



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 099 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, May 9, 2003**

—  
**Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken**

## **CONTENTS**

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

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

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 9, 2003

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### PUBLIC SAFETY ACT, 2002

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-17, An Act to amend certain Acts of Canada, and to enact measures for implementing the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, in order to enhance public safety, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

• (1005)

[*English*]

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** Order, please. There are six motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-17.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 3 and 4 will not be selected by the Chair because they could have been presented in committee.

Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 5 will not be selected by the Chair because they were lost in committee.

[*English*]

The remaining motion has been examined and the Chair is satisfied that it meets the guidelines expressed in the note to Standing Order 76.1(5) regarding the selection of motions in amendment at the report stage.

Motion No. 6 will be debated and voted upon.

[*Translation*]

I will now put Motion No. 6 to the House.

[*English*]

#### MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (for the Minister of Transport)** moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-17, in Clause 112, be amended by replacing line 29 on page 103 with the following:

“and 109 to 111.1, and the provisions of any Act”

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise to address this bill. Before I get into the main part of my speech I want to congratulate the government and the special legislative committee on Bill C-17 for passing 25 amendments that deleted the expression “inexplosive ammunition component” from part 7 of Bill C-17. We worked very hard in trying to get rid of these particular parts of the bill. It was just absurd that they were being put into legislation. It would have created another mess, probably similar to the firearms fiasco.

In particular I would like to thank the office of the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam for working with my office to identify, draft and submit the amendments for consideration by the committee. I must also recognize the member for Churchill, as her office also submitted identical amendments.

The committee owes a debt of gratitude to James M. Hinter, national president, and David A. Tomlinson, legal chairman, of the National Firearms Association, as well as Tony Bernardo, the executive director of the Canadian Shooting Sports Association, for appearing before us and encouraging us to stop short of “criminalizing brass and lead”, in Mr. Hinter's words, and, in the words of Tony Bernardo, “regulating little bits of margarine containers, little pieces of cotton fabric and fishing sinkers”.

The committee must also thank those members of Canada's film and television community who wrote to committee members to inform us of the negative impact, especially on the production of action movies, of including the term “inexplosive ammunition component” in part 7 of Bill C-17.

The words “inexplosive ammunition component” first appeared in part V of Bill C-42. That was the first predecessor of Bill C-17 which we are debating today. They appeared on November 22, 2001. That bill was so flawed that the government withdrew it four months later, but in the interim, a Library of Parliament research paper prepared on January 18, 2002, by Gérald Lafrenière, pointed out the potential problems of regulating inexplosive ammunition components. Naturally, when the Liberals brought back Bill C-42 as Bill C-55 on April 29, 2002, I hoped that they had read the Library of Parliament report. They had not and on May 9, 2002, exactly a year ago today, I told the House the following:

The trouble with the [inexplosive ammunition component] sections is that they will most likely hit the wrong target by potentially criminalizing tens of thousands of law-abiding citizens who load their own ammunition for legal pastimes and sports.

Consequently, law-abiding citizens who manufacture their own ammunition would end up being charged with the new offences proposed in the amendments, offences that call for fines up to \$500,000 and imprisonment of up to five years in jail.

### Government Orders

Offences that are targeting law-abiding Canadians in this act include: acquiring, possessing, selling, offering for sale, transporting or delivering any illicit inexplusive ammunition component and making or manufacturing any explosive from an illicitly trafficked inexplusive ammunition component. The government has not told us how it thinks anyone can make an explosive from an inexplusive ammunition component. The definition in the act states "inexplusive ammunition component" means any cartridge case or bullet, or any projectile that is used in a firearm as defined in section 2 of the criminal code.

Even the government's own definition clearly demonstrates that no one could possibly make an explosive out of inexplusive ammunition components. I would like to propose at the appropriate time that an amendment be made to remove all references to inexplusive ammunition components from the proposed amendments to the explosives act.

That was exactly a year ago today.

Bill C-55 died on the Order Paper on September 16, 2002, and was brought back in slightly modified form as Bill C-17 on October 21. Again the Liberals missed the opportunity to delete the term "inexplusive ammunition component" from the bill. On Monday, November 18, 2002, I spoke on Bill C-17 at second reading and once again called for removal of all references to "inexplusive ammunition components" from the bill.

•(1010)

I am glad to note that some of the members of other parties were listening. I believe that the hard work of members of the firearms community, the film and television community and various members of the committee, including the members for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam and Churchill, as well as some of the Liberal members, helped to convince a majority of Liberal members of the committee that this particular change was essential to making Bill C-17 more acceptable to Canadians, and I thank them.

It is quite clear that the committee state version of Bill C-17 is a definite improvement over Bill C-42 as first presented 17 months ago, but more changes, particularly in the area of increased parliamentary scrutiny, are required.

If Canadians were prepared to sacrifice their liberties for the promise of increased security in the aftermath of September 11, that feeling has faded in the intervening year and a half. For this reason, the government would be wise to carefully consider increased parliamentary scrutiny on the same level as the Emergencies Act if it wants opposition parties to support Bill C-17.

The report stage of Bill C-17, an act to amend certain Acts of Canada, and to enact measures for implementing the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, in order to enhance public safety, otherwise known as the Public Safety Act, will be the subject of the rest of my speech.

I would like to divide my remarks in the remaining time I have into three general categories: general comments on the bill, continuing concerns about the bill's broad use of interim orders, and our reaction to what the committee did. I have already done the third part.

I would like to trace a little of the history of the bill because those watching and reading the *Hansard* record will of course probably forget how this all began. There are many parts of it that go to trying to make Canadians feel safe in a post-September 11 world, but that is part of the bill's problem. It was first drafted in reaction to the terrible terrorist attack on the United States on September 11, 2001.

As I end my remarks today, I would like to make this point. If the true measure of a man is what he does rather than what he says, then the measure of a country must be in part its reaction to times of trial and stress. In the United States 10 days after the September 11 attack, Senator Fritz Hollings was on his feet to introduce America's reaction, S.1447, "a bill to improve aviation security, and for other purposes". With lightning speed, and despite an anthrax scare on Capitol Hill, both the House of Representatives and the Senate quickly passed the legislation and President Bush signed it on November 19, 2001. That is right: from the time the first airplane hit the first tower to the moment President Bush signed his approval of the new bill, barely 10 weeks passed.

During the same 10 weeks this Liberal government slept. In fact it was a full three days after President Bush signed the U.S. law that this Liberal government tabled the first version of the public safety act, then called Bill C-42, on November 22. That bill lived for five months, never went to any committee and was withdrawn on April 24, 2002.

Five days later, the Liberal government introduced Bill C-42's replacement, Bill C-55. It was so complex that a special committee was struck on May 9 solely for the purpose of studying it, but that committee never met. Bill C-55 died on the Order Paper on September 16, 2002, when Parliament prorogued.

I think we can get the drift. Inaction is what marked this government. In fact, the current legislation, Bill C-17, was not tabled in the House until October 31, 2002, fully 13 months after the September 11 attack and nearly 11 months after President Bush signed America's aviation and transportation security act into legislation as public law 107-71.

•(1015)

It is now May 9, 2003, and this bill is just coming back to us from a special legislative committee. There will be debate and hopefully further amendments, and then votes. Then the bill will presumably be referred to the Senate for deliberation. It is unlikely that Bill C-17 will be ready to receive royal assent before October.

September 11 happened and the U.S. had a law signed by the President and in place on November 18, roughly two months later. Canada will not have its law in place until nearly two years have passed. That is simply unacceptable. If it takes a Liberal dominated Parliament two years to react to a major crisis, that is a strong argument for a change in government.

I want to conclude by making people aware that the government should be judged by what it does, not by what it says, and that this bill is a clear indication of the inaction of the government in the face of a crisis.

**Hon. Steve Mahoney (Secretary of State (Selected Crown Corporations), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, before I was given the opportunity to work on my current responsibilities for crown corporations, I was parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Transport and assigned the task of trying to shepherd this bill through committee. I have been away from it for a little while, but I am pleased to have an opportunity to comment on some of the issues that people are concerned about.

*Government Orders*

Members opposite, particularly the Canadian Alliance, tend to want to hold up the United States as the way to do things. The previous speaker said that President Bush did this and he did that following September 11. One of the things that is interesting about the U.S. system is that when a crisis occurs, the American people, the congress, the senate, and everybody in Washington tends to get behind the president regardless of his political stripe. They tend to rally around the flag.

One of the differences in our situation, for better or for worse, is that no such thing ever happens. In fact, I find that the opposition use every opportunity it can to somehow blame the government for everything from the weather to whatever we can imagine. It is an interesting approach. We give the member what he wants.

He said at the beginning of his remarks that he was pleased that the government had eliminated certain issues. Some witnesses who appeared before the committee, and I was there for many meetings until this recent appointment, expressed their strong concerns about the effect of the inclusion of inexplosive ammunition components in part 7 of the bill. This is an issue that this member, in his zest to fight anything to do with ammunition or gun control, was very adamant about.

It was not the government's intention to burden lawful shooting activities within part 7, and the witnesses from Natural Resources Canada indicated that in their testimony before the committee. The government listened closely to the concerns that were expressed by the stakeholders and decided to introduce motions to remove all references to inexplosive ammunition components from Bill C-17.

It is like people here cannot take yes for an answer. We listened, we heard, and we removed the references. While the member did say at the beginning of his remarks that he appreciated it, he then went on with other areas that I would suggest are not related to this.

How did the government react? Let me tell members that the current Minister of Transport, who was the minister on September 11, reacted by immediately closing down the skies. There were 5,000 aircraft flying around the skies over North America. Members should remember what happened in Gander. We should give credit to the people of Gander, and rightly so, for opening their hearts and their homes, their churches and their community halls to help these stranded people. However, do we think that all those planes were diverted to Gander miraculously and landed without incident?

We all saw the pictures in the news of the planes on the tarmac, lined up one after another. When they finally had to leave, just the management of the air traffic control aspect of that was incredible. Is there any thought how some 5,000 aircraft, which were diverted and many of which landed in various airports in Canada, including Gander, were managed? Did the pilots just talk it over among themselves and say, "let us go to Gander, I think it is safe there"?

• (1020)

Let us be fair and give credit where credit is due. The government gave the direction. It is not up to the government to actually physically do it. We have professionals in place in NAV Canada and Transport Canada. But it is up to the government, in this case the Minister of Transport, to set the tone, to give the direction, and to give the order.

I recall that this minister was on a cell phone in a car, driving from Montreal back to Ottawa, when this crisis occurred. Within minutes he took action that I would say could have saved lives; we will never know. But the fact that it was handled so professionally and so smoothly, members should at least be fair and say that it was an issue that happened on the watch of the government.

We do not need to stand and crow that we did it all because that is not true. We relied on the professionals in our employ and on the people of Canada to respond in such a positive way. But what do we hear? We hear members in the House saying we need to change the government because it did not act quickly enough. It is just such nonsense.

There may be reasons that members opposite think we need to change the government. There may be reasons why Canadians think we need to change the government. Who knows? They might change the government. That is why we have such a great democratic country because that option is there. However that is the wrong issue. We should be getting behind the government on this critical bill.

There was much debate in committee about whether or not we were going too far. Concerns were expressed by the Privacy Commissioner. The bar associations that were before us were saying that if we found information on a person travelling from Vancouver to Toronto and the indication was that person was a terrorist, their position was that we should not be able to go further in terms of reviewing the passenger list. However, if we did that and discovered that there was someone else onboard that aircraft who had an outstanding warrant for a crime that had been specified in this bill, a crime that would result in a sentence in excess of five years—and in this country that is a crime such as murder, kidnapping and that kind of thing, the most serious of crimes that one can imagine—we would not have the right to arrest that person when he or she got off the aircraft according to the bar associations.

I remember asking the lawyers who were there representing the bar associations to help me understand this. They were suggesting that I tell my constituents that even though, as a result of our work against terrorism and as a result of our work in following up on information provided by CSIS and the RCMP, we discovered a third party on an aircraft with an outstanding warrant for having murdered someone that we had to let them walk off the plane. Their answer was, yes, that is what they were saying, in the aid of privacy rights.

I believe the official opposition was onside with our position in that particular area. But we have members standing in the House objecting to criminals being given the right to vote and all of these issues. Yet, we are supposed to allow people to walk free when we have an outstanding warrant for their arrest for murder or for kidnapping or for some other vile crime. It just makes no sense at all.

*Government Orders*

This bill has taken time. Let us review the process. The government responded very quickly after we took the initial action on this bill. The initial action was to provide safe haven for tens of thousands of people. We did that, we did it well, and our officials acted responsibly. Our next step was to bring in a bill that would deal with some of the concerns around Bill C-17. Bill C-42 was introduced and there was a big furor over the bill. A lot of concern was expressed about that bill.

● (1025)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, once again we are debating Bill C-17, the half-brother of the short-lived twins, Bill C-42 and Bill C-55.

Since September 11, 2001, many say that nothing is the same, that the world is changing, as evidenced by the recent events in Iraq. Obviously, although the world often changes for the better, we must recognize that, in this case, it is changing for the worse.

Everybody agrees that logic is essential to the drafting of any bill, and the government must listen to that logic. However, it seems that the government is hard of hearing, and I am very sorry about that.

We are certainly happy that controlled access military zones have been removed from the bill before us, but does this mean that we should stop being vigilant? Absolutely not. We must see that the decisions being made today respect the balance between the three branches in our society, namely the executive, legislative and judiciary branches. In its current form, Bill C-17 poses a threat to the balance between the executive and the legislative branches, since it includes specific provisions allowing ministers and officials to make interim orders.

Interim orders are exempt from the application of section 3 of the Statutory Instruments Act. An order is considered to be a statutory instrument; therefore, it should undergo a preliminary check by the Clerk of the Privy Council. His role is precisely to ensure that the proposed regulation does not, and I quote:

—trespass unduly on existing rights and freedoms and is not, in any case, inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Bill of Rights.

So we should ask ourselves the following question: if the purpose is not to trespass unduly on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, why are we exempting the interim orders from the proper examination that would prove they are in compliance with the charter? By chance, would the government have the secret intention of transgressing the most basic rules of our free and democratic society by infringing on the fundamental rights of those individuals who form that society?

We do not question the importance of preventing all possible terrorist acts, and we do not question the necessity of equipping ourselves with all the tools we need to expose those who would threaten the security of citizens.

But there is one inescapable fact and that is that in order to fight against terrorism, we must fight against its main cause, and that is the extreme poverty of hundreds of millions of people.

If we all agree that it is important to eliminate the conditions that breed terrorism, we also agree that we must fight against those who would come to our borders with the intent of committing terrorist acts. Once again, however, this cannot be done at any cost.

One price we must refuse to pay is waiving the right to privacy. In the past, we made choices. We made the choice to live in a constitutional state instead of a police state. We must be careful not to open the door to this style of governance where police are everywhere, always checking what everyone is doing.

Would any of us blindly agree to have personal information relating to us processed and used for purposes other than those related to the fight against terrorism? Should the simple fact of taking a plane warrant the RCMP and CSIS having a record on a person? No. That has been made abundantly clear in the debates on Bill C-55.

It is interesting to know what the Privacy Commissioner thinks of Bill C-17. First, it would appear that his concerns about the defunct Bill C-55 were and are still being completely ignored. The ministers and top government officials have failed, so far, to provide him with an appropriate response. I believe he is still waiting. This is why he is now calling on Parliament to ensure his concerns finally receive the attention they deserve.

● (1030)

I shall quote his words:

But my concern is that the RCMP would also be expressly empowered to use this information to seek out persons wanted on warrants for Criminal Code offences that have nothing to do with terrorism, transportation security or national security.

What we must guard against is the risk of creating a precedent that would eventually open the door to increased police control over various areas of our daily lives. For example, if we allowed special powers intended primarily to protect national security and to counter terrorism to be made available to the RCMP with respect to air passengers, who is to say that this special situation will not be extended to rail, bus or metro passengers?

If, for example, a suicide bomber were to blow himself up on a crowded train, would we go so far as to flag train travellers and use this same opportunity to look for people with outstanding warrants? There is always a tendency to be overzealous. There is always a point of no return when it comes to overzealousness, a point beyond which we must not go for fear of destroying the fragile balance required to maintain a free and democratic society.

*Government Orders*

The commissioner also raises another point that we must not lose sight of. The right to anonymity with regard to the state is a crucial privacy right. With Bill C-17, that right to anonymity will be set aside the moment we are unwise enough to set foot aboard a plane. If it were set out in the act that personal information can be used only in the case of persons representing a true threat to national security, we could feel a bit reassured, but that is not the case. Obviously, the right to privacy will be meaningless as soon as Bill C-17 comes into force, if the government maintains its position. We have confidence, Mr. Speaker, that you will not have to reserve passage on a ship in order to visit your girlfriend overseas. It is likely that your name would end up on a file somewhere.

The members of the Bloc Québécois are here to serve the interests of the public, and so they will fight energetically to see that the right to privacy is respected. We share the Privacy Commissioner's view that there are some major changes needed in Bill C-17. What we have before us today could not be called major changes.

Privacy is one of our basic rights. We are entitled to expect information on us to be used sparingly, at the very least. For the government to confer upon itself the right to collect information on air travellers is one thing, but the right to exchange and distribute that information is quite another.

In fact, Bill C-17 gives the minister the right to disclose the information to the whole world. Not only that, but it allows the minister to disclose and release the information but does not provide a detailed framework for such activities. That is what I call increasing ministerial authority without proper monitoring.

As we have said before, maintaining a balance is crucial to a healthy society and the risks of a faux pas are too high.

With the new powers that the bill would give the minister, he could be authorized to disclose to U.S. authorities information on applications for refugee status made in Canada. Do we have the right to authorize the release of personal information like this? One thing is clear, as soon as information is shared with another party, we lose control of it.

It is naive, idealistic and even rash to believe that we could control a situation when we have not established sufficient limits.

In conclusion, the government cannot always defend the indefensible. The same goes for the protection of privacy.

• (1035)

Let me quote a short sentence from Khalil Gibran, and I dedicate it particularly to my colleagues in the government. This is my gift for today. He said, and I quote:

Strange that we all defend our wrongs with more vigor than we do our rights.

This sentence is food for thought. I hope that it will lead to conclusions that are worthy of the Canadian society, which is, as everyone knows, the best in the world.

[*English*]

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to speak at report stage of Bill C-17, the public safety act. I listened with interest to the government representative, the Secretary of State for Selected Crown Corporations. I would like to congratulate him on his new appointment and I

look forward to debating him and pushing him a little on the question of the need for affordable housing in this country.

In listening to his comments on Bill C-17, he was maybe a little defensive but he was also very aggressive in his defence of the government's position on this bill. He took us back to those tragic events on September 11 and put forward a picture that this bill was essential and necessary because of the horrific events that took place. In fact he asked the opposition members in the House why they would blame the government for everything, even the weather.

Let us be clear. Maybe the government would like to take blame for the weather but in this instance we are holding the government to account on this legislation because there are very significant concerns about the impacts and the long term consequences of the so-called public safety act.

I would like to begin my remarks by quoting from one of the organizations that presented at the committee, the Coalition of Muslim Organizations. In their presentation, just to give this some context, they said:

The Anti-terrorism Act was introduced and enacted in the dark shadow of the tragic events of September 11, 2001. In many ways, the looming, ubiquitous spectre of terror and fear gave rise to legislation that struck the wrong balance between security and civil rights. The predecessors to the Act, Bills C-42 and C-55, were also conceived in that environment of heated reaction. However, the distance of time allows us to reflect on the important issues of public safety and civil rights from a more sober vantage point.

While I was not on the committee that went through this bill in detail, I know my colleague, the member for Churchill, very much focused on these comments and the need to have some sort of reflection and avoid the impetus to rush into yet another piece of security legislation that would have incredible long term impacts and consequences for Canadians and for our society in the values we hold of democracy, civil liberties and the right to privacy.

In looking at the bill, the NDP has been firmly opposed to it because we are very concerned that the very broad powers contained within the bill to collect information on passengers who travel by air, internationally and domestically, information to be amassed and controlled by CSIS and the RCMP, is very serious. I would bet that most Canadians have no idea that this kind of procedure and data gathering is about to take place.

The brief from the Coalition of Muslim Organizations clearly raises the importance to have a reflection about where we are in balancing the need for security, about which everybody is concerned. We are all concerned about the security of our country, the security of our individual families and communities, but clearly that has to be balanced with the rights we have to privacy and our rights to civil liberties.

*Government Orders*

I read through some of the transcripts of the committee and noted the comments of Mr. Radwanski, the privacy commissioner of Canada. I have always appreciated his reflection on a number of the bills that have come before the House. In connection to this bill, commenting on the provisions that would allow this collection of information about individual passengers to be stored, collected and used, he said:

—in Canada we are not required to identify ourselves to the police as we go about our normal, law-abiding business. Unless we are being either arrested or carrying out a licensed activity such as driving, we are not even required to carry ID, let alone identify ourselves to the police.

He went on to say:

Even on a domestic flight of course you're required to provide your name and show photo ID.

● (1040)

When that information is made available to the police, as it will be under Bill C-17 to the RCMP under proposed section 4.82, the effect is exactly the same as if we were required to notify the police every time we travelled so it could check whether we were wanted for any number of Criminal Code offences or an outstanding warrant.

I find these very sober thoughts coming from the privacy commissioner of Canada. With the passage of the bill, we will be setting up a whole series of steps, a whole apparatus that will allow the collection of information. When used in concert with other bills, which regrettably have been approved by the House, they will transfer enormous powers to policing authorities, such as the RCMP, CSIS and the intelligence service. This information collected about Canadians can be used in any variety of ways.

One concern we have about the bill specifically is that the information collected by the RCMP and CSIS can be moved down the line and provided to local authorities. It could be used to make decisions about outstanding warrants. This is precisely the point the privacy commissioner is getting at.

We all agree that laws should be enforced. However in Canada I hope we still have the right to go about our business without having to self-identify, to check in and to produce mandatory ID that can then be used to determine various situations. If passed, Bill C-17 will fundamentally change that. It will have created an environment, along with the other bills which have been passed, to allow that kind of information to now be gathered and used against people.

I know from the organizations I have spoken to, particularly in my riding of Vancouver East where we do have a very diverse multicultural community, there are many people who are very fearful about how the bill will impact on their ability to freely travel, even though they have no connection with any terrorism or with anything that could be suspected in terms of a security risk.

In fact one of the amendments that was sought in committee, which was unfortunately rejected, was the need to have independent oversight, likely the privacy commissioner, to ensure that there were annual reports from the minister responsible, from the RCMP, from CSIS, which would have to go to the privacy commissioner. We want somebody to look at what is going on in terms of the data being collected and the files that are being established based on information drawn from passenger lists.

Suppose we end up with a situation where we knew that 2% of the passengers flying in Canada, or maybe 1%, were Canadian Arabs or from a Moslem background. If we had information which showed us that 20% of the files were being kept based on this legislation, would that be cause for concern?

● (1045)

I know I and my colleagues have brought forward examples in question period about how racial profiling and how targeting is beginning to take place at border crossings and airports. I have even debated the question of a national identity card and how that too is now part of this very fundamentally changed environment, where having a national identity card can actually be used in a very negative way to pull people over and to target people because of how they look or because of their racial background.

I want to say most strongly that we in the NDP have been following the bill, as have other opposition parties and members. While we recognize the need for public security, the words of wisdom from the Coalition of Muslim Organizations calling upon us to have reflection post-September 11 are things we need to heed.

I urge members to reject the amendment that is before us, to reject the bill and to send it back because this bill on public safety will undermine the democratic civil liberties and values that we hold so dear.

● (1050)

**Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to say a few words to Bill C-17. Like my colleague who just spoke, I also have concerns about whether we should push through a bill such as this after such a prolonged period of time.

When September 11 hit everybody with the awareness of how ill-prepared we were to deal with acts of terrorism, everyone, not only across the country but around the world, reacted immediately. Within days we were told massive legislation would be brought forth to address the problem so that nothing like that would ever happen again. We needed to be much more aware of what was going on in our own country and around the world. We also needed to become aware that this would have some effect on our own personal freedoms.

At that time most people said that they would have no problem with infringements on their freedom if it benefited the security and safety of their country. However quite a lot of time has elapsed since that occurrence and perhaps it is time to assess our response to such an act.

In situations like that quite often people overreact out of concern and when they are all hyped up and think they could be next. Now that we have had time for some second thought, perhaps it is time to go through the bill and ask ourselves how much of it is relevant now and how much of it is really necessary now. In retrospect, I think we would find many clauses in the bill which go above and beyond what is required now to deal with the issue of security.

*S. O. 31*

Let me take a different tact because to talk about each clause in the bill, its effect, the transfer of power and the loss of personal freedoms would take possibly months. I would like to talk about security from a different aspect.

We will all remember that fateful day of September 11. I am sure there are two or three events in all our lives for which we remember what happened, where we were at the time and who we were with when it happened. In my own case I remember the day President Kennedy was shot, the day Henderson scored the great goal for Canada in 1972, and of course September 11. There may be other significant days with some personal impact, but general widespread events such as these are enshrined in our memory never to be forgotten.

However, on Septemeber 11, when we watched the second plane hit one of the towers in New York, we began to realize that something was drastically wrong. We also found out that a couple of other planes were involved and heaven's knows how many more were prevented from getting into the air because of the quick action that was taken.

Unfortunately, I was not in Newfoundland on that day because, like many members, my party was having a caucus meeting in western Canada. Having to wait for taxis and being on waiting lists, it took us a few days to get home, but we finally managed to get back home. However I was told that the people in Newfoundland who had not turned on the television or the radio that morning to hear about what had happened were amazed at the number of jets flying overhead.

•(1055)

When we get nice clear blue skies, as we always do in Newfoundland, the white streaks are quite visible, and on that day they were very visible. People were wondering what was happening. What was happening was that many of the trans-Atlantic flights were being diverted to airports in Newfoundland. Places like Gander, St. John's, Stephenville and Goose Bay were crowded, particularly Gander, with flights arriving from all over the place. Even though many of them had been closer to larger areas, such as Toronto and Montreal, they were diverted to Newfoundland for whatever reason. I guess we can argue with the fact.

However that event showed clearly the need to have specific landing sites, specific bases as such, in such areas in the country. During the war, in the late 1930s and early 1940s, Newfoundland was still an independent country. Perhaps a lot of people are saying today that we should have stayed that way. However during that time we had large, strong, efficient naval and air force bases in places such as Gander, Goose Bay, Stephenville and St. John's. They provided a place of security for all our allies, for Canadians, Americans and the British. We still have countries from all over the world doing some minimal training at some of our sites, particularly in Goose Bay.

However, the present government, once Canada joined us in 1949, allowed the stature of these bases to diminish and in fact closed most of them. The recent confrontation in Iraq illustrated to us quite clearly that we never know when confrontations can happen around the world. We strategically should have secure areas, our own bases, well-equipped to respond to any kind of a situation, whether it be our

involvement in some confrontation or whether it be fallout from the involvement or fallout from something completely disassociated with our own country, such as the events that happened in New York. We were there to help out, luckily, because we had some of the infrastructure that was necessary.

We have a government that over the last 15 to 20 years has allowed infrastructure in the country to fall completely apart. I am sure that what is true in Newfoundland is true in other parts of the country. If we are going to talk about security let us make sure we play our part in making sure the country is secure.

It is nice to bring in a bill half an inch thick and talk about taking away personal freedoms and the hypothetical ideas of what might happen down the road, but in reality let us start putting some concrete plans in place to strengthen our country and to make sure we are strategically positioned to handle ourselves, whether it be in peacekeeping times or in times of confrontation.

We have the infrastructure throughout the country. Newfoundland and Labrador is strategically located, with the basic infrastructure already there, but we need to revive and strengthen the infrastructure, not only for the good of the province involved but for the good of the country.

The bill, undoubtedly, after being on the table for practically a year and a half now, needs to be revised. In light of that perhaps we could do something worthwhile for the country.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

### RESERVE FORCE

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the civilian employers who will be honoured this weekend for supporting the reserve force.

There are approximately 23,000 primary reservists in Canada. To train, take courses or serve in operations, these reservists need their employers' support.

In return, these employers benefit from the solid work ethic, leadership training and special abilities that reservists bring to their civilian jobs.

I want to congratulate Canadian Pacific Limited of Calgary, for being named Canada's most supportive employer. I also want to thank all the employers who have won an employer support award in their respective province, or the support to Canadian Forces operations award.

Reservists devote part of their free time to serving this remarkable country. I therefore invite hon. members to join me in saluting these cooperative employers and the dedicated reserve force personnel of Canada.

*S. O. 31*

• (1100)  
[English]

### ZIMBABWE

**Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, as part of its ongoing crackdown on dissenting voices in Zimbabwe, the regime of Robert Mugabe has unconstitutionally trampled on the rights of Zimbabweans to freedom of assembly, free property ownership and freedom of speech.

To bring attention to the plight of opposition MPs who are frequently in danger of arbitrary arrest or of personal injury at the hands of Mr. Mugabe's thugs, Amnesty International has twinned a number of Canadian and Zimbabwean MPs.

For the past year I have been twinned with David Mpala, who is the member of parliament for the riding of Lupane and a member of the opposition Movement for Democratic Change.

On March 31 several MPs, including Mr. Mpala, were arrested without legitimate cause. Their condition is uncertain.

Canada cannot stand idly by as Mr. Mugabe transforms Zimbabwe from a multi-racial democracy into a Stalinist terror state. If Canada refuses to take leadership within the Commonwealth to oppose Mr. Mugabe, then courageous men, like David Mpala, will have risked their lives and their liberty for nothing.

\* \* \*

### MARIJUANA

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the issue of decriminalization of marijuana has spawned yet another debate as to whether Canada should change its laws.

Twenty-three years ago, as a candidate in the 1980 federal general election, I was faced with the same debate. It is interesting to note that the arguments made then are still the same arguments today. They include: marijuana is widely used in Canada; there is no victim; we cannot keep up with the court cases; it ruins people's lives to have a criminal record; the police are not enforcing the laws; et cetera.

What has changed is that marijuana today is 1,500 times more potent than it was in 1973 and yet we continue to discuss penalties based on weight rather than the potency or THC content of the drug.

Marijuana is a gateway drug which usually leads to the use of other stronger more dangerous drugs and it sends the wrong message to our youth and all Canadians about drug use and smoking.

Decriminalization of marijuana is a confusing measure that will not solve the problems some see and certainly will open up other problems. All I can say is that decriminalization is not the solution to our problem.

\* \* \*

### CANADIAN EXECUTIVE SERVICE ORGANIZATION

**Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate one of my constituents for his outstanding efforts on behalf of the Canadian Executive Service Organization.

Mr. McKaig went on assignment to Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan to train the staff of the biggest jewellery manufacturer on international jewellery trading.

Mr. McKaig developed a report that analyzed the domestic market which included pricing, distribution and export, with particular reference to the Canadian market. This company is interested in exporting its products to Canada and, thanks to the dedication and expertise supplied by Tom McKaig, they have become closer to that plan.

I call on the House to join with me in congratulating Mr. McKaig for his exemplary volunteer service and to thank him for his commitment to others in need around the world.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### HEPATITIS AWARENESS MONTH

**Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that May has been declared Hepatitis Awareness Month by the Canadian Liver Foundation.

Hepatitis is the most common disease in Canada, and Canadians should know the consequences and take the necessary measures to protect themselves.

Despite the availability of vaccinations against hepatitis A and B, thousands of people contract these diseases each year because they are unaware of the risks associated with certain types of behaviour, for example, sexual activities, tattoos, body piercing and the injection of drugs. There is no vaccination against hepatitis C, but precautions can be taken.

The Canadian Liver Foundation is on the forefront of efforts to reduce the incidence and impact of hepatitis and all liver diseases. Each year, the foundation provides research subsidies to renowned Canadian doctors and scientists so they can find new treatments and cures for hepatitis and other liver diseases.

I ask the House to join me in saluting the Canadian Liver Foundation and its volunteers during Hepatitis Awareness Month.

•(1105)  
[English]

#### ASIAN HERITAGE MONTH

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, May is Asian Heritage Month and events are taking place in cities across Canada. This acknowledgement of the role Asians have played in shaping Canada recognizes a decade of community celebrations across the country in cities such as Halifax, Montreal, Vancouver, and my hometown of Edmonton. Since last year there has been great enthusiasm as more communities across the country have embraced this opportunity to celebrate the many contributions of Asians to both historic and contemporary Canada.

Last year Canada imported \$53 billion worth of goods from Asia and we exported over \$20 billion worth of goods there. Some 1.3 billion Asian tourists visit us every year and over 39,000 study here at universities and colleges. Three million Canadians are of Asian origin and that is 10% of our population.

I would encourage my colleagues in the House to participate in local events across this nation to celebrate Asian Heritage Month.

\* \* \*

#### INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AWARDS

**Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Northumberland, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to congratulate the recipients of the International Scientific Awards.

At a ceremony this morning the Minister of National Defence presented 12 Canadian scientists from Defence Research and Development Canada, the National Research Council and the Department of National Defence with their awards.

These awards are presented under the technical cooperation program. This program promotes collaborative defence science research between Canada, the United States, Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

The work of these scientists is yet another example of Canada's commitment to collaborate with our allies in sharing knowledge and expertise. I ask the House to join me in congratulating the recipients of this prestigious award.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### FATHER FERNAND LINDSAY

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on Sunday a great citizen of Lanaudière will be celebrating his 75th birthday. Father Fernand Lindsay, founder of the well-known Festival international de Lanaudière and still its artistic director, has just announced the program for the 26th season, which will comprise 25 performances starting June 27.

Father Lindsay was honoured with the Ramon John Hnatyshyn Award for Voluntarism in the Performing Arts at the Governor General's Performing Arts Awards ceremonies this past November, for close to half a century of sharing his passion for classical music with a multitude of young, and not so young, residents of Lanaudière and other parts of Quebec.

S. O. 31

Appointed director of the Jeunesses musicales de Joliette in 1957, and founder of the Festival-Concours de musique de Lanaudière in 1962, Father Lindsay also created the Camp musical de Joliette, before starting the Festival d'été.

Father Lindsay, you have enriched the musical and artistic scene of our region and of Quebec as a whole, and we hope you will continue to do so for many more years. Happy birthday.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### CULTURAL EXCHANGE

**Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on April 10 the Ottawa Centre Renegades peewee hockey team flew to Iqaluit on a cultural exchange visit. Team members and families thoroughly enjoyed their visit to Iqaluit and the opportunity to see the north, the people, the culture and to learn more about the rest of this great country.

This exchange was made possible by great sponsors such as: the Canada sports friendship exchange program funded by the Government of Canada; First Air; Zellers; the Ottawa Senators Foundation; the Ottawa Renegades Football Club; the *Ottawa Citizen*; Glebe Pharmasave; the St. Clair Group; Osler, Hoskin and Harcourt LLP; Exchanges Canada, Government of Canada; Iqaluit Minor Hockey Association; and all the volunteers and many others too numerous to list.

Thanks to all.

\* \* \*

#### OKANAGAN LIFE POETRY CONTEST

**Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents from Salmon Arm to Osoyoos entered the Okanagan Life Poetry Contest. I would like to congratulate two of my constituents, both from Vernon, who tied for top honours in the mothers category, Shannon Spence and Rhelda Evans. I would like to read parts of their poetry.

Shannon Spence wrote:

There is a history in these hands.  
They have all passed slowly in front of our eyes.  
Long and slender and, at time, overworked.  
They have cared for us, smoothing away childhood fears just before the dawn.

Rhelda Evans wrote:

A mother's love is a gift that lasts  
Through changing times and shaky pasts.  
Forgiveness is the shaping tool  
That love insists becomes the rule  
Within the home throughout the years.

As May 11 approaches, I would like to take this moment to wish all mothers, including my own, a very happy Mother's Day.

*S. O. 31*

### WESTRAY MINE DISASTER

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been 11 years since 26 coal miners lost their lives in the deeps of the Westray mine in Pictou County, Nova Scotia. It was one of the darkest days in the province's history. Wives lost their husbands, children lost their fathers, parents lost their sons and friends lost their loved ones. Nearly 200 brave men and women risked their own lives to make every possible effort to try to save those who were trapped below.

There is a long history of coal mining in Nova Scotia. Cape Breton, Springhill and Pictou County were all once sources of coal exported around the world. Now they are silent.

On behalf of all members of this House I honour the memory of the 26 men who lost their lives on May 9, 1992 and extend our condolences to the family and friends they left behind. They are gone but not forgotten.

\* \* \*

• (1110)

### PARLIAMENT

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we are the days for parliamentarians. Our sad demise is flourishing around us as this democratic institution, a guardian of democracy and a place to be regarded as a model for decision making and open debate is being throttled and stalled.

The dog and pony budget show emanating from the Ontario government has drawn the ire of the Speaker of that house, as it should. But hey, we have our problems too. The provisional government of the Liberal Party of Canada has reached its long arm into this place too. Whether it be pronouncements on the first nations governance act, or star wars, or same sex marriage, we see the shadowy powers of the former finance minister calling the shots and laying out the orders of the day.

We in the federal NDP say let us bring back Parliament and can the extracurricular activities once and for all.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### CANADA LABOUR CODE

**Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, after a lockout that lasted more than 38 months, everyone thought the labour unrest was over at last at Cargill, in Baie-Comeau, but the employer has refused to sign the collective agreement.

This is a situation that illustrates more than ever the urgency of changing the Canada Labour Code to include anti-scab measures, like those which have been in place in Quebec for 25 years.

What we want, and what the workers continue to demand as well, is for the Canada Labour Code to make it possible to hold civilized negotiations that foster industrial peace and establish a fair balance of power.

The Prime Minister must assume his responsibilities and make it known to the Minister of Labour that he will be supporting the anti-

scab bill introduced by my colleague, the hon. member for Laurentides, so that this unfair situation may be remedied.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### RESERVE FORCES

**Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today we honour Public Service of Canada employees who also serve our nation as members of the reserve forces.

Reservists train on evenings, weekends, and for periods of full time service usually during the summer. To facilitate this training the government is taking a leading role in reiterating its position on military leave regulations for reservists and setting an example that many civilian employers are following.

Following question period today, the Minister of National Defence and the President of the Treasury Board will mark Federal Reserve Force Day by signing a statement of support for flexible leave regulations and launch a year long awareness program.

Many of these same reservists are in Ottawa today. I would like to thank them on behalf of all Canadians for the outstanding contribution they make to Canada by dedicating a portion of their busy lives to serve in Canada's reserve forces.

\* \* \*

### VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Mr. Speaker, at 3:30 in the morning in Hampton, New Brunswick, Marc Mathurin discovered a fire next door. In rapid fashion the Hampton volunteer fire department responded to a fire at the adjacent hardware store.

Mixtures of hazardous materials, including chemicals and paints, were ablaze. Despite these hazards the firefighters showed courage, dedication, conviction and commitment in containing the fire so it would not spread, jeopardizing other buildings on that site and also other homes.

Fire departments were on site in numbers for over 20 hours. It was a community effort in that fire departments from neighbouring communities came to be of assistance. Crews from eight communities, including Rothesay, Nauwigewauk, Norton, Long Reach, Upham, Belleisle and Kingston joined Hampton firefighters at the scene.

Last February at the Moffatt farm, volunteer firefighters again showed the same amount of dedication when they were on that particular site.

These events are stark illustrations of the courage and commitment that volunteer firefighters offer their communities. I am highlighting these incidents but I would like to applaud volunteer fire departments across the country for their bravery and dedication in every community and in every hamlet across this great nation.

*Oral Questions*

•(1115)

**MEDICALERT MONTH**

**Ms. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to remind the House that May is MedicAlert Month in Canada.

The Canadian MedicAlert Foundation is a national charitable organization that has been protecting the lives of Canadians with health conditions and special medical needs for more than 40 years.

It is currently estimated that one out of every five Canadians requires the services of an emergency department each year. MedicAlert provides immediate and reliable emergency medical information through custom engraved bracelets or necklets linked to a medical record through a 24 hour emergency hotline.

This year MedicAlert aims to educate Canadians about the increasing importance of emergency preparedness. It is pleased to have the support of national and local paramedic associations, emergency nurses and physicians in its May awareness activities.

The Government of Canada recognizes the vital role of the Canadian MedicAlert Foundation in Canada, the emergency health care system, and extends best wishes for a successful MedicAlert Month.

\* \* \*

**WASTE REPORT**

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, waste, waste, waste and more waste, the litany continues. Today I released my waste report explaining to Canadians how the government finds ways to spend our tax dollars.

We start with Citizenship and Immigration which paid \$10,000 to an employee because it hurt his feelings. Aw, the poor dear. Well, he is not quite so poor today anyway.

The Canadian Food Inspection Agency paid \$2,500 because its detector dog reached retirement age before its contract expired.

Correctional Service paid \$2,100 to a prisoner because it trashed his computer.

No one wastes taxpayers' money better than the Department of Canadian Heritage. The National Film Board produces trash and it is not even Canadian trash or good trash: \$300,000 for *The Influent and the Effluent*, a documentary that explores the hidden world of sewers and the relationship between humans and their waste.

Human waste, government waste, it all adds up to a lot of taxpayers' money down the toilet.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador stated his desire to renegotiate the

terms of Confederation. The minister's response was a flippant dismissal, followed by laughter from the government backbenches.

The government's mismanagement of the cod fishery has left the provinces with few choices. One clear choice is to demand more control over the industry. Why is the government unwilling to give Newfoundland a say over its own resources?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the province has its own responsibilities regarding fisheries, but what is very important is that since the science says that we need to have a moratorium on cod and the duty of the minister of fisheries is to apply the moratorium, we need to help the communities. I know that Canada is so willing to have a very good partnership with the government of Newfoundland to help the community, and to know what the plan of the government of Newfoundland is, how much money they are ready to put on the table and what program designs they have in mind, because constitutional change will not help.

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, what arrogance. The Liberal government thinks it knows it all.

While the provinces call for changes, the fisheries minister responds by saying, and I quote him, "The federal government has always been in charge of the fishery". We have seen what a stellar job it has done. Stocks are depleted, businesses are shutting down, and thousands are out of work. Obviously the federal government's way of doing things is not working. Will the government commit to devolving greater control of the resources to the provinces?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday that this is a problem throughout the planet. According to the most recent estimates of the FAO, 75% of the world's fish stocks are either fully exploited, over-exploited or depleted. This has nothing to do with the Constitution of Canada and everything to do with the necessity to follow what the science is telling us to do and to help on the ground the communities affected. It is what federally we want to do with Newfoundland and Labrador, with New Brunswick, with Quebec, with all—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, and a little order, please.

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, what arrogance again, a government that darn near lost Canada a few years ago telling us how it could run it better. Shameful.

The government's arrogance extends beyond Newfoundland and Labrador. Across the country there is a systematic dismissal of provincial concerns by this government. The government has failed to resolve the softwood and offshore drilling issues in British Columbia. The government has failed to address the health delivery options for Alberta and the rest of Canada. The government has failed to resolve devastating duties on wheat in Saskatchewan.

*Oral Questions*

Why is the government's only response to provincial concerns to stall, to dismiss or to ignore them altogether?

• (1120)

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more easy to do for the opposition but nothing less positive to do than to be involved in fed bashing in everything.

The Government of Canada has responsibilities. These responsibilities are not always easy. It is not easy to go in with a moratorium. We are very unhappy to have to do that but it is necessary. We are very proud of the positive solutions we have found with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador on so many files, whether it is Voisey's Bay, whether it is Hibernia or whether it is about fisheries, the fisheries where the fish are still in good shape. That is why this province has the strongest economic growth of all the provinces in Canada.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I doubt if the riots would bear that out.

This situation has far less to do with fish than it does the complete arrogance of this government. These Liberals across the way start to laugh when the provinces voice legitimate concerns.

When the federal government has an attitude like that it is small wonder the provinces get fed up. Why will the government not admit that maybe, just maybe, the provinces might know more than it does when it comes to fishing, farming, firearms or forestry?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us stick to fisheries since it is the problem that we have today. We have a government that is saying we need to apply the moratorium because science is asking us to do that and then to work as good partners to help the communities. We have another government that is saying, "Give me more powers because I want to fish more despite what the scientists say". I have difficulty in seeing how it would help in the long haul for the fisheries to have, instead of one minister that takes the responsibility, six ministers, because we would have to share with the other five provinces involved in the Atlantic fisheries.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, that was a nice try, but they want to co-manage, not fish more.

Let us look at who is who in the hinterland. B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador: all of these provinces have been alienated by the arrogance and the disdain of this government. Before we know it we will be up to the 7/50 formula. Why will the government not act now to discuss provinces' legitimate concerns to head off a constitutional crisis at the pass?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, no, on the hon. member's point, it is not a constitutional crisis, it is a fisheries crisis, and we want to address it in good partnership with all the localities, the communities and the governments. It has nothing to do with the Constitution of Canada and everything to do with the problem that is throughout the planet.

[Translation]

**Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Chandler, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and local MP went and told hundreds of plant workers who have been without any pay for more than a month and who have no work due to a lack of crab to process, that the federal government would not extend their EI benefits.

Will the government, which is responsible for the collapse of the stocks because of its mismanagement, finally realize that what is needed right now is special EI measures for plant workers to help them make ends meet, and that this is the responsibility of the government?

**Hon. Claude Drouin (Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, who is doing a wonderful job to help people in his riding and the region and for everything he has been doing. We announced short-term measures totalling \$14 million to assist these people. We immediately began consultations on long-term measures. Next fall, we will be making announcements to help people who depend on the fishery.

**Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the secretary of state who just answered that workers should be patient said that there would be diversification measures. This fall, as he said, will be too late, particularly since the help that was promised is for communities and not one penny of it will go to the pockets of plant workers who need money now.

Will the minister admit that special employment insurance measures are needed now in order to help plant workers, and that Ottawa cannot wash its hands of the situation?

**Hon. Claude Drouin (Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I find it unfortunate that the member only listened to a part of the answer. There is \$14 million available now for short-term measures. What we have said is that there will be long-term measures. We must not forget that \$600 million has been transferred to Quebec for labour training. We are working with the government, which is looking for solutions to help the people in the region, and that is what we are going to do.

• (1125)

**Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, back home, on the Lower North Shore, there is no crab left. The people need help. Indeed, the economy will have to be diversified through initiatives already being contemplated. It is urgent to act by improving the employment insurance program. Will this government act or not?

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague said, we are already transferring \$600 million to the Province of Quebec to help those who have lost their jobs. In addition, the Department of Human Resources Development is making available to the workers its full range of programs, including employment benefits, support measures, the Youth Employment Strategy and initiatives under a pilot project for older workers.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am returning to my riding, and I have people waiting for me there. Can the government understand that I will not repeat its insensitive line about not being able to do anything? Will it be a little compassionate and announce specific measures instead of having the people in our region wait until the fall?

**Hon. Claude Drouin (Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned a minute ago that we are making \$14 million available immediately. I suggest that the hon. member who made a proposal to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans last night ask people who have projects to contact the Sept-Îles office for assistance. This has not happened yet. We assure them of our full cooperation because, like them, we are committed to finding solutions.

\* \* \*

[English]

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the government House leader. I think he is still there in that position.

The leader of the provisional government says he will not implement the first nations governance act, or maybe. We think the former finance minister will do to first nations governance what he did to taxpayers and the GST, so let us find out where the provisional government really stands. Can we have a free vote on the governance act to find out if the former finance minister means what he says?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is a bit unusual as a question. The House leader of the hon. member's party and her own backbench MP filibustered the bill and now she is asking us whether we will time allocate to undo the filibustering of her colleague and then whether we will allow a free vote on having the time allocation motion, or something like that. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure you were able to follow it. I am still trying to figure it out.

\* \* \*

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, that was a nice try, but we are really trying to find out where the provisional government is at on this question.

In fact the same provisional government leader has said that he wants star wars. One day later, the defence minister says he does too. Now he says we have 99 days to make up our minds. Clearly the minister is not taking his orders from Parliament because he will not let us debate the issue. Could he tell us who put him up to putting star wars on the fast track and why? Why the 99 days?

**Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, no one put me up to anything. This was a proposal that was forwarded by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and myself to cabinet. It is being discussed in cabinet. It was discussed in the national caucus. It was discussed yesterday in the caucus committee and it will be discussed on Monday again in the caucus committee and on Tuesday in the cabinet. There is a lot of discussion going on on this

side of the House and I would commend this process to the other parties.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC):** Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada figures are out and in fact there were 14,000 job losses last month. That is directly related to the SARS issue, but is it not pretty clear evidence of what the mishandling of that issue has cost the Canadian economy? In fact it has cost us 14,000 jobs. How can the government simply sit there and ignore those figures?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are all very proud of the way the Minister of Health handled this issue from the Government of Canada, working closely with provincial and local public health authorities, and we are delighted that we have turned the corner on this difficult health issue.

There is no doubt that this issue was not helpful in terms of employment, but I want the hon. member to know what the government is doing to make sure we return to full strength, with \$100 million that has been committed to the effort, including \$10 million to promote Toronto and Canada as tourist destinations, and changes to the EI rules. The Business Development Bank will work with customers. We are working with communities to restore economic strengths, travel and tourism. It will not be long—

• (1130)

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest.

**Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC):** Mr. Speaker, let us go at this from a different angle. We know why the government is trying to slide out from its responsibilities on the SARS issue and its mishandling of it.

Let us go back to about 14 months ago when the finance minister himself said that we were coasting on a 60¢ dollar. Now we have the dollar rising and jobs disappearing, almost a self-fulfilling prophecy. How does the government explain that one away? It has squandered everything in terms of its ability to deal with that issue, in terms of productivity, for example. Why did we allow—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions.

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what is the hon. member talking about? We have squandered absolutely nothing. We have the best economy in the G-7, as stated by the IMF and the OECD. We have created over two and a half million jobs since we formed the government. Productivity has gone up. People's incomes have gone up. Their real disposable incomes have gone up. Everything is up on this side of the House and everything is down on that side.

*Oral Questions***FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, Canada faces a fall deadline to make a decision on missile defence. The government has had seven years to get involved and it has not. It was three years ago when Canada's top general at Norad said we should get involved or risk losing the protection of Norad. The government keeps playing brinkmanship with Canada's national security. Could it just put aside its leadership race long enough to make a decision on national missile defence?

**Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if one puts all that rhetoric to one side, the fact of the matter is yes, the United States will make a decision in the fall, but the hon. member should know that it is the fall of next year, not the fall of this year. That means there is plenty of time.

As I have said several times in the House, the government side is in the process of a debate. I have described it as one generating a lot of intellectual vigour, such vigour being largely absent, it would seem, from the Canadian Alliance side of the House.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the decision of the government to treat Canadian Forces logistics personnel as second rate soldiers in Afghanistan contradicts military training. Soldiers in every job classification are taught to be in control of their weapons at all times when in theatre. How can the minister expect to preserve a semblance of morale when he orders soldiers to give up their weapons then go into a combat zone?

**Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, no such order was given. The hon. member is somewhat confused. I have dealt with this subject in the House several times. I have consulted with the chief of defence staff who assures me that he has no security concerns in this matter, and that the situation is normal. We saw exactly the same situation pertaining to NATO forces. I think the hon. member should just calm down.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the government has helped itself to \$45 billion from unemployment insurance contributions. Instead of earmarking this money for the workers, it chose to use it all to pay down its debt. And now, when asked for programs to assist fishery workers, for example, the government tells us to wait until the fall.

If the government has run out of ideas, why not take some inspiration from the Bloc Quebecois' plan to improve accessibility to EI, provide more generous benefits and extend the benefit period?

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I explained earlier, workers can count on the government's help. That is why we are transferring \$600 million to the provinces under this agreement, in order to help workers find jobs.

What workers want is work; they do not necessarily want to rely on EI benefits.

**Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, if they want to help the workers, they should do so now. The government has the means to act. The Bloc Quebecois is offering its solutions to guide such actions.

Will the government admit that if it were to improve the employment insurance system, it would be able to expand the impact of its assistance, to include not only fishery workers, but also those in the softwood lumber sector?

• (1135)

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the situation is certainly not easy for people who work in the fishery, but we are trying our best to help them. That is why we are working for the good of the fishers, in conjunction with the ACOA, Economic Development Canada and the other governments in order to find solutions to this difficult situation.

\* \* \*

[English]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence said yesterday that the 1999 statement of requirements for the Sea King replacement is his bible. Apparently he is quoting from the King Jean version.

The minister claims that he is trying to get new helicopters as quickly as possible, but the contract stipulates Canada take no deliveries for at least four to five years. He claims the 1999 requirements have not been changed, but we know the military was ordered last July to dumb down the requirements to qualify Eurocopter.

Is the minister just trying to reinforce our view that he is totally incompetent, or is he misleading the House?

**Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think I made it very clear yesterday, but since those members do not seem to get it, I will repeat the point.

The statement of requirements was developed in 1999 with the approval of the military leadership of this country. That statement of requirements has not changed one iota. Let me repeat, that statement of requirements is the bible on the helicopter file. It has not changed one iota. I think hon. members on the other side should begin to comprehend this point.

\* \* \*

**COPYRIGHT ACT**

**Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the government imposes a levy on all blank recording media regardless of end use apparently on the assumption that all users are potential copyright thieves and that the guilty and the innocent should be punished equally.

What this does is punish those who use large quantities of recording media for perfectly legal purposes, such as a small business in my riding that distributes computer training manuals for CD-ROMs. The tax currently costs 21¢ for each CD-ROM the company sells, and this could soon rise to 59¢.

When will the government amend this law to eliminate its penalty on small business owners who use large quantities of recording media?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member well knows that the whole idea behind the measure was to try to ensure that the copyright of owners, people who created the art, was respected. It was put in place to ensure that when people created something of value and put it in the marketplace, that they would get the protection they deserved and that the law could afford.

It is a balance on every case, and the copyright tribunal has tried to establish that balance. It is always under review to ensure we get it right, and we will continue to do that.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### SOFTWOOD LUMBER

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the largest forestry cooperative in Quebec, located in Laterrière in my riding, is no longer able to pay its creditors. Its president says that the softwood lumber crisis is largely responsible for this situation.

Does the Minister for International Trade finally understand that the possible closing of this sawmill would provide yet more evidence that his assistance plan of last fall does not meet the needs of the current situation and that he must proceed to the next phase as soon as possible?

[English]

**Hon. Herb Dhaliwal (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government provided a comprehensive package to deal with softwood lumber, including community adjustment, research and development and looking for new markets for Canadian wood products.

The hon. member has not stated with which part of that comprehensive package that she disagrees. This is something that has been supported by Canadians across the country and she should work with us to support that because I think it is the right way to go.

The hon. member should stand up and say how good this package is and how well it is working to ensure we protect and support Canadians across the country.

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is talking about the past; I am asking him about the present. The 450 members of the Laterrière cooperative have \$13 million in shares in this company and now want to save their pension fund.

What does the minister plan to tell these workers, whose jobs are threatened, because the government is dragging its feet on introducing a new assistance plan?

**Hon. Claude Drouin (Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.):** Mr.

#### Oral Questions

Speaker, I want to say that we have implemented measures to the tune of \$361 million. Of the \$110 million for communities, \$22 million is available now. Of this, the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean region is to get \$3.5 million, and another \$2 million will go to the Consortium de recherche sur la forêt boréale for research on the black spruce.

These are concrete measures. This is phase one, and we will continue to support the workers in the regions.

\* \* \*

• (1140)

[English]

#### FIREARMS REGISTRY

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the member for Malpeque was once opposed to Bill C-68 because of its search without a warrant provisions.

In 1995 the same MP questioned justice officials about ways to enforce gun registration without turning innocent people into criminals. Why has the MP suddenly become Bill C-68's greatest promoter? Is it perhaps because he is now the Solicitor General?

**Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my golly, the member for Yorkton—Melville obviously does not realize the world has changed since 1995. I know he is back in that time and age, that is for sure.

If we look at the record, we will see exactly where I stood. Look at the voting record, not statements that were made, as the Minister of National Defence talked about earlier. We debate issues on this side of the House. We are not afraid of having differences of opinion. We do not always vote the party line as they do over there.

The fact of the matter is the world has moved on. These are different times.

\* \* \*

#### GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, talk about a legacy. The Prime Minister is on his way out but some well connected Liberals are on their way in.

We have found that election defeat for former Liberal MPs parachutes them right on to the gravy train. David Dingwall now has a five-year term at the Royal Canadian Mint that will cost us \$1.2 million.

Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais can look forward to 27 years in the plush red chamber, at an anticipated cost of over \$3 million.

Could the Prime Minister tell us what the real cost of his pathetic legacy will really be?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am astonished that it is not as evident to that member as it is to the rest of the country that appointments are made on the basis of merit, whether it is to the Senate or any other place.

### Oral Questions

The Prime Minister and the government have appointed people of talent, skill and commitment to do an outstanding job for Canadians and the country, and we are proud of every one of them.

\* \* \*

#### INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when the Information Commissioner last appeared at the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, he said that the government needed to improve the management of information throughout its lifecycle.

In fact, he said that there was a pressing need to update the management of government information policy. My question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board.

What has the government done to address the commissioner's concerns and the concerns of all Canadians?

**Mr. Tony Tirabassi (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House that indeed a new policy on the management of government information came into effect on May 1. The policy responds to some of the concerns of the Information Commissioner by outlining the responsibility of all government employees to ensure that the management of information is done in both an effective and efficient manner.

As well, the policy promotes the management of information in a privacy-protective manner that supports informed decision making and the delivery of high quality programs, services and information through a variety of channels, and in both official languages.

\* \* \*

#### TRADE

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, trade challenges from south of the border are threatening more Canadian jobs. The latest U.S. call for tariffs terrifies blueberry pickers and processors. They know what has happened to softwood lumber. They know what has happened to our wheat farmers.

If duties are imposed on our blueberries, jobs will be wiped out in Nova Scotia, Quebec and other provinces. Some aboriginal communities already struggling will be devastated.

What action has the government taken to ensure that the blueberry industry does not get the raspberry?

**Mr. Murray Calder (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is premature right now to speculate if the U.S. industry will petition for a trade remedy case against blueberries from Canada. Such investigations require formal petitions containing evidence if injury is due to dumping and/or subsidization. We are not aware of any such evidence so far.

\* \* \*

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, that was some defence of our blueberry industry.

Yesterday Bush managed to keep a straight face when he went after Iran for violating arms control treaties. When Bush does not

like an arms control treaty, he does not violate it, he just tears it up. That is what he did with the ABM treaty so he could plow ahead with star wars.

Would the defence minister explain why it is okay for some people to abandon arms control treaties and others not?

• (1145)

**Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it seems this morning that the NDP wants us to move slower on ballistic missile defence, while the Canadian Alliance seems to want us to move faster on ballistic missile defence.

This leads me to conclude that probably we are moving at about the right speed.

**Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence said that Canada needed to decide on missile defence in 100 days. Whose deadline is it?

The House is about to close. In five weeks we will go on summer break and the Prime Minister is whistling past the graveyard; no proposals, no ideas, no consensus and no time.

Will he set up a House of Commons committee on missile defence before it is too late? Will he let Parliament do the work his government has ignored?

**Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I am informed that four opposition days remain before the end of the session. I have not seen any opposition party rushing with alacrity to seize on this opportunity for a debate in Parliament. I would inform them once again, if they are not already aware, that these opportunities exist and they are there for the opposition parties to use.

Meanwhile, on this side of the House, as I have said more than once, we are engaged in an exciting, vigorous debate on the topic.

\* \* \*

#### FISHERIES

**Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, earlier the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said that he could not accede to the Newfoundland government's request because the stocks were in such terrible shape that the government had to impose a moratorium.

Let me say to the minister that the stocks are in such bad shape because the government would not listen to the people who know how to manage them.

I ask the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans this. While we argue about constitutional jurisdiction, will he set up a management committee with the provinces to discuss proper management of the resource so those affected can have some say in managing the resource as they know how to do?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. member that a bit more than 10 years ago the premier was a Liberal for Newfoundland and Labrador and the federal minister was a Tory.

*Oral Questions*

What was said was that Premier Wells blamed Ottawa for mismanaging the fishery, although neither he nor the other three Atlantic premiers had ever urged the federal government to reduce allowed catches. On the contrary, the provinces kept pushing for higher overall quotas and a larger share of the total.

The Government of Canada—

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

\* \* \*

**TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS CANADA**

**Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton Southwest, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, hardly a week goes by without the industry minister doling out taxpayer dollars to some Liberal MP's riding through Technology Partnerships Canada. The minister calls them investments and says that they will be repaid in full. That is simply not true. To date, since 1996, less than 2% of those loans have been repaid.

Why is the minister continuing to mislead the House and Canadians about this program?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, since 1996, Technology Partnerships Canada has created or maintained 43,000 jobs in Canada.

Because of the \$2 billion we have invested, over \$8 billion of private sector funding has been leveraged. This is the way Canada will encourage the development of emerging sectors of the economy. This is the way we stay competitive with the rest of the world.

I urge the member to look at the facts and see the value of this program.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the U.S. congress is proposing changes to the Bush tax plan that could seriously hurt Canadian business. It would only restrict dividend tax reduction to domestic companies. This would leave hundreds of Canadian companies, such as Nortel, Canadian Pacific, TELUS and many others, that have offices in the United States out in the cold.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. Has the Minister of Finance made the appropriate calls to his counterpart in the United States to tell him this is simply wrong?

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can rest assured that the government is quite confident with its tax plan which is very competitive as we operate within the North American economic space. Our corporate tax rates, by the time we implement the plan, will be 6.6% below the Americans. It is clear to me that the tax plan that the government has put in place is working well for Canadians.

•(1150)

[*Translation*]

**THE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT**

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, every day there is more evidence of this government's lack of ideas. Whether it is the softwood lumber crisis, the situation with the crab and cod fishers or the fish plant workers, this government is paralyzed not only by its inaction but also by this endless leadership campaign.

Does the government realize that it is indecent not to use the means at its disposal to take action, and that it cannot continue for much longer to hold the population hostage with the excuse of a leadership campaign?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in reality, the situation is very different. We are dealing with Bill C-28 concerning the budget, the bills on national security, the national library and archives, human resources development, public safety, as I have said, election financing, first nations governance, and so on. We have a very full legislative agenda. Getting one of these bills passed requires the cooperation of hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot.

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, does the government think it is democratic that we should have to go on being unable to ask questions of the person who is really pulling the strings and paralyzing the government via other members and ministers?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it may be frustrating that the members for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot and Winnipeg Centre are filibustering in the parliamentary committee, but I would not say that the member in question has paralyzed Parliament. He might well like to take credit for so doing but it is not true. The government is working very well and has a good legislative agenda. The results of this show clearly in the economy, the Canadian public and the popularity of the Liberals.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Blackstrap, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, an April poll conducted by the Canada West Foundation showed that 71% of Saskatchewan respondents think their province does not get the respect it deserves.

During a recent stop in Saskatoon a well known cabinet minister and Liberal leadership hopeful said that the government is the country's largest employer and landlord. She said that she would actually start bringing national institutions to Saskatchewan.

Could it be the government is finally admitting Saskatchewan has been overlooked in the national picture?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the record shows that Saskatchewan takes its place among all the provinces in a country that together has the fastest growing economy in the G-7, has a record that is unmatched in the western world in the creation of jobs over the last number of years, and is moving into emerging sectors of the economy.

One thinks of investments in Saskatchewan like the light source project in Saskatoon which is making a remarkable difference in science. Together and in partnership with Saskatchewan the government is moving forward in the best interests of all Canadians.

\* \* \*

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Indian affairs minister with his customary intellectual vigour described the 633 Indian chiefs of this country as self-serving bullies. The chiefs replied saying that it takes one to know one. The INAC minister went on to claim that 1.5 million aboriginal Canadians would support his bill, but they were scaredy-cats and afraid of the chiefs.

Why then is the minister advancing this intellectually flawed bill which would hand more power to chiefs, enforcement officers—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Secretary of State.

**Hon. Stephen Owen (Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the legislation the hon. member refers to is proceeding through committee. It is being changed along the way. Canadians are expressing their concerns and support for it in their own way. They have done that through consultations and presentations to the committee. They will continue to do that, some in protest and some in support.

This is one aspect of the government's comprehensive support for aboriginal people in this country, including more than \$2.2 billion added to aboriginal spending in the last budget.

\* \* \*

• (1155)

[Translation]

**CANADIAN HERITAGE**

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, culture and the arts are the soul of our communities, and the source of their vitality. Yesterday, the Minister of Canadian Heritage unveiled the names of the much-awaited cultural capitals of Canada for 2003, at a news conference in Vancouver.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage please elaborate on this important announcement for the benefit of our colleagues?

**Ms. Carole-Marie Allard (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there are no limits to the creativity of the Department of Canadian Heritage. In 2002, we launched the cultural capitals of Canada program and we are now ready to announce the winning communities: Caraquet in New Brunswick, Red Deer in Alberta, Rivière-du-Loup in Quebec, Thunder Bay in Ontario and Vancouver in British Columbia.

These cities will be awarded between \$250,000 and \$500,000 to support specific activities. We congratulate them for their activities in the field of the arts and culture.

\* \* \*

[English]

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, tax shelters, such as Barbados, allow rich privileged Canadians, such as the former finance minister, to avoid paying Canadian taxes. What a convenient way to avoid one's responsibilities as a Canadian citizen.

I ask this provisional interim government, what is it doing to close down the Barbados tax loophole?

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this issue goes back to some of the comments made by the Auditor General.

The hon. member is one who follows the finance file quite well and he would know that measures were taken over a number of years to improve the situation in order to safeguard our tax base. We have done that in the past and we will continue to do that in the future.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has done more damage to the international reputation of Canada's navy than any enemy it has ever encountered.

The former finance minister, soon to be Prime Minister, signed off on cuts that slashed military spending to the bone. Now he has the audacity to suggest he believes in a strong Canadian armed forces. What hypocrisy.

Why does our navy have to wait until a pre-election budget to get the funding it so desperately needs for new supply ships and destroyers?

**Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I remind the opposition members that while they seem to provide token support for the military these days, back in 1995 their own leader called for a \$1 billion cut in the military budget. There seems to have been a little shifting going on over there.

In fact, our navy has done fantastic work in the gulf. It is leading a multi-national task force. It is doing 50% of the work in the gulf with 15% of the assets. It has been working extraordinarily hard and effectively. I think the hon. member should show a bit more appreciation.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the first nations governance bill has provoked an unprecedented outcry, which is increasing tensions daily between the federal government and aboriginal peoples. Most of the witnesses who appeared before the committee rejected Bill C-7, not to mention the opposition of the next Prime Minister of Canada.

Will the current Prime Minister recognize that the only sensible thing to do, given the circumstances, is to immediately withdraw Bill C-7 and leave it up to others to—

**The Speaker:** The hon. secretary of state.

[English]

**Hon. Stephen Owen (Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-7 is proceeding through committee. It will come back to the House and be voted on. There will be regulations put forward and established over the next three years after the bill has been passed. There will be many opportunities for aboriginal people as well as people in the House and across the country to express their concerns about it or their support for it.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**STUDENT EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, school will soon be out, and students are looking to gain experience on the labour market this summer.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Department of Human Resources Development tell us what the federal government is doing to promote the hiring of these qualified and, more importantly, enthusiastic, students this summer?

• (1200)

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking my colleague for this question, because this year is the 35th anniversary of the “Hire a Student” program and the creation of human resource centres of Canada for students.

Last year, with the cooperation and active involvement of employers and the remarkable work done by summer employment officers, we helped Canadian employers fill more than 189,000 positions and provided employment assistance services to more than 280,000 young Canadians so that they could gain experience and ease their integration into the labour market.

\* \* \*

[English]

**POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC):** Mr. Speaker, during last week's leadership debate the former finance minister called for the elimination or the adjustment of the parental contribution program under the Canada student loan program itself. This restriction would

deny student aid to our best and our brightest, and deny access to post-secondary education.

When the parliamentary secretary was a member of the Tory caucus she did not support this position. The chair of the Liberal PSE caucus also supports the call for the elimination of the parental contribution program. Why is she now supporting this departmental position when she knows it is the wrong thing to do?

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the latest budget, \$60 million was earmarked for the Canada Student Loans Program to help provide students in difficulty with better debt reduction measures.

The support we provide to research and post-secondary education in the budget helps to ensure that Canada remains a world leader in investing in the knowledge of its citizens.

\* \* \*

[English]

**GOVERNMENT OF CANADA**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, there are so many issues and so little competence to deal with them.

First of all, the intergovernmental affairs minister said this is only about fish. That is wrong. The natural resources minister said we have a great new comprehensive softwood lumber deal. That is wrong too. The Solicitor General just said the world has changed since 1995. His certainly has. Is it not amazing how one's principles change in order to get into cabinet?

How can the government brag so much about botching so many files?

**Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should talk about what the member for Yorkton—Melville asked before.

The point I raised regarding 1995, and maybe the members did not do their research properly, was concerning the problem of not having the capability to search without a warrant. Because of a debate on this side of the House that was changed. It has been a good week within the Liberal Party.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CARTAGENA PROTOCOL**

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on April 7, the Cartagena protocol on biodiversity was ratified by France, followed by Oman and Tanzania, a few days later. This brings to 48 the number of countries which have ratified the protocol.

Does the minister realize that the protocol could become operational very soon, with the required 50 signatories, and actually hold its first meeting without Canada sitting at the table?

*Privilege*

[English]

**Hon. Herb Dhaliwal (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the environment minister has said in the House before, we are working with the stakeholders to ensure that Canadian interests are carried through. I would think the hon. member would want to ensure that we consult with farmers and with all stakeholders before we move forward. We support the principle, but we must ensure that we protect all Canadians and stakeholders across the country and do it with consultation.

Is the hon. member against consultation? Is the hon. member against ensuring that we take care of Canadian interests? Yes, we support the principle, but we want to make—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Palliser.

\* \* \*

**POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, students need summer jobs because the amount of money they receive from financial aid programs is not enough for many of them to cover the increased costs of post-secondary education. That is not a comment from the students. It is the Millennium Scholarship Foundation that is making that report.

Its study finds that just 3% of parents are able to assist their children to come up with the level of support built into the loan formula. The report concludes that the unmet needs could result in higher dropout rates for low income students.

I invite the government to tell Canadians when post-secondary students will begin to receive the kind of educational assistance and support they require?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we made clear, we are at work to improve the programs and we will continue to do that.

The hon. member should know that the government has done more for post-secondary education than any in memory. Since 1997 over \$11 billion has been invested in post-secondary education; the increasing of the granting councils' budgets; the creation of chairs of excellence; the graduate students' programs we announced in February; the Canadian Foundation for Innovation; \$11 billion and we will continue. We have committed to double that by 2010.

The member should wake up and recognize what we have done for the students of this country.

\* \* \*

● (1205)

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order arising from question period.

During question period a question was asked by the opposition as to why the government is not taking action on national missile defence. The minister in his response said that in fact the government is having discussions in cabinet and in caucus. It would seem to me that it would be appropriate if the minister would table the

documents that they are basing these discussions on so that we can all be involved in the discussions.

**The Speaker:** I am sure it would be very nice if there were documents to table and all that sort of thing, but that is the point. It would be nice, but it is a dream. Unfortunately, it is not a point of order. The minister did not refer to a document which would require him to table it, if he had read from one, but he did not. I am afraid we are stuck.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Solicitor General's last answer was a misleading of the House because he said that search without a warrant was removed from Bill C-68. That is not true.

**The Speaker:** I am afraid that is obviously a matter for debate and not a point of order.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

## COMMENTS BY MEMBER FOR SAINT JOHN

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege because of the comments that were made yesterday in the House by the member for Saint John during the debate on the opposition day motion.

There were some fairly contentious issues in the debate that took place yesterday. In looking at the comments that were made by the member for Saint John in her reference to gays and lesbians in this country, I found that her comments were very disrespectful. They were offensive, they were hurtful and frankly, I think they were very homophobic. Her comments were offensive to me personally and offensive to other members of the House. Is she saying to the member for Burnaby—Douglas and the member—

**The Speaker:** Order. The member has indicated her disagreement with what the hon. member for Saint John said, but she has not said anything to indicate that any member's privileges have been breached. In fact, members do have a privilege in this House, that of freedom of speech. I recognize that members sometimes say things that are hurtful to others or perhaps inappropriate, but we do have freedom of speech in the House.

If I had heard the hon. member say that in some way her privileges as an MP had been breached, I would be inclined to hear this, but I have not heard that at all. I heard a list of adjectives referring to the words as unacceptable. That is not a question of privilege. If the hon. member has a genuine point of privilege, I want to hear that, not a debate on what the hon. member for Saint John said.

I am aware that the matter was discussed yesterday in the House, but I do not think there is a question of privilege here since members do enjoy freedom of speech in the House. The hon. member for Vancouver East will want to frame her question of privilege, if there is one, on those terms.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comments.

The comments that were made by the member for Saint John where she suggested that people should shut up and go hide themselves are something I take personally in terms of my ability to speak in this House. That is why I believe that my privileges have been violated and abused by the member in the comments that she made. They impact upon my ability and the ability of other members of the House to speak out in a way that we know will be respected such as we expect to see in the House. I think it is a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask you to consider it from the point of view that we do expect a certain level of respect among members.

I have basically been told to shut up and go hide myself, as well as other members, such as the member for Burnaby—Douglas or the member for Kings—Hants or the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve. Is this what we are being told by a member of the House? I find it completely unacceptable. I find it is infringing on my rights as a member in the House to speak freely about same sex marriage and about my situation. I find it intolerable.

I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider it on that basis.

● (1210)

**The Speaker:** I think what is clear here is the hon. member disagreed with the comments of the hon. member for Saint John, and others may very well disagree as well.

**An hon. member:** And do.

**The Speaker:** As the hon. member says “and do” and that is fine. Sometimes members disagree with one another in the House, but the fact that the hon. member for Vancouver East could get up on a question of privilege and object to this, the fact that the former leader of her party asked a question of the hon. member yesterday during the course of the debate, indicates that members are free to express their views, and stand up and express their views. The fact that the hon. member for Saint John may have suggested, to quote the hon. member for Vancouver East, to “shut up”, may be her view, but it is a view that was expressed in debate and I do not think that it obviously has had that effect on the hon. member or on other hon. members, nor should it. It is a matter of debate.

The hon. member for Saint John expressed her views, unacceptable as they may have been to some other hon. members, but I do not think the hon. member has to take to heart her suggestion that she shut up. She is entitled to speak her piece too.

The Chair is here to ensure that all hon. members enjoy the opportunity for freedom of speech in the House. That is part of the job that the Chair is here for, and I am pleased to be able to afford that opportunity to the hon. member for Vancouver East. I am sure that on another occasion she will have an opportunity to debate the whole issue with the member for Saint John, something I am sure that many hon. members will look forward to hearing.

I do not think there is a question of privilege in this case, however regretful the comments may have been from the point of view of various hon. members, but I think our opinions of one another's views is brought out by the diversity expressed in the House, which each one of us is free to do.

*Routine Proceedings*

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

**GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to 27 petitions.

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

MARRIAGE

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance):** Madam Speaker, the petitioners in my riding state that marriage is the best foundation for families and raising children, that the definition of marriage as being between a man and a woman is being challenged, and that this House passed a motion in June 1999 which called for marriage to continue to be defined as the union between one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others.

Therefore the petitioners are calling upon Parliament to pass legislation to recognize the institution of marriage in federal law as being a lifelong union between one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance):** Madam Speaker, this petition requests that Parliament protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have several petitions.

I am tabling petitions for constituents calling for the outlawing of materials which promote pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children. I have been working on this issue and I am pleased to know that they support our government action on that front.

● (1215)

STEM CELL RESEARCH

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I also have petitions from a series of constituents supporting embryonic stem cell research. They are calling upon Parliament to focus its legislative effort on adult stem cell research to find cures and therapies necessary to treat illnesses and diseases from which Canadians are suffering.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I also have petitions from constituents who are very concerned about hate propaganda. They want Parliament to protect the rights of Canadians to share their religious beliefs without fear of persecution.

*Routine Proceedings*

## CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance):** Madam Speaker, I have several petitions I would like to present this afternoon. The first one is with regard to child pornography.

The petition states that the creation and use of child pornography is condemned by a clear majority of Canadians but the courts have not applied the current child pornography law in a way which makes it clear that such exploitation of children will always be met with swift punishment.

Therefore the petitioners call upon Parliament to protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

## STEM CELL RESEARCH

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance):** Madam Speaker, the next petition that I would like to present is in regard to support for adult stem cell research.

Because thousands of Canadians suffer from debilitating diseases and illnesses, such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes, cancer, multiple sclerosis and spinal cord injury; and because Canadians support ethical stem cell research which has shown encouraging results; and while non-embryonic stem cells, which are also known as adult stem cells, have shown significant research progress without the immune rejection or ethical problems, the petitioners ask Parliament to focus its legislative support on adult stem cell research to find the cures and therapies necessary to treat the illnesses and diseases of suffering Canadians.

[Translation]

## PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

**Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like to table a petition signed by 240 of my constituents. They are asking Parliament to keep the disability tax credit and to oppose any plan to restrict access to the disability tax credit and to ensure that the government holds off on passing any measures in the House without prior discussions and consultations with disability organizations and health care professionals.

[English]

**Ms. Paddy Torsney:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I misstated what I said when I presented the petitions on stem cell research. As I did say, the petitioners are supportive of adult stem cell research. However they do not support embryonic stem cells.

It must be Friday, I am having a little difficulty. I do appreciate the spirit of the petition and the fact that they have worked so hard to get this together.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Questions Nos. 192, 193, 195 and 196.

[Text]

Question No. 192—**Mr. Jim Abbott:**

What is the total amount of money spent for television, cable and satellite television access for federal correctional institutions since 1993?

**Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):**

Please refer to the table below with respect to cablevision services expenditures incurred by CSC for fiscal years 1999-2000, 2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03. Data from previous years is not available due to a change in financial systems in April 1999. Note that the amounts shown do not include any cablevision services expenses for inmates or parolees, CCC, which have been recovered.

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Cablevision Services	\$32,590.50	\$54,690.79	\$37,169.59	\$37,101.26

Question No. 193—**Mr. Grant Hill:**

With respect to the Canadian firearms program, what is the total amount reimbursed by the Department of Justice to each of the following departments and agencies since April 1, 1994: (a) Solicitor General of Canada; (b) Correctional Service Canada; (c) Human Resources Development Canada; (d) Office of the Information Commissioner; (e) Office of the Privacy Commissioner; (f) National Parole Board; (g) Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade; (h) Public Works and Government Services Canada; (i) Canada Customs and Revenue Agency; (j) Treasury Board Secretariat; and (k) Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

**Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** The total amount reimbursed by the Department of Justice in relation to the Canadian firearms program since April 1, 1994 is as follows: a) Solicitor General, nil; b) Correctional Services, nil; c) Human Resources Development, \$32.7 million, reimbursement of costs in support of provision of staff and related operating costs at central processing site in Miramichi; d) Office of the Information Commissioner, nil; e) Office of the Privacy Commissioner, nil; f) National Parole Board, nil; g) Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, nil; h) Public Works and Government Services, \$1.2 million, reimbursement of costs for services provided to CFC by PWGSC project team; i) Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, \$13.6 million, reimbursement of costs for services provided at border crossings and systems connection; j) Treasury Board Secretariat, nil; and k) Indian Affairs and Northern Development, nil.

Question No. 195—**Mr. Jay Hill:**

What is the total of Department of Justice costs related to the Canadian Firearms Program but not charged to the firearms program?

**Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** The Canadian Firearms Centre is working with the Office of the Auditor General and Treasury Board Secretariat to finalize reporting requirements in response to the Auditor General's December 2002 report. The 2002-03 departmental performance report for the Department of Justice will report firearms program expenditures accordingly.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 196—Mr. Gerry Ritz:**

With regard to the following Indian bands, namely, Burnt Church Band, Council, Dakota Tipi Band, Gamblers Band, Garden Hill First Nation, Ginoogaming First Nation, Gull Bay Band, James Smith Band, Kitchenuhmaykoosib Inninuwug, Little Black Bear Band, Long Lake No. 58 Band, M'chigeeng First Nation, Muscowpetung Band, Mushuau Innu Council, Neskantaga First Nation, Nibinamik First Nation Band, Northlands Band, Ochapowace Band, Ojibway Nation of Saugeen, Peter Ballantyne Cree Nation, Piapot Band, Pikangikum Band, Pinaymootang First Nation Fairford, Red Earth Band, Red Sucker Lake Band, Red Pheasant Band, Roseau River Tribal Council, Sagkeeng/Fort Alexander First Nation, Saulteaux Band, Shamattawa First Nation, Sheshatshiu Innu Council, Washagamis Bay Band, Yellow Quill Band, what are the names and addresses of the third party managers for each named Indian band?

**Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Insofar as the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, DIAND, is concerned, the table below lists the names and addresses of third party managers for the following Indian bands:

Indian Band	Third Party Manager		
Burnt Church Band Council	Deloitte and Touche LLP P.O. Box 2087 Halifax, NS B3J 3B7	Mushuau Innu Council	KPMG LLP P.O. Box 1 Sydney, NS B1P 5Y9
Dakota Tipi Band	4133145 Manitoba Ltd. 100 - 123 Bannatyne Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3B 0R3	Neskantaga First Nation	Fitzpatrick Financial Management Services Ltd. 620 Victoria Avenue East Thunder Bay, ON P7C 1A9
Gamblers Band	Buffalo Jump Management Services Inc. Box 24, Group 117R.R. 1 Selkirk, MB R1A 2A6	Nibinamik First Nation Band	Andrew Alkier, CMC 342 Wildwood Park Winnipeg, MB R3T 0E6
Garden Hill First Nation	4133145 Manitoba Ltd. 100-123 Bannatyne Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3B 0R3	Northlands Band	Aboriginal Strategies Inc. 710 - 294 Portage Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3C 0B9
Ginoogaming First Nation	Fitzpatrick Financial Management Services Ltd. 620 Victoria Avenue East Thunder Bay, ON P7C 1A9	Ochapowace Band	New Horizon First Nations Administration Inc. 490 Hoffer Drive Regina, SK S4N 7A1
Gull Bay Band	Ernst & Young LLP 979 Alloy Drive Thunder Bay, ON P7B 5Z8	Ojibway Nation of Saugeen	Aboriginal Strategies Inc. 710 - 294 Portage Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3C 0B9
James Smith Band	First Nations Management Services, Inc. P.O. Box 1444 North Battleford, SK S9A 3M1	Peter Ballantyne Cree Nation	NRA and Associates Box 278 Prince Albert, SK S6V 5R5
Kitchenuhmaykoosib Inninuwug	This Indian band does not have a third party manager	Piapot Band	New Horizon First Nations Administration Inc. 490 Hoffer Drive Regina, SK S4N 7A1
Little Black Bear Band	New Horizon First Nations Administration Inc. 490 Hoffer Drive Regina, SK S4N 7A1	Pikangikum Band	A. D. Morrison and Associates Ltd. 25 Baseline Road West, Suite 11 London, ON N6J 1V1
Long Lake No. 58 Band	Fitzpatrick Financial Management Services Ltd. 620 Victoria Avenue East Thunder Bay, ON P7C 1A9	Pinaymootang First Nation (Fairford)	BDO Dunwoody LLP 800 - 200 Graham Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3C 4L5
M'chigeeng First Nation	Enkamigak Community Inc. P.O. Box 165662 Spring Bay Road M'Chigeeng, ON P0P 1G0	Red Earth Band	Clonford Management Ltd. Box 880 Shellbrook, SK S0J 2E0
Muscowpetung Band	First Nations Management Services Inc. Box 513 Stony Mountain, MB R0C 3A0	Red Sucker Lake Band	4133145 Manitoba Ltd. 100 - 123 Bannatyne Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3B 0R3
		Red Pheasant Band	RMS Management Services Inc. Box 865 Battleford, SK S0M 0E0
		Roseau River Tribal Council	Aboriginal Strategies Inc. 710 - 294 Portage Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3C 0B9
		Sagkeeng/Fort Alexander First Nation	BDO Dunwoody LLP 800 - 200 Graham Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3C 4L5
		Saulteaux Band	First Nations Management Services P.O. Box 1444 North Battleford, SK S9A 3M1

*Government Orders*

Shamattawa First Nation	2922364 Manitoba Ltd. Kelsey Management Services 1808 - 330 Portage Avenue Winnipeg, MB R3B 0R3
Sheshatshiu Innu Council	KPMG LLP P.O. Box 1 Sydney, NS B1P 5Y9
Washagamis Bay Band	Fregeau & Tompkin Chartered Accountants 213 Main Street East Kenora, ON P9N 1T3
Yellow Quill Band	New Horizon First Nations Administration Inc. 490 Hoffer Drive Regina, SK S4N 7A1

[English]

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Bakopanos):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

### PUBLIC SAFETY ACT, 2002

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-17, an act to amend certain Acts of Canada, and to enact measures for implementing the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, in order to enhance public safety, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of Motion No. 6.

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-17 today.

As we can see and as listeners will be able to see at report stage, this bill is similar to previous bills, namely Bill C-55 and Bill C-42.

At second reading of this bill, the Bloc Québécois voted against it. Despite the outstanding work my colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel did during of this bill, by pointing out and tackling serious problems, the government has refused to listen and to accept any amendment. Yet amendments could have been a step in the right direction, for the government, but as usual, it ignored the opposition.

I think the government is still doing what it has done since it was elected several years ago. Everything that comes from its side is perfect, while it does not want to listen to anything that opposition parties want to suggest to enhance, clarify and improve their bills in committee. The eight government members always adopt a common stand against the opposition members. Often, despite the fact that several government members do not even know what they will be voting on, they always agree with the government's amendments and are automatically against opposition parties' amendments, even though these amendments would improve the bills.

Let us not forget that, when this government introduces a bill, opposition members do their homework. We consult people and ask them what they think and what they would like to have improved in the bill. We connect with the reality in our communities. But we see that, while we are doing our homework, this government takes the bills that its bureaucrats provide it and endorses them unquestioningly.

This has happened once again with Bill C-17. Moreover, despite all the amendments and motions brought forward by the opposition, this bill goes against the privacy commissioner's proposals. There is a part of this bill that deals with everything that affects privacy.

During the study of the second version of this bill, Bill C-55, the privacy commissioner said that he had major objections. When that bill was withdrawn, we thought that, when it was reintroduced as Bill C-17, the government would take the privacy commissioner's objections into consideration. But the opposition is unable to change the government's position. Even the privacy commissioner, who was appointed to protect Canadians' privacy, is unable to do so.

I would like those listening to know how important it is that this government listen to the Privacy Commissioner. He believes that the provision in question, section 4.82 of both bills, would give the RCMP and CSIS unrestricted access to the personal information held by airlines about all Canadian air travellers on domestic as well as international flights, and this worries him enormously.

● (1220)

Why is he worried? He is worried that the RCMP would also be expressly empowered to use this information to seek out persons wanted on warrants for Criminal Code offences that have nothing to do with terrorism, transportation security or national security.

Although we in the Bloc Québécois wish Quebec to become a sovereign nation, at present we are still part of Canada. In Canada, it is well established that we are not required to identify ourselves to police unless we are being arrested or we are carrying out a licensed activity such as driving. The right to anonymity with regard to the state is a crucial privacy right.

Since we are required to identify ourselves to airlines as a condition of air travel and since section 4.82 would give the RCMP unrestricted access to the passenger information obtained by airlines, this would set the extraordinarily privacy-invasive precedent—and invasive it is—of effectively requiring compulsory self-identification to the police.

*Government Orders*

Finally, there is a very serious problem with Bill C-17. We share the opinion of the privacy commissioner, who says that the proposed amendments are an insult to the intelligence of Canadians. It is serious when a privacy commissioner tells the government that, in Bill C-17, clause 4.82 is an insult to the intelligence of Canadians. The government has turned a deaf ear, and I am dumbfounded. The amendments proposed under this new bill present no new solutions to the fundamental issues regarding the principle.

The government is now proposing regulations limiting the Criminal Code offence warrants under which the RCMP will be conducting searches. However, it does nothing to address the fundamental principle that the police have no business using this extraordinary access to personal information to search for people wanted on warrants for any offences unrelated to terrorism.

The privacy commissioner is so discouraged that he is appealing to parliamentarians, because this is insulting to Parliament; he says that it is now up to Parliament to explain to these people that privacy is a fundamental human right of Canadians that must be respected, rather than treated with the apparent indifference that the government is showing.

I think that the privacy commissioner's statements reflect the values that the Bloc Québécois is defending. We agree with his words and utter them in turn, because people's privacy is at stake.

That is why the Bloc Québécois is asking that the government's proposed amendments on the powers of the RCMP and CSIS to collect information cease to exist, and that this bill be taken back to the drawing board to ensure that privacy is respected.

For now, Canada is not a totalitarian state. We enjoy freedom of expression in this country, where privacy is one of the most important things we have.

I join my hon. colleague for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel in telling the government that the Bloc Québécois will be voting against this bill. Furthermore, I will go further than my colleague and ask the government to withdraw Bill C-17.

● (1225)

[*English*]

**Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have listened with some fascination to the comments that have been made by the various members of opposition parties to Bill C-17, the public safety act, and to the amendments that the government has brought to that bill.

I would like to put a little bit of context to my comments before I address some of the concerns that have been raised. First, how do Canadians feel about the government dealing with their rights for the sake of fighting crime and preventing terrorism?

Canadians understand that privacy is extremely important, that it is one of the fundamental tenets on which our democracy is built, but they also understand that public safety, individual safety is also a very important issue.

In April 2002 the Ipsos-Reid poll showed 66% of those Canadians surveyed felt that the police should be given more power to fight crime even if it might be seen as an infringement of some individual

rights. Some 66% felt that terrorism threats outweighed the protection of privacy rights. As of September 9, 2002, the Ipsos-Reid poll indicated that 59% of Canadians felt that the federal government had not done enough to ensure that the police had the necessary tools to fight terrorism.

At times government has to lead public poll. I do not believe that the government has not done enough and I certainly do not believe that we should willy-nilly infringe on individual rights to privacy, and the government does not either.

Now let us address some of the issues that were raised by some members of the opposition. They said that there was a problem on disclosure to third parties when if the information that is retained from the airline passenger manifests, that the RCMP or CSIS could disclose to a third party and there would be no control over respecting privacy rights.

The member from the Bloc just talked about how they have consulted their communities and the public and that they have taken into account the consultation with their communities and their public.

● (1230)

[*Translation*]

Personally, I think that all federal MPs have an obligation to hold public consultations on this issue. I think that those members, on both sides of the House, who take an interest in this issue have held consultations. It is not the exclusive privilege or the exclusive responsibility or the exclusive duty of members of opposition parties to consult their community, their constituents and the general public regarding a bill or a motion, whether it comes from the government or from the opposition.

I can say that members on the government side have held consultations. Indeed, we have seen the results of these consultations in the questions that Liberal members sitting on the legislative committee that studied Bill C-17 asked of witnesses who made representations and presented briefs to this committee.

I would even say that the most relevant and the most difficult questions that were put to the RCMP, to CSIS and to officials from the departments of transport, immigration, revenue and the solicitor general came from government members.

I do not want to deny the fact that difficult questions also came from opposition members.

However, I believe that anyone reviewing the transcripts would see that Liberal members generally asked more difficult questions than did opposition members.

Questions were asked and statements were made by the privacy commissioner during the legislative committee hearings.

*Government Orders*

[English]

During those hearings the privacy commissioner raised some very important issues. He said that he had concerns, if subclause 4.8(2) were to remain as it is laid out, about the RCMP's ability to scan passenger information to search for persons wanted on warrants. He had very serious concerns about that.

What did the government do? The government took those concerns seriously and, therefore, the "identification of persons for whom a warrant has been issued" was removed as a primary purpose for collecting passenger information. What does that government amendment, which was approved and adopted in committee, actually mean? It means that the RCMP would now only be able to access passenger information for the purpose of transportation security.

That was a clear concern of the privacy commissioner. The privacy commissioner had no issue with the RCMP being able to access airline passenger manifests for the purpose of transportation security. His problem was with subclause 4.8(2) which, as it was originally written, the RCMP, as a primary purpose, would have been able to search for people for whom warrants had been issued.

Subclause 4.8(2) has now been amended and, hopefully, when the vote in the House at report stage happens, the House will adopt the amendment, which was approved and adopted in committee, that would limit the RCMP.

We took the privacy commissioner's concerns on that issue very seriously but we obviously needed to retain the aspect of transportation security in the regime because it is necessary for public safety. That is the *raison d'être* of the bill.

What was one of the other privacy commissioner's concerns? He had a concern that as Bill C-17 was initially written there were outmoded offences for which warrants had been issued, such as fraudulently altering brands on cattle or other offences that, we could almost guarantee, would not put public safety at risk nor public transportation safety at risk, such as municipal corruption.

The privacy commissioner made a big point about that and said that it was ridiculous. Many of the offences that were listed under this clause would have allowed the RCMP to detain a passenger if it found that the passenger was wanted for an outstanding warrant. We changed that definition and narrowed it substantially to apply to only serious offences. Those offences would be directly related to terrorist or transportation security threats, such as the use of explosives or participation in a terrorist group. I give that as an example.

The privacy commissioner raised his concerns at committee and the government took those concerns seriously. The last point I want to make is that the privacy commissioner stated clearly in committee that he had all the oversight mechanisms required for him to ensure that the application of this legislation, once it is adopted, will be respected by the RCMP and by CSIS.

• (1235)

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased today to speak to Bill C-17 on public safety. Hon. members will recall that this bill, while containing some changes, has basically already been C-42 and then C-55. Today we

are looking at a new version which, as I will explain a little later, has been modified based on Bill C-42.

Initially, I took part in the debate on Bill C-55, particularly in connection with three fundamental aspects of that bill. I spoke about the matter of the controlled access military zone, which the bill stipulated established a security perimeter.

The second aspect I addressed during the debate on C-55 concerned the matter of interim orders, which are still there in Bill C-17, although some changes have been made. These include the time lapse between the making of the interim order and the time it is tabled. Despite the changes in deadlines, I will explain how the essence and the very bases of the verification process for the use of these orders are still flawed. We would have liked to have seen a verification on the use of these orders within a broader framework that would include the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and not just the enabling legislation.

The third aspect I addressed, which has to all intents and purposes undergone no change whatsoever in becoming Bill C-17, is the matter of the exchange of information. In Bill C-17 there is still a significant role played by the RCMP, no longer necessarily in gathering the information, but Bill C-17 still retains the possibility of being able to pass on certain information, to law enforcement officers among others.

We might have expected the government to respect not just what the Bloc Québécois was calling for, but also the opinion voiced by the Privacy Commissioner.

Therefore, of course, as to the controlled access military zones, we have to admit that the Bloc Québécois won the battle. Indeed, members will recall that, at the time, we opposed such a zone that would create a perimeter. However, last October 31, the government took this change into account after repeated demands by the Bloc Québécois, and this provision was deleted from Bill C-17. We essentially wanted to maintain the necessary balance between security and freedom. The controlled access military zone did create a fundamental imbalance, which was not consistent with a democratic society.

There was also another aspect to this issue because the government could certainly have abused its power, the minister having a clearly established discretionary power. We felt that by granting such power to the minister, the government had gone too far.

Finally, with this security perimeter that would have been established—I say "would", because it is not provided for in Bill C-17—the government had, to all intents and purposes, stripped the population of rights they were entitled to expect to enjoy. Indeed, this controlled access zone denied people living within its boundaries and perimeter some basic democratic rights that Canada has always proudly advocated.

*Government Orders*

Luckily, we won the battle thanks to the efforts of the member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel. We clearly stated on October 31 that we had won. However, I will remind the House that we will monitor this issue very closely, because this balance between security and freedom must be maintained.

• (1240)

Another important aspect is the issue of interim orders. Again, we saw that the bill contains provisions to this effect. Of course, in terms of tabling in Parliament, the period between the tabling of the order in Parliament and the moment it comes into force was reduced. We would obviously have liked it to be reduced to five days. The government decided instead to keep a 15 day period, as in Bill C-55. Remember that in Bill C-42, the order took effect immediately upon being tabled in Parliament. So, this is a bit of an improvement over Bill C-55. Of course it is better than C-42, but we would have like the order to come into force within five days of being tabled.

Not only is the time lapse a problem, but it is also important that there be a preliminary check for compliance with the enabling legislation and with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Bill C-42 contained nothing to this effect, and nor did Bill C-55. However, we would have liked to see this preliminary check included in Bill C-17. However, there is nothing of the sort. Several motions to that effect were moved, but unfortunately they were all rejected.

The third aspect of the bill I would like to talk about, after the controlled access military zone and after the interim order, is the issue of information exchange.

I know I do not have much time left, but it is important to recall that what the Bloc Québécois was calling for was that the right to privacy be protected. Incidentally, on November 1, 2002, the Privacy Commissioner gave his interpretation of the bill, with respect to this issue of information sharing. On November 1, 2002, he said:

—my concern is that the RCMP would also be expressly empowered to use this information to seek out persons wanted on warrants for Criminal Code offences that have nothing to do with terrorism, transportation security or national security.

He also said:

The implications of this are extraordinarily far-reaching.

There are two aspects to this exchange of information. The first is that even if we are quite satisfied with the fact that the RCMP will no longer be responsible for the collection of data, we are still concerned about the powers the RCMP to pass on information to peace officers, among others.

We must not forget that in a democracy, the right to privacy is a fundamental right. In Canada, it is established that people are not required to identify themselves to the police except if they are arrested or doing something that requires a permit, such as driving a motor vehicle.

I will conclude by saying that, with regard to the three aspects of Bill C-42, Bill C-55 and Bill C-17, which is before the House today, the Bloc won its case on the issue of controlled access military zones.

On the issue of interim orders, we would have preferred a shorter time lapse between the tabling of these interim orders in the House

and their coming into force. We would have preferred that it be shortened from 15 to 5 days. Moreover, we would have preferred that a preliminary check be made under the enabling legislation, and also the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Finally, concerning the exchange of information, we would have preferred that the RCMP not have the power to pass on certain information on people.

• (1245)

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** I would like to remind members that cellular phones are not allowed in the House.

The hon. member for Joliette.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, unlike some previous speakers, it is with a lot a frustration that I rise on Bill C-17.

This is the third time that the government has introduced a public safety bill. We first had Bill C-42, which contained a whole series of safety measures that were clearly excessive in terms of rights and freedoms. Then, marginal corrections were made with Bill C-55. And now, the government has introduced Bill C-17, which is essentially identical to Bill C-42 and Bill C-55.

Clearly, the government did not learn from its mistakes. As with Bill C-35—which was passed—as with the airport security tax, the government has adopted or is proposing a whole series of measures, in the aftermath of the tragic events of September 11, 2001, which ultimately do not seem to be of any use in the fight against terrorism. I remind the House that Bill C-35, which was passed despite the Bloc Québécois' opposition, contains all kinds of threats and injuries to rights and freedoms and has not been of any use whatsoever in the fight against terrorism in Canada since it was passed.

I would now like to talk about the air security charge; the government has been unable to demonstrate that this tax contributes in any way to paying for the equipment and technologies necessary to ensure airport security. While the airline industry, both in Canada and in the United States, is going through a catastrophic crisis, an additional tax does not help matters. There was so much government improvisation on this issue that, in the last budget in February, the Finance Minister had to reduce the tax significantly; yet, he kept it, which akes no sense whatsoever.

As I said, the government has been unable to demonstrate that this tax was needed.

*Government Orders*

On several occasions I have wanted to make this point in the House. Bill C-17 now gives me that opportunity. We have been led to believe, in Canada and in the United States, that a person taking a taxi, a bus or a train is considered as a customer, but the Canadian and U.S. governments consider airport or airline customers as potential criminals or terrorists. No wonder people are staying away from the airlines and airports: they are being treated as potential terrorists and criminals.

Bill C-17 is very much a part of all this. I think this act is of no use whatsoever in the fight against terrorism. Members will recall that this was the purpose. The government should have realized, since the tragic events of September 11, that it should have found another way to fight terrorism. As months passed by, one would have expected the government to understand that such measures dare of no use in the fight against terrorism, and it should have dropped the idea after Bill C-55 died on the Order Paper. Yet, the government introduced a new bill, Bill C-17, which, except for one element as I said, goes along the exact same lines as Bills C-42 and C-55.

This was raised by the hon. member for Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, and I think that it must be stressed. Bill C-17 dropped the excessive idea of controlled access military zones, or military security zones as they were called in Bill C-42. In large part, this is a Bloc Québécois victory. We will recall that these zones could be of unlimited size, without any control being exercised, that the RCMP could declare them without providing any justification, without having to check with or be accountable to anyone, and that this could be done without the consent of the affected provinces.

• (1250)

Think, for example, of the Quebec City summit. The federal government could have unilaterally decided to declare a controlled access military zone for the whole of Quebec City, the national capital of Quebecers. The purpose would have been to prevent the potential arrival of terrorists, and particularly to prevent citizens concerned with the current negotiations on the free trade zone of the Americas from coming to express their concern to the leaders and heads of state of the 34 countries that are parties to these negotiations.

As I said, this idea of this kind of controlled access military zone was dropped. Still, the new proposal to establish zones through orders is cause for concern to us. Nowhere does it say that the consent of the affected provinces will be required for these military security zones to be created.

The Bloc Québécois would have liked for all of this to just disappear, but we will remain extremely vigilant, even though, as I said earlier, the fact that the initial idea of controlled access military zones was dropped must be regarded as a Bloc Québécois victory.

There were two other elements that worried us and that still worry us: everything related to the interim orders as well as everything related to sharing information on airline passengers, who are now viewed by the Canadian government as potential terrorists, as I was saying earlier, regardless of whom they may be. These are concerns that also have to do with the protection of privacy.

I would like to say more about both of these matters, the interim orders and the exchange of information, particularly between the

RCMP and CSIS. I know what I am talking about with regard to CSIS because when I was the president of the Conseil central de Montréal of the CSN, we realized that we had been infiltrated by CSIS. This occurred even though everyone knows that the CSN and all unions in Quebec are institutions that are not only recognized, but extremely democratic and transparent. So, I may have more apprehensions than others when it comes to giving special powers to the RCMP and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

With regard to interim orders, the new bill stipulates—or it will if, unfortunately, it is passed—that, “The Minister may make an interim order that contains any provision that may be contained in a regulation made under this Act if the Minister believes that immediate action is required to deal with a significant risk, direct or indirect, to health, safety or the environment”.

In subsection 4, we read the following, “An interim order is exempt from the application of sections 3, 5 and 11 of the Statutory Instruments Act and published in the *Canada Gazette* within twenty-three days after it is made.

So, under the new section 30.1 and subsection 4, proposed interim orders will not be required to comply with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Bill of Rights. It is quite significant and worrisome that a minister could decide to issue an interim order without first having to ensure it complies with instruments that are supposed to protect the rights and freedoms of Canadians and Quebecers.

These provisions are extremely dangerous. Unfortunately, I have just one minute left, and I have addressed only the matter of interim orders. We believe that these interim orders must be required to pass the test of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

In conclusion, I want to say that the privacy commissioner is extremely concerned by the possibility that the RCMP and CSIS could exchange information on airline passengers, and we believe that the legislation should be much more restrictive than this.

For all these reasons, I am not only somewhat frustrated, but I will be voting against Bill C-17.

• (1255)

**Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak today as the Bloc Québécois critic and a member of the legislative committee that analyzed Bill C-17, clause by clause, proposing amendments to it.

*Government Orders*

The Bloc Québécois, which I represent, introduced 49 amendments to this bill. Believe it or not, the Liberals retained not a single one. I am therefore disconcerted to hear Liberals, including the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, who has been telling us that the Liberal members were the ones to ask the hardest questions of the RCMP, CSIS and Transport. With all due respect to that member, regardless of the questions she may have raised, the bill was nevertheless not changed. That is the reality.

They can say in this House that they were hard on the RCMP and CSIS representatives, who I am sure quaked at the questions asked by the Liberals. At any rate, we knew very well that there would not be any major changes made to the bill.

We in the Bloc Québécois introduced 49 amendments and we did not just pull them out of a hat. They reflect the proposals made to us by witnesses before the committee. I am not referring to those from Transport, CSIS, the RCMP and the police organizations anxious to have a police state in Canada and in Quebec. I am referring to the representatives of civil society. I will reserve for the end the independent commission members, who are supposed to be independent individuals appointed to defend our interests, that is the Canadian Bar Association, the Law Society of Upper Canada, the Barreau du Québec and all the other civil organizations which came and told us that this was the greatest encroachment on civil liberties that Canada has ever known. That is the reality. I will read some of the comments and representations from the Canadian Bar Association shortly.

Nevertheless, I want this to be clearly understood. In the name of terrorism and the war on terrorism, subjects we all agree on, the RCMP and CSIS, hand in glove with the Department of Transport, have given us a bill that will threaten our civil liberties. That is the reality.

I am simply going to quote the words of the privacy commissioner, who is independent and appointed by the government explicitly to protect people's rights. He is not there to protect the rights of the Bloc Québécois or the members of the Bloc Québécois. He is there to protect the rights of the whole population. This quotation summarizes in two or three paragraphs what this bill is all about. Thus, the commissioner says, in a letter addressed to the government, and I quote:

In Canada, police forces cannot normally compel businesses to provide personal information about citizens unless they obtain a warrant. Section 4.82 would entitle the national police force and the national security service to demand personal information about all Canadian air travellers without any judicial authorization.

That means, as things stand, that when this bill becomes law, the airlines will provide information—Bill C-44, which was passed last year, already authorizes them to provide information and exchange such information with our neighbours to the south—but the RCMP and CSIS will be able to use it for other purposes. That is what those terrible questions that the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine says she asked of the RCMP and CSIS boils down to.

After my colleagues and I asked our questions and got answers, it became clear that finding terrorists is not the only purpose of this bill. At the same time, they are going to try to do what they cannot do now.

And that means those who use air transportation will be more closely monitored than travellers using any other means of transportation in Canada. Of course, this is the result of September 11, because that was a horrible event we never want to see happen again. Unfortunately, people travelling by air will pay the penalty and a databank on frequent flyers will be created.

• (1300)

That is what will happen. Information on frequent travellers will be kept in the data banks monitored by the RCMP and CSIS. That is why the Bloc Québécois supports the recommendations of the privacy commissioner, who wanted to add the following to paragraph 4.82 (14). I will not read 4.82 in its entirety; the part that the privacy commissioner wanted to add is clear enough on its own. He wanted to add this:

—and a copy of this record must be provided within seven days to the Privacy Commissioner of Canada unless the Privacy Commissioner waives this requirement in writing to the Commissioner and/or the Director.

Given the nature of the information that will be kept by the RCMP and CSIS, for whatever reason, the privacy commissioner was saying that since there was injury to rights—and this is an historical precedent—there must be some guidelines. Businesses are not allowed give out private information on their clients. According to the legislation, the RCMP and CSIS can keep the information for seven days. After that, they may keep it longer if it is required for security purposes. The privacy commissioner simply said that if information is going to be kept longer than seven days, he would like a copy of the files to ensure that it was being kept for reasons of protection and security, to fight terrorism for example, so that he could determine that it was not being used for purposes not consistent with the legislation?

Believe or not, CSIS is against that, as are the RCMP and Transport Canada. The Bloc Québécois amendment requesting that this be added to the act, as requested by the privacy commissioner, was rejected.

A member of the Liberal caucus who was on the committee said that the members of her party had some very hard-hitting questions for RCMP and CSIS witnesses. In spite of their answers, I know very well that this legislation was drawn up by the RCMP and CSIS for their own ends and that the transport department did not have a say.

Of course, police organizations dream of turning Canada and Quebec into police states. This is terrible. It would be to lose the fight against terrorism when the very thing that terrorists want to do is undermine our rights as a free and democratic society. That is what the terrorists were trying to do.

Today, we are letting them win by allowing our police organizations, such as the RCMP and CSIS, to collect information on frequent passengers from independent data bases. It will be possible to use this information without the privacy commissioner being able to check the data.

*Government Orders*

Moreover, there is a clause that says that this information will not be subject to the provisions of the Access to Information Act. Certain provisions in this act say that, for security reasons, the information commissioner is not required to respond to certain requests. However, despite these provisions, the bill before us and air passenger information are totally exempt from the Access to Information Act. In other words, we will never be able to know the contents of a file kept by the RCMP or CSIS. It is even worse.

On this issue, I will let the information commissioner and those who will ask questions make up their own mind. However, the commissioner's report was very clear. To him, it was the worst decision, the worst bill or the worst recommendation ever brought forward in Parliament.

Again, I must point out that the information commissioner and the privacy commissioner are independent persons appointed by the government to defend the interests of Quebecers and Canadians.

● (1305)

When the Canadian Bar Association and the Barreau du Québec support the privacy commissioner request for access to information, it means that all of civil society is critical of this bill. Again, I am sorry that Liberal members did not understand civil society's message.

**Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my hon. colleague on the job he has done on Bill C-17, which was not an easy one. This bill concerns our fundamental rights as human beings, as individuals. I want to congratulate him because he has put forward very useful amendments. Unfortunately, the government rejected them all, as is often the case here, in this Parliament.

Allow me to set things in context for the benefit of listeners. It is not the first time that this kind of a bill has been introduced in the House of Commons. The current bill is a new version of Bill C-55 on public safety introduced in 2002, itself a new version of Bill C-42.

Last spring, our remarks on Bill C-55 focussed on three major areas: controlled access military zones, interim orders and information sharing. These are three vital areas.

● (1310)

Regarding the controlled access military zones, we could claim victory, given that these were completely dropped from the bill. The bill does, however, still contain provisions concerning interim orders, although the timeframes for their tabling in Parliament and approval by cabinet have been considerably reduced. And our main concern, namely the lack of advance verification for consistency, remains.

I have here a press release from the information commissioner. I am sure that no one has read all of it. Let me do so, because it is important and it will help members understand why we have such concerns about this bill.

This news release was written November 1, 2002 by the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. I quote:

Since last May, I have expressed extremely grave concerns about one provision of what was then Bill C-55, the federal Government's Public Safety Act. This same

provision has now been reintroduced, with only minimal and unsatisfactory change, in the replacement legislation, Bill C-17.

The provision in question, section 4.82 of both bills, would give the RCMP and CSIS unrestricted access to the personal information held by airlines about all Canadian air travellers on domestic as well as international flights.

I have raised no objection to the primary purpose of this provision, which is to enable the RCMP and CSIS to use this passenger information for anti-terrorist "transportation security" and "national security" screening. But my concern is that the RCMP would also be expressly empowered to use this information to seek out persons wanted on warrants for Criminal Code offences that have nothing to do with terrorism, transportation security or national security.

The implications of this are extraordinarily far-reaching.

In Canada, it is well established that we are not required to identify ourselves to police unless we are being arrested or we are carrying out a licensed activity such as driving. The right to anonymity with regard to the state is a crucial privacy right. Since we are required to identify ourselves to airlines as a condition of air travel and since section 4.82 would give the RCMP unrestricted access to the passenger information obtained by airlines, this would set the extraordinarily privacy-invasive precedent of effectively requiring compulsory self-identification to the police.

I am prepared, with some reluctance, to accept this as an exceptional measure that can be justified, in the wake of September 11, for the limited and specific purposes of aviation security and national security against terrorism. But I can find no reason why the use of this de facto self-identification to the police should be extended to searching for individuals who are of interest to the state because they are the subject of warrants for Criminal Code offences unrelated to terrorism. That has the same effect as requiring us to notify the police every time we travel, so that they can check whether we are wanted for something.

● (1315)

The Commissioner then said:

If the police were able to carry out their regular Criminal Code law enforcement duties without this new power before September 11, they should likewise be able to do so now. The events of September 11 were a great tragedy and a great crime; they should not be manipulated into becoming an opportunity—an opportunity to expand privacy-invasive police powers for purposes that have nothing to do with anti-terrorism.

If we accept the principle that air travellers within Canada can in effect be forced by law to identify themselves to police for scrutiny against lists of wanted suspects, then there is nothing to prevent the same logic from being applied in future to other modes of transportation. Particularly since this provision might well discourage wanted individuals from travelling by air, why not extend the same scrutiny to train travellers, bus passengers or anyone renting a car? Indeed, the precedent set by this provision could ultimately open the door to practices similar to those that exist in societies where police routinely board trains, establish roadblocks or stop people on the street to check identification papers in search of anyone of interest to the state.

The place to draw the line in protecting the fundamental human right of privacy is at the very outset, at the first unjustifiable intrusion. In this instance, that means amending the bill to remove all reference to warrants and thus limit the police to matching passenger information against anti-terrorism and national security databases.

The concerns that I have raised in this matter since last spring have been publically endorsed by the Information and Privacy Commissioner of British Columbia and the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario; by members of every party in the House of Commons, notably including a member of the government's own Liberal caucus who is an internationally recognized expert on human rights—

*Government Orders*

I cannot not name that person, but I am sure you know who it is. and by editorials in newspapers including the *Toronto Star*, the *Globe and Mail*, the *Vancouver Sun*, the *Vancouver Province*, the *Calgary Herald* and the *Edmonton Journal*.

These concerns have now been ignored by the Government.

The changes that have been made in this provision in the new bill do nothing to address the fundamental issues of principle that are at stake.

The Government now proposes to have regulations limiting the Criminal Code offence warrants for which the RCMP will be searching. But this does nothing to address the fundamental point of principle that the police have no business using this extraordinary access to personal information to search for people wanted on warrants for any offences unrelated to terrorism.

As well, in the new bill the Government has removed the "identification of persons for whom a warrant has been issued" as a "purpose" for accessing passenger information under the legislation. But this is meaningless—indeed disingenuous—since the RCMP would remain empowered to match this information against a database of persons wanted on warrants and to use such matches to bring about arrests. It insults the intelligence of Canadians to suggest, as the Government does in its press release accompanying the bill, that the RCMP may "incidentally" come upon individuals wanted on Criminal Code warrants—if the police are to match names of passengers against a database of individuals wanted on Criminal Code warrants, there can be nothing "incidental" about finding them.

Madam Speaker, here we have the commissioner's fundamental reaction and it is serious; he has gone to the trouble of analyzing this entire issue in depth. Therefore, I am very much afraid of seeing this bill pass. I hope that there is still some chance, as we are now at the report stage, of amending the bill and ensuring that no one's rights will be injured.

• (1320)

[English]

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I too am pleased to rise in the House and also share with my colleague from the Bloc, who just took her place, the concern and the fear we have with Bill C-17.

We know Bill C-17 is the son and daughter of Bill C-42 and Bill C-55 respectively. It is a public safety act. Some people would claim it to be a public relations act. We are concerned because the sweeping powers that were in the earlier bill are in this reincarnation, a sense that government, officials and authority can do whatever they want, whenever they choose. The privacy commissioner says that the police have all the powers they require now to arrest and detain people whom they suspect, and therefore this is not necessary.

Some of us lived through the War Measures Act. Some of us were at the Quebec summit in Quebec City in 2001. To me, people who are proposing this bill seem to be saying that security trumps privacy, and we have some grave concerns about that.

The member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine commented on public opinion polls which said that Canadians in the aftermath of September 11 were prepared to forsake some of their privacy for additional security. I would say respectfully back to her that for a lot of hard-working Canadians that may in fact be a reality. However it is even more incumbent on those who Canadians elect to places and chambers, like the House of Commons, the legislators and parliamentarians, to ensure that our safety and security laws are there, but that they are there in balance to ensure guaranteed privacy when and where Canadians need it.

On the bill itself, because there are a number of different acts that roll into this legislation, the transport minister's regulations

concerning the Aeronautics Act, making powers concerning aviation safety, I concede are better defined than they were in Bill C-42. The lack of specifics in this area was one of the concerns we had about the original bill, specifically our transport critic, the member for Churchill. Therefore we regard this as a mild improvement.

As well, in a feeble attempt to address the concerns of the privacy commissioner, the clause allowing RCMP designated officers to access passenger information to identify those individuals with outstanding arrest warrants has been removed and the bill would now only allow RCMP and CSIS officials to access passenger information for national or transportation security purposes. This too is an improvement. However they may still use this information to pursue individuals with outstanding arrest warrants if the crimes they are wanted for carry a potential sentence of five years or greater.

The privacy commissioner has stated publicly that this change is insufficient to protect the right of Canadians to privacy. In our opinion there are still insufficient safeguards in this current legislation to prevent intrusion, particularly since this information can be shared with American customs officials who currently have a racial profiling policy.

Let me just stop there and, as an aside, tell the House that I recently travelled in company with the secretary treasurer of the Canadian Labour Congress, who is of Arab descent and who travels quite extensively in his job. According to Hassan Yussuff, when he travels through the United States and looks at the people who are pulled aside at the airports for particular and thorough security checks, it is always people of Muslim and Arab descent.

The House heard from my colleague earlier today, the member for Vancouver East. She outlined the concern expressed by the Muslim organization, COMO, with regard to this.

• (1325)

We not only want to protect and ensure that citizens in Canada and people who are travelling here are protected, we also want to ensure they are not singled out, which seems to be the case in some other countries.

One of our major points of opposition to the bill was the clause concerning the military security zones, and it has been repealed. I congratulate the government. In its place the government will use existing legislation to establish controlled access zones to protect naval vessels at three ports: Halifax on the east coast, and Esquimalt and Nanoose Bay on the west coast. These three locations already have military facilities.

*Private Members' Business*

On the interim order powers, it now requires an order to be approved by the governor in council within 14 days, not 90 days. It must also be tabled in Parliament within 15 days regardless of whether Parliament is in session. We do not oppose these changes but they are rather insignificant and, in our opinion, do not address sufficiently the concerns we have about potential abuse in this area.

With regard to the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority Act, this act received royal assent after Bill C-42 was tabled. This is updated to reflect that the act was passed. If the government had its act together this section would have appeared in Bill C-42 as a conditional amendment. The fact that it did not, further underlines how the government seems to have been making up its security policy on the fly for many months now.

The Marine Transportation Security Act is another area that was not contained in Bill C-42. It would have empowered the government to contribute funds to port authorities to help pay for new security measures, something that our caucus supports.

The Criminal Code broadens the scope and we will continue to support that clause of the bill. We can also give our support to a couple of other minor clauses.

I would like to go back and conclude with the points that were made by the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine about the fact that with the changes the privacy commissioner can now support what is before us. I am troubled that the bill, which would enact measures for implementing the biological and toxin weapons convention, that there were amendments put forward by my colleague, the member for Churchill, that specifically impacted on the privacy commissioner and which were defeated at committee. Because they were defeated at committee they were not allowed to be debated here in the House.

I just want to pick out one of them. Motion No. 1 stated:

The Privacy Commissioner may review all material received in respect of the transactions described in subsection (1) to ensure that section 4.81 has been complied with.

To follow up on the argument that was advanced by the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, it would seem to me that if the committee has looked at this and the privacy commissioner has been satisfied, then I fail to understand why a reasonable amendment, such as the one that I have just read into the record that was advanced by the member for Churchill, would have been defeated by the Liberal majority on the committee.

Although there are some improvements in Bill C-17 over its earlier incarnations, this caucus, along with others on the opposition side, cannot support Bill C-17 and we will be voting against it.

• (1330)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles-A. Perron:** Madam Speaker, I beg your indulgence to wish, in the remaining 35 seconds, on my behalf and on behalf of the Bloc Québécois MPs, a happy Mother's Day to all the mothers in this House, in Canada, most particularly to the ones in my constituency, and, especially to my own mother.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** What a good idea. Happy Mother's Day to all the mothers in this House, myself included.

It being 1:33 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

### COMPETITION ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-249, an act to amend the Competition Act, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

**Mr. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-249, an act to amend the Competition Act, as amended, be concurred in at report stage.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Dan McTeague** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Madam Speaker, first, I want to thank the member on the other side who brought to the attention of the House the fact that Sunday will be Mother's Day.

I want to wish a happy Mother's Day to all my constituents and to all Canadian women who will be celebrating that important day.

[*English*]

I am pleased to rise to speak at third reading of Bill C-249; it has been a few years. It deals with a substantive, important change to the Competition Act. I would like to thank the industry committee, including its chair, the member for St. Catharines, as well as my colleague the vice-chair, representing the Alliance, and members of all other parties for their work in making this such an important milestone as far as private members' bills are concerned.

The bill has as its origins the need to ensure that the loophole created in 1986, which in effect allows anti-competitive activity, not occur unless factors other than efficiency are considered. The case that was before the House dealt with Superior Propane and that issue saw a potentially damaging merger take place. The reality is that the language of the act was in dire need of change as a result.

I am pleased that Bill C-249 as amended has the support of the competition commission, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and a substantial number of consumer groups across the country.

As the competition commissioner said at committee on March 31:

The bill seeks to ensure that consumers are not left out of the equation when considering mergers involving efficiency claims. It would also safeguard competition to the benefit of consumers and the [Canadian] economy.

*Private Members' Business*

I want to point out that nowhere else in the world is there an efficiencies defence that is used to promote a potentially damaging merger that would see consumers and the competitive process harmed, not in the United States, not in Europe, not in Australia, nowhere around the world. Other competitive processes always try to at least balance the interests of consumers and the interests of those who are trying to create certain types of innovations and efficiencies.

Unfortunately, the act was left wide open for interpretation. It is correct and appropriate, as the committee quite rightly pointed out rather substantially, not only for this Parliament, that the issue be fully addressed. The commissioner also suggested that the act in itself is an important public knowledge document that allows consumers to certainly be aware of the fact that any quantifiable efficiencies would be treated appropriately.

Former Federal Trade Commission chair Robert Pitofsky pointed this out on the question of efficiencies:

My view is that the acceptance and clarification of the role of efficiencies in defense of mergers has been, on balance, a useful development in the United States. If there are no significant efficiencies, enforcement agencies and judges can be much more comfortable finding that particular mergers are anti-competitive—

His concern, which I think speaks very much to the concern we have here in Canada, was that benefits can only happen if they are likely to be passed on to consumers and efficiencies cannot be achieved in a substantially less anti-competitive way.

More important, I believe that the position taken for some years by groups and organizations that have tremendous concern with this precedent and with the wording of the act agrees that efficiencies in terms of merger review should not be stand-alone, that in fact they should be compared to all other factors. The amendment prescribed by the industry committee is appropriate and correct and I believe that Parliament must pass this bill. More important, I am pleased to have the support of my government as well as the Competition Bureau on this matter.

• (1335)

**Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton Southwest, Canadian Alliance):** Madam Speaker, I want to commend my colleague for introducing this bill and for taking such an active interest in competition law. As he mentioned, his own government is supporting this so I expect we will see the bill become law fairly soon.

I do want to raise some concerns about this piece of legislation, because we in the Alliance and I in particular have decided after reflection not to support this particular bill.

I want to begin my talk here today with a few thoughts on economics, efficiencies and the distribution of wealth. The purpose of the Competition Act, whether we like it or not, is to create wealth. Obviously society would like to have some checks and balances on wealth and wealth distribution, but largely we depend on the market to regulate itself. What makes this subject complicated is that it raises the issue of distribution of wealth. The interesting thing about this bill is that it would set in motion a new purpose for the competition commissioner, that is, to make decisions about wealth distribution.

The issue of wealth distribution or dividing up pieces of the pie is inherently a political question. Who deserves more? Who deserves less? Who does the distributing? Surely these are issues for elected and accountable representatives, not civil servants or quasi-judicial tribunals. The other thorny issue with wealth distribution is that once we begin to consider it, efficiencies are cast aside. If we think of all the time and effort that goes into redistribution in government, if we look at some of the regional development agencies, and if we look at Technology Partnerships Canada, the politicians basically focus on who gets the money, not on keeping the underpinning or the economy healthy to balance that.

Others will give their interpretation of the bill and now I will give mine.

Under the Competition Act, the competition commissioner has the ability to challenge mergers that likely would lessen or prevent competition. The parties to the merger can defend their merger based upon what presently is called the efficiency defence. Such a defence can be made where the merger is likely to bring about gains and market efficiency that will be greater than, and therefore offsetting, the supposed anti-competitive effects of the merger.

Why is this technical economic theory an issue? Mainly because of one prominent case. When Superior Propane proposed a merger with ICG in 1998, it was found that the new company likely would achieve a national market share in propane of 70%. This would have enabled it to become virtually a monopoly propane provider in 16 local markets, mostly in Atlantic Canada. The Competition Bureau deemed this merger to be anti-competitive and therefore challenged it.

Superior and ICG defended their merger using the efficiency defence. The efficiency defence is technical and cumbersome. It falls under section 96 of the Competition Act. It assesses the social benefits of a merger: whether or not a marginally higher price passed on to the consumer outweighs the market efficiencies gained by the creation of a new company.

In the end, the Superior-ICG merger was allowed because the efficiencies resulting from the merger increased the competitiveness of Canadian propane by reducing duplication and allowing the firm to engage in more efficient production. In other words, the increase in productivity resulting from the merger was seen to outweigh the possible costs to the consumer; the costs were not known for certain. They actually did come up with a number for this case. It was found that the impact on low income Canadians possibly could be as high as \$8.6 million. The benefit of the merger, from greater efficiencies of scale and other positive impacts, was found to be \$29 million.

Bill C-249 attempts to clarify the efficiency defence by limiting the application of this efficiency defence. However, the sponsor of Bill C-249, the member who just spoke, has just explained that he has amended his own bill, something that does not typically happen. He sought to amend it because he thought it would be much better than the current form.

Either in its original form or amended as it is, we in the Canadian Alliance simply cannot support Bill C-249. There are several reasons why we cannot support the bill, which I would like to outline.

*Private Members' Business*

First, throughout hearings over the past three years on the issue of competition, the Canadian Alliance members of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology consistently have put forth the view that Canadian consumers and producers are best served not by a tribunal or by government intervention in the marketplace, but by genuine business to business competition.

• (1340)

The focus of competition policy should not be to protect individuals or individual companies but to facilitate competition itself. Therefore, another intervention into the marketplace as outlined by both the bill and the amendment would not necessarily promote competition but could allow for ways for government bodies to interfere with competition.

Second, the industry committee recommended in April 2002 that a task force of experts be established to study the role of efficiencies in the Competition Act. One of the reasons the standing committee made this recommendation was that the efficiency defence has caused a problem within the Competition Bureau itself. Just when the tribunal came to agree with the bureau's guidelines on the treatment of efficiencies according to the total surplus standard, the bureau abandoned its guidelines.

The standing committee also heard from witnesses concerning the problems in accurately calculating efficiencies. Obviously there are not too many members of the House who are experts in econometrics, but this is something where we are looking into the future of efficiencies and predicting. Even those people who are experts in this area have a difficult time doing this.

I would note here that the Competition Bureau commissioned and received a comprehensive study by experts on the treatment of efficiencies in merger reviews. However, that was a study on different international jurisdictions, where the standing committee requested a study of the role that efficiencies should play in all civilly reviewable sections of the Competition Act. In our view, this is a subtle but critically important difference.

Another reason why the committee would like to have this issue studied on a broader level is historical. To quote from the Canadian Bar Association when it appeared before our committee:

It's our understanding that the inclusion of section 96 in the package of amendments to the law enacted in 1986 was a response in part to concerns which had been raised by the business community about the then new merger provisions. It is particularly important to modify [the efficiency defence] only after due reflection has been given and an opportunity for broader public discussion. There is a constituency out there that thinks that was part of an understanding about how the act would have been amended.

The third reason why we in the Alliance cannot support the bill has to do again with interference in the marketplace by government, specifically for the purpose of what it calls wealth distribution. No matter how one looks at the bill or the amendment, it will change competition law by asking the Competition Bureau to play a role in wealth distribution. This is a role for which it is ill suited. There are other mechanisms, for example a taxation system, that are better suited to wealth and income distribution. The intent of the amendment is consistent with the intent of the original bill where the sponsor wanted "gains in efficiency to be passed onto customers within a reasonable time in the form of lower prices".

We in the Canadian Alliance believe the marketplace can sort out these issues better than any formula proposed by Parliament.

Section 96 is designed, in theory, to help Canada create a more productive economy. To quote the Canadian Chamber of Commerce:

Unlike the United States anti-trust laws which aim to directly protect and benefit consumers, our [Competition Act] seeks to ensure that marketplace frameworks are in place to promote competition and the efficient operation of markets. This in turn will lead to benefits for all segments of society.

In conclusion, in our view Canadian consumers are best served not by a tribunal or by government intervention in the marketplace but by genuine business to business competition. The focus of competition policy should not be to protect individuals or individual companies but to facilitate competition itself. The Minister of Industry should recognize business to business competition as one of this government's highest priorities and the Liberals should make a concerted effort to reduce regulation and government interference in the marketplace.

• (1345)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like to say at the outset that the Bloc Québécois will support Bill C-249. I remind the House that this bill would amend the Competition Act to clarify the Competition Tribunal's powers to make an order or not in the case of a merger when gains in efficiency are expected or when the merger would create or strengthen a dominant market position.

I think that it is important, to be able to assess the changes proposed by this bill, to keep in mind the current text of subsection 96(1) of the Competition Act. It says something like this:

The Tribunal shall not make an order under section 92—

The purpose of this section is to dispose of assets or any other measure.

—if it finds that the merger or proposed merger in respect of which the application is made has brought about or is likely to bring about gains in efficiency that will be greater than, and will offset, the effects of any prevention or lessening of competition that will result or is likely to result from the merger or proposed merger and that the gains in efficiency would not likely be attained if the order were made.

In the current act, we see that if the parties before the tribunal are able to demonstrate that the merger would have the effect of creating gains in efficiency that would be greater than the gains which would result from a lessening of competition, the tribunal cannot require dissolution of a merger, even in the case of very significant adverse effects on competition. That is the section as it now reads, and we see that there is not much leeway regarding the evidence related to gains in efficiency.

In the proposed amendment—I shall read just a little of it—in order to determine whether section 92 applies:

—the Tribunal may, together with the factors that may be considered by the Tribunal under section 93, have regard to whether the merger or proposed merger has brought about or is likely to bring about gains in efficiency that will provide benefits to consumers, including competitive prices or product choices, and that would not likely be attained in the absence of the merger or proposed merger.

We see that in the amendment proposed in Bill C-249, the Competition Tribunal is being asked to evaluate whether a merger might have the effect of bringing about gains in efficiency that would benefit consumers, and then to decide whether or not to make an order under section 92.

The spirit of the bill is to identify who will benefit from these gains in efficiency. The Competition Tribunal is being given much more specific guidelines than under the current section of the Competition Act. Already, there is a difference.

There are four positive elements in Bill C-249. First, the bill lessens the importance, as determined by the Competition Bureau, of gains in efficiency attained through mergers. The bill places limits on the use of the efficiency defence that is allowed under the current wording. It is limited to gains in efficiency that benefit consumers and not solely shareholders or foreign consumers.

In the Superior Propane case, the company had, in relation to a merger, pleaded gains in efficiency without specifying for whom. When the committee met, my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques asked Thomas Ross, of the Competition Bureau, if passing Bill C-249 would have allowed the tribunal to make a better determination in the case. In the end, the bureau decided not to appeal the Competition Tribunal's decision, even though it felt that there were numerous negative impacts from the proposed merger. Mr. Ross responded that, in fact, if Bill C-249 had existed, they would have been better able to set limits and perhaps prevent this merger as the gains in efficiency, while they do exist, apparently will not benefit consumers.

So, the first advantage of this legislation is that it lessens the importance of gains in efficiency and also lessens the defence allowed under the interpretation of the current section.

• (1350)

Second, and clearly specified in the bill, is that what is used to judge whether a merger is acceptable is not all pertinent factors, but specifically that gains in efficiency must provide clear benefits to Canadian and Quebec consumers, not just any consumers. The previous speaker said that the Competition Act is primary aimed at creating wealth. It seems to me that the ultimate purpose of the Competition Act must be not to create wealth but to ensure that consumers have access to a variety of quality products at a competitive price.

It seems to me that this element introduced by Bill C-249 comes far closer to the primary purpose of the Competition Act. It is therefore the second argument, we feel, in favour of passing Bill C-249.

The third is that it strikes a better balance between the interests of consumers and of shareholders when a merger is planned. This is not the case with the present provision, there will be checks to see who will benefit from the gains in efficiency. This is, of course, an exercise that will be extremely difficult, but one that is necessary.

As you probably know Madam Speaker, I am a member of the Standing Committee on Finance. We just tabled a report on bank mergers. Underlying all the recommendations made to the Minister of Finance in that report is the idea that bank mergers, through the

### *Private Members' Business*

development of international activities, can certainly serve the interests of shareholders; however, as members of Parliament and representatives of the people, we must ensure that Canadian and Quebec investors and communities also benefit from these mergers. We all know that, although they are private businesses, banks provide services of a quasi-public nature. For example, the accounts in these banks will have to remain accessible.

In our recommendations, we ask the government and the Competition Bureau, during its review, to make sure that the improved efficiency and economies of scale benefit not only shareholders, but also consumers, communities and investors, and especially small and medium-size businesses.

It seems to me that if Bill C-249 were passed, it would reflect all of the concerns of the Standing Committee on Finance regarding bank mergers. We know that this will be an extremely hot topic. I do not expect that it will be dealt with before the end of the Liberal leadership race, because this would obviously be an extremely sensitive issue for the candidates. However, we know that once the race is over, and maybe after the next federal election—let us not fool ourselves—bank mergers will be proposed.

It is in everyone's best interest that Bill C-249 be passed to set guidelines for the Competition Bureau when it comes to proposed bank mergers. That was the third argument.

The fourth and final argument is that the Competition Act, as amended by Bill C-249, would better reflect the objectives of public policy. What is the purpose of legislation? It is there to serve the public interest, not private interests, and to defend the majority of citizens. In the present case, it seems to me that Bill C-249 would make for public policy that better reflects the objectives it is meant to fulfill.

In conclusion, I will say, as I said earlier, that the Competition Act is aimed at thwarting a common tendency in our capitalistic markets. In terms of the concentration of activities resulting in oligopolies or monopolies, we have laws to regulate monopolies and the situation regarding oligopolies is being monitored. As we know, there has been a lot of debate around oil companies and refining costs. But why do we have laws? Because we know that the concentration of businesses affects productivity. At the end of the day, when there are no more competitors, there is no need to be productive. That in turn affects the quality of both services and products. It also affects prices and economic growth.

Competition serves not only consumers but also economic growth and, in that sense, Bill C-249 must be passed. As I mentioned at the very beginning, the Bloc Québécois will support the bill.

In conclusion, I too wish a happy Mother's Day to every mother in Quebec and Canada.

*Private Members' Business*

• (1355)

[English]

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-249, an act to amend the Competition Act. I want to congratulate the member for Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge for his diligent work in bringing this particular private member's bill forward.

Bill C-249 is about the balance of power between companies and consumers, big people and little people. It seeks to amend the Competition Act to clarify the powers of the competition tribunal when making orders in the case of a merger that would, if approved, create a monopoly or near monopoly situation at the expense and detriment of consumers and competition in the marketplace.

The bill would have the effect of giving the competition tribunal more flexibility in approving or disapproving mergers. It is the opinion of the member who put the bill forward that section 96 of the current Competition Act is outdated and needs to be amended to protect consumers against mergers that would allow monopolies or near monopolies with all of the negative consequences that flow from that.

We in the Prairies know a little something about monopoly or near monopoly situations because prairie history is rife with protests that have occurred as a result of the stranglehold that the big railroads and grain companies have had, at present and in the past, over our farming communities and other primary shippers. That is why I was particularly intrigued to hear the member from the Alliance talking against this bill. The Alliance purports to speak for western Canadians, but is sadly out of touch on this particular piece of legislation.

That near monopoly on the Prairies still applies to a great extent and our farmers continue to pay the price. They are seeing freight rates on grain rise dramatically, whether it is grain companies, equipment manufacturers, the people who produce tractors, combines and sprayers, et cetera, or the commercial fertilizer companies. These situations have arisen mainly because Ottawa has walked away from its responsibility to regulate these near monopolies in the public interest.

Recently, our smaller cities have also suffered as a result of the merger of Air Canada and Canadian. In that transaction Air Canada argued that it would make the airline industry more efficient. However, the question always remains, efficient for whom, for the company or for the passengers and consumers the company is supposed to be serving?

In the 36th Parliament we had to deal with the threat of mergers among the big banks that claimed this would create new efficiencies. Sadly, that issue may not be very far away from being back in the House again. The question remains, efficient for whom, the bank or the elderly pensioner whose local branch is closing; the bank or the teller who loses his or her job? Our party and caucus was in the forefront of the campaign, including my colleague from Regina—Qu'Appelle, against bank mergers, and it was a campaign that succeeded, at least temporarily.

I wish to point out to the member proposing Bill C-249 that I do not see in his literature or testimony before committee any reference

to workers. He talks about consumers, and rightly so, but every large merger almost inevitably means lost jobs and that has a negative effect on individuals, families and communities.

Bill C-249 has been before the industry, science and technology committee. One of the witnesses who appeared before that committee on this bill was Konrad von Finckenstein, the Commissioner of Competition. The commissioner said in testimony that he believed the bill before us today was, "a workable alternative to the status quo". I interpret this to mean that the competition commissioner thinks that the current bill is too merger friendly and that he would welcome an opportunity to modernize the legislation around the Competition Act.

Obviously he believes that Bill C-249 would be helpful in that regard because it would ensure that consumers and not just companies must benefit from any gains and efficiencies being predicted due to business mergers.

There is no unanimity in the business sector. I note that the Canadian Federation of Independent Business does support the bill, while the Canadian Chamber of Commerce does not. That again may speak to market solutions and the Canadian Alliance refusing to support this bill.

• (1400)

I suspect that the Canadian Federation of Independent Business is opposed to this because it speaks for smaller businesses likely to be harmed by big business mergers, while the chamber speaks mainly for big business in Canada.

In summary, I believe Bill C-249 would improve the Competition Act by protecting people against the most cynical and voracious business mergers. I am happy to support the legislation.

**Mr. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments that have been made and I extend to all my colleagues my sincere congratulations and gratitude for the work they have done on this.

We know that legislation is often imperfect but we do try, as a Parliament, from time to time to change the directions in terms of the support that exists for this bill. I am pleased to say that it is worth the challenge that will be presented by the House at an appropriate time. It is my hope that we can pass this bill as soon as possible so that the dangerous precedent that has been set in the status quo is not used at any time soon. I think that would be responsible.

I point out to my hon. colleague from the New Democratic Party that this would be as important for consumers as it is for workers. It is an important bill for Canadians and certainly speaks loudly to the point that members of Parliament can and do become involved in issues with which the government normally does not have an opportunity to involve itself. The private member's process does indeed work.

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

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

*Private Members' Business*

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** Pursuant to Standing Order 93 the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, May 14, at the beginning of private members' business.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dan McTeague:** Madam Speaker, there have been discussions between the parties and there is agreement in the House to defer the recorded division requested on Bill C-249 until 3 p.m. on Tuesday, May 13, 2003.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** Is it agreed that the vote will be deferred until Tuesday, May 13?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Paul Szabo:** Madam Speaker, I move that we see the clock as 2:30.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** It being 2:03, the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:03 p.m.)

---



**APPENDIX**

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

**CHAIR OCCUPANTS**

**The Speaker**

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

**The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. BOB KILGER

**The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

**The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

---

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

HON. DON BOUDRIA

MR. LOYOLA HEARN

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland and Labrador	PC
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CA
Duplain, Claude, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Portneuf	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Hon. Wayne, Solicitor General of Canada	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Efford, R. John	Bonavista—Trinity— Conception	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Art	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	CA
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	CA
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de- la-Madeleine—Pabok	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CA
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam —Burnaby	British Columbia	CA
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Frulla, Liza	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint- Paul—Pointe Saint-Charles	Quebec	Lib.
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Sébastien	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	Quebec	BQ
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing— Pembroke	Ontario	CA
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gaudet, Roger	Berthier—Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton Centre-East	Alberta	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay—Boundary— Okanagan	British Columbia	CA
Graham, Hon. Bill, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	CA
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	CA
Grose, Ivan, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency— Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CA
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Harper, Stephen, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CA
Harris, Richard	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	CA
Harvard, John	Charleswood—St. James— Assiniboia	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Quebec	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	Newfoundland and Labrador	PC
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	CA
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	CA
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CA
Hinton, Betty	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	British Columbia	CA
Hubbard, Charles, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	CA
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce— Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CA
Jordan, Joe	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CA
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, The Deputy Speaker	Stormont—Dundas— Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Hon. Gar, Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau— Mirabel	Quebec	BQ
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	Ind.
LeBlanc, Dominic, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.

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

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Wappel, Tom .....	Scarborough Southwest.....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy .....	Winnipeg North Centre.....	Manitoba .....	NDP
Wayne, Elsie.....	Saint John .....	New Brunswick.....	PC
Whelan, Hon. Susan, Minister for International Cooperation.....	Essex.....	Ontario .....	Lib.
White, Randy.....	Langley—Abbotsford.....	British Columbia .....	CA
White, Ted .....	North Vancouver.....	British Columbia .....	CA
Wilfert, Bryon, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance.	Oak Ridges .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Williams, John.....	St. Albert .....	Alberta .....	CA
Wood, Bob.....	Nipissing .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Yelich, Lynne.....	Blackstrap .....	Saskatchewan .....	CA
VACANCY .....	Perth—Middlesex .....	Ontario .....	
VACANCY .....	Témiscamingue .....	Quebec .....	
VACANCY .....	Levis-et-Chutes-de-la- Chaudière.....	Quebec .....	

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib. - Liberal; CA - Canadian Alliance; BQ - Bloc Québécois; NDP - New Democratic Party;  
PC - Progressive Conservative Party; Ind. - Independent

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hinton, Betty	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	CA
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	CA
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CA
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	CA
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	CA
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	CA
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	CA
Moore, James	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	CA
Owen, Hon. Stephen, Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Peschisolido, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Richmond	Lib.
Reynolds, John, West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	CA
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	CA
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	CA
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	CA
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	CA

### MANITOBA (13)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Harvard, John	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	CA
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	PC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Hon. Rey, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	CA
Simard, Raymond	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Toews, Vic	Provencher	CA
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP

### NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
Castonguay, Jeannot, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Madawaska—Restigouche	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Miramichi	Lib.
LeBlanc, Dominic, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	Lib.
Savoy, Andy	Tobique—Mactaquac	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Thompson, Greg .....	New Brunswick Southwest.....	PC
Wayne, Elsie .....	Saint John .....	PC

#### NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (4)

Barnes, Rex .....	Gander—Grand Falls .....	PC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency) .....	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte .....	Lib.
Doyle, Norman .....	St. John's East.....	PC
Efford, R. John .....	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception .....	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola.....	St. John's West .....	PC
Matthews, Bill .....	Burin—St. George's.....	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence.....	Labrador .....	Lib.

#### NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)

Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth) .....	Western Arctic .....	Lib.
---	----------------------	------

#### NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Brisson, Scott .....	Kings—Hants .....	PC
Casey, Bill .....	Cumberland—Colchester .....	PC
Cuzner, Rodger, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister .....	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton.....	Lib.
Eyking, Mark .....	Sydney—Victoria .....	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald.....	South Shore .....	PC
Lill, Wendy .....	Dartmouth .....	NDP
MacKay, Peter .....	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough .....	PC
McDonough, Alexa.....	Halifax .....	NDP
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons .....	Halifax West.....	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter .....	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley— Eastern Shore.....	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans .....	West Nova .....	Lib.

#### NUNAVUT (1)

Karetak-Lindell, Nancy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources .....	Nunavut.....	Lib.
--	--------------	------

#### ONTARIO (101)

Adams, Peter.....	Peterborough .....	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration .....	Brampton Centre.....	Lib.
Augustine, Hon. Jean, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women) .....	Etobicoke—Lakeshore.....	Lib.
Barnes, Sue .....	London West .....	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue ...	Brampton West—Mississauga.....	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald, The Acting Speaker.....	Timmins—James Bay .....	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril .....	Ottawa—Vanier .....	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène.....	Ottawa—Orléans .....	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn .....	St. Paul's .....	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions) ..	Vaughan—King—Aurora.....	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond.....	Nickel Belt .....	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul .....	Simcoe—Grey.....	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.....	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.....	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
Bryden, John	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of National Revenue	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—St. Clair	NDP
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Hon. Paul, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Art	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CA
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Hon. Bill, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Grose, Ivan, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Lib.
Jordan, Joe	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, The Deputy Speaker	Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Hon. Gar, Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Macklin, Paul Harold, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Northumberland	Lib.
Mahoney, Hon. Steve, Secretary of State (Selected Crown Corporations)	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour	Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	NDP
McCallum, Hon. John, Minister of National Defence	Markham	Lib.

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Lib.
<b>QUEBEC (69)</b>		
Allard, Carole-Marie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Lib. Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Portneuf	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Frulla, Liza	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	BQ
Gagnon, Sébastien	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	BQ
Gaudet, Roger	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord .....	Lib.
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada.....	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine .....	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario.....	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel .....	BQ
Lalonde, Francine.....	Mercier .....	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert .....	Châteauguay.....	BQ
Lebel, Ghislain.....	Chambly .....	Ind.
Lincoln, Clifford.....	Lac-Saint-Louis .....	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan.....	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot .....	BQ
Marceau, Richard.....	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier.....	BQ
Marci, Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry.....	Beauharnois—Salaberry .....	Lib.
Martin, Hon. Paul .....	LaSalle—Émard.....	Lib.
Ménard, Réal.....	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve.....	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert.....	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny— L'Islet .....	Lib.
Pacetti, Massimo.....	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel .....	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre .....	Joliette .....	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)	Brome—Missisquoi.....	Lib.
Patry, Bernard.....	Pierrefonds—Dollard .....	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.....	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles .....	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister for International Trade.....	Papineau—Saint-Denis .....	Lib.
Picard, Pauline .....	Drummond .....	BQ
Plamondon, Louis .....	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour .....	BQ
Price, David.....	Compton—Stanstead.....	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport.....	Hull—Aylmer .....	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board.....	Westmount—Ville-Marie .....	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves .....	Trois-Rivières .....	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves.....	Matapédia—Matane .....	BQ
Saada, Jacques .....	Brossard—La Prairie .....	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît.....	Repentigny .....	BQ
Scherrer, Hélène .....	Louis-Hébert .....	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline .....	Longueuil.....	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development .....	Shefford .....	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy.....	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik.....	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande.....	Saint-Lambert .....	Lib.
Tremblay, Suzanne .....	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis.....	BQ
Venne, Pierrette .....	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert.....	Ind. BQ
VACANCY .....	Lévis-et-Chute-de-la-Chaudière .....	
VACANCY .....	Témiscamingue .....	
<b>SASKATCHEWAN (14)</b>		
Anderson, David.....	Cypress Hills—Grasslands .....	CA
Bailey, Roy.....	Souris—Moose Mountain .....	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry .....	Yorkton—Melville .....	CA
Fitzpatrick, Brian .....	Prince Albert .....	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians.....	Wascana .....	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick .....	Churchill River.....	Lib.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne.....	Regina—Qu'Appelle .....	NDP

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

## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of May 9, 2003 — 2nd Session, 37th Parliament)

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

<b>Chair:</b>	Raymond Bonin	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Nancy Karetak-Lindell Maurice Vellacott	
Gérard Binet	John Godfrey	Inky Mark	Brian Pallister	(16)
Serge Cardin	Charles Hubbard	Pat Martin	Julian Reed	
David Chatters	Yvan Loubier	Anita Neville	Benoît Serré	
Stan Dromisky				

#### Associate Members

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

---

## CANADIAN HERITAGE

**Chair:** Clifford Lincoln

**Vice-Chairs:**

Jim Abbott  
Paul Bonwick

Carole-Marie Allard  
Sarmite Bulte  
R. John Efford  
Liza Frulla

Christiane Gagnon  
John Harvard  
Loyola Hearn

Wendy Lill  
James Lunney  
Dennis Mills

Alex Shepherd  
Caroline St-Hilaire  
Chuck Strahl

(16)

### Associate Members

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

Libby Davies  
Stockwell Day  
Norman Doyle  
John Duncan  
Reed Elley  
Ken Epp  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Paul Forseth  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Jim Gouk  
Gurmant Grewal  
Deborah Grey  
Art Hanger  
Stephen Harper  
Richard Harris  
John Herron  
Grant Hill  
Jay Hill  
Howard Hilstrom  
Betty Hinton

Rahim Jaffer  
Dale Johnston  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Robert Lanctôt  
Yvan Loubier  
Gary Lunn  
Peter MacKay  
Inky Mark  
Keith Martin  
Philip Mayfield  
Grant McNally  
Val Meredith  
Rob Merrifield  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Charlie Penson  
Dick Proctor  
James Rajotte

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

---

## CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Chair:**

Joe Fontana

**Vice-Chairs:**
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral  
Jerry PickardDiane Ablonczy  
Sarkis Assadourian  
John Bryden  
Yvon CharbonneauLibby Davies  
Sophia Leung  
Inky MarkGrant McNally  
John O'Reilly  
Massimo PacettiDavid Price  
Yves Rocheleau  
Lynne Yelich

(16)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
André Bachand  
Roy Bailey  
Rex Barnes  
Leon Benoit  
Bernard Bigras  
Bill Blaikie  
Rick Borotsik  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Andy Burton  
Chuck Cadman  
Serge Cardin  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
David Chatters  
Joe Clark  
John Cummins  
Stockwell DayNorman Doyle  
John Duncan  
Reed Elley  
Ken Epp  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Paul Forseth  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Jim Gouk  
Gurmant Grewal  
Deborah Grey  
Art Hanger  
Stephen Harper  
Richard Harris  
Loyola Hearn  
John Herron  
Grant Hill  
Jay Hill  
Howard Hilstrom  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim JafferDale Johnston  
Jim Karygiannis  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Francine Lalonde  
Yvan Loubier  
Gary Lunn  
James Lunney  
Peter MacKay  
Keith Martin  
Brian Masse  
Philip Mayfield  
Val Meredith  
Rob Merrifield  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Anita Neville  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Charlie Penson  
James RajotteScott Reid  
John Reynolds  
Gerry Ritz  
Werner Schmidt  
Carol Skelton  
Monte Solberg  
Kevin Sorenson  
Larry Spencer  
Darrel Stinson  
Chuck Strahl  
Greg Thompson  
Myron Thompson  
Vic Toews  
Maurice Vellacott  
Joseph Volpe  
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis  
Elsie Wayne  
Randy White  
Ted White  
John Williams

## ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Charles Caccia	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	John Herron	
Mark Assad	Sébastien Gagnon	Bob Mills	Hélène Scherrer	(16)
Roy Bailey	Joe Jordan	Julian Reed	Paul Szabo	
Bernard Bigras	Rick Laliberte	Andy Savoy	Alan Tonks	
Joe Comartin	Gary Lunn			

### Associate Members

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

---

**FINANCE****Chair:**

Sue Barnes

**Vice-Chairs:**Nick Discepola  
Richard HarrisScott Brison  
Rick Casson  
Roy Cullen  
Albina GuarnieriRahim Jaffer  
Sophia Leung  
Maria Minna  
Shawn MurphyPierre Paquette  
Charlie Penson  
Pauline Picard  
Gary PillitteriTony Valeri  
Judy Wasylcia-Leis  
Bryon Wilfert

(18)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
André Bachand  
Roy Bailey  
Rex Barnes  
Carolyn Bennett  
Leon Benoit  
Stéphane Bergeron  
Bernard Bigras  
Rick Borotsik  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Andy Burton  
Chuck Cadman  
Bill Casey  
David Chatters  
Joe Clark  
John Cummins  
Stockwell Day  
Odina Desrochers  
Norman Doyle  
Antoine DubéJohn Duncan  
Reed Elley  
Ken Epp  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Paul Forseth  
Cheryl Gallant  
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Jim Gouk  
Gurmant Grewal  
Deborah Grey  
Monique Guay  
Art Hanger  
Stephen Harper  
Loyola Hearn  
John Herron  
Grant Hill  
Jay Hill  
Howard Hilstrom  
Betty Hinton  
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Yvan Loubier  
Gary Lunn  
James Lunney  
Peter MacKay  
Richard Marceau  
Inky Mark  
Keith Martin  
Pat Martin  
Philip Mayfield  
Alexa McDonough  
Grant McNally  
Val Meredith  
Rob Merrifield  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Lorne Nystrom  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Gilles-A. Perron  
Joe PeschisolidoJames Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
John Reynolds  
Gerry Ritz  
Werner Schmidt  
Judy Sgro  
Carol Skelton  
Monte Solberg  
Kevin Sorenson  
Larry Spencer  
Darrel Stinson  
Chuck Strahl  
Greg Thompson  
Myron Thompson  
Vic Toews  
Maurice Vellacott  
Elsie Wayne  
Randy White  
Ted White  
John Williams  
Bob Wood  
Lynne Yelich

## FISHERIES AND OCEANS

**Chair:**

Tom Wappel

**Vice-Chairs:**
Bill Matthews  
Peter Stoffer

Andy Burton  
John Cummins  
Rodger Cuzner  
R. John Efford

Reed Elley  
Georges Farrah  
Ghislain Fournier

Loyola Hearn  
Dominic LeBlanc  
Joe Peschisolido

Carmen Provenzano  
Jean-Yves Roy  
Bob Wood

(16)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
G rard Asselin  
Andr  Bachand  
Roy Bailey  
Rex Barnes  
Leon Benoit  
Rick Borotsik  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Chuck Cadman  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
David Chatters  
Joe Clark  
Joe Comartin  
Stockwell Day  
Norman Doyle

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

Dale Johnston  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Gary Lunn  
James Lunney  
Peter MacKay  
Inky Mark  
Keith Martin  
Philip Mayfield  
Grant McNally  
Val Meredith  
Rob Merrifield  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Charlie Penson  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
John Reynolds

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

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

<b>Chair:</b>	Bernard Patry	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Stockwell Day Diane Marleau	
Stéphane Bergeron	Irwin Cotler	John Harvard	Alexa McDonough	(18)
Murray Calder	John Duncan	André Harvey	Deepak Obhrai	
Aileen Carroll	Art Eggleton	Francine Lalonde	Karen Redman	
Bill Casey	Mark Eyking	Keith Martin		

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Ken Epp	Yvan Loubier	Gerry Ritz
Diane Ablonczy	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn	Svend Robinson
Rob Anders	Raymonde Folco	James Lunney	Yves Rocheleau
David Anderson	Paul Forseth	Peter MacKay	Benoît Sauvageau
André Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Gurbax Malhi	Werner Schmidt
Claude Bachand	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Jim Gouk	Pat Martin	Monte Solberg
Sue Barnes	Gurmant Grewal	Brian Masse	Kevin Sorenson
Colleen Beaumier	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Bob Speller
Leon Benoit	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Bernard Bigras	Mac Harb	Val Meredith	Darrel Stinson
Bill Blaikie	Stephen Harper	Rob Merrifield	Peter Stoffer
Rick Borotsik	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitkreuz	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	John Herron	Shawn Murphy	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Grant Hill	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	Jay Hill	Pat O'Brien	Tony Valeri
Rick Casson	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	Pierre Paquette	Joseph Volpe
Joe Clark	Rahim Jaffer	Charlie Penson	Elsie Wayne
Paul Crête	Dale Johnston	Beth Phinney	Randy White
John Cummins	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte	Ted White
Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid	John Williams
Antoine Dubé	Karen Kraft Sloan	John Reynolds	Lynne Yelich
Reed Elley			

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Mac Harb	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Stéphane Bergeron Mark Eyking	
Bill Blaikie	Rick Casson	Bob Speller	Tony Valeri	(9)
Bill Casey	Pat O'Brien			

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Irwin Cotler	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Colleen Beaumier Deepak Obhrai	
Bill Casey	Gurbax Malhi	Svend Robinson	Yves Rocheleau	(9)
Karen Kraft Sloan	Beth Phinney			

## GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

<b>Chair:</b>	Reg Alcock	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Paul Forseth Tony Valeri	
Carolyn Bennett	Raymonde Folco	Pat Martin	Judy Sgro	(16)
Scott Brison	Robert Lanctôt	Gilles-A. Perron	Paul Szabo	
Roy Cullen	Steve Mahoney	Gerry Ritz	Tony Tirabassi	
Ken Epp				

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Betty Hinton	Charlie Penson
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	Rahim Jaffer	Dick Proctor
Rob Anders	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Liza Frulla	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
André Bachand	Christiane Gagnon	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds
Roy Bailey	Cheryl Gallant	Gary Lunn	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	James Lunney	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Yvon Godin	Peter MacKay	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitkreuz	Jim Gouk	Keith Martin	Larry Spencer
Andy Burton	Gurmant Grewal	Brian Masse	Darrel Stinson
Chuck Cadman	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Chuck Strahl
Bill Casey	Monique Guay	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Rick Casson	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
David Chatters	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Joe Clark	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
Paul Crête	Loyola Hearn	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
John Cummins	John Herron	James Moore	Randy White
Stockwell Day	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Ted White
Odina Desrochers	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	John Williams
Norman Doyle	Howard Hilstrom	Pierre Paquette	Lynne Yelich

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES PROCESS

<b>Chairs:</b>	Gerry Ritz Tony Valeri	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Gilles-A. Perron	Paul Szabo	Tony Tirabassi		(5)

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE RENEWAL

<b>Chairs:</b>	Roy Cullen Paul Forseth	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Carolyn Bennett	Monique Guay	Pat Martin	Judy Sgro	(6)

**HEALTH****Chair:** Bonnie Brown**Vice-Chairs:**Stan Dromisky  
Réal MénardCarolyn Bennett  
Diane Bourgeois  
Jeannot Castonguay  
Brenda ChamberlainRaymonde Folco  
Hedy Fry  
Betty HintonRob Merrifield  
Svend Robinson  
Hélène ScherrerCarol Skelton  
Yolande Thibeault  
Greg Thompson

(16)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
André Bachand  
Roy Bailey  
Rex Barnes  
Leon Benoit  
Bernard Bigras  
Rick Borotsik  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Andy Burton  
Chuck Cadman  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
David Chatters  
Joe Clark  
Joe Comartin  
John Cummins  
Madeleine Dalphond-GuiralLibby Davies  
Stockwell Day  
Bev Desjarlais  
Norman Doyle  
John Duncan  
Reed Elley  
Ken Epp  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Paul Forseth  
Cheryl Gallant  
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Peter Goldring  
Jim Gouk  
Gurmant Grewal  
Deborah Grey  
Art Hanger  
Stephen Harper  
Richard Harris  
Loyola Hearn  
John Herron  
Grant HillJay Hill  
Howard Hilstrom  
Rahim Jaffer  
Dale Johnston  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Yvan Loubier  
Gary Lunn  
James Lunney  
Peter MacKay  
John Maloney  
Inky Mark  
Keith Martin  
Pat Martin  
Philip Mayfield  
Grant McNally  
Val Meredith  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian PallisterCharlie Penson  
Pauline Picard  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
John Reynolds  
Gerry Ritz  
Werner Schmidt  
Monte Solberg  
Kevin Sorenson  
Larry Spencer  
Darrel Stinson  
Chuck Strahl  
Myron Thompson  
Vic Toews  
Maurice Vellacott  
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis  
Elsie Wayne  
Randy White  
Ted White  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich

## HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Judi Longfield	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Eugène Bellemare Monte Solberg	
Peter Adams	Peter Goldring	Ovid Jackson	Larry Spencer	(18)
Libby Davies	Jim Gouk	Gurbax Malhi	Diane St-Jacques	
Norman Doyle	Monique Guay	Larry McCormick	Suzanne Tremblay	
John Finlay	Tony Ianno	Raymond Simard		

### Associate Members

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

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

<b>Chair:</b>	Carolyn Bennett	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Mauril Bélanger	Norman Doyle	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Anita Neville	(9)
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Reed Elley	Wendy Lill	Tony Tirabassi	

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

<b>Chair:</b>	John Godfrey	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Sébastien Gagnon	Wendy Lill	Larry Spencer	Tony Tirabassi	(9)
Loyola Hearn	Anita Neville	Diane St-Jacques	Alan Tonks	

## INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Chair:**

Walt Lastewka

**Vice-Chairs:**
Dan McTeague  
James RajotteAndré Bachand  
Larry Bagnell  
Paul Crête  
Brian FitzpatrickCheryl Gallant  
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Serge MarcilBrian Masse  
Gilbert Normand  
Andy SavoyBrent St. Denis  
Paddy Torsney  
Joseph Volpe

(16)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Peter Adams  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Roy Bailey  
Rex Barnes  
Eugène Bellemare  
Leon Benoit  
Stéphane Bergeron  
Bernard Bigras  
Gérard Binet  
Rick Borotsik  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Andy Burton  
Chuck Cadman  
Serge Cardin  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
David Chatters  
Joe Clark  
John Cummins  
Stockwell DayBev Desjarlais  
Odina Desrochers  
Norman Doyle  
Antoine Dubé  
John Duncan  
Reed Elley  
Ken Epp  
Paul Forseth  
Christiane Gagnon  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Jim Gouk  
Gurmant Grewal  
Deborah Grey  
Art Hanger  
Stephen Harper  
Richard Harris  
Loyola Hearn  
John Herron  
Grant Hill  
Jay Hill  
Howard Hilstrom  
Betty HintonRahim Jaffer  
Dale Johnston  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Mario Laframboise  
Yvan Loubier  
Gary Lunn  
James Lunney  
Peter MacKay  
Inky Mark  
Keith Martin  
Pat Martin  
Philip Mayfield  
Joe McGuire  
Grant McNally  
Réal Ménard  
Val Meredith  
Rob Merrifield  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Lorne Nystrom  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian PallisterPierre Paquette  
Charlie Penson  
Dick Proctor  
Scott Reid  
John Reynolds  
Gerry Ritz  
Werner Schmidt  
Carol Skelton  
Monte Solberg  
Kevin Sorenson  
Larry Spencer  
Darrel Stinson  
Peter Stoffer  
Chuck Strahl  
Greg Thompson  
Myron Thompson  
Vic Toews  
Maurice Vellacott  
Elsie Wayne  
Randy White  
Ted White  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich

## JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

<b>Chair:</b>	Andy Scott	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Chuck Cadman John McKay	
Garry Breitkreuz	Robert Lanctôt	John Maloney	Joe Peschisolido	(18)
Irwin Cotler	Derek Lee	Richard Marceau	Kevin Sorenson	
Hedy Fry	Peter MacKay	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews	
Marlene Jennings	Paul Harold Macklin	Pat O'Brien		

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Bev Desjarlais	Dale Johnston	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Norman Doyle	Gerald Keddy	John Reynolds
David Anderson	John Duncan	Jason Kenney	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Reed Elley	Yvan Loubier	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	James Lunney	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Larry Spencer
Bill Blaikie	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Gurmant Grewal	Alexa McDonough	Chuck Strahl
Diane Bourgeois	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Maurice Vellacott
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	John Herron	Lynn Myers	Randy White
Joe Clark	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Ted White
Joe Comartin	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	John Williams
John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	Lynne Yelich
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Betty Hinton	Dick Proctor	

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOLICITATION LAWS

**Chair:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Vice-Chair:** \_\_\_\_\_

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

<b>Chair:</b>	Derek Lee	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Marlene Jennings Kevin Sorenson	
Robert Lanctôt	John McKay	Lorne Nystrom	Geoff Regan	(11)
Peter MacKay	Lynn Myers	David Pratt	Vic Toews	

**LIAISON**

<b>Chair:</b>	Walt Lastewka	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Judi Longfield	
Peter Adams	Raymond Bonin	Gurmant Grewal	Andy Scott	(20)
Reg Alcock	Bonnie Brown	Clifford Lincoln	Paul Steckle	
Sue Barnes	Charles Caccia	Bernard Patry	Tom Wappel	
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Comuzzi	David Pratt	John Williams	
Carolyn Bennett	Joe Fontana			

**Associate Members**

Jim Abbott	Yvon Godin	Bill Matthews	James Rajotte
Eugène Bellemare	Mac Harb	John McKay	Benoît Sauvageau
Paul Bonwick	Richard Harris	Dan McTeague	Monte Solberg
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Réal Ménard	Peter Stoffer
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Howard Hilstrom	James Moore	Yolande Thibeault
Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston	Carolyn Parrish	Rose-Marie Ur
Nick Discepola	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Beth Phinney	Tony Valeri
Stan Dromisky	Derek Lee	Jerry Pickard	Maurice Vellacott
Paul Forseth	Diane Marleau	David Price	Elsie Wayne

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS**

<b>Chair:</b>		<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Peter Adams	Gurmant Grewal	Judi Longfield	John Williams	(6)
Mauril Bélanger	Walt Lastewka			

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS**

<b>Chair:</b>	Walt Lastewka	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Reg Alcock	Bonnie Brown	Judi Longfield	Tom Wappel	(9)
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Andy Scott	John Williams	

## NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Chair:** David Pratt

**Vice-Chairs:** David Price  
Elsie Wayne

Rob Anders	Bill Blaikie	Dominic LeBlanc	Lawrence O'Brien	(16)
Claude Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Joe McGuire	Janko Peric	
Leon Benoit	Ivan Grose	Anita Neville	Louis Plamondon	
Robert Bertrand				

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Brian Fitzpatrick	Yvan Loubier	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Peter Goldring	James Lunney	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Jim Gouk	Peter MacKay	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Gurmant Grewal	John Maloney	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Deborah Grey	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Stéphane Bergeron	Monique Guay	Keith Martin	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Art Hanger	Pat Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Stephen Harper	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Alexa McDonough	Darrel Stinson
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	Grant McNally	Peter Stoffer
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Dan McTeague	Chuck Strahl
Bill Casey	Grant Hill	Val Meredith	Greg Thompson
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Marlene Catterall	Howard Hilstrom	Bob Mills	Vic Toews
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	James Moore	Rose-Marie Ur
Joe Clark	Rahim Jaffer	John O'Reilly	Maurice Vellacott
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Stockwell Day	Gerald Keddy	Brian Pallister	Ted White
Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Stan Dromisky	Francine Lalonde	Carmen Provenzano	Bob Wood
John Duncan	Wendy Lill	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Reed Elley			

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Chair:** Bob Wood

**Vice-Chair:**

Roy Bailey	Ivan Grose	Louis Plamondon	Rose-Marie Ur	(9)
Bill Blaikie	Dan McTeague	Carmen Provenzano	Elsie Wayne	

**OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

<b>Chair:</b>	Mauril Bélanger	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Yvon Godin Yolande Thibeault	
Carole-Marie Allard Mark Assad Eugène Bellemare John Bryden	Jeannot Castonguay Christiane Gagnon John Herron	Rahim Jaffer Jason Kenney Dan McTeague	Scott Reid Benoît Sauvageau Raymond Simard	(16)

**Associate Members**

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson André Bachand Roy Bailey Rex Barnes Leon Benoit Stéphane Bergeron Rick Borotsik Garry Breitzkreuz Scott Brison Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters Joe Clark Joe Comartin John Cummins	Stockwell Day Norman Doyle John Duncan Reed Elley Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Paul Forseth Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Stephen Harper Richard Harris Loyola Hearn Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton	Dale Johnston Gerald Keddy Yvan Loubier Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Keith Martin Philip Mayfield Grant McNally Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Lorne Nystrom Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Charlie Penson Louis Plamondon James Rajotte John Reynolds	Gerry Ritz Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Guy St-Julien Darrel Stinson Chuck Strahl Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Vic Toews Suzanne Tremblay Maurice Vellacott Elsie Wayne Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich
--	---	--	---

---

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

<b>Chair:</b>	Peter Adams	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Dale Johnston Carolyn Parrish	
Rick Borotsik Marlene Catterall Rodger Cuzner Yvon Godin	Michel Guimond Joe Jordan Lynn Myers	Geoff Regan John Reynolds Jacques Saada	Benoît Sauvageau Werner Schmidt Guy St-Julien	(16)

### Associate Members

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

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Chair:</b>	Carolyn Parrish	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Rick Borotsik Yvon Godin	Lynn Myers David Price	Benoît Sauvageau	Chuck Strahl	(7)

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Paddy Torsney	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Rick Borotsik Yvon Godin	Michel Guimond	Marcel Proulx	Scott Reid	(6)

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS****Chair:**

John Williams

**Vice-Chairs:**Mac Harb  
Beth PhinneyColleen Beaumier  
Odina Desrochers  
John Finlay  
Paul ForsethRoger Gaudet  
Gerald Keddy  
Sophia Leung  
Steve MahoneyPhilip Mayfield  
Val Meredith  
Shawn MurphyMassimo Pacetti  
Tony Tirabassi  
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(17)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
André Bachand  
Roy Bailey  
Rex Barnes  
Leon Benoit  
Rick Borotsik  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Andy Burton  
Chuck Cadman  
Serge Cardin  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
David Chatters  
Joe Clark  
John Cummins  
Stockwell Day  
Bev DesjarlaisNorman Doyle  
John Duncan  
Reed Elley  
Ken Epp  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Jim Gouk  
Gurmant Grewal  
Deborah Grey  
Art Hanger  
Stephen Harper  
Richard Harris  
Loyola Hearn  
John Herron  
Grant Hill  
Jay Hill  
Howard Hilstrom  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim JafferDale Johnston  
Jason Kenney  
Robert Lanctôt  
Gary Lunn  
James Lunney  
Peter MacKay  
Inky Mark  
Keith Martin  
Pat Martin  
Grant McNally  
Rob Merrifield  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Charlie Penson  
Gilles-A. Perron  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
John ReynoldsGerry Ritz  
Jacques Saada  
Benoît Sauvageau  
Werner Schmidt  
Carol Skelton  
Monte Solberg  
Kevin Sorenson  
Larry Spencer  
Darrel Stinson  
Peter Stoffer  
Chuck Strahl  
Greg Thompson  
Myron Thompson  
Vic Toews  
Maurice Vellacott  
Joseph Volpe  
Elsie Wayne  
Randy White  
Ted White  
Lynne Yelich

## TRANSPORT

<b>Chair:</b>	Joe Comuzzi	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	John Cannis James Moore	
Larry Bagnell	Roger Gallaway	Stan Keyes	Pat O'Brien	(16)
Rex Barnes	Jim Gouk	Mario Laframboise	Marcel Proulx	
Bev Desjarlais	Ovid Jackson	Robert Lanctôt	Lynne Yelich	
Liza Frulla				

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Howard Hilstrom	Dick Proctor
Diane Ablonczy	Antoine Dubé	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
Gérard Asselin	Ken Epp	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Jason Kenney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Yvan Loubier	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Ghislain Fournier	Gary Lunn	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Christiane Gagnon	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Paul Bonwick	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Roger Gaudet	Inky Mark	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitreuz	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Keith Martin	Peter Stoffer
Scott Brison	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Deborah Grey	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Art Hanger	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Stephen Harper	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Loyola Hearn	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Paul Crête	John Herron	Brian Pallister	Ted White
John Cummins	Grant Hill	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Jay Hill		

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION

<b>Chair:</b>	Roger Gallaway	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Rex Barnes	John Cannis	Bev Desjarlais	Roger Gaudet	(9)
Andy Burton	Joe Comuzzi	Liza Frulla	Stan Keyes	

---

## SPECIAL COMMITTEES

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

<b>Chair:</b>	Paddy Torsney	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Carole-Marie Allard Randy White	
Bernard Bigras	Mac Harb	Réal Ménard	Kevin Sorenson	(13)
Libby Davies	Dominic LeBlanc	Jacques Saada	Greg Thompson	
Hedy Fry	Derek Lee			

---

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROCEDURES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS**

<b>Chair:</b>	Bob Kilger	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Don Boudria John Reynolds	
Libby Davies Norman Doyle	Michel Gauthier Monique Guay	Loyola Hearn Stan Keyes	Dick Proctor Werner Schmidt	(11)

---

**STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES**

**LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT**

<b>Joint Chairs:</b>	Carolyn Bennett Yves Morin	<b>Joint Vice-Chair:</b>	Deborah Grey
----------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc Michael J. Forrestall	Jean Lapointe Vivienne Poy	Mauril Bélanger Robert Bertrand Rick Borotsik Marlene Catterall Marcel Gagnon Grant Hill Jim Karygiannis	Wendy Lill Jerry Pickard Louis Plamondon Jacques Saada Guy St-Julien Darrel Stinson Andrew Telegdi	(21)
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	--	------

**Associate Members**

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

---

## SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

**Joint Chairs:** Gurmant Grewal  
Céline Hervieux-Payette

**Joint Vice-Chair:** Derek Lee

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron  
James Kelleher  
Pana Merchant

Wilfred Moore  
Pierre Claude Nolin  
Gérard Phalen

Paul Bonwick  
Joe Comuzzi  
John Cummins  
Liza Frulla  
Michel Guimond  
Paul Harold Macklin  
John Maloney  
Pat Martin

John McKay  
Lynn Myers  
Caroline St-Hilaire  
Greg Thompson  
Maurice Vellacott  
Tom Wappel  
Ted White

(24)

### Associate Members

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

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

Dale Johnston  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Robert Lanctôt  
Gary Lunn  
James Lunney  
Peter MacKay  
Inky Mark  
Keith Martin  
Philip Mayfield  
Grant McNally  
Val Meredith  
Rob Merrifield  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Lorne Nystrom  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Charlie Penson

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

## LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

### LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILL C-17, PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

**Chair:** Bob Kilger

**Vice-Chair:**

Sarkis Assadourian  
Claude Bachand  
Rex Barnes  
Garry Breitkreuz

Bev Desjarlais  
Mac Harb  
Mario Laframboise  
Gary Lunn

John Maloney  
James Moore  
John O'Reilly  
Beth Phinney

Marcel Proulx  
Andy Savoy  
Paddy Torsney

(16)

**The Speaker**

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

**Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees**

**The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. BOB KILGER

**The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

**The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

## THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
Hon. David Collenette	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. John Manley	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance
Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Health
Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Industry
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
Hon. Don Boudria	Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
Hon. Robert Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Denis Coderre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Robert Thibault	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
Hon. Susan Whelan	Minister for International Cooperation
Hon. Bill Graham	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Gerry Byrne	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. John McCallum	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Wayne Easter	Solicitor General of Canada
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
Hon. Paul DeVillers	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Gar Knutson	Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)
Hon. Denis Paradis	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)
Hon. Claude Drouin	Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Stephen Owen	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)
Hon. Jean Augustine	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
Hon. Steve Mahoney	Secretary of State (Selected Crown Corporations)

## PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Rodger Cuzner	to the Prime Minister
Mr. Marcel Proulx	to the Minister of Transport
Mr. Alan Tonks	to the Minister of the Environment
Ms. Judy Sgro	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Ms. Carole-Marie Allard	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Bryon Wilfert	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of Industry
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Tony Tirabassi	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Paul Harold Macklin	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Ms. Diane St-Jacques	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Joe Peschisolido	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Murray Calder	to the Minister for International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Claude Duplain	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. Charles Hubbard	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Ms. Colleen Beaumier	to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Sarkis Assadourian	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Ivan Grose	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. André Harvey	to the Minister of International Cooperation
Mr. Dominic LeBlanc	to the Minister of National Defence

# CONTENTS

Friday, May 9, 2003

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Public Safety Act, 2002</b>	
Bill C-17. Report stage.....	6019
<b>Speaker's Ruling</b>	
The Speaker.....	6019
<b>Motions in amendment</b>	
Motion No. 6.....	6019
Mr. Breitzkreuz.....	6019
Mr. Mahoney.....	6020
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral.....	6022
Ms. Davies.....	6023
Mr. Hearn.....	6024

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Reserve Force</b>	
Mr. Bertrand.....	6025
<b>Zimbabwe</b>	
Mr. Reid.....	6026
<b>Marijuana</b>	
Mr. Szabo.....	6026
<b>Canadian Executive Service Organization</b>	
Mr. Malhi.....	6026
<b>Hepatitis Awareness Month</b>	
Mr. Castonguay.....	6026
<b>Asian Heritage Month</b>	
Mr. Jaffer.....	6027
<b>International Scientific Awards</b>	
Mr. Macklin.....	6027
<b>Father Fernand Lindsay</b>	
Mr. Paquette.....	6027
<b>Cultural Exchange</b>	
Ms. Karetak-Lindell.....	6027
<b>Okanagan Life Poetry Contest</b>	
Mr. Stinson.....	6027
<b>Westray Mine Disaster</b>	
Mr. Cuzner.....	6028
<b>Parliament</b>	
Ms. Davies.....	6028
<b>Canada Labour Code</b>	
Mr. Perron.....	6028
<b>Reserve Forces</b>	
Mr. LeBlanc.....	6028
<b>Volunteer Firefighters</b>	
Mr. Herron.....	6028
<b>MedicAlert Month</b>	
Ms. Sgro.....	6029

## Waste Report

Mr. Williams.....	6029
-------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Fisheries

Mr. Reynolds.....	6029
Mr. Dion.....	6029
Mr. Reynolds.....	6029
Mr. Dion.....	6029
Mr. Reynolds.....	6029
Mr. Dion.....	6030
Miss Grey.....	6030
Mr. Dion.....	6030
Miss Grey.....	6030
Mr. Dion.....	6030
Ms. St-Hilaire.....	6030
Mr. Drouin (Beauce).....	6030
Ms. St-Hilaire.....	6030
Mr. Drouin (Beauce).....	6030
Mr. Fournier.....	6030
Ms. St-Jacques.....	6030
Mr. Fournier.....	6031
Mr. Drouin (Beauce).....	6031

### Aboriginal Affairs

Ms. Davies.....	6031
Mr. Boudria.....	6031

### Foreign Affairs

Ms. Davies.....	6031
Mr. McCallum (Markham).....	6031

### The Economy

Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest).....	6031
Mr. Rock.....	6031
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest).....	6031
Mr. Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora).....	6031

### Foreign Affairs

Mr. Benoit.....	6032
Mr. McCallum (Markham).....	6032

### National Defence

Mrs. Gallant.....	6032
Mr. McCallum (Markham).....	6032

### Employment Insurance

Ms. Guay.....	6032
Ms. St-Jacques.....	6032
Ms. Guay.....	6032
Ms. St-Jacques.....	6032

### National Defence

Mr. Ritz.....	6032
Mr. McCallum (Markham).....	6032

### Copyright Act

Mr. Reid.....	6032
---------------	------

Mr. Rock .....	6033
<b>Softwood Lumber</b>	
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	6033
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	6033
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	6033
Mr. Drouin (Beauce) .....	6033
<b>Firearms Registry</b>	
Mr. Breitzkreuz .....	6033
Mr. Easter .....	6033
<b>Government Appointments</b>	
Mr. Williams .....	6033
Mr. Rock .....	6033
<b>Information Management</b>	
Ms. Torsney .....	6034
Mr. Tirabassi .....	6034
<b>Trade</b>	
Ms. McDonough .....	6034
Mr. Calder .....	6034
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Ms. McDonough .....	6034
Mr. McCallum (Markham) .....	6034
Mr. Hearn .....	6034
Mr. McCallum (Markham) .....	6034
<b>Fisheries</b>	
Mr. Hearn .....	6034
Mr. Dion .....	6034
<b>Technology Partnerships Canada</b>	
Mr. Rajotte .....	6035
Mr. Rock .....	6035
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Penson .....	6035
Mr. Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora) .....	6035
<b>The Liberal Government</b>	
Mr. Guimond .....	6035
Mr. Boudria .....	6035
Mr. Guimond .....	6035
Mr. Boudria .....	6035
<b>The Economy</b>	
Mrs. Yelich .....	6035
Mr. Rock .....	6036
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Mr. Pallister .....	6036
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra) .....	6036
<b>Canadian Heritage</b>	
Mr. Bertrand .....	6036
Ms. Allard .....	6036
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Fitzpatrick .....	6036
Mr. Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora) .....	6036
<b>National Defence</b>	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	6036
Mr. McCallum (Markham) .....	6036

<b>Aboriginal affairs</b>	
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral .....	6037
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra) .....	6037
<b>Student Employment</b>	
Mr. Assad .....	6037
Ms. St-Jacques .....	6037
<b>Post-Secondary Education</b>	
Mr. Herron .....	6037
Ms. St-Jacques .....	6037
<b>Government of Canada</b>	
Miss Grey .....	6037
Mr. Easter .....	6037
<b>Cartagena Protocol</b>	
Mr. Bigras .....	6037
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	6038
<b>Post-Secondary Education</b>	
Mr. Proctor .....	6038
Mr. Rock .....	6038
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Oral Question Period</b>	
Mr. Benoit .....	6038
Mr. Breitzkreuz .....	6038
<b>Privilege</b>	
<b>Comments by Member for Saint John</b>	
Ms. Davies .....	6038

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Cuzner .....	6039
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Marriage</b>	
Mrs. Gallant .....	6039
<b>Child Pornography</b>	
Mrs. Gallant .....	6039
Ms. Torsney .....	6039
<b>Stem Cell Research</b>	
Ms. Torsney .....	6039
<b>Freedom of Religion</b>	
Ms. Torsney .....	6039
<b>Child Pornography</b>	
Mr. Breitzkreuz .....	6040
<b>Stem Cell Research</b>	
Mr. Breitzkreuz .....	6040
<b>Persons with Disabilities</b>	
Mr. Fournier .....	6040
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Cuzner .....	6040

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Public Safety Act, 2002</b>	
Bill C-17. Report stage .....	6042
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	6042
Mrs. Jennings .....	6043

Mr. Bigras .....	6044
Mr. Paquette .....	6045
Mr. Laframboise .....	6046
Ms. Guay .....	6048
Mr. Proctor .....	6049

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Competition Act**

Bill C-249. Report stage .....	6050
--------------------------------	------

Mr. McTeague .....	6050
Bill C-249. Motion for concurrence .....	6050
(Motion agreed to) .....	6050
Third reading .....	6050
Mr. Rajotte .....	6051
Mr. Paquette .....	6052
Mr. Proctor .....	6054
Mr. McTeague .....	6054
Division deferred .....	6055

**APPENDIX**

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Publishing and Depository Services

PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5

Internet: <http://publications.gc.ca>

1-800-635-7943 or Local 613-941-5995

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*

Les Éditions et Services de dépôt

TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Internet: <http://publications.gc.ca>

1-800-635-7943 ou appel local (613) 941-5995

**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 Publishing and Depository Services, PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5**

**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 : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt, TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5**

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5**