to prohibit the possession of certain species, the destruction of certain species, the selling or trading of certain species. However, there should be no criminal consequence for individuals who were inadvertently involved.

• (1250)

If someone were to buy tea in a health food store and that tea contained an ingredient on the list, he or she could be liable under the bill for a criminal charge. The mens rea convention exists in order to ensure that unintended consequences of normal human activity are not made criminal. If my colleagues agree with me that plowing or buying tea or picking a common flower should not be criminal acts unless there is the appropriate criminal intent, then all of us agree that these clauses should be amended to include words such as “knowingly” or “wilfully”.

Consider the lack of mens rea required and the sentences available. Courts may impose fines up to \$250,000 for an individual and \$1 million for a corporation. Many of these corporations are family farms so the money always comes out of the same pocket.

We as the Parliament of Canada must seriously contemplate the wording of the legislation before imposing this type of harsh, punitive legislation on the people of Canada.

I would also like to briefly comment on the jurisdictional matters in respect to Bill C-5. I have alluded to the very apparent lack of co-operation by the federal government and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in particular with municipal and provincial authorities.

As it stands today, where a province does not have endangered species legislation or does not have adequate legislation according to the federal government, the bill provides the federal environment minister with the power to impose this law on that province. It is important to remember that whether or not provincial laws are inadequate is a unilateral determination by the environment minister.

The environment is a shared constitutional responsibility. This heavy-handed approach to relations will not protect endangered species. It will hasten the destruction of these species by continued legal wrangling.

It is for this reason my colleagues have recommended deleting the provisions that assign this unilateral power to the minister. We have added an amendment which provides that the minister may make a recommendation to apply the federal law to the province or the

territory if a territorial or provincial minister has requested that the recommendation be made. These amendments remove the unilateral power to impose federal law onto provincial jurisdiction. The federal endangered species act would still apply to federal lands and to aquatic species or migratory birds.

I cannot stress enough the co-operation that is necessary with landowners, resource owners and municipal and provincial governments. Imposing federal laws on provinces that will only create legal and other battles is not in the best interests of endangered species. Unless we work together, this legislation will fail. If the government decides to work with the provinces and property owners, not only will property owners and resource users benefit, but it will be in the best interests of endangered species.

I urge all members to support these amendments so we can move ahead on this matter.

• (1255)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-5, an act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada. First, while we obviously agree with the principle of protecting endangered species, a principle which has the Bloc Quebecois' full support, we are opposed to the bill.

Bill C-5, we are told, is a response to a problem which we identified, the protection of endangered species. The problem lies in the fact that Bill C-5 is not the right response to the challenge, for two main reasons.

First, the bill itself does nothing to improve the protection of endangered species. The work done by environmental groups has made this abundantly clear. This is a bill which some people feel does not go far enough and which fails completely to protect endangered species.

Bill C-5 has also been criticized for taking a piecemeal approach and lacking an overall vision. Nor does it look ahead, as my colleague reminded the House earlier in connection with compensation for landowners.

Finally, what I find the most objectionable about this bill is the discretionary power the Minister of the Environment has grabbed.

Clause 27 allows the cabinet, on the recommendation of the Minister of the Environment, to establish the list of wildlife species at risk and to amend it if necessary, by regulations.

One wonders what the Minister of the Environment has to do with establishing this list—particularly when one knows anything about how the Liberal government operates—which may well turn out to be more of a political list than a scientific one.

Government Orders

The list should first be established by a group of scientists and then approved by cabinet. But instead, clause 27 turns this into a political issue. That is the first point. This bill fails utterly to meet its basic objective, which is to protect endangered species.

The second reason we object is that not only is this bill useless, but it constitutes a direct interference into provincial jurisdiction, into Quebec's jurisdiction in particular. There is overlap—my colleague reminded us of this earlier—with legislation that already exists in Quebec and that has been in place for years.

For example, Quebec has the act respecting threatened or vulnerable species, which was passed in 1989; there is also the act respecting the conservation and development of wildlife; and there is a whole series of regulations that allow the government of Quebec to fulfill its obligations and responsibilities towards wildlife species that are at risk. Given this context, we do not see the use of this federal government initiative, this intrusion into an area of responsibility that is already well served by Quebec's legislation.

I would like to delve further into the content of Bill C-5 as regards this federal meddling into provincial areas of responsibility, Quebec's area of responsibility in particular.

Clause 10, for example, sets out that the minister “may... enter into an agreement... with respect to the administration of any provision of this Act”; therefore, “he may enter into an agreement”. More specifically, in the section dealing with general prohibitions, clause 34(2) clearly states that:

The Governor in Council shall, on the recommendation of the Minister, by order, provide that sections 32 and 33... apply in lands in a province that are not federal lands—

Furthermore, section 34.(3) states that “The Minister must recommend that the order be made if the Minister is of the opinion that the laws of the province do not effectively protect the species or the residences of its individuals”.

This shows that the federal government, through the Minister of the Environment, is claiming the right to intervene as it pleases in this shared area of responsibility.

Subclauses (4) (a) of sections 34 and 35 state that:

(4) Before recommending that the Governor in Council make an order under subsection (2), the Minister must consult

(a) the appropriate provincial minister;

However, Bill C-5 only refers only to consultations, and if there are agreements, obviously, it would be the federal minister's perspective that would take precedence. This is completely unacceptable.

● (1300)

Clause 39 reads as follows:

39(1) To the extent possible, the recovery strategy must be prepared in cooperation with

(a) the appropriate provincial and territorial minister for each province and territory—

Once again, the federal government and the Minister of the Environment are grabbing the power to impose their vision concerning recovery programs.

This is also the case for the action plans addressed by clauses 47 and 48. In all cases it is stated that co-operation is desired “to the extent possible”. Bill C-5 clearly indicates a federal government view I would describe as centralizing. I would also qualify it as paternalistic. It is not only Bill C-5 that is involved. It considers the provinces to be minors upon whom supervision must be imposed if they are to meet their responsibilities. This centralizing and paternalistic vision is one we reject and condemn.

The minister's power is a discretionary one. This we have seen in the list of endangered species. The bill does not respect the division of jurisdictions, as set out in the Constitution and interpreted over the years.

We are well aware that a comprehensive approach is needed to protect endangered species. We criticized Bill C-5 earlier for its piecemeal vision of the protection of endangered species. All stakeholders should co-operate. Quebec has all the tools that are needed, and it is quite capable of getting this co-operation.

The federal government could not care less about the existing legislation. It takes upon itself the right to impose its own vision of the protection of endangered species and, doing so, it undermines all forms of co-operation between stakeholders.

As I said earlier, we cannot accept this centralist and big brother vision. But there is more. We know that Quebec has all the tools to take action. It could be in charge of this great mission which is the protection of endangered species.

The obsession with visibility that has been the trademark of the federal government in the last few years and, strangely enough, since the 1995 referendum, leads me to think that this bill is just one more means among the many others that have been developed lately to have federal visibility in areas where it does not belong.

I would draw an important parallel between Bill C-5 and the social union framework, which Quebec refused to sign, and rightly so, while the other provinces accepted this big brother vision of the federal government. Both this framework and the bill are part of a vision of nation building which negates the existence of a Quebec nation. It denies the distinctiveness of Quebecers. All of this shows how urgent it is for Quebecers to make the choice of a sovereign Quebec as quickly as possible for political, economic, social, and environmental reasons.

● (1305)

[English]

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to stand and speak to Bill C-5.

It is important for us to understand that we come to the House to debate the issues and laws of the land as aggressively and positively as possible. Out of every piece of legislation there are winners and losers. Every once in a while we get a bill that is a win win situation where everyone wins. Seldom do we get a bill that is a lose lose situation where everyone loses, both the people for whom it is intended and those who would be impacted by it. Bill C-5 is a lose lose bill.

Government Orders

First, I will speak on behalf of my constituents of Yellowhead. I will explain how Bill C-5 would impact each and every one of them in a variety of ways.

My constituency runs from Edmonton in Alberta to the B.C. border through Jasper National Park. We have a national park in our riding. That is pertinent to species at risk legislation. Species reside within the park, but to get to the park one must go through farmland. There are farmers and ranchers whose livelihoods would be impacted in a dramatic way by this piece of legislation. They are struggling and having a tough time as it is dealing with grasshoppers and finding enough water to grow their crops let alone protecting habitat and endangered species on their property. Bill C-5 would require them to do that.

The oil and gas industry takes up a considerable amount of my riding. The industry harvests a tremendous number of trees. In some areas of the province it harvests more trees than the forest companies. Because it uses pipelines that take down trees and builds roads to its lease sites and well sites, it disturbs a considerable amount of habitat. This piece of legislation would impact its ability to continue to harvest resources in a considerable way.

Bill C-5 would also impact the forest industry. In my riding there are a tremendous number of companies that harvest and farm the forest. It is an 80 year cycle. They farm the forest for 80 years to grow a tree in my constituency. The forest industry is in the midst of changing the habitat as it does block cuts where it has trees growing at different levels and ages all through the riding. Bill C-5 would impact the forest industry in my riding in a considerable way because it talks about habitat of endangered species.

The coal industry would also be impacted because of the water used in coal plants as well as the pollution that perhaps comes out of them. There is concern about what Bill C-5 would mean to the coal industry.

The tourist area of my riding is Jasper National Park, one of the largest national parks in Canada. Bill C-5 would not have a considerable impact within the park because it is protected under the Parks Act. However snowmobiling, the use of ATVs, fishing and all tourist activities in our constituency would be impacted in a significant way.

Bill C-5 would have a much different impact on my riding than on ridings in downtown Toronto, Vancouver or Montreal. The species at risk bill would not impact the livelihoods of people in those ridings. Those ridings are considerably different and their constituents look at the legislation in a different way.

If we fail to harness the support of those closest to the land, the habitat and the species we are trying to protect, Bill C-5 will fail because it would put species at risk.

One of the things we must ask ourselves regarding any piece of legislation is how much it would cost. What would be its social impacts? We asked the minister how much Bill C-5 would cost. He does not know. The estimates are \$45 million a year and perhaps much more. No study has been done. We do not know what the impacts would be. We do not know how much it would cost the government or those affected by it.

● (1310)

The other thing we ask ourselves is who will determine which species are endangered. Will it be science or legislators? COSEWIC, which is the science, is pitted against the minister and the cabinet. Under this legislation it will not necessarily be scientists because they can be trumped by the minister and cabinet. The same is true with the national standards.

National standards have to be looked at not only from the federal perspective but also from provincial jurisdictions because provinces have species at risk legislation as well. In this case we cannot pit the federal jurisdiction against the provincial jurisdiction without some kind of problem. The government is saying that it will collaborate and listen to the provinces, but then it will trump whatever the provinces do as far as national standards. It is very similar to what we have seen perhaps with the Canada Health Act, which I am even more familiar with, and some of the disruption between the provincial and federal government jurisdictions.

Another one is the reproductive technology bill, which we are hopeful will be in the House by May 10, as the minister has said. It also has the same provincial and federal jurisdictional problems. If an attempt is not made to overcome those problems by collaboration rather than a big stick, then we will have problems.

This is a piece of legislation that goes against every piece of law that we have in the country in the sense that it is a law where people are guilty before proven innocent. People have to prove they are innocent of the guilt. That really becomes a problem. We can take different approaches to any piece of legislation whether it is a carrot or a stick. In this case, to take the stick and say that they are guilty unless they prove themselves innocent, is counterproductive. What we need is a carrot. We need to engage those who are closest to the species and closest to the habitat. Once we do that, we then make them not a part of the problem but a part of the solution. This legislation fails to do that.

I would like to give a few examples of our neighbours to the south who have been working with endangered species legislation since 1973.

One example that comes to mind is the case of the northern spotted owl which affected most of the forest area of Washington, Oregon and northern California in the 1990s. There were over 2,000 acres of land restricted from logging and tens of thousands of loggers lost their jobs because of that legislation.

There was another piece of legislation only last year in Oregon concerning a short nosed sucker and a lost river sucker. These are two bottom feeding fish in the Klamath basin in Oregon. Thousands of farmers and landowners lost irrigation water because of them. The estimated damage to their crops and livestock was \$300 million U.S. to \$400 million U.S. because of these fish.

Government Orders

Then there is the illustration of the lynx hair, which was actually sabotage. A group of scientists took the lynx hair and planted it in a national forest in Washington state so the park could not be used. This case will go to a congressional hearing on February 28. The park had to be fenced and there was a halting of all economic, recreational or human use, including no logging, hiking or snowmobiles. This would have happened they had not been caught. Hopefully the perpetrators will be taken to task for this.

Every piece of legislation, as I said, has winners and losers. This piece of legislation has no winners, especially the endangered species. The farmers, the oil and gas people, the forest companies, the coal workers and the tourist industry are the losers.

To give an example of what some people think of the legislation, so members do not think it is just me saying this, Mr. Pope, a director on the stock growers association, said that if someone had to set out to deliberately create a law that would harm wildlife, destroy habitat and discourage private landowners from protecting wildlife on their land, it would be difficult to surpass a law like this one in its current state.

• (1315)

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to wonder, after a year and a half in this House, if the Liberal government's motto is "If a job is worth doing it is worth doing poorly". I came here with an interest in this job when the electors of Cypress Hills—Grasslands showed their wisdom by electing me. I came expecting that there would be serious debate in the House, that there would be a give and take of ideas, that there would be a merging and a rejection of those ideas and that decisions would be based on well-informed debate and well-informed bias. To be honest, I saw some of this happen in the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development when I was allowed to sit in on some of the sessions.

The minister, on the other hand, has destroyed this entire process. I believe that at some point he should be held accountable for disregard of the parliamentary process regarding this bill.

I have a great concern about a bill that goes through committee, where some people got what they wanted and others did not, and then have it hijacked by a minister who has his own special agenda. I am disappointed that I do not hear more government members speaking out about that as well. I know there are a great number of them who have a big concern about what has happened with the bill. I suggest that perhaps the minister's motto will be "I started out with nothing and I still have most of that left".

I will speak today on the Group No. 2 motions and two issues of importance in those motions. First, it is that of the federal government taking upon itself the power to override provincial legislation and agreements.

The government has become a bully. We see that in several areas. We have seen it in the area of health. We are beginning to see it in the area of agriculture and its new farm plan. I believe that we will see it in the area of the environment. The government has been bullying provinces. It is beginning to bully rural municipalities. It is beginning as well to bully landowners.

Is it possible for us to cooperate? I will take a look at the history. We have heard a bit about the Department of Fisheries and Oceans today. It has moved in the last couple of years into the prairie provinces. There will be a fair amount of money spent by DFO in the prairie provinces. The government is talking about putting in five fisheries centres with thirty biologists at each centre. Therefore Saskatchewan will have the privilege of having 60 fisheries biologists in its province which it has never had before even though the provincial environment ministry has been managing the fishery reasonably well.

How does it work with DFO coming in? We have heard the members from Selkirk—Interlake and Provencher talk about Manitoba and how there have been problems with drainage ditches. The RMs have ongoing concerns and regular confrontations with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. We have heard DFO costing RMs and cities up to \$200,000 extra to construct flood dikes.

In Alberta DFO began to go after the drainage ditches that were built for irrigation until the Alberta government told it to go to wherever.

We heard from the member for Souris—Moose Mountain that DFO had been billing RMs in Saskatchewan for studies that they did not even know were being done. Therefore we have an ongoing problem with DFO

Perhaps there is something more than just a grab for control. We know Alberta has done very well with one of its natural resources, namely oil. It has been able to become a powerhouse within Canada. A couple of weeks ago one of the senior bureaucrats declared that Newfoundland would not be allowed to become another Alberta.

Another resource that is at stake, and which is just as important as oil, is water. I am starting to wonder if this whole environmental issue focused around Bill C-5 and some of the DFO activity is less a concern about environmentalism than a concern about control over waters that are within provincial boundaries which are supposed to be under provincial jurisdiction.

The bullying, coercion and a lack of co-operation that we see will just lead us to one place. As far as the provinces are concerned it will be in court. We will see the federal government in court against the provincial governments, the provincial governments taking the federal government to court and at the bottom of the pile both levels of government hammering the landowner with his own tax money. That lack of co-operation is unacceptable and the bill will not work.

My second concern in the Group No. 2 amendments is in the area of criminal liability.

Government Orders

● (1320)

I want to paint a bit of a picture of farmers in my area. We have burrowing owls in my area. People go out in the spring with machinery and have a 50:50 chance of seeding their land. We have lots of gophers when the crop begins to come up. Gophers start digging their holes in the crop land. Badgers come along and they are only too happy to chase the gophers down the holes. Later the burrowing owls come to nest in the holes in our area of the world.

At harvest time we come along with the combines and cut the crop off the top, take our crops and people go home. The question that has to be asked is if this disturbs the owl's habitat. If it does, I guess the farmer can expect that the feds will show up at some point at his door and conceivably he could be charged.

The should have known principle in the bill is something that is new after hundreds of years of criminal law. What are the consequences of breaking the should have known law? In the bill the penalties are \$250,000 and up to five years in jail. That is enough to destroy virtually any landowner or any farmer and put him completely out of business. If he cannot prove due diligence, he can be charged and fined.

The bill basically ignores one of the tenets of western legal history and that is that criminal penalties are only given for offences committed with a criminal mind. It is known as mens rea; that is a person knowing he or she is breaking the law. That is why one can be charged and held accountable.

It is interesting that the minister actually had a concern about this. In his presentation of October 3, 2001, he said:

It's a legitimate matter for concern. The accident, the unwitting destruction...it is a concern, and we want to give the maximum protection we can to the legitimate and honest person who makes a mistake, who unwittingly does that.

It is interesting that when the bill came back to the House, the minister declined to give people that protection.

The burrowing owl is fairly well known. Farmers can work with that. There are some other species I would like to ask members about. Have they heard of slender mouse-ear-cress? No, I did not think so. How about the hairy prairie-clover? The burrowing owl we are all familiar with. The sand verbena might be a plant that is new to everyone. I am sure members know of the western spiderwort and the tiny cryptanthus.

The piping plover may be one we are a little more familiar. These are all species that in my riding have been declared as threatened or endangered. Interestingly enough, all of them are already covered by section 5 of the Wildlife Act. Everyone of them is already protected.

This legislation is wrong. It punishes rural Canadians in particular. It cannot succeed if the government will not work with rural people.

We all acknowledge that the government's main role is to provide security and protection for its citizens. Why does the government continue to punish rural Canada?

I have a little story with which I will finish. An agricultural salesman showed up at a farmer's farm yard one day. He saw that the farmer had a pet pig, but the pig had one wooden leg. The farmer said the pig went everywhere with him and the salesman asked

“What happened to the pig?” The farmer said “Let me tell you what a hero the pig is”. He said that he was working near the edge of the road by a muddy slew and one day his tractor slipped off the road. It tipped over and pinned him underneath. He could not do anything so he told the pig to go get a board, to bring it over, balance it on a rock, slide it under the tire and to sit on the end of it. When the pig sat on the end of it, the tractor lifted up enough and he was able to get out. The pig saved his life. The salesman asked how the pig got the wooden leg.

The farmer said he would tell him another story. The pig slept in the living room. One night he smelled smoke. Sure enough, the house was on fire. The pig ran upstairs, woke him and his wife up, and they and the four kids got out before the house burned down. Again, he saved his life as well as the lives of the rest of his family. The agricultural salesman said that the pig certainly was a hero but he still wanted to know how he got his wooden leg. The farmer said “Well, with a pig like that you don't want to eat it all at once”.

That is what the government is doing to rural Canada. It is slowly killing it off, one leg at a time.

● (1325)

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to the amendments to Bill C-5, the species at risk bill.

Once again I am disappointed in the government's approach to dealing with its citizens. Bill C-5 addresses some very serious issues concerning the survival of endangered species in Canada and the habitat that these species occupy.

I am certain that no Canadian in their right mind would care to wilfully endanger any of the numerous species that are endangered. In fact, I think if we were to ask Canadians what should happen to someone who knowingly and wilfully threatens an endangered species or their habitat, they would tell us that serious fine or jail time would be appropriate. I would suggest that most Canadians would be reasonably comfortable with the government's proposed fines of up to \$250,000 for an individual and up to \$1 million for a corporation with the possibility of a five year sentence. The operative words here are knowingly and wilfully.

That being said, I think Canadians would be appalled to learn that the government will make it a criminal act to kill, harm or harass any one of hundreds of endangered species or interfere with their critical habitat, even if the individual or corporation did not know that they were committing an offence. Yes, that is right, the government is proposing legislation that will put Canadians in the position of possibly committing a serious criminal offence without even knowing it.

The legislation does not require intent or even reckless behaviour. Rather, it places the burden of proof on the individual to prove that he or she was practising due diligence should harm come to an endangered species.

Government Orders

In order for Canadian landowners to protect themselves, they will have to become experts at recognizing hundreds of endangered or at risk species.

Again, who among us can readily identify, for example, a sage grouse or a Bicknell's thrush? How many members in this place could identify a five lined skink or a spring salamander? I am having trouble even pronouncing these things let alone identifying them. Moreover, how many Canadians could even begin to identify where any of these animals lived?

I do not want anyone to get me wrong. I believe it is very important to put in place legislation that is designed to protect these animals and the hundreds of others currently at risk in Canada. However, in the way the legislation is worded, not only must average Canadians be able to recognize the species but they will also need to identify their critical habitat in the event that they disturb a place where some of these animals spend part of their life cycle. This would also include places in which they used to live and might be reintroduced. According to the proposed law, if due diligence is not taken a person could face a very serious criminal prosecution resulting in fines, or jail time as I mentioned earlier. It is wrong for the government to go down this path.

Bill C-5 ignores one of the fundamental tenets of our legal history: criminal offences must be committed with a criminal mind. *Mens rea* is the Latin term for this.

The Canadian Alliance supports the goal of protecting endangered species but it cannot be done in such a heavy-handed manner. If the government wants to protect endangered species, it needs to put the emphasis on going after people or corporations that knowingly and willingly put endangered species at risk.

The approach in Bill C-5 is adversarial and provides no opportunity to landowners or corporations to co-operate with the government to preserve natural habitats or endangered species. The government will simply say "gotcha" and then all one can do is hope that the minister is reasonable in exercising discretion as outlined in the bill.

With 70 million hectares of agricultural lands and 25 million hectares of privately owned forest lands in Canada, how do farmers and operators exercise due diligence over such large areas, especially when many are small operations with very limited resources and with little or no familiarity with endangered species regulations?

The minister knows this is a problem. He said it himself, and I quote:

The accident, the unwitting destruction—it is a concern, and we want to give the maximum protection we can to the legitimate and honest person who makes a mistake, who unwittingly does that.

The minister said that in the standing committee meetings on October 3, 2001.

The minister's words are nice but the bill would make honest people into criminals.

The Canadian Alliance amendments attempt to restore the balance by requiring that the crown at least prove some measure of intent before somebody can be convicted.

● (1330)

Did someone wilfully harm an endangered species? Did they do so with intent? Was it done in a reckless manner? These amendments would go some way to ensuring that innocent people do not inadvertently commit a criminal offence,

I urge the government and other opposition parties to hear this argument and to vote in favour of Canadian Alliance Group No. 2 amendments.

At minimum, the federal government must work with the provinces to provide training for landowners and users who will be required to meet the due diligence standard but do not have the knowledge or information to identify lists of species or their critical habitat.

In closing I would like my colleagues to consider how many of their constituents own recreational vacation properties. We tend to think of this type of legislation in terms of commercial use of large tracts of land. What will a member say to a constituent who is facing criminal prosecution because in clearing land for a vacation cabin he unwittingly destroys the habitat of a species at risk that he did not even know was there? Some might say that is a bit of a stretch but I say that it is a very real possibility given the uncompromising zeal of some environmental advocates.

I urge all members to support the Canadian Alliance Group No. 2 amendments.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the members who spoke before me on Bill C-5. I find the silence of the government members interesting. Perhaps they can find little to defend about the bill before us today. Their silence is suspicious to say the least.

Before looking at Bill C-5 more specifically, I would like to try to address the issues raised by this bill or the problems it is supposed to solve with respect to protecting biodiversity.

I believe that all members of this House agree fully on the increase in the rate of disappearance and on the seriousness of the situation concerning biodiversity, and the disappearance or the threat of disappearance of certain species.

We must ask ourselves some questions. Does Bill C-5 really provide additional protection that can be enforced? Will the bill really contribute to enhancing the protection of our ecosystems and the endangered species that make up these ecosystems? These are the two basic things that Bill C-5 should do: protect ecosystems and protect endangered species.

Since this third version of the bill was introduced, what we have heard leaves us with the impression that, strange as it may seem, the Minister of the Environment did not ask himself these two simple questions before introducing his bill.

Government Orders

Why is the Minister of the Environment introducing Bill C-5 on biodiversity? Not because the current Minister of the Environment woke up one morning and said to himself "It will do my image and my reputation good to introduce a bill on biodiversity and the protection of species at risk". Rather, he was trying to pick up on a job started by his predecessors, Mr. Marchi and the current Minister of Canadian Heritage who had already, on two occasions, tried to make good a promise. The first one was made by the federal government at the Rio summit in 1992. At the time, the Progressive Conservatives were in power. It will be recalled that Mr. Mulroney was in Rio de Janeiro.

We can understand that some electors are skeptical about the role of members of parliament, the role of elected people, the role of ministers and premiers when we see these men and women—a nice family picture, arm in arm, a big smile of their face—telling us "Starting today, following the Rio summit, we will take biodiversity into consideration. Do not worry, we are considering this situation to be a priority". I would be curious to identify the number of situations or concerns that the various governments have put forward. At a given time, everything was a priority during their mandate, depending on the community they were addressing.

At the Rio summit in 1992, presidents, first ministers, statesmen and stateswomen, arm in arm, with a big smile on their face, signed the Rio convention on biodiversity.

There is a problem. Once this has been signed, once the convention has been ratified, the respective states must pass some legislation. That was not done yet, but the conservatives said "We are going to do it". Less than a year later, they were threatened. They were completely extinct, or almost.

I think they will support this bill on species at risk, but their situation has prevented them from being able to introduce legislative measures to meet their commitment.

That was not too serious, because the Liberals had made a promise in their 1993 red book to introduce a biodiversity bill. Indeed, in 1995, a little less than two years after the election, the present Minister of Heritage introduced an endangered species bill. At that time, it was the bill which led up to Bill C-65. The main thing that made the present heritage minister back up was that the bill addressed only zones protected by the federal government.

An unbelievable number of protests and criticisms ensued, particularly from environmental groups and others who closely monitor environmental problems. The criticism of that bill was that it was restricted solely to federal lands. Critics pointed out that only four provinces at that time, Quebec being one, had endangered species legislation.

•(1335)

According to the environmentalists and the opposition parties, this bill, which applied only to federal lands, was an unsatisfactory and incomplete response to the great promise of Rio de Janeiro.

So the bill introduced by the present heritage minister was just take one for the federal government; it was shelved around 1995.

In 1996, the present Canadian ambassador to the WHO in Geneva—whom I can name—Sergio Marchi, then Minister of the

Environment, introduced Bill C-65, the Canada Endangered Species Protection Act, which is in a way the ancestor of this bill being debated today.

The government was again criticized by the various stakeholder groups and, this time, the criticism was not merely from Quebec or the sovereignists, or the opposition parties, but also from the governments of Alberta, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, New Brunswick and the Yukon and Northwest Territories, all of which voiced major concerns about the concept of transborder species and the powers defined by the act. Many criticisms were directed at the Minister of the Environment of the day, and the bill was again judged unsatisfactory.

What did the Liberals do? In 1996, four years after the Rio summit and three years after being elected, they let Bill C-65, which they have now reintroduced, die on the order paper.

This bill on species at risk that we are discussing today is not the current Minister of the Environment's idea, nor is it an idea or a promise from the 2000 election campaign, it is something that Canadians have been waiting for more than 10 years.

When we see our heads of government strutting about New York talking about the rights of children or the status of women throughout the world, when there are big summits with heads of state and government leaders from around the world who sign agreements, then return to their own countries, try to introduce the necessary legislation and, ten years later, are still talking about this same legislation, it is no wonder that people are skeptical about provincial and federal politicians.

It seems to me that given the outcries in 1995 and 1996 that led to the two previous bills, a modicum of good faith and imagination would have encouraged the minister at that time, or the current Minister of the Environment, to meet with his provincial counterparts and put the issues out on the table, the fact that four provinces already had bills, including Quebec, to protect threatened or endangered species and their ecosystems.

In order to take into consideration this reality and the fact that the federal government already has legislation on threatened species with the Fisheries Act and other acts of Environment Canada and others, they could have looked at the areas that the different stakeholders in this area agreed on. They could also have invited environmental groups to discuss Bill C-5, and taken into consideration the main criticisms that would have provided for real and adequate environmental protection in the first, second, and let us hope that there will not be a third attempt at the legislation—this has still not been a part of discussions.

But the main problem with Bill C-5 is the fact that it does not answer the two simple and fundamental questions that it should answer, and the fact that the decisions to determine what is a threatened species and what is not will not be made by scientists. These decisions on the designation of species will be made by the minister and by cabinet, rather than by scientists themselves.

Government Orders

We are convinced that the minister will not wake up one morning and say “Now, in my opinion this species is becoming an endangered species”. He will take into consideration the research and the analyses done by scientists. But what we question, along with environmental groups and elected provincial representatives, is the very broad power the Minister of the Environment and cabinet are appropriating, when it comes to designating threatened species.

• (1340)

I will conclude by saying that, with a minimum of goodwill, openness and transparency, we should be able to co-operate and arrive at a good solution for everyone. We could fulfill a commitment made ten years ago, during the summit in Rio de Janeiro, where everyone unanimously agreed that the biodiversity of threatened species should be monitored by effective agreements and legislation in our respective countries.

• (1345)

[*English*]

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to Bill C-5, an act to protect species at risk. This has been a topic of debate and discussion in Canada for many years and it is still being debated.

I would like to use Motion No. 23 in this group of amendments as an example of one of the problems with the institution of the House of Commons and its committee work.

The bill was prepared by the government, tabled in the House and then sent to committee for study. The committee was made up of members, including the member for Davenport who is the chairman of the committee, the Canadian Alliance members for Red Deer and Souris—Moose Mountain and others from the Liberal side such as the member for Halton and the parliamentary secretary, the member for Kitchener Centre.

Witnesses appeared before the committee. Members heard all angles about what was right and wrong with the bill. The committee then proceeded to a clause by clause study of the bill and amendments were brought forward from all parties to make the bill better and to reflect what members had heard from witnesses. This is not always an easy thing to do. There was debate and discussion and negotiations. Being a committee of the House, I felt it worked in a good way to bring about the right end, to bring forward a bill amended to the point where it would become somewhat more acceptable to Canadians.

Unfortunately we did not get all of the amendments we wanted. Many of them were voted down. One we were unable to bring forward was the issue of compensation which is still a huge issue to us.

With respect to Motion No. 23, the committee agreed to pass this amendment to the bill. However when the bill came back to the House for discussion, the government brought in an amendment to counter the amendment to the bill, thereby bringing it back to where it had been.

When an amendment is passed by a committee of the House, the majority of whose members are Liberals, one would think the government would support that amendment. No, it brought an

amendment forward to reverse the amendment. So around and around we go.

When the government reverses an amendment passed at committee, it shows a total lack of respect for the function of the committees of the House of Commons. To me it means that government members on the committee are split on this issue. Hopefully when the bill comes forward for a vote those members and other people on the government side who support their position, will continue to support that position and will not vote in favour of the bill which has been changed from the amended form they agreed to.

The motion deals with the operation of a stewardship action plan. The committee wanted to make sure that when the plan was put forward, the minister shall act, not may act; the minister would have to do something to put this into place. The committee agreed to that but the government has put forward an amendment making this aspect at the discretion of the minister who may or may not act at all. This takes the power away from the bill and puts it into the hands of one minister who may or may not do something. That is not good enough. We feel that the word “shall” should be included. The government needs to act on these issues when they are brought forward. Things like this should not be at the total discretion of one minister of the crown.

Motion No. 35 is another government amendment to establish the legal list of species at risk. The committee debated this issue at length. Members came to an agreement but again, after the bill was brought back to the House, the government brought forward amendments to reverse what was agreed to at committee.

Committees bring in witnesses from all across Canada. In many cases, the committees will travel to different areas of the country to get input from various individuals. This is how members can get a good sense from all sides of what needs to be looked at, strengthened or changed.

• (1350)

Certainly there is a lot of discussion because these positions are not always the same, but it is an opportunity at that level to make some change. The motion is a reversal of the approach taken by the standing committee toward the establishment of a legal list of species at risk. Like the original bill, it would mean that cabinet must actively choose to place species identified by the expert scientific panel, COSEWIC, on the legal list. If it does nothing, then COSEWIC recommendations will have no effect.

The committee had placed a reverse onus on the government. If cabinet did not act within six months, then the recommendations would be added to the legal list automatically. Many groups felt that would be the way to go because if the government did not move on it, then it automatically would be added. By putting that reverse onus on the government, some direction or action was guaranteed. However an amendment has been put in by the government to take that out.

Government Orders

If recommendations come forward from the scientific community in Canada that certain endangered species should be added to the list and there was no action by the government, then they would not be added. We are suggesting if the government does not act, they should be added.

This is just another case of where what was agreed to by the committee has been changed. We must always keep in mind that the committee has a majority of government members on it. Therefore if something was agreed to at committee, one would think that the government would be in support of it, but as is quite clear here, it is not.

Motion No. 39 which the Canadian Alliance has brought forward, and to which many members have spoken, deals with the issue of a person knowingly killing, harming or harassing an endangered species. There have been many examples. How do we educate every Canadian to know what every endangered species looks like, what their environments are in which they live, and which ones are in their areas?

We have heard a lot about the burrowing owl. We are pretty confident that most people would be able to identify it on their property and to take the necessary measures to protect the habitat. There are many people on the land, through farming and ranching and the resource sector, who have implemented their own programs for protecting species at risk. I have seen some of them myself, particularly regarding the burrowing owl. However when it is an obscure, probably water-borne species, how are we going to educate every Canadian so that people know that every time they perform an activity on their land or in their resource sector they are not disturbing the habitat? It would be an almost impossible thing to do.

There has to be the aspect in the bill whereby we have to prove that the person knew he or she was going to destroy. If the person still proceeded with that activity, then certainly the full weight of the bill should be brought to bear, but if the person was an average Canadian carrying out his or her duties, livelihood, or even a recreational activity, that person should not have the weight of the bill brought down upon him or her.

One is innocent until proven guilty, but the way the bill is structured, one is guilty until proven innocent. That goes against everything in which our justice system believes. It ignores the basic part of the western legal history that criminal penalties are given only for offences committed with a criminal mind, *mens rea*. That is an absolutely critical part of what we need to have placed back into the legislation.

We hope we can get respect and support from the government benches on this. We know there is support. Many government members have supported what we have put forward. When the bill comes to be voted on, I hope they realize and remember that a lot of the things they fought for at committee to have amended or placed in the bill have now been reversed by the government. I hope they do not pass a bill which would endanger Canadians just for carrying out their regular lives not knowing they are at risk.

• (1355)

I want to finish on the issue of the bill going to committee where witnesses, experts in their field, come forward with the under-

standing that what they say will be listened to, that the committee will weigh the pros and cons of each issue and then it will come up with a more balanced approach to move that forward. When that happens, when it is agreed to at committee, it comes back to the House and then the government introduces amendments to reverse a lot of what was done at committee, that is wrong.

I hope the members on the government side who do not support the legislation will vote against it when the time comes to vote.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-5, the species at risk legislation.

This legislation, perhaps more than any other, will be encroaching on the jurisdiction of the provinces. The political history of Canada has shown that this is dangerous territory and should not be taken lightly at all. In short, when it comes to jurisdiction the bill extends itself into provincial jurisdiction. This is unacceptable and should be done only with the consent of the provinces.

When it comes to criminal intent, the bill puts the burden of proof on the accused and not on the prosecution, meaning anyone who inadvertently destroys a species at risk or its critical habitat is guilty until proven innocent. Both of these are unacceptable positions for the government to take. A few of the motions put forward by the official opposition explain why. Motion No. 39 and Motion No. 44 are necessary amendments that would require that to be found guilty of a criminal offence a person must knowingly do harm to an endangered species.

Bill C-5 would make it a criminal act to kill, harm or harass any one of hundreds of endangered species or to interfere with their critical habitat. The fines are definitely a deterrent: up to \$1 million for a corporation and \$250,000 for an individual. The proposed act provides for imprisonment of up to five years for an indictable offence. It is possible that a person could inadvertently commit such an offence without knowing it. The bill would not require intent or even reckless behaviour as a condition for charge. Shockingly, it places the burden of proof on the individual to prove that he or she was exercising due diligence should harm come to an endangered species.

There is a great deal of expertise and knowledge to assume on behalf of all Canadians. In this way the bill ignores one of the fundamental tenets of our legal history, that criminal penalties are only given for offences committed with a criminal intent.

S. O. 31

In the past we have said that it is not fair to convict someone of a serious criminal offence when he or she might have done so without intent or without knowledge. In order to protect ourselves from breaking this law, we would need to become experts at recognizing various species, such as the sage grouse, the burrowing owl or aurora trout. We would not only need to recognize them but we would need to recognize their critical habitat in case we were disturb a place where some of these animals spent part of their life cycle.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. Bob Wood (Nipissing, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am taking the opportunity this afternoon to underline the performances of Canada's men's and women's curling teams at the Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City.

Canada continues to be a force to be contended with in the sport of curling. The Kevin Martin rink, from Edmonton, Alberta, narrowly missed the gold medal in men's curling with a six to five defeat to Norway. Martin was joined by lead Don Bartlett, second Carter Rycroft, third Don Walchuk and alternate Ken Trainberg on the podium.

The women's team, composed of skip Kelly Law, Julie Skinner, Georgina Wheatcroft, Diane Nelson and Cheryl Noble, won the bronze medal by a score of nine to five against the United States. This is the same team that won the 2000 Canadian and world championships.

Canadians are very proud of these athletes today and I wish to congratulate them.

* * *

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to all our Olympic athletes who just competed in the 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City, Utah.

All told, Canadian athletes are returning home with a record 17 medals. I would especially like to congratulate the Canadian women's hockey team and the men's hockey team, both of which won gold medals for Canada.

Our men's hockey team has waited 50 years to confirm what we already know, that we are number one at hockey. The women's team beat the Americans when it counted, in the gold medal final of the Olympic Games.

Our athletes dedicate hours upon hours to training and practice and in return they get the satisfaction of knowing they are the best. Hayley Wickenheiser, who grew up in Shaunavon, Saskatchewan in my riding, has not only proven herself as a worldclass athlete and tournament MVP but also as a role model for young Canadian athletes.

We only expected our athletes to do their best and from that we simply got the best. I congratulate all Canadian medal winning athletes. They have made us proud.

* * *

● (1400)

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand today to acknowledge the tremendous accomplishment of a great group of Canadian athletes.

The entire country watched yesterday as the members of our men's ice hockey team won its first Olympic gold medal since Oslo in 1952. The team, as all proud Canadians know, includes Ed Belfour, Martin Brodeur, Curtis Joseph, Rob Blake, Eric Brewer, Adam Foote, Ed Jovanovski, Al MacInnis, Scott Niedermayer, Chris Pronger, Theoren Fleury, Simon Gagné, Jarome Iginla, Paul Kariya, Mario Lemieux, Eric Lindros, Joe Nieuwendyk, Owen Nolan, Mike Peca, Joe Sakic, Brendan Shanahan, Ryan Smyth and Steve Yzerman

This group of talented and dedicated athletes won the gold medal under immense international and domestic pressure. Together with their head coach Pat Quinn, all their assistants and the Great One, Wayne Gretzky, they made us all proud. Their win capped an incredible Olympics for all Canadian athletes.

I say way to go Canada. Vive le Canada.

* * *

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Ms. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate a remarkable young Winnipeg woman who has recently gone on to international athletic glory.

Not only is she one of the very small handful of athletes who have competed in both the summer and winter Olympics. Clara Hughes made history on Saturday, becoming the first Canadian athlete to win a medal in both the summer and winter Olympic games.

Hughes won a pair of bronze medals in the 1996 summer games in Atlanta as a road cyclist, and this past Saturday she won a bronze medal in the ladies' 5,000 metre speed skate in Salt Lake City. She is only the fourth athlete to win a medal at both the summer and winter Olympic games.

Clara Hughes is one of 37 female athletes of the 66 sent by Canada to return home with an Olympic medal around her neck. Clara's embrace of speed over distance has done her very well and I know all Canadians wish that she continue her remarkable career in both of her sports.

* * *

[*Translation*]

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Canada's olympic team at the Winter Olympics that ended yesterday, in Salt Lake City.

S. O. 31

All Canadians can be very proud of our team, which was made up of 156 exceptional men and women who trained for countless hours over several years to achieve this ultimate goal in sports: to go to the Olympic Games.

I also wish to pay tribute to the thousands of coaches, officials, event co-ordinators, managerial staff, volunteers and parents who supported our team for many years, particularly in preparation for the Salt Lake City Olympic Games.

We are proud of all our athletes and I invite my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2002 Canadian Olympic team.

* * *

[*English*]

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there were seven Canadian athletes at the winter Olympics in Salt Lake City who have close ties to Red Deer. They are Jamie Salé, Deidra Dionne, Jeremy Wotherspoon, Steven Elm, Regan Lauscher, Grant Albrecht and Ryan Smyth. Red Deer and all of central Alberta are proud of these athletes. We respect and admire their dedication to their sport. Our nation is very lucky to have these individuals representing us at the Olympic games.

I offer special congratulations to long-time residents of Red Deer, Jamie Salé and Diedra Dionne, who won a gold and a bronze medal at the games. Everyone knows the story about Jamie and the pairs figure skating and of course most people saw Diedra flying through the air to win a bronze medal in freestyle skiing.

We cheered loudly for Ryan Smyth and his Team Canada teammates, and it paid off. Yesterday Ryan and the men's hockey team ended the 50 year drought and won the gold medal.

To these athletes and to all of team Canada, we are extremely proud of them and thank them for representing us so well on the international sporting stage.

* * *

[*Translation*]

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the road from Chicoutimi to Salt Lake City was not an easy one for gold medal winner Marc Gagnon and for the very promising Marie Ève Drolet.

The results achieved by our two athletes are the outcome of years of sustained efforts and sacrifices, with the support of their parents.

Seeing Marc Gagnon on the podium during our national anthem was an incredibly intense moment and an inspiration for us all. In becoming Canada's greatest winter Olympics medal winner, Marc Gagnon is a role model for generations to come.

Congratulations and thanks to the speed skating club Les Comètes de Chicoutimi for training athletes who make us proud.

Allow me to also congratulate Marc's teammates, Jonathan Guilmette, François-Louis Tremblay, Mathieu Turcotte and Éric

Bédard, for winning the 5,000 metre men's relay. Finally, I would also like to congratulate Jonathan Guilmette for his silver medal in the 500 metre race.

* * *

• (1405)

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. Robert Laclôt (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois, I wish to congratulate the Quebec and Canadian athletes on their remarkable performances at the Salt Lake City Winter Olympics.

Through their determination and extraordinary talent, the Quebec and Canadian athletes provided us with moments that were heavily charged with emotion, from start to finish, right until the closing moments.

What a brilliant hockey victory. First we had the gold win by Danielle Sauvageau's women's team, and then the team of Mario Lemieux, Martin Brodeur and Simon Gagné earned the ultimate honour after a gap of 50 years.

Many names will go down in sport history: Marc Gagnon, for his record number of medals; Jamie Salé and David Pelletier, and all the others whose performances brought them such credit in these competitions among the world's best.

To the Quebec and Canadian athletes, and to all those who contributed to their success, our thanks for those memorable images, which will remain in our memories. You will all remain a source of inspiration and will act as ambassadors for the youth of Quebec.

Congratulations to you all. We are proud of you.

* * *

[*English*]

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. Benoît Serré (Timiskaming—Cochrane, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to congratulate our Canadian Olympic team. From figure skating to speed skating to hockey our Canadian athletes from every region of the country have shown dedication, perseverance and, most of all, excellence and class.

I am especially pleased by the accomplishments of both our women's and men's hockey teams. They have restored Canadian supremacy of our national sport: hockey.

[*Translation*]

Yesterday, from coast to coast to coast, millions of Canadians had their eyes glued to their television screens, united in their pride as citizens of this great country of Canada. Our Olympians have made a remarkable contribution to the unity of this country.

I am sure that all members of this House, and indeed all Canadians, join with me in congratulating our wonderful Olympic athletes.

Bravo to all our athletes, and hooray for Canada.

[English]

KEN MACKENZIE

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great man and a true friend. Ken MacKenzie was not great in the way our world measures greatness but he was a great man in the hearts of thousands of people.

From his beloved summer home of Turtle Lake, Saskatchewan to the U.S. border, Ken MacKenzie was a friend to thousands along the entire west side of Saskatchewan. It was obvious that Ken was born with a unique talent to accomplish his mission in life. That mission was to bring happiness to everyone, to make people feel good about themselves and to make people believe in themselves. Ken was still carrying on his life mission even when he was confined to hospital care.

Elrose, Saskatchewan and indeed the western side of Saskatchewan will always remember the man who personified the song “When you're smiling, the whole world smiles with you”. Ken taught us to “Look for the silver lining whenever a cloud appears in the blue. Remember somewhere the sun is shining”.

* * *

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians waited 50 years for yesterday's brilliant moment to arrive. Indeed, 50 years after the Edmonton Mercurys won the Olympic hockey tournament in Oslo our Canadian men's hockey team brought home again yesterday the gold medal. What a way to celebrate a golden anniversary.

With a 5-2 victory over the U.S. men's hockey team our men's team matched our Canadian women's hockey team's gold medal performance over the U.S. women's team. We can now safely say that with victorious Olympic men and women hockey champions, Canada rules hockey.

Another historical Canadian moment was also achieved in this month of February 2002, Black History Month. Jarome Iginla, a valued member of our men's hockey team, is the first black Canadian to become an Olympic gold medalist in hockey. I say way to go, Jarome.

As my nine year old daughter yelled yesterday, “Baaam”. Canada is Olympic gold through and through.

* * *

[Translation]

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Canada watched as the men's hockey team was victorious in the Olympic final, bringing home the first gold for a Canadian hockey team in 50 years.

This marvellous win is in addition to the win by our women's team a week earlier.

S. O. 31

We can proudly say that our national sport was well represented by our Canadian athletes. The leadership and the determination of these players set a wonderful example for our Canadian youth.

Congratulations to all the athletes and to the members of the men's hockey team, who must still be savoring their victory. This gold medal brought the 19th Winter Olympic Games to a successful conclusion and we are very proud of it.

The men have had us pretty worried, but they played a top-notch game, and we congratulate them and thank them for this magnificent gold.

* * *

• (1410)

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as we all finish savoring Sunday's great hockey moment, I want to celebrate another great moment on ice: the victory Saturday night of two Quebec athletes from the riding of Mercier—Marc Gagnon and Jonathan Guilmette, who won gold and silver in the 500 metre short track speed skating event.

Still trailing the American at the beginning of the last lap, Marc Gagnon sprinted ahead at the last moment, and Jonathan Guilmette miraculously broke through and crossed the finish line second. Such artistry. And such teamwork. The two Quebecers, their friend Jean-François Monette, and their trainers, Guy Thibault and André Guilmette, had just added two medals to the collection.

“You have to have a dream and go after it,” was Marc Gagnon's comment right after his victory. We thank these brave Quebecers for letting us share their dream.

* * *

[English]

ARMED FORCES

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to our soldiers in Afghanistan. I am sure that the opposition will be pleased to hear what I have to say.

We had a report that on Thursday night Canadian troops came to the rescue of U.S. soldiers stranded with their two Chinook helicopters that were forced down in hostile territory by poor visibility and a dwindling fuel supply during a sandstorm.

Our Canadian military led a nighttime mission across a heavily mined desert near Kandahar in their high tech armoured vehicles. The six troopers from the Lord Strathcona's Horse regiment of Edmonton, using their nighttime vision equipment, located and rescued the Americans. The rescue mission by our Canadian soldiers is proof of the expertise of our military personnel and the capabilities of their equipment.

I am sure that members of the opposition will join us in sending our best wishes to our Canadian troops who are doing an excellent job in their mission in Afghanistan. This kind of mission proves once again that the Canadian armed forces have never been more combat ready.

*Oral Questions***CURLING**

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I too congratulate both the men's and women's Olympic hockey teams whose skills and determination earned them gold medals as well as the adulation of all Canadians. These teams, along with all Canadian Olympians, showed their Olympic spirit during the games and have done more to bring Canadians together than anything we could do in the House.

Now it is time to focus on another one of Canada's premier sporting events. In Brandon, Manitoba today the Canadian women's curling championship, the Scott Tournament of Hearts, takes place. The Tournament of Hearts will attract teams from every province and territory and showcase the finest curlers in Canada. Brandon, the curling capital of Canada, will host over 80,000 spectators and 70 athletes competing to be the best in women's curling.

I thank Lois Fowler, the chair of the Brandon host committee, and the 605 volunteers who have done a tremendous job in working long hours to put the event together. These volunteers have brought credit to their community and their province.

On behalf of Manitobans I thank them and the Scott Tournament of Hearts.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House of an unprecedented meeting of 24 inspirational Afghan women currently living in Canada that is proceeding in the West Block today with the help of the Minister for International Cooperation and CIDA officials.

These Afghan Canadian women, including high school students, have arrived from Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Guelph, Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal to meet officials and parliamentarians to press us to ensure that our troops and other Canadian representatives are all committed to increasing safety for women and children in Afghanistan so Afghan women in Canada have the genuine option of returning to their country of origin to give their expertise to rehabilitation and reconstruction as soon as possible.

I give special thanks to Senator Jaffer, Adeena Niazi and Marilou McPhedran for their leadership in this program.

* * *

● (1415)

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Salt Lake Winter Olympics have come to a close and the residents of my riding of St. Albert have much to celebrate.

First, we had Jennifer Heil from Spruce Grove. Jennifer, a first time Olympian, clearly has a bright future in freestyle skiing ahead of her. She placed fourth in the women's moguls competition.

Next, Ken Traenberg from St. Albert and Don Bartlett from Spruce Grove helped bring home the silver medal in men's curling.

Finally, Jarome Iginla, a native of St. Albert, had an amazing hockey game yesterday, scoring two of Canada's goals in a 5-2 win

over the United States, helping to bring hockey gold home to Canada.

Canadians can be truly proud of all our Olympic athletes, and the people of the St. Albert constituency can take pride in knowing their very own athletes performed so well in front of millions not just in Canada but all around the world. I congratulate them all.

* * *

FATHER JOSEPH MEEÛS

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the community of Rankin Inlet, Nunavut, honoured Father Joseph MeeÛs. On Sunday, February 24, 2002, he celebrated a milestone anniversary, his 50th year of priesthood in the Roman Catholic church.

Ataata Jusipi, as he is affectionately known, was born in Belgium, arrived in Canada in 1952 and has since then devoted his life to the Arctic, serving in the diocese of Churchill-Hudson Bay since 1968.

Father MeeÛs has earned the respect of all, including the clergy of different denominations. Devoted to the cause of the people, he serves the community, elders and youth alike with wisdom and great humility.

We thank Ataata Jusipi for his kindness, generosity and devotion to the Arctic and its people. On behalf of my constituents we wish him well.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD*[English]***THE ECONOMY**

Mr. John Reynolds (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is nice to welcome the Prime Minister back from his trip. I am sure the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry were there to meet him when he got off the plane.

The Canadian Alliance has repeatedly raised concerns about the government's failure to address the country's international competitiveness.

Further, the government has also failed to grapple with the problems of defence. Yesterday team Canada showed us all what international competitiveness and a strong defence were all about.

My question for the Prime Minister: How about that Joe Sakic?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that. It was a fabulous afternoon yesterday. We were all cheering. However it was not only yesterday. The last two weeks have been very good. We are all very proud. It is a sign that we started to invest a little bit more money in sports a few years ago. We have the results at this time.

Oral Questions

Mr. John Reynolds (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, our hockey team may have the gold but under the government our economy is still finishing out of the medals.

One of Canada's leading economists has just produced a study that has found the federal tax burden has not fallen in seven years, despite the government's so-called tax cuts.

Canadians still face paying over 40% of their GDP in taxes, while in the United States it is only 30%, and it is our biggest competitor and our trading partner.

How can the government claim to have offered tax relief when the tax burden for hard-working Canadians has not budged at all?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a good example of the opposition always being late and not being aware of what is going on.

He has referred to 1999 statistics. Since that time we have had a budget that reduced the taxes paid by Canadians and have reduced corporate taxes to five points below the Americans. Capital gains taxes in Canada are five points below the American capital gains. I could go on and on.

Despite all these reductions, we still have a good social system that applies to all the citizens of Canada.

Mr. John Reynolds (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we only have to look at our TR4 slips this month versus last year to find out that those figures are just not accurate.

Another study shows that because of the government's rising taxes the underground economy has risen from 3% to 16%, and that is just not last year, that is right now.

The co-author of the study said:

—cutting taxes is still the...most important thing governments can do to...reverse the growth in the underground economy

Why has the government not offered real tax relief to Canadian citizens this year?

• (1420)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government reduced taxes for the Canadian people by \$100 billion over the period of five years. It is reflected to everybody.

If the hon. member would read the budget he would see that lower and middle income Canadians are paying hundreds and thousands of dollars less taxes today than they were paying two years ago.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that is not true.

[Translation]

Last Friday, the econometric firm DRI-WEFA confirmed that the government's supposed tax reduction was no more than a mirage. We learned that there has been no change to the tax burden since 1996, and it remains a huge 40% of the GDP.

Clearly, this Minister of Finance is more concerned about image than reality. How can he continue to mislead people by saying that he has lessened the tax burden, when this is false?

[English]

Hon. John McCallum (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister has pointed out, these statistics do not tell the full story.

The fact of the matter is that this year alone we had \$20 billion in tax relief. The fact is that by 2004 income tax will be down by 21% on average, 27% for families. The fact of the matter is that we are giving our companies a Canadian advantage with a lower corporate tax rate as of a couple of years and a substantially lower rate of tax on capital gains as we speak.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, those are not facts, those are ridiculous Liberal talking points.

The studies produced by the Canadian Tax Foundation and DRI-WEFA make it absolutely clear that we are losing \$44 billion to the underground economy because of overtaxation and that the federal tax burden today is exactly where it was six years ago.

How can the government claim that it is reducing taxes when Canadians are in fact paying more in taxes this year than they did at this time last year?

Hon. John McCallum (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a wonderful economic story to tell in London, New York and around the world. However, the Canadian Alliance, with its spurious statistics, its non-stop negativity and its non-stop trashing of the Canadian economy, it is sad to say, is part of the problem not part of the solution.

* * *

[Translation]

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance announced the creation of a \$2 billion foundation for strategic infrastructures.

On February 5, he changed his tune and said that only the savings made on the service of the debt would be invested in infrastructures, that is a significantly smaller amount of \$350 million over two years, according to the minister's own officials.

In spite of this correction, the Deputy Prime Minister continues to say that there is an amount of \$2 billion available right now.

Since the establishment of this fund has yet to be approved by parliament, that its budget is fluctuating and that timetables are changing, could the Prime Minister tell us how much money will be available, in the end, for strategic infrastructures and when?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the \$2 billion for strategic infrastructures will be available as soon as the bill has been approved by the House of Commons.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport told the House that the \$2 billion for the strategic infrastructure fund was only, and I quote an initial payment.

Oral Questions

Given the magnitude of the Liberals' promises, which total \$3.5 billion for Quebec highways alone, could the Deputy Prime Minister confirm the comments of the parliamentary secretary and tell Quebecers whether the \$2 billion strategic infrastructure fund is renewable or not?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the \$2 billion for strategic infrastructures is not just for highways. In the budget delivered in December by the Minister of Finance, an amount of \$600 million is specifically earmarked for highways, in addition to the \$2 billion for strategic infrastructures, which could of course be used for projects other than highways.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the promises made by Liberal ministers and members regarding highways during the election campaign go well beyond the moneys currently available for this purpose.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister say what percentage of the \$2 billion infrastructure fund will be allocated to the construction of the highways promised by his colleagues during the election? What portion of the \$2 billion will be spent on the highways?

• (1425)

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 100% of the money will be spent on strategic projects. We will define the projects. But we know, as we heard on Friday afternoon, that it was not in the interest of the Bloc Québécois or the Parti Québécois before the election, but only when the Liberal candidates raised the issue about highways in Quebec.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Friday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport said in the House that there would be no interprovincial cost-sharing of the funds available in the infrastructure program, implying that this would allow the government to fulfill its promises made in Quebec during the election campaign.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister confirm the comments made by the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, to the effect that there would be no interprovincial cost-sharing in connection with the infrastructure fund?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion on the other side of the House.

Other funds already exist for highways. The Minister of Transport is trying to conclude an agreement with the Province of Quebec in this regard.

There is also the strategic infrastructure fund. As I mentioned, it is a program for strategic infrastructure for the 21st century, including, possibly, highways.

* * *

[English]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, who in the name of heaven is running the Export Development Corporation? Certainly no one concerned with securing softwood lumber jobs for Canadians who have been seeking EDC support.

Today we learned that the Export Development Corporation is bankrolling an American firm so it can purchase locomotives being built in Mexico.

Why is it not a condition of receiving EDC funds that they be invested in creating Canadian jobs instead of Mexican jobs?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear that in the North American economy, the EDC has the mandate to promote Canadian exports, and that is exactly what it did in the particular contract to which the NDP leader is referring.

GM has been in the position to save 850 jobs in Canada because it had Bombardier help deliver on that contract in the United States.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it may have created 850 jobs in Canada but why would it not have created more jobs in Canada? Surely the whole point of EDC is to support the export of Canadian products, not the export of Canadian jobs.

At least one company has confirmed that it could have handled the locomotives contract and hired hundreds of Canadian workers. It may be a bonanza for Bombardier but it is an insult to Canadians needing jobs.

Why are EDC funds being used to finance the flight of Canadian jobs to Mexico when they are desperately needed here in Canada?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the EDC supported the company that won the contract. EDC does not decide which company wins a contract in the United States. However EDC was in a position to help finance the purchaser of that contract because Bombardier had actually won the contract, which kept 850 jobs in Canada.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

In just 25 days the U.S. commerce department will make a final determination on softwood lumber, a decision that could literally destroy Canadian companies and communities. The negotiation so far has not worked. It is becoming clear that the only American who can bring the U.S. lumber coalition to a reasonable position is President Bush.

The Prime Minister and the president have talked about softwood lumber before. Now they need to negotiate.

Before the Prime Minister leaves this continent again will he launch personal negotiations with President Bush to resolve the softwood lumber issue before time runs out?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have talked with the president many times about the softwood lumber issue. He knows Canada's position very well. I have told him many times that the free trade agreement we signed with the Americans does not only apply to products such as natural gas and oil, but that it also applies to softwood lumber.

The leader of the fifth party should not take cheap shots. I have been on the road for 10 days and will be attending the Commonwealth meeting next week. I do not do this for pleasure but through duty.

Oral Questions

●(1430)

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, there is a duty to a number of Canadian communities that are suffering right now and talk by the Prime Minister is not enough. Negotiation could work.

The major obstacle now is the refusal of the American lumber coalition to respond seriously to the position put forward by the Canadian provinces. The American president could intervene to persuade the coalition to accept the Canadian position reasonably.

If the Prime Minister will not negotiate, given the failure of the minister and the failure of the others, what does he propose be done to protect Canadians whose livelihoods are now at stake? Why will he not negotiate—

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the president is extremely aware of the problem. I have talked with him regularly and very forcefully. I am confident there will be a solution to the problem before the expiration date according to the American law.

* * *

EXPORT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we have just learned that Export Development Corporation has lent billions of dollars of Canadian taxpayers' money at below market rates to Union Pacific Railroad of the United States. This is only the latest example of the Liberal government's corporate welfare policy to large U.S. companies. EDC subsidized Northwest Airlines' purchase of Canadian jets to the tune of billions of dollars just a year ago.

Why do taxpayers of Canada have to subsidize yet another large American company worth over \$30 billion?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. member will look at all the facts.

He is attacking EDC but he should tell the House of Commons and the Canadian people that EDC is helping Canadian companies to sell abroad. EDC is not losing money. EDC is making money and at the same time it is helping Canadian exporters.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that it took a question about Bombardier to bring the Prime Minister to his feet on this issue.

What is really strange about this EDC deal is that Bombardier's portion of the contract is being manufactured by Mexican facilities. It is obvious that EDC is totally out of control. Is this the Liberal industrial policy, corporate welfare for multimillion dollar American companies supplied by Mexican labour?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker, because I am very much interested in the welfare of the Canadian people. I want people to know that when there is a success in Canada, the Alliance Party always attacks any successful business people in Canada.

[Translation]

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURES

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, right now, we can identify three possible sources of funding to meet the Liberal promises made during the election campaign.

There is \$108 million for Quebec's highways in the current Department of Transport budget; there is the approximately \$600 million fund for border infrastructure throughout Canada, security being an issue we cannot ignore; and there is apparently—I use the word apparently deliberately—\$2 billion for strategic infrastructure for Canada as a whole.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister admit that, right now, there is really only \$108 million earmarked for the Liberals' highway construction promises? One hundred and eight million, period.

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is enough money for a large number of infrastructure projects, among them highways across the country, including Quebec.

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, will the Deputy Prime Minister confirm that the \$600 million fund for border infrastructure can in no way be used for highways 30, 50, 175 and 185?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is asking for very detailed information, but I can tell him that we have money for highways, we have money for borders, and we have money for strategic infrastructure.

We are not going to pay for all the highways in Quebec. The Province of Quebec has some responsibilities. We must talk with our provincial partners, as well as with other possible partners for investments in strategic infrastructure. There are many things to be done.

* * *

[English]

TERRORISM

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there were reports today that the murder of Daniel Pearl, *The Wall Street Journal* reporter who was brutally slain by his al-Qaeda captors, may have been planned or directed from Canada. One of the suspected murderers may have received his orders to kidnap and kill Pearl in calls made from Pakistan to Canada.

It seems that the government's post-September 11 efforts have been for nothing. How can the government repeatedly assure Canadians that terrorists are not operating from within this country when the killers of Daniel Pearl may have received their marching orders from the al-Qaeda masters here in Canada?

●(1435)

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague certainly is well aware that I am not going to comment on any investigation.

Oral Questions

He is also well aware that we have a very efficient RCMP and security intelligence agency. He is aware that they deal with their counterparts around the world. They will all make sure that these individuals who should be brought to justice will be brought to justice.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government has been warned repeatedly. Even CSIS has told the government that terrorist networks are operating within this country. The Ressay case made it clear that terrorists are operating here.

Last week we learned that the RCMP intelligence section was not even talking to its CSIS counterparts and has not been doing so the whole time the Liberal government has been in power. Now the murder of Daniel Pearl may have been planned or directed from this country.

How can the government possibly assure Canadians that it has not dropped the ball on the war against terror at home when it appears that the murder of Daniel Pearl may be tied to terrorists operating in Canada?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that my hon. colleague would use so much speculation. The fact is that what he has commented on is a report from CSIS and the RCMP that is two or three years old.

I met with the commissioner of the RCMP today. He indicated to me that CSIS and the RCMP co-operate very well. They also co-operate with other agencies around the world.

We are not in this place to play games. We are here to make sure that the safety of Canadians and citizens around the world is preserved and we will do that.

* * *

[Translation]

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURES

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign, the Liberals made a formal promise to Quebec of \$3.5 billion for roads.

Today, the Deputy Prime Minister is refusing to respond in any way to our questions. The people of Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, Montérégie, Bas-du-Fleuve and the Outaouais have had it up to here with the Liberal government's unkept promises.

How much money are they going to put on the table to make good their promises? That is what we want to know.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the people of Lac-Saint-Jean and Chicoutimi have been promised for the last—

An hon. member: 25 years.

Hon. Jean Chrétien: —25 years, by the former member for Jonquière, that there would be roads. Now that they have a Liberal MP, there is hope.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Roberval.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Prime Minister that the same member was there between 1984 and 1993, with zero results. However, that was before he changed political hats.

Might I just remind the Prime Minister that his ministers, the ministers of justice and of immigration, along with the members for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord and Beauharnois—Salaberry, have made formal commitments, which were featured in campaign literature.

What we want to know now is how much cash there is on the table. That is what we want to know.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, the hon. member was previously a Conservative MP. There was also a certain Mr. Bouchard, who was a Conservative MP and then become Premier of Quebec, and he never did a single thing about the highway between Chicoutimi and Quebec City.

That hon. member had the right idea, however; he opted for the Liberals and now the region has some hope again.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister recently insulted those of us who have been calling for a strengthening of investment in defence as “a bunch of guys who are lobbyists who are representing those who sell armaments”.

The Prime Minister's comments are an insult. They are an insult to the majority of Canadians who want us to be able to stand up for ourselves in the world. They are an insult to the men and women of the Canadian forces both past and present.

Commander Mike Jeffery has said that this government is “driving our personnel into the ground”.

Will the minister dismiss this distinguished Canadian's comments as those of just a lobbyist, or is the general right?

• (1440)

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the general has pointed out that there are indeed some challenges for the army. The government recognizes this.

The government has ensured that in any of the deployment overseas our men and women have the tools they need to do the job. We have increased the defence budget for the last four years. We have \$5 billion more coming in the next five years. We now rank sixth in NATO in terms of defence expenditures.

Most important is what the men and women of the Canadian forces with the support of the government have been able to produce. We have the third largest force on the ground in Afghanistan. We are playing a very meaningful role.

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): More government spin, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

Here is what Canadian forces people are saying. Major General Ed Fitch has said that the army is on starvation rations. Brigadier General Ivan Fenton has said that the army is very overstretched due to benign neglect. The commander of our army, General Mike Jeffery, said on Friday that the army is living on borrowed time.

We ask a lot of our Canadian troops. When will the government start to show some respect for them? Serving Canadian military officers rarely speak out against the decisions of their political masters. Why are they speaking out now?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately members of the opposition twist and turn and take comments that are made by our dedicated military personnel out of context.

There are challenges. We know there are challenges. That is one of the reasons we want to do a defence review but we are providing the men and women who have gone to Afghanistan and on other international operations with what they need to do the job.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Citizens of Atlantic Canada are concerned about the effect of oil spills on our fragile coastal ecosystems. The Minister of Transport has recently expressed concerns in the House about the need for increased fines for polluters.

With reports indicating that oil soaked birds have been washing up on the shores of Nova Scotia over the past weekend, can the minister tell the House what action the government is taking?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that we are very concerned about protecting our marine environment. In particular, the example of what we saw on the weekend in Nova Scotia is being pursued by my department, Environment Canada and the coast guard.

In that regard, under the auspices of the Canada Shipping Act, just recently the owners of a Philippines based ship were fined \$125,000, the highest fine ever for ship source pollution in Canadian waters. This shows that the legislation passed by the House does protect Canadian waters.

* * *

TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS CANADA

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the largest beneficiaries in the technology partnerships Canada loans: SNC-Lavalin, \$8.7 million in loans, \$131,000 donated to the Liberal Party; Spar Aerospace, \$4.8 million in loans, \$134,000 to the Liberal Party; Bombardier, \$87 million in loans, \$411,000 donated to the Liberal Party. These lucky companies are contributing to the Liberal Party at a higher rate than they are paying back their loans.

How does the industry minister explain the connection between TPC loans and these huge contributions? What active steps is he taking to ensure these loans are repaid?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should know that these are not loans. These are investments made in order to enable these companies to develop technology which turns into jobs and prosperity here in Canada.

Technology partnerships Canada is a program of which we are proud. It is mostly pre-competitive research and development. It shows the way for the future for many Canadian businesses. We will continue to invest in this fashion. It is a proven success.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if these are supposed to be investments rather than loans, then I presume we now have an equity position in all these companies. Maybe we have shares in all these companies as the Government of Canada.

The whole loans and grants system in the country is out of control. Nine of the last ten TPC grants went to Liberal ridings. The Liberals shovel money to their corporate buddies who dutifully shovel it back into the coffers of the Liberal Party.

What tangible benefits can the industry minister tell us these TPC loans have produced? How does he explain that only 2% of these billions of dollars of loans have ever been repaid?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, members should be reminded that the auditor general has looked carefully into the TPC program, has examined the question and has concluded that we have used due diligence with respect to each one of these investments. We make public disclosures through the public accounts of all the money that is invested.

The member is right in his suggestion. Sometimes we do take positions in companies. We are paid royalties. We have warrants that are given sometimes in return for these investments.

The important thing is that Canada, like many other countries, through this program provides money which might not otherwise be available for R and D which enables growth, jobs and prosperity.

* * *

●(1445)

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, a spokeswoman for Correctional Service Canada says its new one-half billion dollar condo plan will prepare criminals for the day they are released back into society.

Under the new Liberal plan, hardened violent offenders will enjoy a more comfortable lifestyle inside jail than many law-abiding citizens on fixed incomes face on the outside.

Oral Questions

Will the pampers plan not ensure the reality of existence for criminals outside prison pales in comparison to having all their needs met on the inside?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if my hon. colleague were to take a look inside our prison system and to look at our prisons, he would not think they were any great places to be.

We have to have institutions for women. We have to make sure they pay for the crime. We have to make sure there is rehabilitation in place. We have done that and we will continue to do that.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that while this government moves ahead with its \$500 million plan to ensure all the best creature comforts for criminals, it continues to ignore the voices of victims.

An internal audit of Correctional Service Canada has confirmed that only about a third of victim impact statements follow criminals to their parole hearings. Why is it that the interests of criminals, including all the comforts of home, always take precedence over victims' rights when it comes to Liberals?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague is well aware and as I have said a number of times in the House, victim impact statements are retained and are read at parole hearings.

The fact of the matter is that what money is being spent by this government and by CSC is spent to make sure that we have proper institutions in place to make sure that women offenders pay the price for their crimes and they are rehabilitated.

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, to continue along this theme, the solicitor general continues to allow his bureaucrats to put the comfort of killers ahead of public safety. Correctional Service Canada plans on spending \$500 million in taxpayer dollars to expand its cottage style or open concept prisons, fondly known as club fed. How can he justify this to Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the biggest problem with my hon. colleague is the Tories got ahead of him with the question and the fact of the matter is that the answer has not changed. We have offenders in this country. They have to be in prison. They have to pay the price for their crimes. They have to have rehabilitation. We have done that and we will continue to do that.

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that is of little consolation to victims of those criminals.

The commissioner of CSC has ordered a review of the prison system but it will not be complete until this fall.

I ask the solicitor general: Why is his department putting the cart before the horse? Why is he not waiting until that review is complete before committing to huge prison infrastructure expenditures?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a review of the prison system is a very important thing, but the fact is that this procedure taking place at this moment started a number of years ago. What we have to have is institutions for women who commit crimes in this country. They must pay for their crimes and they must be rehabilitated.

[*Translation*]

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, again last week, there was a death in the Lower St. Lawrence following an accident on highway 185, the Trans-Canada, bringing to 90 the number of deaths in the past ten years. These are deaths that a four-lane highway would have prevented.

Since the government of Quebec has already begun investing in this highway, and since it has been the subject of promises by the federal Liberals, what is the Prime Minister waiting for to honour his ministers' and MPs' promises? When is he going to put the money on the table to end this carnage?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our programs in this regard are well known. We are currently negotiating a cost-sharing agreement for the projects approved with the provincial governments, including the government of Quebec.

If the government of Quebec feels that the stretch between Rivière-du-Loup and the New Brunswick border is a priority, I will be very pleased to agree. When I was a member from New Brunswick, I complained that there was no good highway between Quebec and New Brunswick.

Mr. Robert Lanctôt (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Liberal promises about highway 30, an amount of \$357 million was announced as official in the member for Beauharnois—Salaberry's advertising material during the election campaign.

The \$108 million out of the total budget put on the table by the federal government is far from enough to cover even the bridges necessary to extend highway 30.

When is the federal government going to honour the promises made by the ministers and MPs and put on the table, as promised, the \$357 million which was part of a firm commitment to complete highway 30, not just wishful thinking?

● (1450)

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, we have already said that the amounts in the strategic infrastructure fund could be used for highways as well. But with so much interest in highways across the way, I think that perhaps there will soon be a provincial election.

* * *

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the federal government's citizens first initiative rates the performance of federal departments from the perspective of people who use the system.

In the year 2000, unemployed Canadians gave Canada employment centres a failing grade. Forty-six out of 100 said they were very unhappy with the service.

Why is the government content with a failing grade in delivering services to the unemployed?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has made and continues to make sure that we have an employment insurance program in place to make sure that any workers in this country who have difficulty are taken care of.

We have made and will continue to make sure that we have the proper programs, training and other things that are needed for unemployed people in this country.

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government's stated goal is to increase the performance of federal departments by 10% by 2005. That means that a mere 60% of Canadians would be satisfied with the performance of Canada employment centres, a D-minus instead of an F.

Why is the government content with low targets and bottom rung service for unemployed Canadians?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): The government has never said, Mr. Speaker, that there is not room for improvement. We are always striving to make sure that we provide what is needed for the people in this country.

There are objectives to meet and we will meet them.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in October 2001, an Islamic court in northern Nigeria sentenced Safiya Husseini to death by stoning for having sexual relations out of wedlock.

Last week a protest was held in Montreal to bring attention to this unacceptable violation of human rights.

Could the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa tell the House what the Government of Canada is doing to prevent her execution?

[Translation]

Hon. Denis Paradis (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, I expressed Canada's concerns with respect to this execution.

On Thursday, I met with Nigeria's Minister of Information. I told him of our concerns. I gave him a copy of *Hansard*, showing the views expressed in the House, as well as a copy of the petition tabled by the member for Burnaby—Douglas. The Nigerian minister assured me that an appeal will be heard on March 18 and that Nigeria will honour its human rights obligations.

Oral Questions

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the \$240 billion farm bill currently before the U.S. congress will include subsidies for pulse crops. In order to harvest a cheque from the U.S. government, farmers south of the border will massively overproduce, killing the pulse industry in western Canada.

At the same time, this government is proposing a one size fits all safety net for Canada that will actually cut our farm safety net funding. Canadian farmers cannot survive continued attacks from their own government as well as foreign governments.

How will the minister of agriculture protect our pulse industry from these new subsidies?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is drawing a conclusion on the U.S. farm bill before it is completed.

However, I have certainly expressed our concerns to my counterpart in the U.S. as has our ambassador in Washington, as I have to the U.S. ambassador here.

We are working with the provinces and with the industry to address all the issues that we need to address in the realities of agriculture today. Included in that is the reorganization of the emphasis within the research department of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada to specifically address some of the concerns of the pulse industry.

* * *

● (1455)

GUN REGISTRY

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, the taxpayer funded \$680 million long gun registry with no tangible benefit is about to be privatized by the Liberal government.

On pain of criminal charges, gun owners must provide the government with sensitive information that could be extremely dangerous in the wrong hands. Many, including the government's own privacy commissioner, have expressed grave concerns about this privatization plan.

Could the Minister of Justice tell Canadians what safeguards will be implemented to ensure the security of this personal information and just how this is going to be a savings for taxpayers?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Basically, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is outsourcing. The aim and goal is to make sure that we will keep offering the Canadian population very good services, and of course privacy concerns will be addressed and taken care of.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURES

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance said that any surplus would be used to pay off the debt. However, if the government wants to fulfill all the promises made by its candidates during the last election campaign, the current amount of \$108 million for highways is clearly insufficient.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister intend to fulfill the promises and commitments made by his colleagues and, consequently, will he allocate any surpluses to highways?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the fiscal plan is based on a sound foundation.

We are confident that such large projects are necessary for a strategic program and that, during the first few years, expenditures will be more or less of the magnitude anticipated by the Minister of Finance.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my constituency is home to many people displaced by the conflict in Sri Lanka. For over 20 years Sri Lanka has been racked by a bloody civil war pitting the government of Sri Lanka against the Tamil Tigers of Tamil Eelam.

On Friday, the government of Norway announced that the leader of the Tamil Tigers and the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka had signed a formal cessation of hostilities, paving the way for face to face peace talks.

What are the views of the Minister of Foreign Affairs on this breakthrough? Is Canada willing to offer any assistance to the parties? Can my constituents hope for peace?

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his question, which interests hundreds of thousands of Canadians. We welcome the peace initiative in Sri Lanka and we welcome the initiative of the government of Norway.

I want to tell the House that we will do everything we can in this country to ensure that there is a lasting peace in Sri Lanka which will respond to the legitimate concerns of all citizens of that country.

I am proud of the fact that CIDA has engaged in a program in Sri Lanka over the last couple of years searching to find solutions to conflict resolution, solutions to federalism. In fact, the Secretary of State for Western Economic Diversification was made a part of that team. We are proud of our efforts to date and we will continue those efforts.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Prime Minister. The

minister of agriculture is planning a trip to Washington next month but he will get a cold reception. Senator Kent Conrad, chair of the U. S. senate finance committee, has written a letter to the president to protest the minister's visit.

The agriculture minister simply does not have the clout to protect the Canadian interest in the United States. That job belongs to the Prime Minister, but the Prime Minister seems to be too busy to deal with Canada-U.S. trade issues. Just ask the softwood lumber workers.

Will the Prime Minister take time out of his globetrotting to lead an agriculture mission to Washington and personally lead the fight against rising U.S. subsidies?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am always defending the interests of the farmers when I meet with the president of the United States. It is always on the agenda.

I say that it is counter to their interests to keep subsidizing the way they are. They are depressing the prices internationally and it is hurting farmers not only in Canada but elsewhere.

However, I am surprised at the beginning of the hon. member's question. Let me put it this way: I think he was wrong. If Senator Conrad said that, it is because he is afraid that my minister of agriculture is very competent.

* * *

[Translation]

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURES

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if, after March 31, the government wants to allocate part of the year end surpluses to something other than the debt, it must pass a bill, otherwise it will be too late.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister intend to introduce a bill to recover part of the surpluses and allocate them to the highway infrastructure program, so as to fulfill the Liberal promises made during the election campaign?

● (1500)

Hon. John McCallum (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government will pay off part of the debt as it has done in the past, including \$17 billion last year. The interest saved on the reduced debt will be used for these infrastructure projects.

* * *

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada's commitment to the Kyoto accord has come under continued attack from Premiers Campbell and Klein yet the Liberal government has done nothing to counter these baseless attacks.

Does the industry minister have any concrete data on what the real cost would be to Canadian industry of not proceeding with our Kyoto commitment to reduce those harmful emissions? If he does have that data, has he given it to the environment minister and will he share it with the House today?

Routine Proceedings

Mrs. Karen Redman (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the opposition parties talk like the cost of acting is something that we know, and we do not know, quite frankly. We are still working it out.

However, what is more relevant is what is the cost of not acting. To date, Canadians currently spend over \$1 billion per month managing the effects of increasing extreme weather. Climate change is something the government takes very seriously.

* * *

GUN REGISTRY

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice said that the government would outsource the information on the gun registry. Perhaps he should give it back to the Minister of Industry who invented this debacle.

The Minister of Justice is a smart man. Could he answer a simple question: How will this work and how will it save taxpayers money?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, we are proud of the gun legislation in Canada. It is a question of privilege, it is not a right. We are a different society. We are pleased with what we have done.

The gun registry works well. Licensing has been terminated. At this point in time we are proceeding with registration. Indeed, in order to provide good service to the population we are outsourcing as we have done with other departments. Privacy concerns will also be addressed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

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 five petitions.

* * *

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the first group of men and women of the most successful Canadian Winter Olympic team is returning home today. For all Canadians the last two weeks in Salt Lake City have been unforgettable. It was marvellous and incredible to see the class of Jamie Sale and David Pelletier.

[Translation]

It was also marvellous to watch Marc Gagnon's incredible speed and the fact that Catriona Le May Doan proved wrong that it is impossible to be the flag bearer and win a gold medal.

● (1505)

[English]

The other day the women's hockey team won. It was unbelievable.

Yesterday the nation stood still. I do not know how many millions of people were watching the game but it was marvellous. Winning this game was very important because for the first time in 50 years our hockey team was coming back to Canada with a gold medal.

[Translation]

These are truly moments that we will never forget, seeing all these people who come from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the South to the North Pole, together on the ice.

[English]

They were skating, carrying the Canadian flag, shoulder to shoulder, people of French origin, British origin, many first and second generation Canadians, singing the national anthem and waving Canadian flags. All Canadians were so proud. The streets of Canada were filled with people who were joyful. There were probably not many homes in Canada that were not celebrating.

[Translation]

It was a day of great fraternity and solidarity, seeing these young men and women who have spent years preparing themselves, who wanted to be the best and who firmly believed that when you set your mind to it, you can do it. They have all overcome tremendous obstacles. Often, back home, people made fun of these athletes, because they were different.

I know some of these young people who took part in speed skating a few years ago, like Gaetan Boucher. People used to wonder what he was doing, as he was the only one in his sport. Now, in the space of ten years, Canadians dominate speed skating, because of pioneers like him. Yesterday was a day of glory.

[English]

Yesterday was a great day for all Canadians. It was a day of pride, a day of achievement, a day of brotherhood and a day where we stood side by side singing O Canada and being proud to be Canadian.

Mr. John Reynolds (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I join the Prime Minister in congratulating Team Canada, the on ice and snow version. Canada's men's and women's hockey teams did us proud in bringing the gold back to Canada. Overall this was Canada's most successful winter games.

Canadians will never forget the amazing success of Jamie Sale and David Pelletier who accepted silver with class and without complaint. The whole world knew that they deserved gold that they eventually won.

We will never forget Marc Gagnon and Catriona LeMay Doan who were golden in speed skating; Clara Hughes, the first Canadian to win medals in both the winter and summer games; Haley Wickenheiser, who led our women's hockey team to victory; and so many other Olympians.

Routine Proceedings

We will always remember Sakic, Lemieux, Iginla, Yzerman, Fleury, that great goaltender Brodeur, and the rest of the star-studded men's hockey team ably led by Pat Quinn and Wayne Gretzky. They brought back to Canada, after 50 years, what is rightfully ours. I hope the Prime Minister is sitting here 50 years from now waiting for the next one, maybe on the opposite side.

Yesterday's event was probably the greatest sporting moment in Canadian history since Paul Henderson scored his famous goal against the Soviet Union 30 years ago.

Canadians are a winter people, living in a land that Voltaire called *quelques arpents de neige*, a few acres of snow, and Bob and Doug McKenzie called the great white north. The ice and snow of a Canadian winter cannot chill our hearts and spirits for we have learned how to warm ourselves with the thrill of winter sports.

The only thing that could possibly surpass the thrill of these games would be to repeat these same successes again on home ice so to speak at the Vancouver Whistler Olympic Games of 2010.

• (1510)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Salt Lake City Winter Olympic Games are over and several images come to mind.

Like the Prime Minister, I would like to congratulate all the athletes for their hard work and their determination, not just those who made it to the podium. We should extend our congratulations to the athletes from all over the world we have not heard about because they did not win, as they did not get to hear their national anthem and are going back home in anonymity.

Our thoughts are with their families, their friends and all those who supported them while they were working hard and dreaming about stepping onto the podium, a goal they have not been able to reach. What we should bear in mind is that thousands of young athletes throughout the world are using sport to push their limits and do their best.

Congratulations to all the winners, of course, to whom victory brings honour, glory and fame. But let us also be proud of the efforts made by the athletes who did not win and are coming back home a bit disappointed. Let us show them that their hard work makes their families, their friends and their communities very proud. These are the people for whom it is important to invest time and money in amateur sport.

[*English*]

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful moment when all members of the House agree that our Canadian athletes brought great honour and pride to all of us as Canadians in their performances and contributions to the success of the Olympics. They demonstrated what can be achieved through dogged determination, a high degree of self-discipline, impressive skills and outstanding teamwork. We need to learn from what we have seen them accomplish.

The sense of celebration was shared widely by Canadians. There was something symbolic about the feeling of pride that Canadians expressed so widely as we watched the wonderful accomplishments

of those who won and those who simply contributed their best. For me it was a particular joy to watch the winning men's hockey game yesterday, after the thrill of the women's victory on Friday, with 190 men and women steelworkers who paused in the middle of a very important conference on human rights to join in that celebration. There was a great deal of talk about the great sense of loss of self-respect and sovereignty that so many Canadians have felt in past months because of recent events and decisions by the government.

Let us take the opportunity to build on the sense of pride and self-respect that we all celebrate in the aftermath of the Olympics and move forward with that. It is a moment for us to remember that amateur sports are an incredibly important part of community building. They are about athletics but they are also about community and solidarity building. Let us celebrate and move forward with that same spirit.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I join others in the House in saluting the athletes, coaches and managers of Canada's Olympic teams. For two weeks they held us spellbound as they captured the imagination of the country. Time and again Canada held its collective breath watching seconds tick away as our athletes made that one last effort that would bring them to victory. We are immensely proud of every one of them. We are proud of their 17 medals and successes. Medals and winning are not the only things that count. We are especially proud of the way they conducted themselves no matter how trying or how controversial the circumstances.

[*Translation*]

Let us celebrate the huge effort put in by our athletes to bring to their country the greatest number of medals Canada has ever won at the Winter Olympic Games. The talent, determination, passion and great panache of our athletes have provided a window to the world for Canada, and the whole world has fallen in love with them. Canada could not have asked for better ambassadors.

I join with my colleagues, here in this House, and all Canadians, I am sure, to congratulate all the members of Canada's Olympic team and especially to thank them for representing so well the Canada that we have become. You have inspired all of Canada. The olympic spirit you carry within yourselves has made us realize how great it is to be Canadian, how proud we are of being Canadian.

Thanks again and congratulations.

* * *

• (1515)

[*English*]

REMEMBRANCE DAY NATIONAL FLAG ACT

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-432, an act requiring the national flag of Canada to be flown at half-mast on Remembrance Day.

Routine Proceedings

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the environment of what is happening in the south and the great thrill that we have been talking about as Canadians, we should remember that 100,000 Canadians have spilled their blood across the world. The purpose of the bill is to remember and honour those 100,000 people by having the national flag of Canada flown at half-mast on all government buildings every November 11.

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

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC/DR) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-433, an act to amend the Criminal Code (puppy mills).

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is an amendment to the Criminal Code. It would, for emphasis, allow for a sentencing judge to take into consideration the horrific circumstances that exist when an individual engages in an activity that has become known colloquially as a puppy mill.

This does not have a friendly connotation by any means. It involves horrendous conditions that put cruel and unusual circumstances on any animal. Most often they are dogs and cats which are used for commercial production.

I want to thank my colleague from New Brunswick Southwest for seconding the bill. It would allow a judge, in my opinion, to send the proper message, one of deterrence, one of denunciation for horrific acts against animals. I would hope all members of the House would support the bill.

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

The Speaker: The Chair has missed two items by calling the wrong order so we will go back to presenting reports from interparliamentary delegations.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present two reports in both official languages.

The first is from the Canada-Japan Interparliamentary Group on the Chair's annual visit to diet members held in Tokyo, Japan in November 2001.

The other is the report of the 10th annual meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum held in Honolulu, Hawaii in January 2002.

* * *

PETITIONS**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present a number of petitions with hundreds of signatures from people in my riding. The petition states that whereas, aboriginal people over the last two months have been netting—

● (1520)

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Yorkton—Melville knows that it is out of order to read petitions. He will want to give us a brief summary. I know he is always a stickler for compliance with the rules.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, I will briefly outline the substance of the petition.

A number of aboriginal people have been netting fish from a stocked lake in my area, Lake of the Prairies. These fish have been sold on the commercial market. The petitioners respect the aboriginal right to fish. However, Lake of the Prairies was built in the 1960s to act as a water reservoir and was stocked with fish for the benefit of all citizens to become an economic generator in that area.

The petitioners are asking that parliament enforce the laws of Canada so that those who take advantage of their status and breach federal laws be held accountable for their actions and that our government ensure that we have a single justice system for all citizens.

ANTARCTICA

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from citizens who are concerned about Antarctica. These citizens live in Peterborough, Lakefield, Curve Lake, Bailieboro, Ennismore, Toronto, Norwood, Cavan, Millbrook, North Monaghan and Douro.

The petitioners point out that Antarctica contains a pristine, scientifically valuable environment that needs protection. They point out that Canada, despite being a polar nation, lags behind many nations as far as the environmental initiatives in Antarctica are concerned.

The petitioners point out that the environmental protocol to the Antarctic treaty presents practical guidelines concerning environmental issues in Antarctica. They call upon parliament, as the parliament of a signatory country to the Antarctic treaty, to ratify all of the environmental protocol's guidelines into Canadian law.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: No. 101.

[Text]

Question No. 101—**Mr. Peter Adams:**

Does the government have a plan to increase the federal role in passenger train service, and in particular, what progress has been made on plans to return VIA service to Peterborough and other communities in Ontario?

Mr. André Harvey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): In April 2000, the government announced that it was providing VIA with approximately \$402 million in new capital funding. This funding will enable VIA to revitalize its services through the acquisition of additional cars and locomotives to expand capacity, upgrading infrastructure to allow faster train speeds and increased frequencies on some routes in the Quebec-Windsor corridor, and refurbishing stations.

Government Orders

At the same time, VIA was asked to examine its system to determine if there was a business case for expanding its services. Last fall, VIA added a new Toronto-Kitchener frequency, extended a Toronto-Windsor train to Oshawa and extended a Montreal-Toronto train to Aldershot.

The Minister of Transport is presently awaiting a report from VIA on the feasibility of other service changes, including the introduction of service to Peterborough. VIA has met with interested parties such as the municipalities and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the owner of the track. The report will assess necessary capital investments and operating funding requirements as well as the degree of community support. Once the report is received, it will be carefully considered. As VIA's operating funding has not been increased, the introduction of new service can only be considered if a business case has been demonstrated and if it will not require an increase in VIA's current funding level.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 102 could be made an order for return, the return would be tabled immediately.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 102—**Mr. Jim Pankiw:**

Since 1994 and for each of the subsequent calendar years, what has the government through Statistics Canada determined to be: (a) the total number of homicides; (b) the total number of homicides involving a firearm; (c) the total number of attempted murders; (d) the total number of attempted murders involving a firearm; (e) the total number of all other offences against the person, excluding murder and attempted murder; (f) the total number of criminal offences against the person involving the use of a firearm, excluding murder and attempted murder; (g) the total number of suicides; and (h) the total number of suicides involving the use of a firearm?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SPECIES AT RISK ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-5, an act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 2.

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement, government orders will be extended by 13 minutes.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I was speaking about the difficulty most people would have in recognizing an endangered species or its habitat in a wildlife area. Many people in Canada would have great difficulty recognizing or enumerating any of our endangered species, particularly with a bill that is punitive for those who do not recognize them. This is one of the difficulties with this legislation. What happens to tourists and campers who explore Canada? The burden of proof is too high for innocent Canadians.

We must protect endangered species. It is a critical goal and a responsibility this side of the House takes very seriously. People want to co-operate but this entrapment approach by the government is adversarial and does nothing to encourage co-operation. Without co-operation we simply cannot move ahead.

The minister must be more reasonable and realistic in exercising his discretion. It would be almost impossible for companies that deal with mineral or oil and gas exploration to demonstrate due diligence over operations covering hundreds of thousands or even millions of hectares when they do not even control all of the external factors involved. What would happen if the practices approved today were deemed fatal to species later? Who would take the fall?

There are 70 million hectares of agricultural land and 25 million hectares of privately owned forest lands in Canada. How would farmers and operators exercise due diligence over these areas, especially when many are small operations with very limited resources and no familiarity with endangered species regulations? Who will provide education for the yet to be determined caretakers of these species?

The government knows this is a problem. In response to a question from the official opposition, the minister said that it is a legitimate matter for concern. He said that the accidental and unwitting destruction is a concern and that the government wants to give the maximum protection possible to the legitimate and honest person who unwittingly makes a mistake. If it is such a concern, why is the government not doing anything about it? The bill would make such an honest person a criminal. Some protection.

This bill reminds me of the gun registration legislation, Bill C-68. In fact, this endangered species legislation is part of a disgraceful pattern in the government's handling of rural issues. Its cruelty to animals legislation makes farmers worry about the continuing standard animal husbandry practices. Its heavy-handed approach to registering long guns utterly fails to consider everyday living and farming practices in rural and northern Canada.

The Kyoto accord will potentially add heavy costs to agricultural producers across Canada. The premiers are united against this type of government shortsightedness. Now the endangered species legislation threatens to criminalize farmers and property owners, the very people who are in the best position to help our endangered species.

Government Orders

The official opposition's amendments would restore the balance by requiring that the crown prove some measure of intent before someone could be convicted. Did the farmer willingly harm an endangered species? Did the farmer wilfully harm the species and do so with intent?

All of these amendments would go some way to ensure that innocent people would not inadvertently commit a criminal offence. It would be a better start than the one the government is offering in the bill before us.

At a minimum the federal government must work with the provinces to provide training for landowners and users who would be required to meet the due diligence standard but do not have the knowledge or information to identify listed species or their critical habitat and residences. If the government does not provide the proper and realistic education on endangered species, we can only hope that the courts will act as a check and balance for our protection.

Is it realistic for everyone in an area to know everything about an endangered species? If it is not, the courts will likely rule most convictions out of order. Then we are back to square one.

• (1525)

Canadians want to protect endangered species. Everyone wants to do that but it will not come willingly under the heavy-handed approach outlined in the bill.

Canadian Alliance Motion No. 80 also covers the critical need to have criminal intent outlined in the legislation. Canadians deserve to be innocent until proven guilty.

Canadian Alliance Motion No. 94 deals with important provincial jurisdictional issues. The preservation of endangered species is a shared responsibility between the federal and provincial governments. Just over five years ago, in 1996, the federal and provincial ministers agreed to a national accord for the protection of species at risk in Canada.

Sadly though in this legislation the minister unilaterally assumes discretion to apply the new species at risk accord to provincial lands, a giant step backward in federal and provincial relations. To confuse matters more does not happen automatically. Instead, it is completely up to the minister to determine whether the laws of a province are adequate. If he decides they are not, he can invoke using his heavy-handedness to apply the federal law in the province. Is it only me who sees a political showdown coming?

This completely undermines the principles of co-operation which were developed in the 1996 accord. Co-operation under my rules only, trust me politics in this House have shown that co-operation must be a shared responsibility where both sides are happy with the results. Dictated co-operation does not work.

Because it is completely at the minister's discretion, it leads to an uncertainty and confusion for provinces and, more important, for land resource owners. How does the minister feel about the provincial laws of today? What side of the bed did he wake up on? The provinces will try in good faith to arrange their affairs to comply with the law but they have no idea what the law will be if the federal government can step in at any time.

Lawsuits and appeals in the supreme court will undoubtedly choke the courts for generations to come and the species that we are trying to protect will disappear in the meantime. It will undermine collective efforts to protect species and show to the world that Canada is not serious in its commitments to co-operate in meeting this important goal.

This is like the approach of the former minister of health to health care co-operation. We must do better on this issue.

• (1530)

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak once again to Bill C-5. As all members in the House are aware, this bill is supposed to protect endangered species. The motions in Group No. 2 deal specifically with jurisdiction and criminal intent.

The last time I had the opportunity to speak on the bill, it was with regard to the motions in Group No. 1 and the idea of compensation. As many of my colleagues have, I talked about the importance of obviously putting together legislation that brings together all the stakeholders involved in protecting endangered species. Why should we even deal with the bill if it does not create the atmosphere in the country of all the stakeholders coming together to protect endangered species.

Those stakeholders are various groups. They are landowners, ranchers, others have agricultural backgrounds and some of them are basically enthusiasts of nature, environmentalists or people who are interested in various forms of wildlife. All of them have an interest.

It is clear that even when Canadians are polled on this issue and even if endangered species does not rank at their top priority, over 90% of Canadians have expressed the interest in putting together some form of legislation that would protect endangered species.

In going through the bill and trying to deal with the legislation that hopefully will be effective in protecting endangered species, the question is can we get all Canadian from all those sides that I have mentioned working together. This is where the government has failed.

We have identified where it has failed over and over again in trying to bring stakeholders together. Instead, its mentality has been a divide and conquer mentality which refuses to bring all stakeholders together and jeopardizes the future of the protection of endangered species no matter what we do in this place.

We identified the idea of compensation. I will take a moment to repeat those concerns. Landowners who currently are stewards of the land, who make efforts usually on a voluntary basis, because they care so deeply about their land and about the endangered species that may be present on their land, make an effort to try to protect those habitats specifically on their lands without any involvement or legislation by the government.

Government Orders

How can we continue to do that in light of the government saying that if there are particular types of endangered species found on their land that this land could be confiscated without any form of compensation? The compensation question is still not clear. To get landowners on side and people involved in the agriculture industry, we have to give them the confidence that the government will respect private property rights. In fact, the government has no commitment to private property rights. This is the fear behalf of a lot of the landowners. If they are actually making the effort to be stewards of the land now and in future if the bill is passed and the compensation question is not clear, they are at risk of losing often generations of livelihood and generations of tradition on some of these lands because the government has not clearly put into the bill a mechanism or equation for compensation. This is outrageous.

I went on to talk about various communities in Europe that have actually outlined ways to deal with that compensation question. I wish the government would take that seriously. That is one other area that will pull apart the stakeholders when it comes to dealing with endangered species.

Group No. 2 motions talk about the area of jurisdiction and criminal intent. The Bloc is very concerned. I know Bloc members have many interests in the environment. They are pushing on many fronts to ensure the federal government respects the environment. We saw that with Kyoto and with a number of environmental bills. I am sure their commitment to endangered species is no less.

However the idea of jurisdiction in this case brings forth a lot of questions of how this relationship that is managed by the federal government will bring in the partners, the provincial governments.

When I talk about the stakeholders in the area of compensation, here is another example of trying to bring the stakeholders together, outside of the people who are directly related to the land, which are obviously the different levels of government. We can all be shooting on the same cylinders: co-operating together in this place and in the provinces to ensure that the paramount importance is put on endangered species. The government is refusing to even look at the way it will be trampling on provincial rights.

•(1535)

We have seen it time and time again from this government in health care, education and in a host of other areas where we know the government has no real commitment to working with the provinces. If anything, it would run roughshod over the provinces and invoke its own types of laws, when in fact those responsibilities may be of a provincial nature.

My colleague from Edmonton East, who spoke before me, talked about the idea of a national accord when it comes to environment, especially in the area of endangered species. This is an area where the government has lacked leadership in trying to bring those stakeholders together. I mentioned health care and education.

There has been talk of trying to bring the stakeholders from the provinces together in other areas. Let us face it, being federal representatives, we have to respect the provincial jurisdictions, but there are ways we can work better together if leadership is shown at the federal level to engage those provinces in the areas of health care, education and obviously the environment.

In creating a national accord, there would not be the duplication that we see in so many areas because the government has grown so large and tries to get involved in so many different things. We would try to eliminate the areas of duplication and obviously work in better co-operation with the provinces. The government has failed to do so and refuses to deal with the areas of jurisdiction that may be unacceptable to the provinces, where they may feel there is duplication. It obviously would not be in the best interests of taxpayers unless we address the jurisdictional issue.

That is why the idea of a national accord, such as in areas of education and health care, is something on which we should try to work together to allow provinces the flexibility to take care of its citizens and allow better co-operation and co-ordination with the federal government.

My colleague also spoke, as other colleagues have, about one of the big concerns we have in the bill outside the jurisdiction area. That is how the bill could affect criminal intent when it comes to people who are stewards of the land. The bill puts the burden of proof on the accused and not on the prosecution, meaning that farmers, ranchers, or anyone inadvertently destroying a species at risk or its critical habitat are guilty until proven innocent. This is unacceptable.

On the principle of obviously wanting to prosecute people who intentionally commit crimes against endangered species, I do not think we would find anyone opposed. When I was the environment critic for the official opposition, I had some discussions with some land management and agricultural groups. They said they had a real problem with the particular part of the bill that would invoke criminal intent. Even though we all know, and I think the parliamentary secretary to the environment minister would agree, there are people out there who are stewards of the land and who are currently working to protect endangered species, there are times in the daily operations of farmers, ranchers or others who deal in the natural resource industries when habitats might be affected negatively.

In many cases that could be done unintentionally. It is not the intention of many of these groups to damage habitats but unfortunately it could happen. What is being suggested in the bill is that even an innocent farmer or someone who is going about the business of dealing with their own business could be prosecuted in the event of an accident. This is unacceptable.

If there is obviously clear intention, which can be proven without making this sort of change to the bill, on the part of people who are going to actively destroy habitat, then we should prosecute them to the highest levels. We should ensure that fines are levelled and everything else. However we have jeopardized totally the whole notion of justice with this change of saying that a person is guilty until proven innocent. That goes against our belief in the justice system.

Government Orders

As I have said, the government has an opportunity to bring the stakeholders together. We have been repeating this message over and over again in the official opposition. The stakeholders involved have been repeating this message over and over again. This is the third time the government has tried to put this type of legislation through the House. Why has it failed? Because each time it consistently has refused to listen to the opposition and various stakeholders to bring people together on an issue that is very important. It refuses to listen to Canadians. That is unacceptable and that is why we have a really big problem with this bill.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Lanctôt (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise again to take part in the debate on Bill C-5, an act respecting the protection of wildlife species at risk in Canada.

What strikes me with this bill as with many others is that its real purpose is to allow the minister responsible to grab powers that do not belong to him. The primary purpose of this bill is to allow the minister responsible to get hold of certain powers, to centralize the decision making process.

This could be done in a fairer manner, but that does not seem to be the government's intention. It prefers to use so-called noble objectives to give itself the means to take what it should not take. In this case, the minister responsible is using the species at risk to give himself powers that he did not have before.

Sure, we must protect species at risk, but why is the minister responsible giving himself powers that do not belong to him? The Bloc Québécois believes that it is possible to create standards to improve and help species and ecosystems that are at risk, while also respecting Quebec's jurisdictions and avoiding useless interference.

This interference is not hidden in any way, but is an indirect way of running things. And this is not acceptable in a parliamentary system. As we all know, ours is a political system with a constitution, and it is critical that we respect the division of powers.

This is supposed to be a federal system, but the government is increasingly behaving like a centralizing agent, which goes against the principles that should apply. Jurisdictions and powers are being usurped, and this is totally contrary to the division of constitutional powers.

It would have been more appropriate to strengthen what is already in place by working on existing structures.

It would be more appropriate to adequately use available resources with programs that already meet existing needs. It is totally useless to waste time and money duplicating what already exists by appropriating these powers. Let us not forget that these powers are currently held by another level of government under the constitution.

What gives the federal government the authority to ignore the constitution and take powers that do not belong to it? Of course the government will provide a vague and evasive answer, in an attempt to lull the public, which is wondering about the appropriateness of acting in this fashion. But what is of even greater concern to me is where this appropriation of powers will stop.

The environment is an area of shared responsibility between the federal government and the Government of Quebec, and we are working to ensure that this is how it will apply. So why is the federal government using this so-called authorization to usurp powers that belong to others? This way of acting is both inconceivable and unacceptable.

Interference will no doubt result in administrative duplication. This approach will result in a cumbersome administration that will rapidly become antiquated and outdated. None of this adds anything to the effective protection of species at risk.

I deeply regret the fact that the federal government is using something as fragile as the protection of endangered species for its own political purposes. Indeed, it is the political agenda that is driving the real objectives of this bill. It seems clear that the government wants to fulfill political objectives first and foremost.

The government talks about shared responsibilities, but there is no real sharing. It is more like a one way street, or rather highway, where the government decides first, then discusses. The consultation process is backwards. Under this bill, the minister is appropriating incredible discretionary powers, with no consideration for the constitutional division of powers.

• (1545)

I already said it, sharing necessarily implies dialogue and discussion between parties. Yet, based on the actions of the federal government, this is not the case. It would seem to be that the minister is attempting to grab power for himself at the expense of the provinces and Quebec. That is the definition of interference.

To make progress on such an issue, we have to start at the beginning, and not by interfering in Quebec's areas of responsibility. We have no choice but to be offended when we see that Quebec's legislation in the field of wildlife protection is completely ignored. It would have made sense to incorporate the related legislative provisions from Quebec in order to come to the required protection outcomes, but they are not included in the objectives of this bill.

Negotiations would have been desirable and beneficial for all, but once again, the federal government prefers to disregard results in this area to do as it pleases and ride roughshod over the division of powers, while yet again centralizing its powers.

The Bloc Québécois believes that we must act to establish measures that will provide sufficient protection for species at risk. However, it is impossible for us to support this bill, because it disregards the management responsibilities of the provinces and Quebec.

The Bloc Québécois believes that prompt action on this is necessary. The undue appropriation of powers by the federal government must not, however, be allowed. As a result, an effective consultation process must be put in place between the federal government and Quebec, in order to successfully arrive at an appropriate solution to this emergency situation. We will then be able to put in place a suitable approach for meeting the requirements of the situation.

Government Orders

Those requirements have nothing whatsoever to do with national identity. This appears to be the case, however, when one reads the first “whereas” statements in the bill. It appears obvious that this is in fact an attempt by the minister responsible to appropriate the powers incumbent upon Quebec and the provinces. This is tantamount to contravening the jurisdictional division as set out in the constitution.

All of us hope for, and want, concrete measures to protect endangered species. Before my consent is given, however, not only would the objectives have to be clearly identified but it would also have to be made clear that the protection of endangered species is the one and only priority. This is not what we see in Bill C-5.

I shall therefore wait for a bill that is respectful of the division of jurisdictions and includes an objective of conservation before my support is forthcoming. I cannot give it to Bill C-5 because of the lack of respect with which it was drafted and the pernicious intent of the federal government.

The primary purpose of this bill is political advantage. This is obvious from the way it was drafted. The government appeals to Canadian national identity as our heritage, which deserves protection, but totally ignores the primary clientele of this bill, that is species at risk. Concrete measures must therefore be taken before it is too late to really protect species at risk while at the same time respecting the constitutional division of powers.

• (1550)

[*English*]

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure to put forward my position and that of the PC/DR coalition with respect to Bill C-5, the species at risk legislation more commonly referred to as SARA.

First I would like to congratulate the PC/DR coalition member for Fundy—Royal, who has put a lot of effort into this legislation. He has walked it through the committee stages and the House. I can assure the House that he is very disappointed with the way the Liberal government has seen fit to bring forward this piece of legislation, and now we are speaking to amendments which I am told had the support of committee members, inclusive of government members as well as opposition members. They were good amendments to the first piece of legislation that the government has brought forward not in three years but in three terms, and now unfortunately it is a piece of legislation that is supported by no one.

It is supported by none of the stakeholders and none of the producers, ranchers and farmers whom it will impact. It is supported by none of the provinces and now comes forward as basically an empty shell of itself, as legislation that will cause nothing but irreparable damage in areas that have been depending on this legislation. The people I represent, the producers, farmers and ranchers out there, are very supportive of endangered species or species at risk legislation. They are and have been the stewards of the land, the stewards of the habitat of the animals and birds and flowers that it is necessary to protect, the endangered species.

All these people want is to be treated fairly. They are the ones who on behalf of society have made sure that the habitat is available for the animals so that society can take advantage of that. However, there are a few areas of the legislation that will impact these people

and the obvious one is the area of compensation. I do not think that anybody should expect a farmer, producer, rancher or owner of land to be forced to do something on behalf of society without ever having the opportunity of compensation.

There was an amendment that went forward. That amendment talked about fair and reasonable compensation on a case by case basis, fair and reasonable compensation when something impacts a particular piece of property or piece of land. We must not forget that this is about people's livelihoods. These farmers, producers and ranchers depend on the land to feed their families and certainly to pay the necessary bills in their communities.

There should well be a fair and reasonable compensatory package. In fact, our member for Fundy—Royal put together a white paper, a discussion paper with respect to that, and he called it “Carrots Instead of Sticks”, the carrot being the compensatory package as opposed to the stick of government that will whack everybody over the nose.

The fact that the “fair and reasonable” has been yanked by the minister is absolutely and totally objectionable. There is no way that the minister should have changed that instead of having the committee bring forward that amendment. We know that everyone benefits from the protection of our habitat, yet we cannot demand that farmers and agriculturalists pay the costs.

There is also an issue with respect to the amendment on scientific listings. Scientific listings should be based on the science of the endangered species, not on political requirements, as has been identified by the Minister of the Environment on the Liberal side. The Liberals have now allowed the politicians and the politics to be involved in those listings as opposed to having just simply scientific listings. That is objectionable. This is headed in absolutely the wrong direction.

I find it really interesting that we have a government that is prepared to tell others what to do and how to do it. It not only tells people what to do and how to do it but insists that they do it. However, in its own jurisdiction, the federal jurisdiction, the government has not made this mandatory in the legislation. Does that not say to hon. members that there is a big brother attitude in the federal government?

• (1555)

Every provincial government had letters of support for the hon. member for Fundy—Royal when they put forward the amendment with respect to provincial criteria regarding when the federal government would insist the provinces get involved in specific areas. When the amendment was put forward the government removed it even though Alberta, Ontario, P.E.I., Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick supported it. It was pulled. It was yanked by a government that is not prepared to put its own signature and apply its own criteria to its own lands. Yet it insists on having it done by provinces, municipalities, producers, farmers and ranchers.

It is totally abhorrent. It should not have happened. It is not what one would consider co-operative federalism. It is not working with provinces, stakeholders or the people affected. It smacks of the big brother attitude of the Liberal government.

Government Orders

The other issue is legality. It is about turning producers into criminals. This category of amendments deals with the criminality of not dealing with species at risk. Producers, farmers, ranchers or people who have habitats on their land may not know what all the endangered species are. A lot of these people live in my area. In my riding there are bluffs, woodlots, wetlands and wild lands which contain habitats for endangered species. Some producers may unknowingly and unwittingly have an impact on habitats because it is their job. It is their livelihood. It is their land.

Under Bill C-5 that would be criminal. These people do not know they are affecting habitats. They have not been told. They have not been made aware. However our good friends from the government can come forward and say it is a criminal act. A criminal act under Bill C-5 could mean jail or a huge fine. It could destroy lives.

Members might say pshaw, that would never happen. They might say our government does not do things like that to Canadians. However there is not a lot of trust out there among Canadian citizens for governments and bureaucrats.

In western Canada the Department of Fisheries and Oceans has taken its job extremely seriously to the point where if the book is black and white it will go to the black and white. It does not matter how it impacts municipalities, property rights or people's lives. DFO personnel are there now. There have been instances in my own riding where they have decided they must make their signatures come whatever or high water. It has had a great impact on a lot of my producers.

Let us not say it will never happen. It can and it will. The government and its bureaucrats are prepared to do anything to make those signatures.

There are a lot of areas in the amendments that should be supported. We in my party will not be supporting the legislation as brought forward. We find it objectionable that the amendments that were approved in committee and supported by members of the government were not allowed to come forward and make Bill C-5 the right piece of legislation.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I too have serious concerns about Bill C-5. Our critic, the hon. member for Red Deer, has been working diligently to point out to the government the shortcomings of the bill. Unfortunately there does not appear to be much attention on the government side to what is being said. I hope the government realizes it is not only the opposition that is saying these things. We are speaking on behalf of a large number of Canadians. Canadians in rural Canada would be the ones most affected by the bill. It would in many cases trample and trash their individual rights.

One of the rights it would trash is provincial rights. We have a constitution in Canada that says there are two sovereign parts. The federal government is sovereign in its areas of jurisdiction and provincial governments are sovereign in their areas of responsibility. It is clearly spelled out in the constitution. As far as I can tell, Bill C-5 is another attempt by the federal government to steamroll over areas of responsibility that belong to the provinces as their sovereign right under the constitution. The federal government is saying "Step aside, we are taking over".

Species at risk do not always respect political boundaries. They may cross into Saskatchewan, Alberta or somewhere else and we may not even notice. Since they do not vote I do not think the Liberal government would notice either.

However that is not the point. The point is that we cannot ignore and trash provincial responsibilities and sovereignty. It is a thing we have debated for many years in Canada. We have gone through painful wranglings, first ministers meetings, constitutional rounds, referenda and so on about provincial sovereignty, rights and responsibilities. The government thinks separatism in the province of Quebec is waning and that it can go back to the old trick of saying "Who cares what they think, we will do what we want to do". I hope the government realizes this is not the way of co-operative federalism. It should sit and negotiate these things with the provinces to get them onside.

The provinces have a heart as well as the federal government. I am not sure about a Liberal heart, but the federal government has a heart. It cares not just for the people but for species at risk. I think all Canadians care about species at risk. The question is, how will we do it? Will we trash people's rights to preserve the rights of species at risk? These are the things that should be debated.

I will go back to Bill C-49. It does not have much to do much with species at risk but I always like to quote a paragraph because it demonstrates the attitude of the government. I will show how the attitude pervades Bill C-5 as well. Subclause 36(3) of Bill C-49 deals with the federal government taking ownership of items currently owned by the private sector. It states:

The Governor in Council may require air carriers to transfer to the Authority, on such terms as the Governor in Council considers appropriate, their rights, titles, interests or obligations under any contract respecting screening specified by the Minister—

This is the important part:

—despite any contractual restriction on the transfer of those rights, titles, interests or obligations.

The whole body of jurisprudence and legislation we have built into contract law, civil law and everything else that guarantees a contract is a contract is refuted in one simple clause of Bill C-49. Not one of them is worth the paper they were written on because the governor in council says "On our terms you will transfer it to us". What an attitude that is.

Let us look at what the government would do to Canadians under Bill C-5. On page 51, subclause 87(2) deals with seizing things. If the government could not figure out what it was seizing it would call it a thing. Whatever the government seized it would call a thing.

● (1600)

Under Bill C-5 the government could take people's property. If the owners could not prove within 30 days that it was their property the government could destroy it and that would be the end of it. Thirty days is all people would have. They may not even be in the country to know the government has taken something off their land. They would have 30 days to prove it was theirs. If they could not, that is too bad. It would be gone.

Government Orders

Bill C-5 is a fairly simple, draconian and arrogant piece of legislation that should not be tolerated by Canadians. Subclause 87 (3) of the bill talks about perishable things seized by the government:

If the seized thing is perishable, the enforcement officer may dispose of it or destroy it, and any proceeds of its disposition must be paid to the lawful owner—

The government could seize goods that were perishable, notice they were starting to smell and decide to destroy them. How much would it pay the rightful owner? It would pay absolutely nothing because it destroyed the goods and did not sell them. It would have no responsibility to compensate the person who owned the stuff. That is a draconian, arrogant and wilful trashing of people's rights.

Clause 89 deals with investigation. In the world of criminal prosecution we have the police. It costs us millions of dollars a year to pay for the police. They go in, investigate crimes and lay charges. The cases end up in court, people may be found guilty, judges levy fines which are sometimes just a slap on the wrist, and that is the end of it.

For some reason or other under the species at risk act we would not only get fines of up to \$1 million, which is more than a slap on the wrist. One would have to pay the costs of inspection, seizure, abandonment, forfeiture or disposition of the stuff seized. Not only would one get a fine. One would have to pay for the investigation.

Murderers, bank robbers and people who take property, trash it, destroy it, steal it and sell it do not have to pay a dime for the investigation. However there is something special about species at risk. As well as paying a fine people would have to pay for the investigation, seizure, abandonment, forfeiture and disposition. Perhaps hon. members would agree it is lopsided. These are the types of things that are in the bill.

Clause 90 deals with people walking all over private property. It says enforcement officers could go onto anyone's property when they liked, as they liked and so on with no right of objection whatsoever by the owner.

Let us say that is okay. Not only would property owners have to let enforcement officers on their property. They would have to give enforcement officers all reasonable assistance to enable them to carry out their duties. Bill C-5 would deputize property owners as law enforcement officers.

When someone is committing a bank robbery or whatever crime the police tell us to phone them and they will look after it. They say not to worry. If someone is running around with a gun they tell us not to get involved. They tell us to stay out of trouble and they will look after it. Under Bill C-5 if people were running around the countryside with guns shooting endangered species, whatever those may be, one would have a legal obligation to help enforcement officers even one did not have a gun. On and on it goes.

I have only spoken about two or three clauses of the bill. There are many more. I would like to go through the rest but surely I have given an idea of why we in my party object to the bill.

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, once again I am pleased to take part in the debate on Bill C-5, the Species at Risk Act.

We are speaking today to the amendments in Group No. 2. Some of these amendments were tabled by my colleague from the Bloc, the hon. member for Mercier.

I listened very carefully to the remarks by the Canadian Alliance member and I really appreciated the first part of his speech. The Canadian Alliance members are opening their minds and finally realizing that the environment is a shared under the Canadian constitution. This is the first time I hear that. Congratulations. You have moved forward, you have developed in the area of the Canadian constitution.

But beyond the remarks made by the Canadian Alliance member on the environment, I would say that it is more than a matter of shared jurisdiction, because habitat is also involved. Amendment No. 2, put forward by my colleague Mrs. Lalonde, states—

• (1610)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I remind the hon. member that members may not be referred to by name, but rather by the name of their riding.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I was reading the motion and her name is on it.

I would like to quote Motion No. 2 of the hon. member for Mercier, which reads “the protection of habitats and species on provincial lands is entirely under provincial jurisdiction”.

The refusal by the government to support the motion moved by my colleague proves that it wants to usurp a shared jurisdiction. Whatever it says or does, it is clear that this government is constantly usurping rights.

In a speech made on June 2, 2000, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis said he was very disappointed with this government. He spoke about listing, saying it would be decided by a committee. At present, we have a list of 339 species at risk established by the COSEWIC. In this bill, however, the government ignores this list. It will be up to the governor in council to decide what species are to be added to the list. This decision will be taken by the Minister of Natural Resources, the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry.

Some ministers may prefer a particular specie while others will make a different choice. It will be a tower of Babel where everyone speaks a different language. Instead of using the list of 339 species established over a 20-year period by scientists who deal specifically with species at risk, the government has decided to establish a different list.

Why not use the existing list? What we are being told is “We in cabinet are the specialists”. The Minister of Defence may inform cabinet that he prefers one specie over another. Ministers will fight among themselves, and everyone will be able to do whatever they want in the field; there will no longer be an established list to go by.

Government Orders

As we can see, there are major irritants in this bill. The provinces and the federal government have made progress in terms of species at risk, but they now appear to be rejecting out of hand years of effort made by scientists and environmentalists.

The government claims to be in sole possession of the truth and says that we need it to lead the battle to protect species at risk. Personally, I do not think that the government is serious with this bill. It does not want to make progress. It simply wants to interfere in an area under provincial jurisdiction. It wants to negotiate directly with landowners on the issue of habitats, which is rather strange, since habitats are under provincial jurisdiction.

We can see just how pernicious the government's interference is. It perniciously grabs powers beyond its jurisdiction. It says that it has respect for us, but it is always the same thing. I have been here since 1997; some of my colleagues have been here since 1993. We often talk about it; the government always does things the same way.

"We are the sole possessors of the truth, so follow us, otherwise you are not part of the gang". I have not heard this in a long time. I believe that nobody is the sole possessor of the truth.

With this bill, the government should have shown its willingness to respect species at risk and to do something to protect them. Protecting species at risk is important. Some may think that history needs to be rewritten all the time, but no. It is possible to use documents that were produced by serious people who have already identified species at risk.

• (1615)

COSEWIC has already come up with a list. The government should say, "We are starting from there and moving forward". Even the ecologists are saying this. I am not an ecologist, but I am someone for whom the environment is very important. We must leave a healthy environment for our children and for those who come after us. We hope that we will finally be able to leave them a planet that they can develop as they see fit. The way we have started out, the heritage we are leaving them is going to be a mediocre one. What we are telling them is, "We are going to pollute to the hilt, sow discord everywhere, and you can sort it all out". I say no.

This bill could have given our people hope regarding species at risk. A species at risk did not start out that way. It is because we have polluted the atmosphere that it is becoming a species at risk. This would have been the time to take action and listen to everyone.

It is a funny thing but, when we make speeches, when we speak in committee, when we oppose a clause and say with considerable common sense that "that is not what we should do", we think that they are listening to us. But when we see the final version of the bill at third reading in the House, we realize that they had their ears open but they were not listening. It is always the same.

It is annoying for all the members and for all those who want to go forward. We must learn to know the species at risk better so that the provinces and the federal government can work together to find the best ways to protect them.

However, this bill is not doing that at all. It is not what it aims to do, and I find that very sad. We have spent hours on this bill and we

have not accomplished a lot. We have merely talked for the sake of talking.

There was once a television program entitled *Parler pour parler*, or "Let's talk for the sake of talking". I have not come here to talk for the sake of talking. I have come here to move things forward. People from my riding think that it is important. They tell me "Go to Ottawa to defend us because you know the priorities in our area". However, I note that the Liberals do not see or hear anything. The only thing they say is "no, no, no".

This is why the Bloc will be unable to support this bill. It is sad, but if the government had done its homework we would have been glad to say that we are finally going in the right direction.

[English]

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-5. I must say it has been many years in the making and the end result is not a good product.

Similar legislation first came forth in 1996. The Canadian Alliance worked diligently on this issue starting back when the legislation first came to the House and to committee. We offered substantial recommendations for change. Interestingly, many of the proposals that we made for change were promoted by environmental groups across the country. They were practical and worthwhile changes. Had they been included they would have made the legislation something that could have been supported. Unfortunately, those changes were not included in the legislation and the end result has left us with some serious problems.

I will speak to the amendments put forth by the Canadian Alliance regarding the issue of intent when it comes to damaging an endangered species. It is important to tie this issue with some of the other key issues when we are looking at whether or not these amendments are supportable.

The Canadian Alliance, by offering practical suggestions, demonstrated clearly that it wanted endangered species legislation which would protect endangered species. Our current critic, the hon. member for Red Deer, made that clear in his presentations on this issue and with his hard work in committee.

The Canadian Alliance understands that for the legislation to work we must look at what the practical impact would be on the people who are most likely to be affected, that is, farmers, resource owners and resource users. It would also include recreational property owners and users. Beyond that, almost everyone in the country could be affected by the legislation in a very negative way from two points of view.

First, if the legislation will not allow landowners and land users to deal with the legislation in a practical way then it could be counterproductive. That must be examined carefully. The issue of fair compensation has to be tied in. Landowners or resource users may find an endangered species on their property. For the legislation to work at all they must know that they would be compensated for the cost of protecting the species, whether it is the cost of some of their land being taken out of production or the cost of doing something to help protect the species. Unfortunately, that was not included in the legislation ensuring that it would not work. It is the first thing that would ensure that.

Government Orders

The second issue relates directly to the amendments that I am speaking to today, which is that criminal liability must require intent. The act would make criminals out of people who may inadvertently or unknowingly harm endangered species or their habitat.

●(1620)

Many farmers now leave a long stubble in their fields. The eventual growth there in the spring is an ideal habitat for a lot of species. Farmers work with these species every year. There is a provision where farmers would be expected to hire someone to do an environmental assessment so they can determine with some certainty that there are no endangered species in their field so that they are free to work and feel safe in working their field. That is something that just cannot be done.

The legislation would fail with that provision. I guarantee it. If the legislation passes as it is, it would fail and endangered species would be harmed more than they would be helped by the legislation. Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind about that.

Members should put themselves in the position of farmers. It could be in another resource industry. It could be anyone. It could be people who own cottages out at a lake. If an endangered species were to be found on a farmer's property there would be no fair compensation for the costs of protecting that species or for taking the land out of production.

The legislation would put that in place and jeopardize the livelihood of farmers. If that is the case in some situations, what will they do? These people have been good stewards of the land. They have done everything to protect species. They provide a good environment for all kinds of wildlife and all kinds of species. These same people, because of the legislation, may be driven to making sure that no one ever finds out that there was an endangered species on their property. They will do that through whatever means is necessary. Is that what we want to do to our farmers and to others in resource industries across the country?

Is that what the government wants to do with the legislation? I do not believe that at all. It feels that it has to put forth some legislation that might help protect endangered species but it knows, because of what went on in committee, as do environmentalists across the country, that it will be in reality the impact of the legislation if it passes as it is now.

In the name of fairness I ask the government, if it thinks it is right to put farmers, people in the other resource industries and people who have cottages at the lake who have invested large amounts of money in their properties so they can enjoy them, is it proper for any government to put them in a position where to protect their property they have to break the law to ensure that nobody would find out that there was an endangered species on their property? I do not believe that is right. It is wrong.

The Canadian Alliance proposals would at least give farmers and others the comfort that if they did not know there was an endangered species on their property they would not have to prove they did not know and they would not be held legally responsible for what they did unknowingly.

Bill C-5 would make it a criminal act to kill, harm or harass one of any number of endangered species. The bill would ignore one of the

fundamental tenets of western legal history, that criminal penalties are only given for offences committed with a criminal mind. *Mens rea* is the latin legal term for it. That would be ignored in the way the government has written the legislation. Normal protection would be ignored. A farmer or someone else who completely unknowingly destroys a habitat or an endangered species could receive penalties of up to \$1 million and five years in jail.

●(1625)

I am sure that is not the intent of the legislation. Let us get it fixed, get it back to the drawing board and ensure that the product we put out would help protect endangered species.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate on Bill C-5 which is an act to protect endangered species. Protection of endangered species is something that all Canadians and certainly our party agree should be accomplished. I will make the case that the legislation does not do what it sets out to do which is to protect endangered species.

My colleagues have quite correctly stated today that the average person in Canada does not know which species are endangered and which are not. Most people in Canada would know that the whooping crane, because of all the publicity and awareness programs that have gone on in association with a huge white bird with black wing tips, is an endangered species and they would do what they could to protect them. However there are literally hundreds of endangered plant species that the average person is not aware of. The bill takes the position that individuals should or ought to know what those endangered species are. I think that is unreasonable.

A lot has been said in regard to the fact that the bill would take a position that we would be guilty until we could prove ourselves innocent. That is totally against the principle of justice that this country was founded on, namely that we are innocent until proven guilty.

That is what is missing in the bill plus the point which was made by the previous speaker about the *mens rea* aspect. I know it is not sufficient to say that ignorance is no excuse for breaking the law. However, with no criminal intent and no intention of destroying the habitat or uprooting some rare plants or whatever, then the law should go a lot easier on people. There must be some burden of proof put on the prosecutor to show that there was criminal intent and that the law was willingly broken.

When I spoke to the bill before I talked about the aspect of penalties. One being that land could be confiscated upon proof that there was an endangered species on it. That speaks volumes for the government's attitude about private ownership of property. If property could be confiscated for the public good, then the case must be made that it should be compensated for at fair market value. If it is not compensated for at fair market value then the case could be made that we never actually owned the land in the first place. If we do not own the land in the first place, then why is it that we pay taxes on it and are responsible for what takes place on that land?

Government Orders

It would be quite easy to make a case that the legislation does exactly the opposite of what it sets out to do. It would set out to protect endangered species and by taking this confrontational, uncooperative, non-team building approach with the people who actually own or lease the land that the habitat is on the bill would do the complete reverse of what it intended to do in the first place.

● (1630)

On my property in Alberta there are what are referred to as bush partridges but actually they are grouse. I have never hunted them. I have done my best to leave little patches of long grass in which they overwinter. They are not an endangered species but I am afraid they are going to be because they are having a hard time adapting. So much of the land has been pastured. They have to have tall grass that will collect snow in order to overwinter or they simply will not survive.

They also live on rosehips. Rosehips are the fruit of the rose, the little buds that are left after the flower has fallen off. They are very high in vitamins D and A and contain quite a lot of protein and energy. They are the main source of feed for these little partridges during the worst parts of the winter. I have done what I can to fence off areas to make sure my cattle do not go into the bush and destroy their habitat so that the partridges will have some sanctuary.

Even then there are times when I am coming home or going to town that I notice that one of the little partridges has strayed out on the road to pick up some tiny pebbles for his crop. Birds have to have something in their crops to grind their food because they have no teeth. While it is out on the road, someone may come over the hill, run over the partridge and there goes some of my breeding stock. It is impossible to protect all of them.

We could make the case that people should know that partridges come out to the road to get gravel for their crops and therefore they should drive more carefully. I am wondering how the law and the courts would deal with a person who had killed a bird.

If it were a whooping crane that was on the road and a person came over the hill and hit it with their car, would that person be responsible? Everyone recognizes that a whooping crane is an endangered species. Does that make the person who hit the crane with the car responsible for the death of the crane as a wilful destruction of habitat or of an endangered species? I do not think it does.

The very aspect that we have to show there was some intent to do harm to that species or habitat is a basic tenet of Canadian law and British law before it. It is something that we appear to be giving up and we should not be. If we are willing to give that up with regard to this aspect, how does that bode for people who try to defend themselves against very serious crimes?

If an individual has been charged with something and has been considered to be guilty before having had a chance to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he or she is not guilty, that is absolutely wrong. The onus should be on the crown to prove its case against an individual. The person should be considered and presumed innocent until the crown can prove otherwise. That is exactly what this is all about.

When Canadians learn that basic tenet of Canadian justice has been thrown out, they are going to question the validity of this law, as we have. In this caucus we have questioned the validity and the purpose of it.

The government has said on so many occasions that it is important to educate the public on this issue, that issue, or some other issue. I do not think there has ever been an issue where it was as relevant to educate the public as this one. The public has to know which species are endangered in Canada, whether they are flora or fauna. We have to bring the Canadian public on side and make them all environmentally aware.

● (1635)

I believe that Canadians will gladly become advocates of the preservation of endangered species and will be good stewards, provided there is some incentive for them to do so. I have seen the government on the other side use the carrot and the stick so often, but in this case it would be far better off for the endangered species to use more carrot and a lot less stick.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The recorded division will apply to Motions Nos. 11, 48, 51 and 98 to 102.

[English]

The next question next is on Motion No. 23. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 35. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 39. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 44, 57, 80, 86, 90 and 122.

● (1640)

The next question is on Motion No. 56. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

● (1645)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The next question is on Motion No. 67. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on Motion No. 67 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 74.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 78. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 84. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 112. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 113. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

● (1655)

We will now move to the motions in Group No. 3.

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-5, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 34 on page 2 with the following:

“be considered in the legal listing of species and in developing and imple-”.

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-5, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 10 on page 3 with the following:

“in the public registry under subsection 50(3)”.

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-5, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 21 on page 5 with the following:

“processes; and”.

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-5, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 10 and 11 on page 6 with the following:

“gy included in the public registry under subsection 43(2), and includes any amendment”.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-5, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing, in the English version, line 15 on page 6 with the following:

“den, nest or other similar area or place, that”.

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-5, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12 on page 7 with the following:

“cies, variety or biologically distinct population of animal, plant or”.

Motion No. 10

Government Orders

That Bill C-5, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 21 and 22 on page 7 with the following:

“cies, subspecies, variety or biologically distinct population is, in the”.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-5, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 7 to 12 on page 8 with the following:

“becoming extinct as a result of human activity, to provide for the recovery of wildlife species that are extirpated, endangered or threatened as a result of human activity and to manage species of special concern to prevent them from becoming endangered or threatened as a result of human activity.”.

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-5, in Clause 6, be amended by adding after line 12 on page 8 the following:

“(2) The purposes of this Act, outlined in subsection (1), shall be pursued and accomplished in a manner consistent with the goals of sustainable development.”.

• (1700)

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-5, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing lines 24 to 26 on page 9 with the following:

“A copy of the agreement must be included in the public registry within 45 days after it is entered into, and a copy of every annual report must be included in the public registry within 45 days after it is received by the delegating minister.”.

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-5, in Clause 15, be amended by replacing lines 23 to 26 on page 13 with the following:

“(c.1) indicate in the assessment whether the wildlife species migrates across Canada's boundary or has a range extending across Canada's boundary.”.

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-5, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 16 to 18 on page 15 with the following:

“knowledge subcommittee must be appointed by the Minister after consultation with any aboriginal organization he or she considers appropriate.”.

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-5, in Clause 25, be amended by replacing, in the French version, lines 35 to 42 on page 16 with the following:

“(3) Dans les quatre-vingt-dix jours suivant la réception de l'évaluation visée au paragraphe (1), le ministre est tenu de mettre dans le registre une déclaration énonçant comment il se propose de réagir à l'évaluation et, dans la mesure du possible, selon quel échancier.”.

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-5, in Clause 28, be amended by replacing, in the English version, line 35 on page 18 with the following:

“its assessment. A copy of the assessment”.

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-5, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 10 to 18 on page 23 with the following:

“(2) If there is more than one competent minister with respect to the wildlife species, they must prepare the”.

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-5, in Clause 41, be amended by replacing, in the English version, lines 13 and 14 on page 25 with the following:

“distribution objectives that will assist the recovery and survival of the species, and”.

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-5, in Clause 42, be amended by replacing line 18 on page 26 with the following:

“listed as a threatened species or an extirpated species.”.

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-5, in Clause 43, be amended by replacing, in the English version, lines 19 and 20 on page 26 with the following:

“43. (1) Within 60 days after the proposed recovery strategy is included in the public”.

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-5, in Clause 44, be amended by

(a) replacing lines 35 to 37 on page 26 with the following:

“by the competent minister as the proposed recovery strategy, he or she must include it in the public registry as the proposed recovery strategy in relation to”

(b) replacing line 3 on page 27 with the following:

“wildlife species into a proposed recovery strategy for”.

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-5, in Clause 46, be amended by replacing lines 20 to 23 on page 27 with the following:

“the public registry and in every subsequent five-year period, until its objectives have been achieved or the species' recovery is no longer feasible. The report must”.

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-5, in Clause 51, be amended by

(a) replacing lines 42 and 43 on page 29 with the following:

“competent minister as a proposed action plan, he or she must include it in the public registry as a proposed”

(b) replacing line 3 on page 30 with the following:

“wildlife species into a proposed action plan for the”.

• (1705)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I believe you will find there is unanimous consent to allow me to move Motion No. 79.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to allow the member for Repentigny to move Motion No. 79?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (for Ms. Francine Lalonde) moved:

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-5 be amended by deleting Clause 57.

[*English*]

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 115

That Bill C-5, in Clause 73, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 43 on page 39 with the following:

“and in every subsequent five year period, until its objectives have been achieved. The report must be included in the public registry.”.

Motion No. 119

That Bill C-5, in Clause 83, be amended by replacing line 30 on page 47 with the following:

“(b) it is used by an aboriginal person for ceremonial or medicinal”.

Motion No. 120

That Bill C-5, in Clause 97, be amended by replacing line 23 on page 55 with the following:

“36(1), 58(1), 60(1) or 61(1) or section”.

Motion No. 134

That Bill C-5 be amended by adding after line 33 on page 75 the following new clause:

"141.1 If Bill C-10, introduced in the 1st Session of the 37th Parliament and entitled the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act, receives royal assent, then, on the later of the coming into force of subsection 34(2) of that Act and the definition "competent minister" in subsection 2(1) of this Act, paragraph (a) of the definition "competent minister" in subsection 2(1) of this Act is replaced by the following:

(a) the Minister of Canadian Heritage with respect to individuals in or on federal lands that are administered by that Minister and that are national parks, national historic sites, national marine conservation areas or other protected heritage areas as those expressions are defined in subsection 2(1) of the Parks Canada Agency Act;"

Motion No. 135

That Bill C-5, in Clause 142, be amended by replacing line 34 on page 75 with the following:

"142. Except for section 141.1, the provisions of this Act come into"

• (1710)

The Deputy Speaker: Shall I dispense with the reading of Motion No. 136?

Some hon. members: We would like to hear it.

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 136

That Bill C-5, in Schedule 1, be amended by replacing page 76 to 86 with the following:

SCHEDULE 1

(Subsections 2(1), 42(2) and 68(2))

LIST OF WILDLIFE SPECIES AT RISK

PART 1

EXTIRPATED SPECIES

MAMMALS

Bear, Grizzly (*Ursus arctos*) Prairie population

Ours grizzly population des Prairies

Ferret, Black-footed (*Mustela nigripes*)

Putois d'Amérique

Walrus, Atlantic (*Odobenus rosmarus rosmarus*) Northwest Atlantic population

Morse de l'Atlantique population de l'Atlantique Nord-Ouest

Whale, Grey (*Eschrichtius robustus*) Atlantic population

Baleine grise de Californie population de l'Atlantique

BIRDS

Grouse, Sage (*Centrocercus urophasianus phaios*) British Columbia population

Tétras des armoises population de la Colombie-Britannique

Prairie-Chicken, Greater (*Tympanuchus cupido*)

Tétras des prairies

AMPHIBIANS

Salamander, Tiger (*Ambystoma tigrinum*) Great Lakes population

Salamandre tigrée population des Grands Lacs

REPTILES

Lizard, Pygmy Short-horned (*Phrynosoma douglassii douglassii*) British Columbia population

Iguane pygmée à cornes courtes population de la Colombie-Britannique

Rattlesnake, Timber (*Crotalus horridus*)

Crotale des bois

FISH

Chub, Gravel (*Erimystax x-punctatus*)

Gravelier

Paddlefish (*Polyodon spathula*)

Spatulaire

MOLLUSCS

Wedgemussel, Dwarf (*Alasmodonta heterodon*)

Alasmodonte naine

Government Orders

LEPIDOPTERANS

Elfin, Frosted (*Callophrys irus*, *Incisalia irus*)

Lutin givré

Marble, Island (*Euchloe ausonides*)

Marbré insulaire

Blue, Karner (*Lycaeides melissa samuelis*)

Mélissa bleu

PLANTS

Mary, Spring Blue-eyed (*Collinsia verna*)

Collinsie printanière

Tick-trefoil, Illinois (*Desmodium illinoense*)

Desmodie d'Illinois

PART 2

ENDANGERED SPECIES

MAMMALS

Badger jacksoni subspecies, American (*Taxidea taxus jacksoni*)

Blaireau d'Amérique, jacksoni

Badger jeffersonii subspecies, American (*Taxidea taxus jeffersonii*)

Blaireau d'Amérique, jeffersonii

Caribou, Woodland (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*) Atlantic—Gaspésie population

Caribou des bois population de la Gaspésie—Atlantique

Fox, Swift (*Vulpes velox*)

Renard véloce

Marmot, Vancouver Island (*Marmota vancouverensis*)

Marmotte de l'île Vancouver

Marten, American (*Martes americana atrata*) Newfoundland population

Martre d'Amérique population de Terre-Neuve

Whale, Killer (*Orcinus orca*) Northeast Pacific southern resident population

Épaulard population résidente du Sud du Pacifique Nord-Est

BIRDS

Chat, Western Yellow-breasted (*Icteria virens auricollis*) British Columbia population

Paruline polyglotte de l'Ouest population de la Colombie-Britannique

Crane, Whooping (*Grus americana*)

Grue blanche

Curllew, Eskimo (*Numenius borealis*)

Courlis esquimau

Flycatcher, Acadian (*Empidonax virescens*)

Moucherolle vert

Grouse, Sage (*Centrocercus urophasianus urophasianus*) Prairie population

Tétras des armoises population des Prairies

Owl, Barn (*Tyto alba*) Eastern population

Effraie des clochers population de l'Est

Owl, Burrowing (*Speotyto cunicularia*)

Chevêche des terriers

Owl, Northern Spotted (*Strix occidentalis caurina*)

Chouette tachetée du Nord

Plover, Mountain (*Charadrius montanus*)

Pluvier montagnard

Plover circumcinctus subspecies, Piping (*Charadrius melodus circumcinctus*)

Pluvier siffleur, circumcinctus

Plover melodus subspecies, Piping (*Charadrius melodus melodus*)

Pluvier siffleur, melodus

Rail, King (*Rallus elegans*)

Râle élégant

Shrike, Eastern Loggerhead (*Lanius ludovicianus migrans*)

Pie-grièche migratrice de l'Est

Sparrow, Henslow's (*Ammodramus henslowii*)

Bruant de Henslow

Government Orders

- Tern, Roseate (*Sterna dougallii*)
 Sterne de Dougall
 Thrasher, Sage (*Oreoscoptes montanus*)
 Moqueur des armoises
 Warbler, Kirtland's (*Dendroica kirtlandii*)
 Paruline de Kirtland
 Warbler, Prothonotary (*Protonotaria citrea*)
 Paruline orangée
 Woodpecker, White-headed (*Picoides albolarvatus*)
 Pic à tête blanche
 AMPHIBIANS
 Frog, Northern Cricket (*Acris crepitans*)
 Rainette grillon
 Frog, Northern Leopard (*Rana pipiens*) Southern Mountain population
 Grenouille léopard population des montagnes du Sud
 Frog, Oregon Spotted (*Rana pretiosa*)
 Grenouille maculée de l'Oregon
 Frog, Rocky Mountain Tailed (*Ascaphus montanus*)
 Grenouille-à-queue des Rocheuses
 Salamander, Tiger (*Ambystoma tigrinum*) Southern Mountain population
 Salamandre tigrée population des montagnes du Sud
 REPTILES
 Snake, Sharp-tailed (*Contia tenuis*)
 Couleuvre à queue fine
 Turtle, Leatherback (*Derموchelys coriacea*)
 Tortue luth
 Snake, Night (*Hypsiglena torquata*)
 Couleuvre nocturne
 FISH
 Dace, Nooksack (*Rhinichthys* sp.)
 Naseux de Nooksack
 Lamprey, Morrison Creek (*Lampetra richardsoni*)
 Lamproie du ruisseau Morrison
 Salmon, Atlantic (*Salmo salar*)
 Saumon d'Atlantique Populations de l'intérieur de la baie de Fundy
 Stickleback, Benthic Paxton Lake (*Gasterosteus* sp.)
 Épinoche benthique du lac Paxton
 Stickleback, Benthic Vananda Creek (*Gasterosteus* sp.)
 Épinoche benthique du ruisseau Vananda
 Stickleback, Limnetic Paxton Lake (*Gasterosteus* sp.)
 Épinoche limnétique du lac Paxton
 Stickleback, Limnetic Vananda Creek (*Gasterosteus* sp.)
 Épinoche limnétique du ruisseau Vananda
 Trout, Aurora (*Salvelinus fontinalis timagamiensis*)
 Omble Aurora
 Whitefish, Atlantic (*Coregonus huntsmani*)
 Corégone de l'Atlantique
 MOLLUSCS
 Bean, Rayed (*Villosa fabalis*)
 Villeuse haricot
 Lampmussel, Wavy-rayed (*Lampsilis fasciola*)
 Lampsile fasciolée
 Mussel, Mudpuppy (*Simpsonais ambigua*)
 Mulette du Necturus
 Physa, Hotwater (*Physella wrighti*)
 Physe d'eau chaude
 Riffleshell, Northern (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*)
 Dysnomie ventrue jaune
 Snail, Banff Springs (*Physella johnsoni*)
 Physe des fontaines de Banff
 Snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*)
 Epioblasme tricorn
 LEPIDOPTERANS
 Ringlet, Maritime (*Coenonympha tullia nipisiquit*)
 Satyre fauve des Maritimes
 Blue, Island (*Plebejus saepiolus insulanus*)
 Bleu insulaire
 Checkerspot, Taylor's (*Euphydryas editha taylori*)
 Damier de Taylor
 PLANTS
 Agalinis, Gattinger's (*Agalinis gattingeri*)
 Gérardie de Gattinger
 Agalinis, Skinner's (*Agalinis skinneriana*)
 Gérardie de Skinner
 Ammania, Scarlet (*Ammannia robusta*)
 Ammannie robuste
 Avens, Eastern Mountain (*Geum peckii*)
 Benoîte de Peck
 Balsamroot, Deltoid (*Balsamorhiza deltoidea*)
 Balsamorhizie à feuilles deltoïdes
 Bulrush, Bashful (*Trichophorum planifolium*)
 Scirpe timide
 Bluehearts (*Buchnera americana*)
 Buchnera d'Amérique
 Braya, Long's (*Braya longii*)
 Braya de Long
 Bugbane, Tall (*Cimicifuga elata*)
 Cimicaire élevée
 Bush-Clover, Slender (*Lespedeza virginica*)
 Lespédèze de Virginie
 Buttercup, Water-plantain (*Ranunculus alismaefolius* var. *alismaefolius*)
 Renoncule à feuilles d'alisme
 Cactus, Eastern Prickly Pear (*Opuntia humifusa*)
 Oponce de l'Est
 Coreopsis, Pink (*Coreopsis rosea*)
 Coréopsis rose
 Cryptanthe, Tiny (*Cryptantha minima*)
 Cryptanthe minuscule
 Fern, Southern Maidenhair (*Adiantum capillus-veneris*)
 Adiante cheveux-de-Vénus
 Gentian, White Prairie (*Gentiana alba*)
 Gentiane blanche
 Ginseng, American (*Panax quinquefolium*)
 Ginseng à cinq folioles
 Virginia Goat's-rue (*Tephrosia virginiana*)
 Téphrosie de Virginie
 Goldenrod, Showy (*Solidago speciosa* var. *rigidiuscula*)
 Verge d'or voyant
 Lady's-slipper, Small White (*Cypripedium candidum*)
 Cypripède blanc
 Lotus, Seaside Birds-foot (*Lotus formosissimus*)
 Lotier splendide
 Lousewort, Furbish's (*Pedicularis furbishiae*)
 Pédiculaire de Furbish
 Lupine, Prairie (*Lupinus lepidus* var. *lepidus*)
 Lupin élégant
 Milkwort, Pink (*Polygala incarnata*)
 Polygale incarnat

Government Orders

Mountain-Mint, Hoary (*Pycnanthemum incanum*)
 Pycnanthème gris
 Mulberry, Red (*Morus rubra*)
 Mûrier rouge
 Orchid, Western Prairie Fringed (*Platanthera praeclara*)
 Platanthère blanchâtre de l'Ouest
 Owl-Clover, Bearded (*Triphysaria versicolor* ssp. *versicolor*)
 Triphysaire versicolore
 Paintbrush, Golden (*Castilleja levisecta*)
 Castilléjie dorée
 Plantain, Heart-leaved (*Plantago cordata*)
 Plantain à feuilles cordées
 Pogonia, Large Whorled (*Isotria verticillata*)
 Isotrie verticillée
 Pogonia, Nodding (*Triphora trianthophora*)
 Triphore penché
 Pogonia, Small Whorled (*Isotria medeoloides*)
 Isotrie fausse-médéole
 Quillwort, Engelmann's (*Isoetes engelmannii*)
 Isoète d'Engelmann
 Sanicle, Bear's-foot (*Sanicula arctopoides*)
 Sanicle patte-d'ours
 Sedge, False Hop (*Carex lupuliformis*)
 Carex faux-lupulina
 Sedge, Juniper (*Carex juniperorum*)
 Carex des Genévriers
 Spike-rush, Horsetail (*Eleocharis equisetoides*)
 Éléocharide fausse-prêle
 Sundew, Thread-leaved (*Drosera filiformis*)
 Droséra filiforme
 Thistle, Pitcher's (*Cirsium pitcheri*)
 Chardon de Pitcher
 Toothcup (*Rotala ramosior*)
 Rotala rameux
 Tree, Cucumber (*Magnolia acuminata*)
 Magnolia acuminé
 Trillium, Drooping (*Trillium flexipes*)
 Trille à pédoncule incliné
 Twayblade, Purple (*Liparis liliifolia*)
 Liparis à feuilles de lis
 Willow, Barrens (*Salix jejuna*)
 Saule des landes
 Wintergreen, Spotted (*Chimaphila maculata*)
 Chimaphile maculé
 Woolly-heads, Tall (*Psilocarphus elatior*) (Pacific population)
 Psilocarphe élevé (Population du Pacifique)
 Wood-Poppy (*Stylophorum diphyllum*)
 Stylophore à deux feuilles
 Woodsia, Blunt-lobed (*Woodsia obtusa*)
 Woodsie obtuse
 LICHENS
 Seaside Centipede (*Heterodermia sitchensis*)
 Hétérodermie maritime
 MOSESSES
 Moss, Poor Pocket (*Fissidens pauperculus*)
 Fissident appauvri
 Moss, Rigid Apple (*Bartramia stricta*)
 Bartramie à feuilles dressées
 PART 3

THREATENED SPECIES

MAMMALS

Bat, Pallid (*Antrozous pallidus*)
 Chauve-souris blonde
 Bison, Wood (*Bison bison athabascae*)
 Bison des bois
 Caribou, Woodland (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*) Boreal population
 Caribou des bois population boréale
 Caribou, Woodland (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*) Southern Mountain population
 Caribou des bois population des montagnes du Sud
 Ermine haidarum subspecies (*Mustela erminea haidarum*)
 Hermine, haidarum
 Otter, Sea (*Enhydra lutris*)
 Loutre de mer
 Shrew, Pacific Water (*Sorex bendirii*)
 Musaraigne de Bendire
 Whale, Killer (*Orcinus orca*) Northeast Pacific northern resident population
 Épaulard population résidente du Nord du Pacifique Nord-Est
 Whale, Killer (*Orcinus orca*) Northeast Pacific transient population
 Épaulard population migratrice du Pacifique Nord-Est

BIRDS

Bittern, Least (*Ixobrychus exilis*)
 Petit Blongios
 Falcon, Anatum Peregrine (*Falco peregrinus anatum*)
 Faucon pèlerin, anatum
 Goshawk, Queen Charlotte (*Accipiter gentilis laingi*)
 Autour des palombes des îles de la Reine-Charlotte
 Gull, Ross's (*Rhodostethia rosea*)
 Mouette rosée
 Murrelet, Marbled (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*)
 Guillemot marbré
 Pipit, Sprague's (*Anthus spragueii*)
 Pipit de Sprague
 Warbler, Hooded (*Wilsonia citrina*)
 Paruline à capuchon
 AMPHIBIANS
 Great Basin Spadefoot (*Spea intermontana*)
 Crapaud du Grand Bassin
 Salamander, Allegheny Mountain Dusky (*Desmognathus ochrophaeus*)
 Salamandre sombre des montagnes
 Salamander, Jefferson (*Ambystoma jeffersonianum*)
 Salamandre de Jefferson
 Salamander, Pacific Giant (*Dicamptodon tenebrosus*)
 Grande salamandre
 Toad, Fowler's (*Bufo fowleri*)
 Crapaud de Fowler

REPTILES

Gartersnake, Butler's (*Thamnophis butleri*)
 Couleuvre à petite tête
 Snake, Black Rat (*Elaphe obsoleta obsoleta*)
 Couleuvre obscure
 Snake, Eastern Fox (*Elaphe vulpina gloydi*)
 Couleuvre fauve de l'Est
 Snake, Eastern Hog-nosed (*Heterodon platirhinos*)
 Couleuvre à nez plat
 Snake, Queen (*Regina septemvittata*)
 Couleuvre royale
 FISH
 Chubsucker, Lake (*Erimyzon sucetta*)

Government Orders

- Sucet de lac
 Darter, Eastern Sand (*Ammocrypta pellucida*)
 Dard de sable
 Gar, Spotted (*Lepisosteus oculatus*)
 Lépisosté tacheté
 Lamprey, Cowichan Lake (*Lampetra macrostoma*)
 Lamproie du lac Cowichan
 Minnow, Western Silvery (*Hybognathus argyritis*)
 Méné d'argent de l'Ouest
 Sculpin, Cultus Pygmy (*Cottus* sp.)
 Chabot pygmé
 Sculpin, Shorthead (*Cottus confusus*)
 Chabot à tête courte
 Shiner, Rosyface (*Notropis rubellus*) Eastern population
 Tête rose population de l'Est
 Smelt, Lake Utopia Dwarf (*Osmerus* sp.)
 Éperlan nain du lac Utopia
 Wolffish, Northern (*Anarhichas denticulatus*)
 Loup à tête large
 Spotted Wolffish (*Anarhichas minor*)
 Loup tacheté
 MOLLUSCS
 Abalone, Northern (*Haliotis kamtschatkana*)
 Haliotide pie
 LEPIDOPTERANS
 Hairstreak, Behr's (*Columbia*) (*Satyrium behrii columbia*)
 Porte-queue de Colombie-Britannique
 Skipper, Dun (*Euphyes vestris*) Western population
 Hespérie rurale population de l'Ouest
 PLANTS
 Aster, Anticosti (*Symphyotrichum anticostense*)
 Aster d'Anticosti
 Aster, Western Silver-leaved (*Symphyotrichum sericeum*)
 Aster soyeux
 Aster, White-top (*Sericocarpus rigidus*)
 Aster rigide
 Blue-Flag, Western (*Iris missouriensis*)
 Iris du Missouri
 Braya, Fernald's (*Braya fernaldii*)
 Braya de Fernald
 Buffalograss (*Buchloë dactyloides*)
 Buchloë faux-dactyle
 Coffee-tree, Kentucky (*Gymnocladus dioica*)
 Chicot févier
 Colicroot (*Aletris farinosa*)
 Aletris farineux
 Corydalis, Scouler's (*Corydalis scouleri*)
 Corydale de Scouler
 Deerberry (*Vaccinium stamineum*)
 Airelle à longues étamines
 Fern, Mexican Mosquito (*Azolla mexicana*)
 Azolle du Mexique
 Gentian, Plymouth (*Sabatia kennedyana*)
 Sabatie de Kennedy
 Golden Crest (*Lophiola aurea*)
 Lophiolie dorée
 Goldenseal (*Hydrastis canadensis*)
 Hydraste du Canada
 Greenbrier, Round-leaved (*Smilax rotundifolia*) Great Lakes Plains population
 Smilax à feuilles rondes (Population des plaines des Grands Lacs)
 Lily, Lyall's Mariposa (*Calochortus lyallii*)
 Calochorte de Lyall
 Mouse-ear-cress, Slender (*Halimolobos virgata*)
 Halimolobos mince
 Orchid, Phantom (*Cephalanthera austini*)
 Cephalanthère d'Austin
 Prairie-clover, Hairy (*Dalea villosa* var. *villosa*)
 Dalée velue
 Redroot (*Lachnanthes caroliniana*)
 Lachnanthe de Caroline
 Sanicle, Purple (*Sanicula bipinnatifida*)
 Sanicle bipinnatifide
 Soapweed (*Yucca glauca*)
 Yucca glauque
 Spike-rush, Tubercled (*Eleocharis tuberculosa*)
 Éléocharide tuberculée
 Star, Dense Blazing (*Liatris spicata*)
 Liatris à épi
 Violet, Yellow Montane (*Viola praemorsa* ssp. *praemorsa*)
 Violette jaune des monts
 Water-pennywort (*Hydrocotyle umbellata*)
 Hydrocotyle à ombelle
 Water-willow, American (*Justicia americana*)
 Carmantine d'Amérique
 MOSESSES
 Moss, Haller's Apple (*Bartramia halleriana*)
 Bartramie de Haller
 PART 4
 SPECIAL CONCERN
 MAMMALS
 Beaver, Mountain (*Aplodontia rufa*)
 Castor de montagne
 Prairie Dog, Black-tailed (*Cynomys ludovicianus*)
 Chien de prairie
 Mole, Eastern (*Scalopus aquaticus*)
 Taupe à queue glabre
 Vole, Woodland (*Microtus pinetorum*)
 Campagnol sylvestre
 Whale, Killer (*Orcinus orca*) Northeast Pacific offshore population
 Épaulard population au large du Pacifique Nord-Est
 Wolf, Eastern (*Canis lupus lycaon*)
 Loup de l'Est
 BIRDS
 Chat, Eastern Yellow-breasted (*Icteria virens virens*)
 Paruline polyglotte de l'Est
 Duck, Harlequin (*Histrionicus histrionicus*) Eastern population
 Arlequin plongeur (Population de l'Est)
 Falcon, Peale's Peregrine (*Falco peregrinus pealei*)
 Faucon pèlerin, pealei
 Goldeneye, Barrow's (*Bucephala islandica*) Eastern population
 Garrot d'Islande population de l'Est
 Gull, Ivory (*Pagophila eburnea*)
 Mouette blanche
 Owl, Barn (*Tyto alba*) Western population
 Effraie des clochers population de l'Ouest
 Owl, Flammulated (*Otus flammeolus*)
 Petit-duc nain
 Rail, Yellow (*Coturnicops noveboracensis*)

Government Orders

Rôle jaune
 Sparrow, "Ipswich" Savannah (*Passerculus sandwichensis princeps*)
 Bruant des prés, princeps
 Woodpecker, Lewis's (*Melanerpes lewis*)
 Pic de Lewis
 AMPHIBIANS
 Frog, Coast Tailed (*Ascaphus truei*)
 Grenouille-à-queue côtière
 Salamander, Coeur d'Alène (*Plethodon idahoensis*)
 Salamandre Coeur d'Alène
 FISH
 Chub, Silver (*Macrhybopsis storeriana*)
 Méné à grandes écailles
 Minnow, Pugnose (*Opsopoeodus emiliae*)
 Petit-bec
 Sculpin, Columbia Mottled (*Cottus bairdi hubbsi*)
 Chabot tacheté de Columbia
 Shiner, Bridle (*Notropis bifrenatus*)
 Méné d'herbe
 Sucker, Spotted (*Minytrema melanops*)
 Meunier tacheté
 Topminnow, Blackstripe (*Fundulus notatus*)
 Fondule rayé
 Warmouth (*Lepomis gulosus*)
 Crapet sac-à-lait
 Wolfish, Atlantic (*Anarhichas lupus*)
 Loup Atlantique
 MOLLUSCS
 Oyster, Olympia (*Ostrea conchaphila*)
 Huître plate du Pacifique
 LEPIDOPTERANS
 Admiral, Weidemeyer's (*Limenitis weidemeyerii*)
 Amiral de Weidemeyer
 Monarch (*Danaus plexippus*)
 Monarque
 PLANTS
 Ash, Blue (*Fraxinus quadrangulata*)
 Frêne bleu
 Beggarticks, Vancouver Island (*Bidens amplissima*)
 Grand bident
 Fern, American Hart's-tongue (*Asplenium scolopendrium* var. *americanum*)
 Scolopendre d'Amérique
 Fern, Coastal Wood (*Dryopteris arguta*)
 Dryoptéride côtière
 Goldenrod, Riddell's (*Solidago riddellii*)
 Verge d'or de Riddell
 Hairgrass, Mackenzie (*Deschampsia mackenzieana*)
 Deschampsie du bassin du Mackenzie
 Milk-vetch, Fernald's (*Astragalus robbinsii* var. *fernaldii*)
 Astragale de Fernald
 Pepperbush, Sweet (*Clethra alnifolia*)
 Cléthre à feuilles d'aulne
 Tansy, Floccose (*Tanacetum huronense* var. *floccosum*)
 Tanaisie floconneuse
 Willow, Felt-leaf (*Salix silicicola*)
 Saule silicicole
 Willow, Sand-dune Short-capsuled (*Salix brachycarpa* var. *psammophila*)
 Saule psammophile
 Willow, Turnor's (*Salix turnorii*)

Saule de Turnor
 Woolly-heads, Tall (*Psilocarphus elatior*) Prairie population
 Psilocarpe élevé (Population des Prairies)
 Yarrow, Large-headed Woolly (*Achillea millefolium* var. *megacephalum*)
 Achillée à gros capitules

[*Editor's Note: Chair read text of Motion No. 136 to the House*]

• (1720)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am following you carefully and I believe you skipped some of the species. I would like to check it out.

Under the bird species among others, you did not mention the Acadian flycatcher, the prothonotary warbler and the white-headed woodpecker. I was wondering if you would get back to them later. There is also the whole part dealing with the mountain plover, *charadrius montanus*, the piping plover, *circumcinctus*, the king rail, the—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. As I said at the start, I have about seven pages to read. I have read about one and one half so far. Perhaps we are not at the same place.

I would point out to my dear colleagues that, should there be any errors or omissions, the clerks at the table will no doubt carry out a check. In the meantime, I will continue this fascinating reading.

• (1725)

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: I follow you, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: You are in fact following me closely. Continuing, then.

I am told that the next pages contain more bird names. Returning to my initial comment, which is that I am following with great attention the various groups already on the list before me, I would point out that during the next hour and when I have finished reading the other pages, if anything has been forgotten, you will at that time have the possibility to rise on a point of order and we will check whether any omissions have occurred during the reading. I would ask all hon. members to bear with me.

[*English*]

[*Editor's Note: Chair continues to read text of motion*]

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am using the order paper list and now it seems you have deviated from that. For clarity, are we using a different list now?

The Deputy Speaker: I am using the same list. I started in my case with the left hand column, which is basically the English text, then I went to the right hand side of the page which is the French version. It should all be the same in the end. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is following. I can only deal with the material I have been given.

I can provide a bit of clarification for the hon. member for Red Deer. What I have before me comes from the order paper, but I confess it comes from the order paper dated February 18.

I will go back to reading from the English side of the page and stay on that side. Hopefully then there will be somewhat less confusion, if that is possible.

Government Orders

[Editor's Note: Chair continues to read text of motion]

● (1745)

The Deputy Speaker: Colleagues, I do not like to remind the House every once in a while but it seems to happen every once in a while. Cell phones are not to be left on in the House of Commons. I do not know how much clearer we can make it. It is totally unacceptable and totally contrary to the rules of the House to have a cell phone on in the Chamber.

[Editor's Note: Chair continued reading text of motion]

● (1755)

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, out of respect for the voice of the Speaker, and the fact that his throat may not last until the end of this lengthy reading, there have been discussions among the parties and I think you would find consent for the following. I move:

That all motions in Group No. 3 be deemed to have been read, moved and seconded and that the Chair see the clock as being 6.43 p.m.

This is the time scheduled for adjournment today.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the chief government whip 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)

● (1800)

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 137

That Bill C-5, in Schedule 2, be amended by replacing page 87 to 89 with the following:

SCHEDULE 2

(Section 130)

PART 1

ENDANGERED SPECIES

MAMMALS

Caribou, Peary (*Rangifer tarandus pearyi*) Banks Island population

Caribou de Peary population de l'île Banks

Caribou, Peary (*Rangifer tarandus pearyi*) High Arctic population

Caribou de Peary population du haut Arctique

Whale, Beluga (*Delphinapterus leucas*) St. Lawrence River population

Béluga population du fleuve St-Laurent

Whale, Beluga (*Delphinapterus leucas*) Ungava Bay population

Béluga population de la baie d'Ungava

Whale, Beluga (*Delphinapterus leucas*) Southeast Baffin Island—Cumberland Sound population

Béluga population du sud-est de l'île de Baffin et de la baie Cumberland

Whale, Bowhead (*Balaena mysticetus*) Eastern Arctic population

Baleine boréale population de l'Arctique de l'Est

Whale, Bowhead (*Balaena mysticetus*) Western Arctic population

Baleine boréale population de l'Arctique de l'Ouest

Whale, Right (*Eubalaena glacialis*)

Baleine noire

Wolverine (*Gulo gulo*) Eastern population

Carcajou population de l'Est

BIRDS

Bobwhite, Northern (*Colinus virginianus*)

Colin de Virginie

REPTILES

Racer, Blue (*Coluber constrictor foxii*)

Couleuvre agile bleue

Snake, Lake Erie Water (*Nerodia sipedon insularum*)

Couleuvre d'eau du lac Érié

FISH

Sucker, Salish (*Catostomus* sp.)

Meunier de Salish

PART 2

THREATENED SPECIES

MAMMALS

Caribou, Peary (*Rangifer tarandus pearyi*) Low Arctic population

Caribou de Peary population du bas Arctique

Mole, Townsend's (*Scapanus townsendii*)

Taube de Townsend

Porpoise, Harbour (*Phocoena phocoena*) Northwest Atlantic population

Marsouin commun population du Nord-Ouest de l'Atlantique

Whale, Beluga (*Delphinapterus leucas*) Eastern Hudson Bay population

Béluga population de l'est de la baie d'Hudson

Whale, Humpback (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) North Pacific population

Rorqual à bosse population du Pacifique Nord

BIRDS

Shrike, Prairie Loggerhead (*Lanius ludovicianus excubitorides*)

Pie-grièche migratrice des Prairies

REPTILES

Rattlesnake, Eastern Massasauga (*Sistrurus catenatus catenatus*)

Crotale Massasauga de l'Est

Turtle, Blanding's (*Emydoidea blandingi*) Nova Scotia population

Tortue mouchetée population de la Nouvelle-Écosse

Turtle, Spiny Softshell (*Apalone spinifera*)

Tortue molle à épines

FISH

Cisco, Blackfin (*Coregonus nigripinnis*)

Cisco à nageoires noires

Cisco, Shortjaw (*Coregonus zenithicus*)

Cisco à mâchoires égales

Cisco, Shortnose (*Coregonus reighardi*)

Cisco à museau court

Darter, Channel (*Percina copelandi*)

Fouille-rodie gris

Madtom, Margined (*Noturus insignis*)

Chat-fou liséré

Redhorse, Black (*Moxostoma duquesnei*)

Chevalier noir

Redhorse, Copper (*Moxostoma hubbsi*)

Chevalier cuivré

Sculpin, Deepwater (*Myoxocephalus thompsoni*) Great Lakes population

Chabot de profondeur des Grands Lacs populations des Grands Lacs

Sticklebacks, Enos Lake (*Gasterosteus* spp.)

Épinoches du lac Enos

Whitefish, Lake (*Coregonus clupeaformis*) Lake Simcoe population

Grand corégone population du lac Simcoe

PLANTS

Aster, White Wood (*Eurybia divaricatas*)

Aster divariqué

Government Orders

Chestnut, American (*Castanea dentata*)
 Châtaignier d'Amérique
 Jacob's Ladder, van Brunt's (*Polemonium van-bruntiae*)
 Polémoine de van Brunt
 Lipocarpha, Small-flowered (*Lipocarpha micrantha*)
 Lipocarpe à petites fleurs
 Spiderwort, Western (*Tradescantia occidentalis*)
 Tradescantie de l'Ouest
 Verbena, Sand (*Abronia micrantha*)
 Abronie à petites fleurs
 Violet, Bird's-foot (*Viola pedata*)
 Violette pédalée

Motion No. 138
 That Bill C-5, in Schedule 2.1, be amended by replacing page 90 to 96 with the following:

SCHEDULE 3
 (Section 130)
 SPECIAL CONCERN
 MAMMALS
 Bat, Fringed (*Myotis thysanodes*)
 Chauve-souris à queue frangée
 Bat, Keen's Long-eared (*Myotis keenii*)
 Chauve-souris de Keen
 Bat, Spotted (*Euderma maculatum*)
 Oreillard maculé
 Bear, Grizzly (*Ursus arctos*)
 Ours grizzly
 Bear, Polar (*Ursus maritimus*)
 Ours polaire
 Cottontail, Nuttall's (*Sylvilagus nuttallii nuttallii*) British Columbia population
 Lapin de Nuttall population de la Colombie-Britannique
 Fox, Grey (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*)
 Renard gris
 Kangaroo Rat, Ord's (*Dipodomys ordii*)
 Rat kangourou d'Ord
 Mouse, Western Harvest (*Reithrodontomys megalotis megalotis*) British Columbia population
 Souris des moissons population de la Colombie-Britannique
 Seal, Harbour (*Phoca vitulina mellonae*) Lacs des Loups Marins landlocked population
 Phoque commun population confinée aux lacs des Loups Marins
 Shrew, Gaspé (*Sorex gaspensis*)
 Musaraigne de Gaspé
 Squirrel, Southern Flying (*Glaucomys volans*)
 Petit polatouche
 Whale, Beluga (*Delphinapterus leucas*) Eastern High Arctic/Baffin Bay population
 Béluga population de l'Est du haut Arctique et de la baie de Baffin
 Whale, Blue (*Balaenoptera musculus*)
 Rorqual bleu
 Whale, Fin (*Balaenoptera physalus*)
 Rorqual commun
 Whale, Humpback (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) Western North Atlantic population
 Rorqual à bosse population du Nord-Ouest de l'Atlantique
 Whale, Northern Bottlenose (*Hyperoodon ampullatus*) Gully population
 Baleine à bec commune population du ravin océanique
 Whale, Sowerby's Beaked (*Mesoplodon bidens*)
 Baleine à bec de Sowerby
 Wolverine (*Gulo gulo*) Western population
 Carcajou population de l'Ouest

BIRDS
 Curlew, Long-billed (*Numenius americanus*)
 Courlis à long bec
 Falcon, Tundra Peregrine (*Falco peregrinus tundrius*)
 Faucon pèlerin, toundra
 Hawk, Ferruginous (*Buteo regalis*)
 Buse rouilleuse
 Hawk, Red-shouldered (*Buteo lineatus*)
 Buse à épaulettes
 Heron, Pacific Great Blue (*Ardea herodias fannini*)
 Grand héron Population de la côte du Pacifique
 Murrelet, Ancient (*Synthliboramphus antiquus*)
 Guillemot à cou blanc
 Owl, Short-eared (*Asio flammeus*)
 Hibou des marais
 Thrush, Bicknell's (*Catharus bicknelli*)
 Grive de Bicknell
 Warbler, Cerulean (*Dendroica cerulea*)
 Paruline azurée
 Waterthrush, Louisiana (*Seiurus motacilla*)
 Paruline hochequeue
 Woodpecker, Red-headed (*Melanerpes erythrocephalus*)
 Pic à tête rouge

AMPHIBIANS
 Frog, Northern Leopard (*Rana pipiens*) Prairie population
 Grenouille léopard population des Prairies
 Frog, Northern Red-legged (*Rana aurora*)
 Grenouille du Nord à pattes rouges
 Salamander, Smallmouth (*Ambystoma texanum*)
 Salamandre à nez court
 Salamander, Spring (*Gyrinophilus porphyriticus*)
 Salamandre pourpre
 Toad, Great Plains (*Bufo cognatus*)
 Crapaud des steppes

REPTILES
 Lizard, Eastern Short-horned (*Phrynosoma douglassii brevirostre*)
 Phrynosome de Douglas de l'Est
 Racer, Eastern Yellow-bellied (*Coluber constrictor flaviventris*)
 Couleuvre agile à ventre jaune de l'Est
 Skink, Five-lined (*Eumeces fasciatus*)
 Scinque pentaligne
 Skink, Northern Prairie (*Eumeces septentrionalis septentrionalis*)
 Scinque des Prairies
 Turtle, Spotted (*Clemmys guttata*)
 Tortue ponctuée
 Turtle, Wood (*Clemmys insculpta*)
 Tortue des bois

FISH
 Buffalo, Bigmouth (*Ictiobus cyprinellus*)
 Buffalo à grande bouche
 Buffalo, Black (*Ictiobus niger*)
 Buffalo noir
 Cisco, Spring (*Coregonus sp.*)
 Cisco de printemps
 Cod, Atlantic (*Gadus morhua*)
 Morue franche
 Dace, Redside (*Clinostomus elongatus*)
 Méné long
 Dace, Speckled (*Rhinichthys osculus*)

Government Orders

Naseux moucheté	Scirpe de Long
Dace, Umatilla (<i>Rhinichthys umatilla</i>)	Columbo, American (<i>Frasera carolinensis</i>)
Naseux d'Umatilla	Frasère de Caroline
Darter, Greenside (<i>Etheostoma blennioides</i>)	Fern, Broad Beech (<i>Phegopteris hexagonoptera</i>)
Dard vert	Phégoptéride à hexagones
Killifish, Banded (<i>Fundulus diaphanus</i>) Newfoundland population	Fleabane, Provancher's (<i>Erigeron philadelphicus</i> ssp. <i>provancheri</i>)
Fondule barré population de Terre-Neuve	Vergerette de Provancher
Kiyi (<i>Coregonus kiyi</i>)	Gentian, Victorin's (<i>Gentianopsis victorinii</i>)
Kiyi	Gentiane de Victorin
Lamprey, Chestnut (<i>Ichthyomyzon castaneus</i>)	Goosefoot, Smooth (<i>Chenopodium subglabrum</i>)
Lamproie brune	Chénopode glabre
Lamprey, Northern Brook (<i>Ichthyomyzon fossor</i>)	Green Dragon (<i>Arisaema dracontium</i>)
Lamproie du Nord	Arisème dragon
Madtom, Northern (<i>Noturus stigmosus</i>)	Hackberry, Dwarf (<i>Celtis tenuifolia</i>)
Chat-fou du Nord	Micocoulier raboucri
Prickleback, Pighead (<i>Acantholumpenus mackayi</i>)	Helleborine, Giant (<i>Epipactis gigantea</i>)
Terrassier à six lignes	Épipactis géant
Redhorse, River (<i>Moxostoma carinatum</i>)	Hop-tree, Common (<i>Ptelea trifoliata</i>)
Chevalier de rivière	Ptélea trifolié
Sardine, Pacific (<i>Sardinops sagax</i>)	Hyacinth, Wild (<i>Camassia scilloides</i>)
Sardine du Pacifique	Camassie faux-scille
Sculpin, Fourhorn (<i>Myoxocephalus quadricornis</i>) Freshwater form	Indian-plantain, Tuberos (<i>Arnoglossum plantagineum</i>)
Chaboisseau à quatre cornes forme d'eau douce	Arnoglosse plantain
Shiner, Bigmouth (<i>Notropis dorsalis</i>)	Lilaeopsis (<i>Lilaeopsis chinensis</i>)
Méné à grande bouche	Liléopsis de l'Est
Shiner, Pugnose (<i>Notropis anogenus</i>)	Locoweed, Hare-footed (<i>Oxytropis lagopus</i>)
Méné camus	Oxytrope patte-de-lièvre
Shiner, Silver (<i>Notropis photogenis</i>)	Meadowfoam, Macoun's (<i>Limnanthes macounii</i>)
Méné miroir	Limnanthe de Macoun
Sticklebacks, Charlotte Unarmoured (<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus</i>)	Oak, Shumard (<i>Quercus shumardii</i>)
Épinoche lisse des îles de la Reine-Charlotte	Chêne de Shumard
Stickleback, Giant (<i>Gasterosteus</i> sp.)	Orchid, Eastern Prairie Fringed (<i>Platanthera leucophaea</i>)
Épinoche géante	Platanthère blanchâtre de l'Est
Sturgeon, Green (<i>Acipenser medirostris</i>)	Pondweed, Hill's (<i>Potamogeton hillii</i>)
Esturgeon vert	Potamot de Hill
Sturgeon, Shortnose (<i>Acipenser brevirostrum</i>)	Quillwort, Bolander's (<i>Isoetes bolanderi</i>)
Esturgeon à museau court	Isoète de Bolander
Sturgeon, White (<i>Acipenser transmontanus</i>)	Rose, Climbing Prairie (<i>Rosa setigera</i>)
Esturgeon blanc	Rosier sétigère
Sunfish, Orangespotted (<i>Lepomis humilis</i>)	Rose-mallow, Swamp (<i>Hibiscus moscheutos</i>)
Crapet menu	Ketmie des marais
Sunfish, Redbreast (<i>Lepomis auritus</i>)	Rue-anemone, False (<i>Enemion biternatum</i>)
Crapet rouge	Isopyre à feuilles biternées
Whitefish, Squanga (<i>Coregonus</i> sp.)	Rush, New Jersey (<i>Juncus caesariensis</i>)
Corégone du Squanga	Jonc du New Jersey
Wolffish, Bering (<i>Anarhichas orientalis</i>)	Thrift, Athabasca (<i>Armeria maritima</i> ssp. <i>interior</i>)
Loup de Bering	
PLANTS	
Aster, Bathurst (<i>Symphotrichum subulatum</i>) Bathurst population	
Aster subulé population de Bathurst	
Aster, Crooked-stemmed (<i>Symphotrichum prenanthoides</i>)	
Aster fausse-prenanthe	
Aster, Gulf of St. Lawrence (<i>Symphotrichum laurentianum</i>)	
Aster du Golfe St-Laurent	
Aster, Willow (<i>Symphotrichum praealtum</i>)	
Aster très élevé	
Bartonia, Branched (<i>Bartonia paniculata</i> ssp. <i>paniculata</i>)	
Bartonie paniculé	
Bulrush, Long's (<i>Scirpus longii</i>)	

Government Orders

Armeria de l'Athabasca
Water-hemlock, Victorin's (Cicuta maculata var. victorinii)
Cicutaire de Victorin
LICHENS
Cryptic Paw (Nephroma occultum)
Lichen cryptique
Oldgrowth Specklebelly (Pseudocyphellaria rainierensis)
Pseudocyphellie des forêts surannées

Seaside Bone (Hypogymnia heterophylla)
Hypogymnie maritime

The Deputy Speaker: It being 6.01 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24 (1).

(The House adjourned at 6.01 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, February 25, 2002

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Competition Act

Bill C-248. Second reading	9169
Mr. Marcil	9169
Mr. Penson	9170
Mr. Doyle	9171
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee).....	9173

Suspension of Sitting

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair).....	9173
(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11.36 a.m.)	9174

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Species at Risk Act

Bill C-5. Report Stage	9174
Mr. Spencer	9174
Mr. Reed	9175
Mr. Hilstrom	9176
Mr. Laframboise	9177
Mr. Bailey	9178
Mr. Toews	9179
Mr. Paquette	9180
Mr. Merrifield	9181
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands).....	9183
Mr. Cadman	9184
Mr. Sauvageau	9185
Mr. Casson	9187
Mr. Goldring	9188

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

2002 Winter Olympics

Mr. Wood.....	9189
---------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands).....	9189
--	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Ms. Torsney	9189
-------------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Ms. Neville.....	9189
------------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Mr. Proulx	9189
------------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Mr. Mills (Red Deer).....	9190
---------------------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Mr. Harvey	9190
------------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Mr. Lanctôt	9190
-------------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Mr. Serré	9190
-----------------	------

Ken Mackenzie

Mr. Bailey	9191
------------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Mrs. Jennings.....	9191
--------------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Mr. Godin	9191
-----------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Ms. Lalonde.....	9191
------------------	------

Armed Forces

Mr. Bertrand.....	9191
-------------------	------

Curling

Mr. Borotsik.....	9192
-------------------	------

International Co-operation

Ms. Bennett	9192
-------------------	------

2002 Winter Olympics

Mr. Williams	9192
--------------------	------

Father Joseph Meeùs

Ms. Karetak-Lindell	9192
---------------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

The Economy

Mr. Reynolds.....	9192
Mr. Chrétien	9192
Mr. Reynolds	9193
Mr. Chrétien	9193
Mr. Reynolds	9193
Mr. Chrétien	9193
Mr. Kenney	9193
Mr. McCallum (Markham).....	9193
Mr. Kenney	9193
Mr. McCallum (Markham).....	9193

Highway Infrastructure

Mr. Duceppe	9193
Mr. Chrétien	9193
Mr. Duceppe	9193
Mr. Chrétien	9194
Ms. Girard-Bujold	9194
Mr. Manley	9194
Ms. Girard-Bujold	9194
Mr. Manley	9194

Softwood Lumber

Ms. McDonough	9194
Mr. Pettigrew	9194
Ms. McDonough	9194
Mr. Pettigrew	9194
Mr. Clark	9194
Mr. Chrétien	9194
Mr. Clark	9195
Mr. Chrétien	9195

Export Development Corporation			
Mr. Penson	9195		
Mr. Chrétien	9195		
Mr. Penson	9195		
Mr. Chrétien	9195		
Highway Infrastructures			
Mr. Laframboise	9195		
Mr. Collenette	9195		
Mr. Laframboise	9195		
Mr. Manley	9195		
Terrorism			
Mr. Jaffer	9195		
Mr. MacAulay	9195		
Mr. Jaffer	9196		
Mr. MacAulay	9196		
Highway Infrastructures			
Mr. Gauthier	9196		
Mr. Chrétien	9196		
Mr. Gauthier	9196		
Mr. Chrétien	9196		
National Defence			
Mr. Pallister	9196		
Mr. Eggleton	9196		
Mr. Pallister	9196		
Mr. Eggleton	9197		
The Environment			
Mr. Eyking	9197		
Mr. Collenette	9197		
Technology Partnerships Canada			
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	9197		
Mr. Rock	9197		
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	9197		
Mr. Rock	9197		
Correctional Service Canada			
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	9197		
Mr. MacAulay	9198		
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	9198		
Mr. MacAulay	9198		
Mr. Burton	9198		
Mr. MacAulay	9198		
Mr. Burton	9198		
Mr. MacAulay	9198		
Highway Infrastructure			
Mr. Crête	9198		
Mr. Chrétien	9198		
Mr. Lanctôt	9198		
Mr. Manley	9198		
Employment Insurance			
Mrs. Skelton	9198		
Mr. MacAulay	9199		
Mrs. Skelton	9199		
Mr. MacAulay	9199		
Human Rights			
Ms. Neville	9199		
		Mr. Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi)	9199
		Agriculture	
		Mr. Hilstrom	9199
		Mr. Vanclief	9199
		Gun Registry	
		Mr. MacKay	9199
		Mr. Cauchon	9199
		Highway Infrastructures	
		Mr. Loubier	9200
		Mr. Manley	9200
		Foreign Affairs	
		Mr. McKay	9200
		Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale)	9200
		Agriculture	
		Mr. Hilstrom	9200
		Mr. Chrétien	9200
		Highway Infrastructures	
		Ms. Picard	9200
		Mr. McCallum (Markham)	9200
		The Environment	
		Mr. Comartin	9200
		Mrs. Redman	9201
		Gun Registry	
		Mr. MacKay	9201
		Mr. Cauchon	9201
		ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
		Government Response to Petitions	
		Mr. Regan	9201
		2002 Winter Olympics	
		Mr. Chrétien	9201
		Mr. Reynolds	9201
		Mr. Duceppe	9202
		Ms. McDonough	9202
		Mr. Clark	9202
		Remembrance Day National Flag Act	
		Mr. Bailey	9202
		Bill C-432. Introduction and first reading	9202
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	9203
		Criminal Code	
		Mr. MacKay	9203
		Bill C-433. Introduction and first reading	9203
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	9203
		Interparliamentary Delegations	
		Mr. Wilfert	9203
		Petitions	
		Aboriginal Affairs	
		Mr. Breitzkreuz	9203
		Antarctica	
		Mr. Adams	9203

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Regan 9203

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Regan 9204

(Return tabled) 9204

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Species at Risk Act**

Bill C-5. Report Stage 9204

Mr. Goldring 9204

Mr. Jaffer 9205

Mr. Lanctôt 9207

Mr. Borotsik 9208

Mr. Williams 9209

Ms. Girard-Bujold 9210

Mr. Benoit 9211

Mr. Johnston 9212

Division on Motion No. 2 deferred 9213

Division on Motion No. 23 deferred 9214

Division on Motion No. 35 deferred 9214

Division on Motion No. 39 deferred 9214

Division on Motion No. 56 deferred 9214

Division on Motion No. 67 deferred 9214

Division on Motion No. 78 deferred 9215

Division on Motion No. 84 deferred 9215

Division on Motion No. 112 deferred 9215

Division on Motion No. 113 deferred 9215

Mr. Casson 9215

Motion No. 3 9215

Motion No. 4 9215

Motion No. 5 9215

Motions Nos. 7, 8, 9 and 10 9215

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) 9216

Motion No. 14 9216

Mr. Burton 9216

Motion No. 15 9216

Motions Nos. 19, 30, 32, 34, 36, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73

and 77 9216

Motion No. 79 9216

Motions Nos. 115, 119, 120, 134 and 135 9216

Motion No. 136 9217

Mr. Bellehumeur 9221

Ms. Catterall 9222

Motion 9222

(Motion agreed to) 9222

Motions Nos. 137 and 138 9222

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**