



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 052 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, February 18, 2000

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, February 18, 2000

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*English*]

CITIZENSHIP OF CANADA ACT

Hon. Martin Cauchon (for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) moved that Bill C-16, an act respecting Canadian citizenship, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity on behalf of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to open debate on Bill C-16, the citizenship of Canada act.

To me and to so many Canadians from whom I have heard, citizenship is about truly belonging to this society. It is anchored in allegiance to the values which Canadians share. It is a concept with real meaning and it is a proud celebration of what it means to be Canadian.

That makes citizenship far more than just a piece of paper, more than just some box to be checked off on a form, more than a convenience for international travel. It makes the law on citizenship one of our most fundamental laws. Our citizenship law sets the ground rules for those who can truly call themselves Canadian. It captures the common understanding among Canadians about what it means to be one of us.

In 1947 a Liberal government introduced the status of Canadian citizenship in law for the first time. It was a legislative initiative driven by the vision and energy of Mr. Paul Martin Sr. We were the first country in the Commonwealth to take that step. That 1947 act took us through a 30 year period of immense change in Canadian society.

In 1977, with Robert Andras as Minister of Manpower and Immigration, the Liberal government implemented a new Citizenship Act. That law reflected a growing sense of nationhood. It reflected the growing equality of women under the law. It drew on Canada's experience with our first Canadian Citizenship Act. That act has served us well over the past two decades of even faster evolution in our society.

However, the time has come for change, for modernization. The time has come for an act that fully recognizes the impact of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The time has come for an act that addresses the many legal questions and administrative issues that have emerged with experience over time. The time has come for an act that reinforces the value of Canadian citizenship. Bill C-16 does that.

First, let me point out that our core citizenship principles have stood the test of time. What Canadians thought citizenship should mean in 1947 is substantially what Canadians still think today. Children born in Canada will still be Canadian citizens automatically. Children born in other countries to a parent who was born in Canada still have a right to Canadian citizenship. Those who come to Canada later in life must be permanent residents before they can apply for citizenship. They still must prove their attachment to Canada. They must prove their knowledge of our society and our values. They must prove their knowledge of at least one of our two official languages.

[*Translation*]

I would remind members that the former Minister of Citizenship and Immigration introduced Bill C-63 during the last parliamentary session.

• (1010)

It was intended as both an attempt to modernize the Citizenship Act and to enhance the value of Canadian citizenship. It died on the order paper when the House was prorogued, but not before being the object of much discussion in this House and in committee.

[*English*]

This bill is substantially similar in its intent and its major provisions to Bill C-63. It reflects the broad consensus that was clear in debate last time.

Government Orders

However, this legislation is not identical to the bill which was before us in the last session. We have not simply slapped a new number on an old bill.

Let me cover some of the major changes. For example, while we still intend to strengthen the residency requirement, we have identified room for change in how the residency requirement can be met. Under this bill a permanent resident will have to be physically in Canada for at least three of the six years before applying for citizenship; not just an address, not visiting other countries for whatever reason, but physically present here. However, we have lengthened the period of time that people can use to count that physical presence from five years under Bill C-63 to six years in this bill.

We have also decided to reinstate a time credit for physical presence for people who had some other legal status in Canada other than that of a permanent resident. For example, someone who was initially here as a convention refugee, on a minister's permit or as a visitor will be able to use half of their time under that status for up to one of the three years they need to meet the residency requirement.

We have already made it clear that we want to give children adopted abroad much simpler access to Canadian citizenship. The courts have told us that we must bring down the disparities between adopted and biological children born abroad, and we want to do so.

However, we also want to respond to concerns raised about previous proposals. For example, we will clearly limit citizenship through adoption to minors only. We will make new rules retroactive to 1977. We will include a requirement which will ensure that an adoption is in the best interests of the child.

Let me turn to some other changes.

We still propose a new citizenship oath, slightly modified from the previous proposal. New citizens will swear to respect our rights and freedoms. They will promise to uphold the values of our democracy. They will continue to swear allegiance to Canada and to Her Majesty the Queen.

We will alter the proposed powers of annulment and revocation. While we still want to be able to annul the citizenship of a person who uses a false identity or who is involved in criminal activities under our citizenship law, we have dropped the requirement in Bill C-63 that a person wishing to oppose the minister's intent to annul is restricted to doing so in writing.

We also intend to make it clear that we can only revoke the citizenship of a person who knowingly sought to deceive us. Moreover, we will not seek to revoke the citizenship of children at all.

For all those significant changes it is important to underline that the major new directions to citizenship law that our government set out in 1998 are still valid. They are still in this bill.

We still intend to limit the number of generations of people born outside Canada who can claim Canadian citizenship and we still propose to clarify the conditions for those people to formally retain Canadian citizenship.

We continue to believe that moving citizenship decision making from a quasi-judicial process to one that is administrative makes sense in every way. We intend to support that change by the use of clear and consistent criteria and tests. We intend to rely mostly on citizenship officials to carry out that process.

We see continuous roles for today's citizenship judges, men and women who, by this bill, will be known as citizenship commissioners. They will have an increased role in promoting active citizenship in the community. They will advise the minister on citizenship issues and continue to preside over citizenship ceremonies. They will be ambassadors of citizenship in their communities.

• (1015)

The bill retains the proposals for streamlined review processes for people who want to challenge decisions. If the person thinks that there has been a simple error of fact, then he or she will be able to apply to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration for a review of those facts in that decision. If the person thinks there has been an error of interpretation under law, he or she will be able to apply to the Federal Court of Canada for a review. Under the new system a federal court judge can require that it be reconsidered. All those proposals are still in this bill because they are sound and appropriate.

Let me conclude my remarks with these comments. The history of citizenship in Canada is one of evolution and yet enduring principles too. The 1947 act was anchored in its time. It reflected the relative status of men and women in those days. It reflected a world in which we saw our closest links to other lands in which people were British subjects.

By 1977 the evolution of life in Canadian society meant it was time for modernization. The 1977 act removed many inequities in the old act. It brought in more consistent and equal criteria for citizenship. It recognized that women deserved treatment and rights to citizenship that were no different from those enjoyed by men.

In this new millennium we need an act that is even more modernized, more streamlined, clearer and more consistent.

[*Translation*]

This bill meets those requirements. The new Canada Citizenship Act being debated today is going to enhance the value of Canadian citizenship.

Government Orders

This bill is going to modernize our Citizenship Act, modernize our processes. It is going to integrate the changes our society has undergone, as well as our modern legislative framework and our governmental processes.

[*English*]

It will remain true to the fundamental elements of what we understand citizenship to mean. The principles at the heart of our citizenship law have endured over more than half a century since the Hon. Paul Martin Sr. brought in Canada's first Canada Citizenship Act in 1946.

Under the leadership of the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, Canada had just proven its status as a country equal to any other on the globe. Canadians had fought as Canadians to liberate Europe from the evil of Nazi aggression. Other Canadians had fought in Asia and the Pacific to defend our values and our interests. Here at home Canadians had contributed in many ways to the war effort.

The creation of a unique citizenship to call our own was a fitting way to capture what our country and our people had just accomplished. It was a fitting way for Canada to give its people a sense of belonging rooted in this land and its people.

Canadians by birth and Canadians by choice all did their part to earn our place on the world stage back then. They all became citizens of this great country in 1947 for the first time ever. Canadians by birth and Canadians by choice are doing the same today.

The citizenship of Canada act will be about the values we share as were its predecessors. It will be a statement about belonging to this country as were its predecessors. It will link us all, whether we are Canadian by birth or by choice.

[*Translation*]

Some 350,000 babies are born in this country every year, and some 160,000 people apply for Canadian citizenship. Our Citizenship Act enables more than half a million people to become part of the great Canadian family as equals, as Canadians.

[*English*]

A new citizenship law will be a fitting way to help celebrate the new millennium. We look forward to the support of the House on Bill C-16.

• (1020)

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am very happy to talk about Bill C-16 which will replace the current Citizenship Act, if and when it passes. There are some things about the bill which I support and others which I do not and I will get into

that during my presentation. However there are other issues which have to be mentioned today.

It is a clear error in judgment on the part of the government to bring in legislation to replace the current Citizenship Act before legislation which will overhaul the Immigration Act has been passed by the House. The government has been saying for the last four years in particular but really for the six years since I have been here in Ottawa that it is going to bring forward legislation which will provide a massive overhaul of the Immigration Act immediately, next year. The government always says it will be later this year or next year but this has been going on for six years. It has not happened and it is very hard to explain why.

The Citizenship Act changes should not come in until the changes to the Immigration Act are made. The Citizenship Act refers to the Immigration Act in several places.

I will talk about the unfortunate order of events and why this has happened. The government does not seem to be willing to make the necessary tough decisions to change the Immigration Act so it has gone ahead with changes to the Citizenship Act so it can say it has done something. I understand that but I do not think it is acceptable.

As my colleague opposite has said, citizenship is something we are all extremely proud of. Canadian citizenship is seen by many people around the world as something they would like. Many people cherish the thought of becoming a Canadian citizen. It is not only Canadians who see Canadian citizenship as something of great value, as I know all Canadians do; others would like to become Canadian citizens.

As we put in place a new citizenship act, which this bill will do, it is important that it is done right. The government presented Bill C-63 in the last parliament, which was its idea of doing it right. The government dropped that legislation because it was so flawed and the government could not see putting it through. That became very clear in committee.

Bill C-16 is the government's response to the problems seen in committee. This is good, except the government has not dealt with a lot of the problems which were pointed out again and again in committee. I will talk about some of those things. I cannot pretend I am going to touch on all of them but I will focus on three or four of the main areas.

We went through the whole committee process on Bill C-63 in the last parliament. Witnesses suggested many changes. Many excellent suggestions were made. The government listened to a few but not nearly enough of them. That is not acceptable for an act which governs something as important as citizenship, something which we are all so proud of.

I would love to see a citizenship bill which I could support. This is not it, unless changes are made at committee which would make

Government Orders

it something Canadians and I could support. It is not that important what I support as one citizen, but it is important that the Canadian public generally support the legislation. I do not believe this legislation is something that Canadians can support.

This bill is the second attempt and there have been some changes, a few changes which are beneficial but not that many.

With reference to the previous legislation, I want to make it extremely clear that it was not only witnesses but members of the immigration committee which reviewed that legislation who pointed out very strong concerns with Bill C-63, the predecessor to Bill C-16. They expressed their desire for change.

• (1025)

A few changes were implemented, but very few. In fact, there were only three changes from Bill C-63 to Bill C-16, yet the government dropped Bill C-63 because it was flawed. I do not understand why it did not fix the bill before it brought it back as Bill C-16. The bill has been re-tabled, and I say re-tabled because there have been only three or four changes made.

There are some good changes. For example my colleague from Dewdney—Alouette can express some claim to victory for the change that was proposed at committee by the Mennonite community. It requested that the new law contain measures to facilitate the acquisition of Canadian citizenship for the people in its community who still wished to return to the country or who had already done so.

In essence clause 57 allows a three year period for individuals born to Canadian parents outside of Canada between 1947 and 1977 to acquire Canadian citizenship upon application. Members of the Mennonite community explained that very well at committee. It was supported by the member for Dewdney—Alouette. That is a good change. That is a committee working as it should.

One other change is that the part of Bill C-63 which allowed bureaucrats or the minister without approval of parliament to redefine spouse has been withdrawn from the bill. A couple of weeks ago when I saw this bill I thought that was a positive move. That was something my colleagues and I called for quite strongly during the debate on Bill C-63. It was something some Liberal members on the committee called for. It was withdrawn and I thought we had made some progress.

Then last week Bill C-23 was tabled in the House but not in a way that is acceptable. I then understood why that clause was taken out of the citizenship bill. It was no longer required as a result of the omnibus bill which would give same sex benefits in several pieces of legislation. The modernization of benefits and obligations act tabled by the justice minister amends 68 federal statutes, affects 20 departments and agencies and extends benefits to same sex couples on the same basis as common law opposite sex couples.

The government has chosen to extend benefits based on a person's private sexual activity while excluding other types of dependent relationships. I fail to see why it would do that. Why would it extend these benefits on the basis of sexual activity rather than on a relationship of dependency? That is exactly what has happened.

The change was made to the citizenship bill which took the power away from civil servants or the minister to make a change. That was the right thing to do. The government has brought the changes it is proposing to deal with that before parliament, which is the right thing to do. However it has been done in a way that is unacceptable to Canadians. It has been done on the basis of sexual activity.

Former Liberal Prime Minister Trudeau said that the government had no place in the bedrooms of the nation yet that is what Bill C-23 does. The official opposition believes that any discussion of extending benefits should be accompanied by an affirmation of the definition of marriage.

• (1030)

There was no definition of marriage in Bill C-63. Was that too much to ask for? An opposition day motion was passed in the House with support from all political parties which ensured that the current definition of marriage would be retained, yet the government has not seen fit to have that included in this new act.

I point that out that the unacceptable part of the citizenship bill, the former Bill C-63, was taken out, but it has not been properly dealt with in this new citizenship bill. It is way off target. That debate is taking place in the House as we debate Bill C-23. I will not go into it in any great depth. The problem has not been solved. It has been shuffled off to another piece of legislation and the response by the government has been inappropriate.

My colleagues and I have talked and will talk about that in great depth as we debate that piece of legislation. That is a positive thing that is not included in this bill. The reason for it not being included does not leave me with a very positive feeling.

I will get into more particulars about the bill, but I want to talk a little more about something I mentioned at the beginning of my speech. It is unfortunate that the citizenship legislation came before the House before those major changes were made to the Immigration Act. It is clearly in the wrong order. The changes to the Immigration Act may well require more changes to the Citizenship Act in the very near future. It is in the wrong order because the Citizenship Act does refer to the broader, more encompassing Immigration Act in several areas.

Beyond that, there are so many reasons that the Immigration Act changes should be before the House today rather than the Citizenship Act. There are serious issues facing Canadians today regarding

immigration. These issues have been pointed out by Canadians across the country, and certainly by us here, but there has been no response to them.

It has been recognized by various parties, including CSIS, the RCMP and American officials who recognize and talk about the problem, that Canada is a haven for terrorists and criminals and is a favourite destination for people smugglers. Is that something that makes us proud to be Canadian? I do not think so. It is something that points out the need for changes to the Immigration Act, changes which should have come before this bill.

Polls show that immigration has become one of the top concerns for Canadians today. They want it fixed. Why is it not being fixed?

Farrell Research reports 71% of greater Vancouver residents believe the refugee system is too lax and 76% believe that Canada has been made an easy target for people smuggling. That is no big surprise. Canadians across the country feel like that.

Additionally, in 1998 an Environics survey revealed that 69% of Canadians agree that many people seeking asylum in Canada are not real refugees. That has been borne out by some of the things we have seen over the past year where even the refugee determination system has determined that many people making claims are not genuine refugees. Unfortunately, many are finding their way into our country anyway. Even if they are not accepted they are allowed to stay.

Our formal acceptance rate for refugees is 44% which is more than double and triple other countries that are comparable to Canada, like the United States, Australia and New Zealand. Forty-four per cent is high, but our acceptance rate is more like 80%. I have explained that in committee and there is no argument, even from officials. Only 20% of those who claim refugee status are actually ever known to leave the country. That means that the other 80% are allowed to stay. Many just abandon their cases, withdraw their cases or are refused status and just stay in the country. The end result is the same: They are allowed to stay in our country, illegally in many cases.

• (1035)

We have an effective acceptance rate of 80%. The 44% who are chosen through the system are, hopefully, genuine refugees. However, the other 36% who make up the 80% are not. Clearly they are not because they have never been accepted. Many have been rejected by our system and yet they are allowed to stay. So in effect we have that 80%.

The refugee determination system is badly broken. Why was this not dealt with before the Citizenship Act was presented to parliament so the Citizenship Act would be based on and fit in with or mesh with an Immigration Act which has been overhauled? Canadians recognize the need for that. The government recognizes that.

Government Orders

For four years now the government has been saying "Maybe this year or next year we will bring in major changes to the Immigration Act. It has really been saying this for six years but it has been an open promise for the last four years. Not one change has been made. It is completely unacceptable that this would be put forward now before those changes are made.

There is another side of the Immigration Act that demonstrates very well that our system is not working. People who come under the independent categories have to wade through a bureaucracy that is unimaginable. They have to go through a process that can take up to two and a half to three years, and many times much longer. Often the process takes so long that people who are needed in this country by businesses and by the country, people who will add to our economy immediately, give up. They go to the United States, to Australia or somewhere else because the process there works a lot better. That is unfortunate because we are losing good people. Why was that not fixed before we got to the citizenship bill? It is very unfortunate that it was not.

I have heard dozens and dozens, probably hundreds, which is not an exaggeration, of heart-rending stories of families begging to be reunited that just cannot be reunited. These are families of people who have qualified under the independent categories. They will add to our economy right away. Of course they want to bring their husbands or wives and their dependent children. Who would not want that? Canada would expect that would happen. Often, even after they are accepted, it takes years and years to reunify the family. That is shameful. It causes uncalled for pain. Once somebody is accepted as an immigrant, why on earth would the process to bring their families in not be almost immediate? Why would it not be a matter of a few months not years? Commonly and most often it takes years. Why is that not fixed?

Let us look at an example. Let us talk about Leticia Cables, a nanny who was taking sanctuary in a church in Edmonton. She is a Filipino nanny who worked hard and was honest but who is presently being deported by the government. She is being forced out of this country by this government right now.

On the one hand, we have an unquestionably hardworking and honest nanny who made a mistake but who will be given no consideration by this minister to allow her to stay. That is shameful. On the other hand, we have a Honduran who has been arrested 20 times for drug trafficking, as I have heard from the hon. member for North Vancouver, who is in our country illegally. He is allowed to stay and has been set free. Does that make any sense?

Where is the good management of this government? Where is the good judgment of this government? This is the government that will not allow this nanny to stay. She admits that she broke a rule but that she did not know she had done wrong. Why are we not giving her special consideration when 1,300 criminals in 1998 were granted ministerial permits to stay in this country? Of those 1,300 criminals, 350 were violent offenders, murderers and rapists. Those

Government Orders

350 criminals were allowed to stay under ministerial permit, but the minister will not give this nanny a permit to stay in this country. She is chasing her out. For what? The nanny broke a rule. I do not believe she knew she was breaking the rule. She said that she was given the advice by one of her employers who was a lawyer and someone she trusted, yet this minister is chasing her out.

• (1040)

Where are the precedents of the government when it comes to immigration? Why does it not fix that up? It could then fix up the Citizenship Act, because I agree that it needs fixing as well. I cannot go on any longer about the problems with the Immigration Act as we are dealing with the Citizenship Act.

Some hon. members: More, more.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit: Some hon. members call for more, Madam Speaker. I could go on all day pointing out how nonfunctional our immigration system is in the area of refugee determination and in the area of independent immigrants being allowed to come to our country and reuniting very quickly with their families. It is a broken system.

I will get back to the citizenship bill that we are debating today. We should be debating changes to the Immigration Act. I would be happy to do that. I am ready for it. Canadians think it is many years overdue, but here we are.

I will talk specifically about three different areas of the citizenship bill. The first is clause 6(1)(b) in relation to residency. This was an area where there were a lot of concerns expressed at committee. I know my colleague, the hon. member for Dewdney—Alouette and my other colleague from Calgary, who were both on the committee at times throughout the debate on this bill, know that there was a lot of concern expressed about residency.

The intent was good. Bill C-16 defines the term permanent resident more concisely than does the current act. The existing legislation may be loosely interpreted. Some individuals have been found to be residing in Canada because they have a bank account here or own property in the country without actually having ever lived in Canada. Redefining that is good.

Bill C-16 calls for 1,095 days, or three years, physical presence in Canada before someone is eligible to apply for citizenship. However, Bill C-16 does not provide any mechanism for determining when applicants arrive in Canada or when they leave, nor is there any intention to develop one. The proposed change is a good idea and I support that change, but there is no way expressed, or in fact even in testimony from the various civil servants who appeared before the committee, of plans to enforce the law.

It is of great concern to me when the government puts forth law that cannot be enforced. It admitted to that. I have several quotes

here. I will not read them all because I have a few pages of quotes from witnesses at committee, including the civil servants who deal in this area, where they admit that, no, they cannot really enforce it. One quote says that they will enforce it when they really want to. In other words, this allows them to target people they want to target, but it will not ensure that people really have had physical presence in the country three years out of six. A physical presence in the country for three years out of six is a good idea. I think that is an appropriate goal, but that is all it is in here, a goal, because there is no way of really enforcing it.

The minister of immigration at the time, on March 3, 1999, expressed the following:

Our primary goal is to ensure that people who obtain Canadian citizenship have a deep commitment to their adopted country. We believe that such a commitment is possible only if the person is physically present in the country.

I think that makes sense.

• (1045)

I understand that many newcomers need to travel extensively, either for business or personal reasons. Many maintain strong economic and social links with their countries of origin and Canada benefits from these links. That is why, in Bill C-16, we provide these permanent residents with the flexibility to travel outside the country by extending the period during which they need to meet the physical requirements. It has been extended to six years now, three years out of six. I believe that is a fair accommodation.

That is important because we are truly part of a global economy. That is a huge advantage for Canada because we have people from almost every country in the world who speak the languages of probably all countries on the face of the earth. It is great for doing business. They know the culture. They can speak the language. It gives us an incredible advantage over many nations that do not have that diversity. This is a good change. The intent is good, but why do we have a law that we cannot enforce?

This change is in response to a committee report from 1994. That is a six year time lag. In the committee report of 1994 the government dominated Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration recognized the problem being dealt in this clause in point 6 on page 12 of the report where it says that residency should be defined in the new act so as to require physical presence in the country on an application for citizenship.

However, my main concern is that the very next recommendation in the same report, recommendation No. 7, states that measures should be introduced to enable accurate monitoring of the periods of time that permanent residents are absent from Canada.

That government dominated report recognized not only the need for the change but the need to be able to enforce the law. Unfortunately it is not there. I have pages of quotes. I know I cannot go through them all today, but I have some quotes to which I

Government Orders

will refer. The member opposite has expressed an interest in hearing more, so I will certainly give a little more.

Greg Fyffe, assistant deputy minister of policy and program development, when questioned by me and others at committee on how he was going to monitor the physical presence, said that it was obviously a serious concern.

Norman Sabourin, director of citizenship and citizenship registrar, during the same meeting agreed with Mr. Fyffe when he said that there was no question that without any regimented border controls in place in Canada there would always be a challenge in assessing whether or not a person was in Canada. Mr. Sabourin claimed that the department had developed a lot of expertise in assessing documentary evidence that supported and outlined whether or not a person was in Canada. These include passports.

In terms of passports, how many people who cross the border, for example from Canada to the United States, ever have a passport? Of course a non-Canadian will have one, but how many have them stamped? I have travelled to about half a dozen countries in the last four years and only once had my passport stamped, and that is when I asked to have it stamped. The passport is not a very reliable document to use when trying to determine physical presence in the country.

Mr. Sabourin went on to explain some other methods the department would require individuals to employ in order to verify whether they are physically present in Canada. They include whether or not a person has been attending school or has been in a job, or whether or not someone can vouch for that fact. There is some merit to that.

Mr. Sabourin, the departmental official, explained how they would monitor physical presence by saying that finally, and maybe the most important part of equation, they have in place a quality assurance program which allows them to verify the quality and integrity of information provided by applicants. As part of this program they randomly target applicants to verify the information they provided and to explore in detail whether or not the information is accurate. They are also able to develop profiles based on indicators of certain types of applicants who might be less enthusiastic than others in providing a complete picture of their presence in Canada. It concerns me that this clause will allow the department to target certain types of applicants.

• (1050)

It appears that the department will be picking the types, stereotyping, and relying on luck in many cases to implement the change which it feels is so important and which I believe is so important. I contend that based on the promise of random quality assurances that nothing is in place to allow this physical presence to be properly monitored. I have to skip over the rest of my commentary on that clause. There are other valid points that should be made but I understand that time is limited.

Another concern is the area of retroactivity. People who have applied under the current Citizenship Act will be made to meet the law set out in the new citizenship act when it is passed. That type of retroactivity is not acceptable. Subclause 55(2) stipulates that when the application has made its way to the point where a citizenship judge is considering it, the application will be considered under the old act. The department has stated that processing time may vary between eight and twelve months.

However, we have been informed that the real processing time is more like 17 months under the current act. There should not be two different paths that applications follow depending strictly on the speed with which the department currently processes. People will be penalized if the department has stalled their application, or if it is moving slowly through the process for whatever reason. People should not be penalized and made to qualify under the new act just because they have not reached the final stage where a judge is about to declare them citizens.

That is very unusual under law and I do not think it is appropriate under this law. One Liberal member of the committee, the member for Scarborough Southwest, stated on April 28, 1999, in relation to this clause that he took the position of the traditional historic pattern of the Liberal Party of not having retroactive legislation. If this citizenship law passes as it is, as he understood it, notwithstanding that someone has been making his plans in anticipation of the law as it currently exists he will lose his one year credit and will have to wait for no apparent reason other than the change in law to apply for Canadian citizenship.

To him that is retroactivity; it is taking away from people who have relied on an existing law and it is un-Liberal, whatever that means. That came from a member of the Liberal Party at the committee who showed great concern about this clause. Generally the committee did not like it and here we have it again in Bill C-16.

Other penalties which are of concern relate to bureaucratic delays as well. This is the last point I will talk about today because I see that my time is drawing to a close. People being punished for bureaucratic delays concerns me. It is something that is unacceptable. It is something which is in this bill. It is allowed to happen as a result of this bill in different areas.

Subsection 6(1)(b)(i) of the current act allows individuals who claim refugee status to count each full day of residency in Canada from the date of application as a half day toward the total needed for a citizenship application. If there is a delay for whatever reason in getting the application through then a half day credit will be allowed toward residency in Canada. That will be completely taken away under the current bill. If there are bureaucratic delays, under the bill no time will be granted. People will be punished for the time it takes the civil service to deal with the application.

Therefore refugees who want to become citizens will be punished because of the slow process of the bureaucracy. Does that

S. O. 31

make any sense? We and several other witnesses have called for leaving in place something like what is under the current act. If the process is slowed down by the bureaucracy, at least part of that time will be considered to be time when the applicant is physically present in Canada because the person is physically present in Canada. That makes sense. Many witnesses said that it made sense, but we do not find that change in the legislation. To me that is a great concern which must be fixed.

• (1055)

I have several other areas I will talk about in future readings of the bill. My colleagues will talk about some of the changes they want to see in the bill. We presented many of these arguments when Bill C-63 was before the House. We heard many of the same arguments from witnesses at committee. The government heard some of them. It did not deal with them very well, particularly in terms of residency, but it heard them. Maybe we can fix them in committee but many of them have not even been acknowledged by changes in the new piece of legislation.

For that reason I cannot support the legislation. I cannot speak for all my colleagues, but I believe they are unlikely to support this piece of legislation unless we get some of the key changes required to make it a good piece of legislation.

We want a new citizenship act. The old one is outdated. Does the new piece of legislation provide for a new citizenship act that will work for Canadians and for people who are aspiring to become Canadians? No, I do not believe it does. For that reason we will not be supporting this piece of legislation but I certainly look forward to the arguments, the discussion presented by all opposition parties and by the government in the House and at committee. Hopefully we can make some changes that will make it work.

That is what I am looking for. It is not a bill that should be partisan. I do not believe that it will be treated as a partisan piece of legislation. We are talking about Canadian citizenship. We all feel the same about Canadian citizenship. We take the same pride in Canadian citizenship. We realize what a valuable asset Canadian citizenship is. All we want is a good piece of legislation.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): We have two minutes before Statements by Members. The hon. member for Rosemont may start his speech, if it is agreeable to him.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Madam Speaker, I only have two minutes, but I can continue later. This will perhaps allow me to tell you how I have planned my remarks. That is about all I will have time for.

Bill C-16 is a bill on Canadian citizenship, which, naturally, to all intents and purposes, contains the essentials of Bill C-63, a bill that died on the order paper.

The Bloc Québécois debated it at the standing committee. My colleague from Hochelaga—Maisonneuve was leading the fight at that point on the bill as a whole and had introduced a number of amendments to include a number of—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I believe it is time to proceed to Statements by Members. The hon. member for Hull—Aylmer.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian citizenship is more than a status. Our citizenship makes us who we are. It marks our belonging. For example, every year over 150,000 immigrants become citizens.

Our government has proposed legislation on citizenship. It has established clear and fair criteria in keeping with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

• (1100)

What is new in the bill is that persons applying for citizenship must demonstrate solid links with Canada. They will have to have lived in Canada at least three years over the six years preceding the application.

The Liberal government continues to work to ensure that we are open to the world and that we promote the development of other cultures wishing to settle in the country. This is the direction of the Liberal government's commitment and action in immigration.

* * *

[English]

REFUGEES

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it has now been more than a year since the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was told by Vancouver police that dozens of bogus refugee claimants from Honduras were trafficking drugs in our city.

Some of those refugee claimants have now been arrested more than 15 times each. While the minister does nothing to remove them from Canada, the bogus refugees happily climb into the paddy wagons week after week, treating the experience like a working vacation and costing taxpayers millions of dollars in welfare, medical care and social services.

The United Nations convention on refugees requires refugees to make their claims in the first safe country they reach, but almost all of the refugee claimants in Canada changed planes in Miami, Heathrow or Frankfurt.

One does not have to be a policeman on the streets of Vancouver to work out why the claims are not made in Miami, Heathrow or Frankfurt, but the minister stands by while we get taken for suckers. She is worse than the cardboard cutout we had for a minister before her.

* * *

NORTEL NETWORKS

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Internet has revolutionized the way we work and communicate, the changes that are coming will make the advances thus far seem inconsequential.

Nortel Networks' new technology, the Open IP Environment, is predicted to bring massive changes to the Internet over the next two to three years, providing consumers with Internet access from virtually everywhere.

Where will a lot of this work take place? Right here in Canada, and right here in the Ottawa area.

Earlier this week Nortel Networks announced an investment of \$260 million U.S. into the further development of fibre optics technology for the Internet, of which more than \$100 million will come into the Ottawa area.

Nortel expects to hire 1,000 employees in Ottawa, bringing the number of full time Nortel workers in the area to 14,000.

Recent investments in Internet and fibre optics technology mean the creation of thousands of new jobs and place the national capital region clearly in the vanguard of the Internet revolution.

* * *

THE LATE CHARLES SCHULZ

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Charles Schulz entertained Canadians and people around the world for 50 years with his *Peanuts* comic strip.

He passed away at his home last Saturday, just as Charlie Brown, Snoopy, Lucy, Linus and the rest of the lovable *Peanuts* gang bid their farewell in newspapers across the planet. "Such an ending was as if he had written it that way", said Canadian cartoonist Lynn Johnston.

[Translation]

As a caricaturist and visual arts teacher, I recognize the importance of this entertaining and educational means of communications Mr. Schulz gave us. The appealing characters in his weekly strip taught us many a lesson about life.

S. O. 31

Thank you, Mr. Schulz, for having been a family member for nearly 50 years.

[English]

"You're a good man, Charlie Brown".

* * *

MENINGITIS

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today in Edmonton an inoculation frenzy is under way. Meningitis has struck and threatens Edmonton's youth.

Today nearly 300,000 of our children will receive an inoculation cloak to protect them against this evil scourge. My daughter, Kristina, is one of those to be inoculated today.

Two precious lives have been lost and over a dozen more hang in the balance. Meningitis can strike any place at any time and meningitis does not discriminate.

Dr. Gerald Predy, Chief Medical Officer for Edmonton's Capital Health Authority, leads the troops in the battle against the meningitis menace with his army of over 500 nurses.

I want Dr. Predy and fellow Edmontonians to know that the support and prayers of the House are with them during this most trying of times.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, clean air and the protection of human health is a top priority for the government and we are taking action.

• (1105)

We are reducing the air pollutants that form ground level ozone, a primary component of smog.

This week Ottawa hosted the first formal negotiations of the Ozone Annex under the 1991 Canada-United States air quality agreement. Canada's objective is to reduce the flow of ozone and ozone precursor pollutants from the United States into Canada, reducing transboundary smog.

Scientists tells us that at least 5,000 Canadians die prematurely each year from the effects of poor air quality. Over the next eight months delegations from Canada and the United States will reach agreement on targets and schedules to reduce emissions that create ozone. Canada is setting strong national targets and a timetable for

S. O. 31

strong action to reduce ozone and particulate matters with Canada-wide standards. We will continue to take aggressive action. We will continue to provide strong leadership to improve air quality and to deal with the health concerns facing all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

“CHARTRAND ET SIMONNE” MINISERIES

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since February 2 Radio-Canada has been showing the “Chartrand et Simone” miniseries, which runs on Wednesdays and which relates the true love story between Michel Chartrand, a committed, passionate, quick-tempered and tender person, and another exemplary person, Simone, his wife, the daughter of Mr. Justice Monet.

I had the privilege of watching the whole series. Two excellent actors, Luc Picard and Geneviève Rioux, give a brilliant performance in the leading roles. I hope Radio-Canada can broadcast the rest of that miniseries.

This miniseries makes us relive important moments in Quebec’s union history, including the Asbestos and Murdochville strikes. We can see those who were alongside Michel Chartrand, namely, Gérard Pelletier, Jean Marchand, Jeanne Sauvé and Pierre Elliott Trudeau, before they all joined the Liberal team.

Congratulations to producers Robert Ménard and Claire Wojas, to director Alain Chartrand and to his team for a wonderful production.

* * *

[English]

MOLSON BREWERIES

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate and commend Molson for its outstanding effort to support the community and help save our great Ottawa Senators hockey team.

Canada’s oldest brewing company, Molson, recently announced an initiative to support hockey in Ottawa. A creative idea that requires support from the community, Molson will donate \$2 for every case of Molson sold.

Molson has a history of helping communities. For example, in 1786 John Molson helped to build a hospital. Since the late 1980s Molson has championed the cause of HIV/AIDS. Recently the company has shown community spirit by sponsoring a program called “Local Heroes”, which is intended to revitalize recreational facilities in Canadian communities.

Over the years Molson has supported over 1,000 projects, and for that we extend our thanks.

GOVERNMENT GRANTS

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are outraged by the reckless spending at HRDC in the billion dollar boondoggle. But this is only the tip of the iceberg. This is a systemic problem which is widespread in Indian affairs, western economic diversification, ACOA and CIDA. Let us look at CIDA.

CIDA Inc.’s December 1999 audit revealed missing reports, sloppy bookkeeping, no follow-up audits, no lessons learned and payments made to projects even after they failed. It is the same old thing.

The situation has worsened since the 1992 audit. More than half of nearly \$1 billion goes to feasibility studies and still only one in ten projects ever gets off the ground. There is no measurement of benefits from projects. Ninety per cent of the projects did not even report where the money went.

Some of the biggest CIDA contracts have gone to a company which was among the largest single contributor to the Liberal Party prior to the last election. CIDA is being used as a slush fund in the same way as HRDC.

* * *

[Translation]

LEBANON

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada-Lebanon Parliamentary Friendship Group wants to strongly condemn the most recent bombing of Lebanon by Israel.

[English]

It is understandable that Israel is angered by the loss of life suffered by its occupational force in South Lebanon where the Hezbollah make attacks on the Israeli occupational forces. The adherence by Israel to United Nations resolution 425 to withdraw from Lebanon would reduce tensions considerably in the Middle East.

[Translation]

We want the establishment of a lasting and fair peace between Israel and its neighbours. The destruction of Lebanese infrastructure by Israel was an act of confrontation that threatened innocent lives, and it goes against regional peace and stability.

• (1110)

[English]

Because we care about the establishment of a lasting and equitable peace in the Middle East, we call upon the world’s democracies to ensure that all parties return to the path of respect for international law.

FARMERS

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as you know we had many Saskatchewan farmers in Ottawa this week telling us about the worst farm crisis for grain farmers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba since the 1930s.

As a matter of fact, the reason for the farm crisis is basically because of a subsidy war between the Europeans and the Americans. In Europe the farmer gets 56 cents on the dollar from the treasuries in those countries. In the United States the farmer gets 38 cents on the dollar from the treasury in Washington. In our country the farmers get 9 cents on the dollar in support from the treasury in this country.

We know that we have to create a level playing field. We also know that we now have the fiscal capability to do that, with a projected surplus for the next year of about \$10 billion and about \$95 billion in the next five years. With the budget coming down in about 10 days it would be very wise for the Government of Canada to make sure there is a substantial commitment from the federal government to the farmers of Saskatchewan and Manitoba in the grain sector to level the playing field for our farmers to that of the Europeans and the Americans.

* * *

[Translation]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities made short work of the Prime Minister's simplistic line about the financial problem at Human Resources Development Canada being limited to \$250.

Why then did the Liberal majority not go along with the opposition parties' suggestions to call as witnesses Mel Cappe, the Clerk of the Privy Council; the President of the Treasury Board; Denis Desautels, the Auditor General of Canada; John Reid, the Commissioner of Access to Information; and Mr. Martin, the Director of Internal Audit at Human Resources Development Canada?

Members of the committee were unanimous that there should be an in-depth investigation into all grant programs at Human Resources Development Canada. Quite a comedown for the Prime Minister, who is irresponsibly suggesting that the crisis involves nothing more than a few small amounts.

It is a shame that the Liberal majority refused to follow through on its logic and rejected the Bloc Québécois proposal to call the Minister for International Trade and the Prime Minister as wit-

S. O. 31

nesses. The biggest culprits are being allowed to wash their hands of the scandal for which they are responsible.

* * *

[English]

HARNESS RACING

Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this month I was a presenter at the prestigious O'Brien Awards for excellence in the sport of harness racing in Canada. It once again showcased the superstars of our sport.

When the dust had settled, the lightning-quick Blissful Hall paced away with the Horse of the Year Award. His outspoken, opinionated, colourful trainer, Ben Wallace, garnered a much deserved Trainer of the Year Award.

The real story of the night was the emergence of a new superstar in the driving ranks. Canada has produced the greatest drivers in the history of harness racing, from Joe O'Brien to Keith Waples to John Campbell, and now a new young lion called Chris Christoforou, who won over 600 races and over \$6 million in 1999, both Canadian records. Chris learned his lessons well from his father, Chris Sr. Harness racing knows that this young man is ready, willing and certainly able to race through the home stretch to victory for the great Canadian sport of harness racing.

* * *

LIGHTHOUSES

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of many individuals in Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough who are concerned by the proposals being considered by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to solarize lighthouses in the area.

Not only is solarization expensive, unnecessary and ineffective, it begs the question, why convert cabled lighthouses to solar? We have already witnessed the removal of horns, buoys and backup diesel motor systems as cost cutting measures, to the detriment of ocean safety. Blankets of fog in places like the Strait of Canso often render solar lighthouses ineffective. A rush to alter equipment and automation is dangerous and haste could cost lives.

Fishermen are deeply concerned with the prospect of losing these lighthouses by converting them to a solar operation. The most immediate threat is to lighthouses in Cranberry; however, Whitehead and Eddie Point could soon be targeted upon the completion of the Cranberry transformation.

I ask the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to seriously weigh the safety concerns of the fishermen most directly affected by these proposed changes. I urge the minister to reconsider all plans to further downgrade and denigrate these historical and practical lighthouses in the province.

Oral Questions

• (1115)

WHITBY, ONTARIO

Mrs. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Ajax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Whitby 2000 time capsule is where mementoes, stories and pieces of heritage about the town of Whitby, its residents, institutions and businesses will be stored until the year 2030, at which time it will be exhumed.

The year 2030 marks the 175th anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Whitby. Current and former citizens of Whitby are invited to make a submission, reflect on changes in Whitby or share dreams and aspirations for the future.

School children may wish to submit a special school project on Whitby as it is today, or document popular trends, record the history of Whitby or predict the future.

Families could record their family history with photographs or write letters to future descendants. Community groups may submit a history of their particular group with photographs of various projects.

Submission application forms must be completed by individuals or groups wishing to submit material for inclusion in the Whitby 2000 time capsule. The 2000 time capsule co-ordinating committee will review the submissions and notify applicants of the process—

The Deputy Speaker: It is now time for oral questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD*[English]***HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday when asked about \$640,000 jobs grants in her riding in November, the HRD minister told parliament:

... when I became Minister. . . I delegated the authority for approvals in my riding to my deputy minister.

Yet access to information reveals that in November the minister alone had authority for approvals. I invite the minister to explain this latest discrepancy.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to confirm again that I wrote to my deputy and indicated that she would be the sole decision maker in terms of projects that were approved in the riding of Brant.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister is confirming that the information she provides through access to information is not reliable. Can she tell the House why she does not provide reliable information through access?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I can confirm is that I made it very clear I would not be approving grants and contributions in the riding of Brant. I indicated that the deputy minister would be doing so, and I did that by letter.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is a document which she provided to an access request headed "Delegation of Authority". There is a column that says approval of proposal.

The minister has full authority and everyone else listed in the column has no authority at all. If the minister has evidence to show that this document is reliable then she should table it immediately, and I ask her to do so.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if it pleases the House, I would be glad, when it is translated and in accordance with the rules of the House, to table the letter to the deputy.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague has outlined, yesterday the human resources minister confirmed that the Canada jobs fund grants were approved for her riding last November despite the fact it did not qualify, and yet she said:

—what I will confirm is that when I became Minister of Human Resources Development Canada I delegated the authority for approvals in my riding to my deputy minister.

That was presumably last summer. The chart obtained through access to information by the official opposition clearly disputes this because it says that as of November only the minister had approval for those grants. Why is there a discrepancy?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things to which the hon. member makes reference. Let me clarify that indeed the riding of Brant did qualify for Canada jobs funds.

One of the things I would also like to do, perhaps at the end of question period, is table the terms and conditions of the two programs on which we have been focusing: the transitional jobs fund which came into vogue in 1996 and ended in 1999 and the Canada jobs fund which began in 1999. I think that would provide assistance to the opposition.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a very clear discrepancy between what the minister said yesterday in the House and what she is claiming today.

The reality is that she claims when she took over the job of the human resources development department, which was last summer, she instructed by letter, according to what she says today, that the deputy could approve those grants. The information we received

that was updated as of November clearly shows that only the minister could approve all the grants, including the ones in her own riding. Why does she instruct her employees in HRDC to respond to access to information requests with false information?

• (1120)

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I say again, I have indicated to members of the House that I am prepared to table information they might find valuable, and I would be glad to do that.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, an internal audit done in 1997 by Consulting and Audit Canada has confirmed what the Bloc Québécois' analysis clearly showed—political pressure was brought to bear on the administrative staff of Human Resources Development Canada in order to speed up the grant approval process.

Is the minister going to continue denying that the Liberal government has literally transformed the transitional jobs fund into a propaganda tool for the purpose of winning votes?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first let me clarify this was not an audit that the hon. member is referring to but it was a review of the program that was done in the spring of 1997.

Let me also confirm for the hon. member something he knows very well, that these projects exist not only in ridings held by Liberal members but very significantly in ridings held by Bloc members as well.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if the minister understood French better, she would have known that I was talking about an audit. Audit is part of the company's name. In addition, if they injected money into a riding such as Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, it is because they thought they could wrestle the riding away from us. My riding did not get one red cent. We may be naive, but we are not right out to lunch.

Is the minister going to continue to deny the evidence, when the same audit shows that the most dubious projects did not follow the standard approval process?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear in talking about this review. It talks about the role politicians play in the transitional jobs fund. Indeed this is quite unique. The review did not suggest in its recommendations that politicians, local members of parliament

who have information and knowledge about their ridings, should not be consulted in this undertaking.

In fact some of the other things the review said were quite positive. It said that the approval process and criteria appear to be working. It said that the transitional jobs fund was an effective way to pool information—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the past ten days, the minister has not stopped being in a muddle and hiding behind her six point action plan, which convinces no one.

Will the minister acknowledge that this new overpowering bit of news revealed by the 1997 audit inquiry proves the offensiveness of the position taken by the Prime Minister, who is trying to put the blame for the scandal onto the backs of officials, when the whole operation was planned in his own office?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, everything the hon. member says is absolutely untrue. I would remind the House that it is this hon. member who in quotations to his local newspapers said that clearly because of the success he has had with getting grants and contributions in his riding there is no political undertaking here at all.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, we are seeing more and more that this affair is covering up institutionalized political interference.

Will the minister not agree that, under the circumstances, the testimony of her predecessor, the current Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and of the Prime Minister are vital to shed light on this misappropriation of funds in order to serve the election objectives of the Liberal Party of Canada?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is patently untrue. Let us review the facts again. The transitional jobs fund and the Canada jobs fund were programs and grants to help communities of high unemployment and to provide opportunities for work for men and women in those ridings, and those ridings include ridings held by the New Democrats, the Reform, the Bloc, the Tories and the Liberals.

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister of human resources was talking about the fund being

Oral Questions

there to help the people who need jobs in areas where there are high rates of unemployment.

We well know that she will not answer our questions about such places as Vancouver with pockets of high unemployment at 13.1% that never received transitional jobs fund grants.

• (1125)

Could the minister answer once and for all why MPs in the House did not know about those changes in the transitional jobs fund so that they could have had the opportunity to get the money too?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I am very happy to table the terms and conditions both of the transitional jobs fund and the Canada jobs fund in the House today.

What is very clear is that these undertakings have made a real difference in areas across Canada. We on this side of the House know that the federal government can play a role to ensure where we need to help provide opportunities for men and women who do not have the opportunity for the dignity of jobs that they can be funded.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, how is it that, in the riding of Vancouver East, money was available from the transitional jobs fund when there was a Liberal incumbent but it is no longer available with an NDP incumbent there. They have received no money and are not eligible. There is a double standard.

We would like to know the truth in this business. How do we ensure that all the members in this House may take advantage of these funds, and not just the Liberals?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that in the riding of Vancouver East indeed there was a transitional jobs fund project that created 18 jobs. I have been made aware that there were no further proposals after that.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, daily the minister of HRDC subjects Canadians to the sad spectacle of self-destruction with the documented mishandling and mismanagement of taxpayers money uncovered by the internal audit, the subsequent fallout, the spin-doctoring, the withholding of information, the manipulation of statistics and the sliding scale of eligibility. Could the minister explain why Canadians should trust her at all?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the opportunity to

review again for the hon. member and for the House the undertakings here and the importance we have put on this issue.

It was an internal audit of the department that highlighted administrative deficiencies which we had to fix. As minister I received that information. I took it seriously and we are now implementing a plan that will fix the problem.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, we know the minister had that audit in hand on November 17. Why did she not come before the House then and come clean with Canadians?

For days the minister has dodged questions in the House and pointed the finger at officials, previous ministers and members of the opposition in a weak attempt to lend credibility to what was an obvious effort to pad employment in her own riding. This type of creative accounting has baffled Statistics Canada officials, MPs and Canadians generally.

With this fiasco now firmly stuck to the minister, will she display some semblance of credibility and ministerial responsibility and simply resign?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I say again that I have taken my responsibility seriously and I will fix the problem.

I would ask the hon. member on the issue of accountability how he defends the work of his party when it was in power and left us with a \$42 billion deficit.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, two years ago auditors criticized the human resources department for doling out grants for political purposes in the transitional jobs fund.

This audit exposed a \$6 million forestry project in New Brunswick that they said should not have been granted. The government estimates of job creation were highly inflated and were “more political than other programming”.

This \$6 million bungle has mushroomed to a \$1 billion bungle. Why does the minister insist on continuing with business as usual and on giving grants for political purposes rather—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Human Resources Development.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me clarify again for the hon. member. She made reference to an audit. It was not an audit. It was a review of the transitional jobs fund program, a very important undertaking.

Oral Questions

The recommendations in that review did not suggest that we should change the relationship we build community by community with local members of parliament. Indeed it said they had a role to play.

I remind the hon. member that something the review did say was that job creation under the transitional jobs fund tends to be more productive and uninterrupted than it is under any of the more traditional types of HRDC programs, especially where seasonal employment is common.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister can explain it however she wants but the reality is that the review, the audit, said that things were not being done properly.

• (1130)

The minister and her predecessors have been warned for years that things have to change. Why has this minister done nothing to prevent the billion dollar bungle that we have now?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the review suggested is that we needed to provide more skills development for those employees working on this project and we did that. What it suggested is that we needed to have stronger administrative practices and we are improving them.

What I can say to the hon. member in the context of the broad issue of grants and contributions in my department is that we have identified that we have a problem. We have a plan of action that is now being implemented and the problem will be fixed.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, analyzing the minister's responses, one can see she has a fertile imagination. The computer system varies from one program to the other. The rates used are for either 1995 or 1997. The bases for calculation are regional, provincial or federal, and so on.

Since this minister claims to hold the monopoly on the truth, can she table in this House the parameters justifying the transitional jobs fund subsidies given in her riding?

[*English*]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I am going to be tabling with the acceptance of the House the terms and conditions of both the transitional jobs fund and the Canada jobs fund because I think those terms and conditions will clarify a number of things that have found their way to the floor here.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister's riding is in the Niagara region, where there has not been more than 10.7% unemployment since 1996.

Can the minister explain to this House how she managed to get transitional jobs funding for her riding, when the program directives indicated that recipients were eligible only if they were in an employment insurance economic region with an unemployment rate of 12% or higher?

[*English*]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again when the hon. member sees the terms and conditions of the transitional jobs fund she will see that there is within those terms and conditions the opportunity to support areas with pockets of high unemployment in economic regions. Not only was that done in the riding of Brant, but in the ridings of Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Kelowna, Kootenay—Columbia, Nanaimo—Alberni, Nanaimo—Cowichan, and Saint John. There were areas where the unemployment level was less than 12%. The program applied.

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, while the minister attempts to minimize the scandal and blame others, it is clearly in her area of responsibility.

We have obtained a list circulated by Peter Donolo, the Prime Minister's former director of communications, to members of the Liberal caucus. It lists hundreds of places where Liberals can go for a photo op with recipients of government grants and contributions. Does this not just prove that this billion dollar boondoggle is more about buying political support than about creating jobs?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the document refers to activities and events connected with many different programs, not simply the transitional jobs fund. It is part of the ordinary democratic process of governments past and present, federal and provincial, for ministers and members to attend sites of activities and events to show what the government is doing to help ordinary Canadians all over the country. There is nothing wrong with that. It is part of the democratic process.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's former director of communications used this list to advise Liberal MPs where they could get an easy photo op by exploiting recipients of federal grants. This list was circulated to only a select group of MPs and what a surprise. What a surprise that only Liberal MPs and cabinet ministers got a copy. That is a real democratic process.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister acknowledge the obvious, that these grants were more about raising the profile of Liberal MPs than they were about giving grant money to Canadians and creating jobs? Is that not obvious to everybody?

Oral Questions

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what should be obvious is that it is normal for governments to let Canadians know what they are doing to help them have jobs, to help them have better communities and to ask their supporters, ministers and MPs, to be the vehicle for getting out this information.

• (1135)

This can work two ways. It can help governments and it can also give people information by which governments can be criticized. But in the case of this government, because we have created almost a million and a half jobs since 1993 and we have the lowest unemployment rate in a generation, no wonder Canadians think—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Longueuil.

* * *

[Translation]

HERITAGE CANADA

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the heritage minister said that she put more money into Quebec for Canada Day because there was no Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste elsewhere in Canada, and what she wanted to do in Quebec, to repeat her terms, was to “match the Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste”.

Can the Minister of Canadian Heritage explain to us what she meant by matching the Société Saint Jean-Baptiste?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the investment by the Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste for Saint-Jean-Baptiste celebrations is considerable, and for Canada and Quebec the celebration of Saint-Jean-Baptiste and Canada Day is equally important.

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, can the minister inform the House how much she spends in francophone communities outside Quebec to celebrate the holiday of French Canadians?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, normally the amount spent in support of the francophone community outside Quebec is, in general, \$250 million annually.

* * *

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the HRD minister said that grants that happened to end up in her riding were the decision of her deputy minister. Yet in

1991 the Prime Minister said that his ministers must be held ultimately accountable for their departments and staff.

Why is the minister passing the blame to her deputy minister for the grants in her riding when according to her boss she is ultimately responsible for the actions of her department?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, quite the contrary, I am not blaming anyone here. I am just trying to ensure that appropriate decision making is undertaken. That is why I wrote to my deputy and asked her “to please accept this as notice of my delegation to you of full signing authority for all Canada jobs fund projects located in the riding of Brant”.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, clearly the minister is trying to delegate blame. In terms of any management practice, many things can be delegated. Accountability cannot be delegated.

I would like to ask the minister a very direct and simple question. Who is in charge of her department, the minister or the deputy minister, and who is accountable?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the questions from the other side are pointing out that the things that we need to have done have not been done in the past. I have taken this very seriously. I am accountable to ensure that the problems that have been identified are fixed and I will do that.

* * *

[Translation]

PARENTAL LEAVE

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the leader of the opposition in the national assembly strengthened the existing consensus by giving his support to Minister Marois regarding the millions of dollars to which Quebec is entitled under the parental insurance project.

Considering that Minister Marois has asked to meet the Minister of Human Resources Development, will the minister quickly follow up on that request to settle the issue and allow the Quebec parental insurance project to become a reality in 2001?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me say again, as I said yesterday, that we had a negotiating table with the Government of Quebec in the year 1997. They are the ones who chose to break off the negotiations despite the offer that we had made to them.

Oral Questions

For us right now, as indicated in the Speech from the Throne, we are looking specifically at the expansion of parental benefits to make them more accessible and flexible. It would seem to me that that is where I should turn my attention in the first instance.

* * *

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health.

In October the Prime Minister shared his vision for the new millennium: a nation built on learning, innovation and excellence. Can the parliamentary secretary outline the Government of Canada's commitment to creating a positive research environment where Canadian researchers can achieve world class potential here at home?

● (1140)

Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the member for York West for her question.

I am pleased to tell the House that earlier this morning the Minister of Health announced nearly \$66 million in medical research funding in Ontario at seven different universities through the Canadian Medical Research Council.

[Translation]

This follows the announcement made in Quebec last week concerning a \$165 million federal investment, over a five year period, to support the work of 500 health researchers. Funding will double over a four year period.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government has its priorities all wrong.

While the government has been busy giving subsidized money to multi-billion dollar companies like Wal-Mart, the official opposition has been out in the countryside consulting with farmers. As many as 75% of farmers believe that the future of their farms is very bleak.

The human resources development minister is part of the problem, not part of the solution. How can the minister justify wasting millions of dollars subsidizing companies like Wal-Mart when she should be helping farmers save their farms?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question was totally off base from the beginning.

No money was given to Wal-Mart. He is wrong about that. He is also wrong in saying that we are not working to help farmers. We are working to help them. We are putting forward programs worth billions of dollars. We are going to continue to do our best to help them deal with this serious income crisis at the present time.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as a result of the government's policies, western farmers cannot even get a break-even price for the products of their hard labour. Yet RMH Teleservices, a U.S. company worth \$80 billion, was given \$1.6 million to set up in the minister's riding. This was money it did not ask for, money it did not need. In fact it would have set up there anyway.

The minister has attempted to excuse the abuse of taxpayers' money by saying that grants are needed. Can the minister explain how RMH Teleservices—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Human Resources Development.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would love to invite the hon. member to come to my riding where he could see the call centre in operation. There are men and women working in that call centre who had not had the opportunity to work for six or seven years. They had been on social assistance.

The kind of work that this opportunity provides to my community spoke directly to our labour market needs. The people in the riding of Brant are very thankful for the role the Government of Canada played in that undertaking.

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of HRDC. My question is not about job creation, it is about the integrity of the government and the minister.

Yesterday the minister could not explain how a \$750,000 grant became a \$2 million cheque to a Liberal supporter. Today her officials acknowledge a million dollar top-up.

My question is simple. Who approved the top-up?

Hon. George S. Baker (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this was a combination of moneys from ACOA and HRDC.

Oral Questions

The chambers of commerce praised this operation. The municipalities praised this operation in Cape Breton. The people of Cape Breton praised 250 permanent jobs in this area.

When is the NDP going to get in step with its own constituents?

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. I have documents from the minister's own department stating that \$2 million was received from the transitional jobs fund for this company. Call after call to my office in Glace Bay tell stories of recent layoffs at Scotia Rainbow, bounced cheques, and public records indicating legal action against Scotia Rainbow.

It appears the only cheques that have not bounced from this company are the cheques contributing to the Liberal Party.

I am asking the minister, is that job creation?

Hon. George S. Baker (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 250 permanent jobs in an area devastated by the downturn in the groundfish industry. The NDP always supported that kind of job creation. Perhaps it is because of their last convention. With their leader pulling to the right and their backbenchers pulling to the left neither of them know whether their membership is following them or chasing them.

• (1145)

The Deputy Speaker: I appreciate that there is a lot of enthusiasm on both sides for questions and answers today but it is difficult for the Chair to hear when everyone is making their points at the same time.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development seems to have problems with geography in her own riding. She reminds me of the Fisheries and Oceans official who did not even know where Newfoundland was. Just imagine.

Can the minister now confirm that her riding is part of economic region 5-50, which is called Hamilton—Niagara?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that my riding is part of the economic region for Niagara and has been for a decade.

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, the cost to move Duchess Foods to the minister's riding was just over \$20,000 per mile. It cost Canadian taxpayers an additional \$2 million to move the minister's riding to the Niagara economic region.

The minister is clearly lost in her portfolio. Will she now admit that her riding did not qualify?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, absolutely not. Under the terms and conditions of both the transitional jobs fund and the Canada jobs fund the undertakings were appropriate.

This is a member who himself has benefited from these programs and knows the importance that they have played in his region. Likewise, in my region where individuals needed the support of the federal government to provide opportunities, it was given. Surely he understands that there are things that are the same in his region as in my region and that these kinds of programs really do make a difference in the lives of individuals.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Rick Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Canadian government is launching negotiations with the United States on cross border smog. In Windsor and Tecumseh we are on the firing line.

I ask the minister: If Ontario is not yet keeping up with most U.S. states, how can Canada expect to gain the respect of the U.S. negotiators in these talks?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the area of Windsor is a particularly important one in this respect as so much of the smog comes from American sources.

It is true that in dealing with the Americans we need to have the province of Ontario very clearly doing more than has been done in the past. I take the Ontario minister's word that he will match all American standards. In fact, I took some consolation from this morning's newspaper when, in response to a criticism that air quality might decline, he said "If that happens, I will 'eat my shorts'."

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a lot of questions have been asked of the HRDC minister regarding excessive grants in her riding. It is no wonder Canadians question the competence of this minister when we look at the different answers she has given.

First, she cited pockets of unemployment. Then, it was periods of unemployment. Then, it was her deputy minister's fault. Then, it was based on the EI boundaries. However, when we asked her to table this information she refused.

Oral Questions

Will the minister stop the charade and admit to Canadians that she is now trying to redefine the rules after the fact to justify these grants?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think what will be helpful for the members on that side is that I table the terms and conditions so that they do understand that the transitional jobs fund was a particular program with its own terms and conditions and then it transformed into the Canada jobs fund with another set of terms and conditions.

Day after day they confuse the issues by not taking the time to understand the details of these programs and to understand the support that they have given to Canadians right across this country.

* * *

[Translation]

AUDIOVISUAL PRODUCTIONS

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Canadian Heritage released her report on federal support mechanisms to audiovisual production.

Suzanne Aubry, the president of Quebec's Société des auteurs, recherchistes, documentalistes et compositeurs, reacted by saying that she had been hoping for the release of the actual amounts given to producers.

Considering that the industry itself is asking for greater transparency in the management of public funds, why did the Minister of Canadian Heritage choose to have all the information subjected to Revenue Canada's confidentiality rules?

• (1150)

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I did not subject the information to these rules. This is the law.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a reasonable question for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Yesterday I met with Saskatchewan farmers, as many members have. They are down here lobbying about the farm crisis. They asked me to ask the Prime Minister a question on their behalf. They want to invite the Prime Minister to come to Saskatchewan to meet farmers face to face to learn about the farm crisis.

My question for the Deputy Prime Minister is will he take this invitation to his boss, the Prime Minister, and invite him, on behalf of Saskatchewan farmers, to come to our province for a face to face meeting on the farm crisis.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to transmit the hon. member's request.

However, I can confirm, from my own discussions with the Prime Minister, that he is already well aware of the crisis. As Prime Minister of all of Canada, he is working hard to help Saskatchewan farmers and other farmers to live through this crisis and get back to a period of prosperity once again.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, no one is questioning the value of properly managed accountable administration of public money. But these shifty efforts, the backtracking and the coverup of what was obviously a corrupt and disastrous plan that was inherited by the current minister has left public confidence in shambles.

When will the minister just set the record straight and admit that her riding did not qualify for TJF or CJF funds?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me clarify again that the statistics that we have used, both for the identification of inclusion in the riding of Brant for transitional jobs fund, are acceptable.

In the context of the 56 economic regions that exist across this country, Statistics Canada accepts that we have used its data properly. We use this data consistently across the country for the 56 economic regions and for the pockets of unemployment that were identified for application of the transitional jobs fund.

* * *

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

I received numerous requests from across Canada for comments on the potential price increases in airline travel for individuals and of course business travellers in view of the potential monopoly by Air Canada.

Will the Minister of Transport explain how he will prevent this?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it will be the House and the Senate, the Parliament of Canada that will prevent price gouging, which was a cornerstone of our policy supported by the standing committees of both Houses of parliament.

Oral Questions

I introduced Bill C-26 yesterday to restructure the airline industry. We will give new powers to the Canadian Transportation Agency to monitor monopoly pricing, not just on business class fares or on economy fares but on all classes of fares used by Canadians, recognizing that 85% or 90% of all fares that are used by Canadians are excursion fares.

We believe that this will protect Canadian consumers.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development Corporation has gone through contortions to justify the grants in her riding, saying that she qualified the grants by virtue of high unemployment.

Three grants were awarded to the riding of the Minister of Justice in Edmonton but there was no riding in Alberta that qualified by virtue of high unemployment.

Why were these three grants approved just before the election in Alberta?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the grants that the hon. member is referring to apply because there were communities in that province that needed assistance. One in particular included the Canadian Paraplegic Association.

There is absolutely no question that these funds have made a difference in the opportunities that are available to paraplegics in the province of the hon. member. Reform Party members, time and time again in the public domain, have indicated their support for these programs.

* * *

[Translation]

ACID RAIN

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a study shows that Quebec's forests have been hard hit by acid rain and that the growth of deciduous trees has declined on average by 30% and that of coniferous trees by 50%.

According to this study, the soil fertilizers will be exhausted in 40 to 50 years because acid rain is destroying more than their capacity to regenerate.

Does the Minister of the Environment intend to take advantage of the negotiations on transborder pollution that began this week in order to put the heat on Ontario and the United States, which are the source of over 50% of the acid rain affecting Quebec, to reduce their emissions as quickly as possible?

• (1155)

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. We must

never forget that the acid rain problem is still with us. It was not dealt with in the 1980s.

We are holding unofficial talks with the Americans at this time. We want to hold official talks, but things are not at that stage yet. The beginning of our discussions with the Americans about other air pollution issues will help matters along.

I was very happy that Minister Bégin promised Quebec's full co-operation and I quote—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when my predecessor Doug Young was Minister of Human Resources Development, he dropped workers into a black hole from January to May, with no money coming in, because of the changes to employment insurance.

Is the Minister of Human Resources Development going to show some compassion and work along with the provincial government to solve this problem of the black hole, because whole families are waiting for a solution?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of travelling to the riding of the hon. member and meeting with the men and women working in the fish plants who themselves identify that they need to diversify their economy. I have been there and have talked to them about the role the Canada jobs fund can play in opening up opportunities in the Acadian peninsula, in helping to bring together community members so that a strategic plan can be undertaken to provide options for them. I would ask the hon. member why, as their representative, he has not done any of this to date.

Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC): Mr. Speaker, we have an interesting scenario before us. The minister tells Canadians that her officials are in the dark ages but then appoints them to fix the problem a day after Canadians witnessed the minister's lack of accountability and inept performance.

When will the Prime Minister abandon his legacy building efforts, act in the best interest of Canadians and remove this minister?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is acting in the best interest of Canadians by asking this very capable minister to identify problems and to solve the problems. The Prime Minister is acting, as always, in the best

interest of Canadians. This is demonstrated by the way, under his leadership, we eliminated the burden of the \$42 billion deficit left to us by the Tories. We cut by over 4% the over 11% burden of unemployment left to us by the Tories.

We are serving Canadians by cleaning up the mess left to us by the Tories and part of this is supporting the minister for HRDC in her work for all Canadians.

* * *

HOMELESSNESS

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has been appointed as the minister responsible for homelessness and delivered a very important report just before Christmas. The Minister for Public Works and Government Services Canada is also responsible for the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

So I ask the parliamentary secretary to the minister, what is he doing in his responsibilities to help with the problem of homelessness in Canada?

Ms. Carolyn Parrish (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the CMHC provides mortgage loan insurance to Canadians from coast to coast to coast. Last year over half a million units were insured. The Government of Canada spends about \$1.9 billion annually in support of housing assistance for 644,000 low income households.

Since 1994 the government has fostered public-private partnerships to create approximately 13,000 units of affordable housing. Right here in the capital region an anonymous donation of \$1 million was matched and bettered through federal funds of \$1.5 million for five innovative programs.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the human resources minister plays fast and loose with the words “openness” and “transparency” —

The Deputy Speaker: I do not think the hon. member for Calgary—Nose Hill would want to indulge in this kind of personal attack. I would suggest that we try to stick with questions and not with preambles that are designed to provoke.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, rather than having the documents, which are very important to understanding the issue of the billion dollar bungle, pulled from the minister piece by piece, will she stand today and commit to tabling all the files and all the lists of files that were covered by the random sample audit and

which were the subject of so much controversy and scandal? There are 40,000 files.

• (1200)

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member has been, but on a number of occasions I have stated to the House that in response to a request and interest shown at the standing committee I am working with my department to pull together this information, this varying information, so that members of parliament can have access to it and make use of it. It is not necessarily kept by riding. We keep it by program.

I have committed to do that. When the information is available I will be glad to present it.

* * *

[Translation]

BILL C-20

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois is becoming more and more convinced that Bill C-20 is undemocratic, but it is also becoming more and more obvious that the process by which the government wants to get it passed is still more undemocratic. It does not want to allow all of the party witnesses to speak.

Is the government prepared to hear all of the witnesses on the lists provided by the parties, as well as all of the increasing number of others who are asking to be heard by the committee?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member across the floor is well aware, along with the entire House, the government has indicated that it would be most reasonable, as always, in this matter.

We have said that we agreed to use a rather broad definition of what constituted a technical witness. I believe the committee has said it would hear 45, a very high number, higher than for most bills—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Don Boudria: Once again, the government has been reasonable, but we do not want to cause an unreasonable delay.

* * *

[English]

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, during question period the hon. Minister for Human Resources

Points of Order

Development read directly from a letter which she says she wrote to her deputy minister, in which she abdicated her approval responsibility for the grants and contributions in question. Since she read directly from the letter, I would ask that she table that correspondence today, rather than waiting to have it translated.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to do that.

The Deputy Speaker: The document is not in both official languages. I believe the consent of the House will be required to table the document. Perhaps I could hear from the House leader on this point.

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, under our rules, when a letter is quoted the actual document must be tabled, whatever the document is. That has historically been the case. Over the last couple of weeks I have tabled letters in unilingual French or in unilingual English in the House.

• (1205)

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair has the immense advantage of having at hand a copy of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, edited by Mr. Marleau and Mr. Montpetit. I refer hon. members to page 372 of the work, which states:

All documents tabled in the House by a Minister or, as the case may be, by a Parliamentary Secretary, whether during a sitting or deposited with the Clerk, are required to be presented in both official languages.

That requirement is there. If the House gives its consent, the letter that is in one language could be tabled. Is there consent for the tabling of this document at this time?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I think there is a large difference between a minister bringing a document into the House to be tabled as part of the normal course of the minister's business and the minister quoting from a piece of correspondence that she happens to have received from someone, be it a constituent, a member of parliament or someone else, in only one language. It is an entirely different situation, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I think that your ruling perhaps applies more to official documents being brought in by ministers rather than something being quoted by the minister on a cursory basis.

The Deputy Speaker: I would not normally engage in debate on a matter of this kind. However, I would also refer the member to page 518 of the same M and M work, which deals with the tabling of documents. It states:

Any document quoted by a Minister in debate or in response to a question during Question Period must be tabled.

The end of the paragraph states:

All documents tabled in the House by a Minister are required to be tabled in both official languages.

And there are various citations at the bottom.

The minister has indicated that she is prepared to have the document translated and will then table the document. Since there is no consent to table it without that translation, I am afraid we are going to have to wait for that eventuality, and I so rule.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to find out from you what criteria guided you in your decision to allow a question to be put to a minister.

Prior to this week, we put a question to the Minister for International Trade on the Department of Human Resources Development issue, a question the Chair denied us.

Today a question was put to the Minister of Human Resources Development and was answered by the Minister for Veterans Affairs. Is there some reason why one minister can answer in a matter belonging to another and another minister cannot?

[English]

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe that your interpretation of the rule, as I saw it being dispensed, is quite correct. There are two different concepts here. The first is that one may not ask a question of a previous minister or a minister who is no longer responsible. That is in citation 410 of Beauchesne's.

However, it is also equally true that the government itself can decide that any minister can answer a question. That is not the same proposition; it is a totally different one. The two of them are very different and the Speaker was quite correct in giving a different decision in both cases because they are different propositions.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order on the same matter. In other words, if I understand correctly, one minister is not obliged to answer in a matter that is not his responsibility. We agree on that.

• (1210)

We are told that a minister cannot do that. Yet today we saw another minister answer a question when he should not have been allowed to do so. There is a problem somewhere. If a minister does not have the right to answer, then he cannot answer.

Points of Order

However, the government can decide that another minister will reply. This means that the government could say the minister does not have to answer, or does not have the right to do so unless authorized by the government House leader. Otherwise, how can we explain that another minister was allowed to answer, a minister who is not responsible for the issue, but who is a clever parliamentarian, who can give a good show in the House and who can save the minister who has problems answering questions?

In other words, the Minister for International Trade does not have to answer, but if he wanted to do so, and had the courage to do it, he could. But he does not have that courage, as evidenced by the fact that the Minister of Veterans Affairs came to the rescue of the Minister of Human Resources Development on an issue for which he is not responsible.

One cannot, in one instance, not have the right to do something and do it just the same and, in another instance, not have the right to do it and not do it. This does not make sense. I would like to know why the Chair prevents the minister from answering before the minister has even decided whether he will answer or hide behind the fact that he does not have to answer. I understand the principle, but it is not for the Chair to prevent the minister from answering right off the bat, since others just did it.

The Deputy Speaker: Once again, I refer to the book by Marleau and Montpetit, not only to promote sales but also because I believe it contains some very relevant passages with respect to the matter raised by the Bloc Québécois leader and the whip.

I believe that the point made by the government House leader is correct. Let me quote from page 432 of the book:

Questions, although customarily addressed to specific Ministers, are directed to the Ministry as a whole. It is the prerogative of the government to designate which Minister responds to which question. The Prime Minister (or the Deputy Prime Minister or any other minister acting on behalf of the Prime Minister) may respond to any or all questions posed during Question Period. Only one Minister may respond to a question, and it need not be the one to whom the question is addressed who actually answers it.

The standing orders are very clear on this point. The Chair recognized the minister who rose to respond to the questions. That is entirely consistent with the standing orders in our new book.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, I want to be very sure I understand what you have just said. I think it was very informative.

In other words, you are saying that the Minister of Veterans Affairs could respond today because the government allowed him to do so, but that the Minister for International Trade could not, because the government did not wish him to do so. It prevented him from doing so, but it could have allowed the Minister for International Trade to respond to the question had it so wished.

I know that the government finds this annoying, but that would have been possible, right? That is what you are saying?

The Deputy Speaker: I will read the last sentence of the paragraph I began earlier:

The Speaker has no authority to compel a particular Minister to respond to a question.

That is clear. These are the standing orders, and they have been adhered to all week during Oral Question Period.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, once again, we want to clearly understand the ruling you have just brought down. You have responded to the hon. leader of the Bloc Québécois by saying that the government could very well have allowed the Minister for International Trade to respond.

Yet the question I am asking you, which takes me back to the original one, is this: What does the Chair use as a guide in deciding not to allow the opposition's question?

A little earlier this week, the Speaker decided not to recognize a question because reference was being made to a prior responsibility of the present Minister for International Trade, whereas the government could have chosen to allow the Minister for International Trade to respond. The Speaker is the one who prevented the government from making that decision.

• (1215)

The Deputy Speaker: I was not in the Chair yesterday. If there was a problem yesterday, all that I can say is that the hon. member ought to have raised it yesterday after question period.

I am not responsible for what has gone on in the House all week. I am citing the rules that apply to what happened in the House today, and I believe that is correct. Yesterday I was not here and I did not see what occurred.

I am sure that the hon. member could raise the matter with the Speaker when he is here next week. I suggest that he do so.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: If this is the same point of order, I trust that it will be very brief. I do not want to waste the House's time. This is a matter that should be raised with the Speaker.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, listening to your wise counsel is not a waste of time. I will seek it again. Do not tell me it is a waste of time to listen to you, it is informative.

Mr. Speaker, you are in fact telling us that since you are the one in the Chair today, your situation is similar to that of the minister, in that you are responsible today, and you go by the standing orders. Today is today and yesterday was yesterday. Something happened today concerning the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and I am submitting the issue to you.

Points of Order

We want to know how we should put our questions and we want you to tell us what approach to take, since this is your role. You are at the service of all parliamentarians. Because the question was directed to the Minister for International Trade, you are saying the Chair could deem the question to be out of order because that minister is not the one responsible.

To clarify, today the question directed to the Minister of Human Resources Development was answered by the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I wonder where the logic is; at any rate, that is what happened—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry—

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Give me a moment to finish. Our question should have been worded as follows: “The question is either for the Minister of Human Resources Development, who is currently responsible, or for the Minister for International Trade, who is largely responsible for this mess”. The government would then have had the option of allowing the former minister to answer or of preventing him from doing so, as was the case today.

Did I understand correctly the conclusions you drew on this issue and your teachings to the House today?

The Deputy Speaker: First of all, I suggest that all hon. members read chapter 11 of the book which looks at the rules governing Oral Question Period in this House. It is very clear and very informative. I will cite another paragraph from page 433:

Members may not insist on an answer nor may a Member insist that a specific Minister respond to his or her question. A Minister's refusal to answer a question may not be questioned or treated as the subject of a point of order or question of privilege.

That is clear enough and very informative. I suggest that the hon. member and all other hon. members read chapter 11 of this excellent book, which will enlighten everyone.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. leader of the Bloc Québécois for a very, very brief comment.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, to make myself even more concise than usual, I understand that the minister may refuse, as you have just repeated, but that was not the question. We want to know how the Speaker of the House may refuse, on behalf of a minister, who may or may not have had the government's permission to respond, but who still takes—

The Deputy Speaker: I again suggest that members read chapter 11 and ask the Speaker questions next week, if they wish.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Is this still the same question?

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: We have done with this question for today. We have been debating it for 20 minutes and I clarified things as best I could.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I thank you sincerely for your indulgence but I want to make sure I understand.

You said a moment ago that, regarding the events of a little earlier this week, we should check with the Speaker who was in the Chair at the time. I understand that answer.

However, I come back to my original question. Are there criteria under Marleau-Montpetit—or whatever its name is—that guide the Chair when it decides whether the House will deem that a question is in order? It appears that earlier this week the Speaker did not admit it because—

• (1220)

The Deputy Speaker: Chapter 11 contains a number of passages describing what is in order and what is not. I suggest the hon. member and all the others read that, because it contains a lot of information. It will help everyone plan questions and answers in the House.

I think that puts an end to the debate.

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since we are talking about reading and you are not prepared to enlighten us immediately on the question, I would suggest to the government and to all members in this House further reading in the context of a less happy debate, the debate on Bill C-20.

It concerns an article that appeared in the daily *La Presse* on November 29, entitled “Chrétien's statement suits Bouchard, according to Dumont”.

With a view to enlightening this House in the context of Bill C-20—

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent in the House to table such a document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your good work.

Following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill denying the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table a document that will enlighten the members.

Points of Order

The document is entitled “e maintien d’une union monétaire avec un Québec séparé”, and do not tell me that I do not have the unanimous consent of the House because I feel otherwise.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction of a racist bill against Quebec and Quebecers by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, I would like to table an article from *La Presse canadienne* dated January 29, 2000, regarding the role of the Bloc Québécois in the achievement of sovereignty in Quebec—

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction, by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, of a bill denying the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I have here a document entitled “Le statut politique et constitutionnel du Québec”.

I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table this document that will enlighten the members on this issue.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in response to questions in the House, I would like to table in both official languages the terms and conditions of the transitional jobs fund, the terms and conditions of the Canada jobs fund, and the statistics used to identify the 56 EI economic regions in Canada and the data for 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last January 5, *Le Droit* published an article entitled “A breach of democracy”.

Following the referral to committee of a bill denying the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table this document which was published in *Le Droit*.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill denying Quebecers their basic rights, I ask for unanimous consent to table a document that will enlighten the House.

It is an article published in *Le Soleil* on December 4—

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of Bill C-20, denying Quebecers their basic rights, I would like to table a document entitled “Un court historique des unions monétaires d’États indépendants” that will certainly enlighten the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1225)

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have here a document from a reader of *La Voix de l’Est* who says “Whom do they think we are in Ottawa? Some numbskulls who do not even know French? They called their bill the clarity bill, and yet there is nothing clear about it. They must not be trying to enlighten the people”.

If sovereignty is mentioned, they will say we should talk about independence. If independence is mentioned, they will say we should talk about separation.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the announcement by the government that it was introducing a bill drastically altering the rules of the game should a referendum be held in Quebec, I ask for the consent of all members present in this House to table a document that will enlighten it.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Points of Order

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in light of the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill that denies Quebecers their fundamental rights, I am asking for the unanimous consent of the House to table a document which will certainly enlighten this House.

It is an article on the advantages to Ontario of the separation of Quebec, which appeared in *La Presse* on January 26.

The article states:

The sovereignty of Quebec would temporarily upset the economy of Ontario but, in the long term, Canada's richest province would undeniably gain from Quebec's departure from the federation. This is what was revealed by the *Globe and Mail* yesterday, after it managed, with great difficulty, to get its hands on secret studies commissioned by the Government of Ontario during the 1995 referendum campaign, when everything seemed lost for the federalists. According to these documents, Ontario felt at that time that the federal government was prepared to use military force if Quebec declared independence unilaterally. The government of the neighbouring province also feared that Quebec's departure might trigger a long recession and destabilize the dollar.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon: It took three years—

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the tabling of the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: The interpreters tell us that they cannot do their job when everyone is talking at the same time.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I continue to read this document?

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): No, I am sorry. The hon. member for Quebec did not understand correctly. It is someone else's turn.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, the hon. member for Québec, is preparing to table a document and to read us that document. She is being interrupted. I feel that we are being slighted here, because what is said here becomes a historical record. It is taken down and printed.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I know the hon. member for Chambly was incredibly interested in the document that the member for Quebec was reading from, but we did put the

question to the House on the document for the member for Quebec and it was denied.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: Mr. Speaker, how can people give informed consent if they do not know the content of the document?

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): That is a problem that we deal with here on a daily basis.

• (1230)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to table an article published in *Le Devoir* regarding Bill C-20, which reads as follows:

We learned of the federal government's decision to get involved, through a bill, in the Quebec referendum process. In a democracy, nothing is more dangerous than the opportunistic manipulation of the rules. To try to have one's view prevail by amending the procedure and by taking advantage of one's position of force opens the door to serious excesses.

First, by setting the required support for sovereignty at a threshold higher than 50% plus one, the government is trying to influence things so as to make it impossible to achieve sovereignty. We believe that this measure is highly undemocratic and it was condemned by all the political parties at the National Assembly. We believe that in a referendum debate on a question to which voters would answer yes or no, the only possible interpretation—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill denying the basic rights of Quebecers—they are going even further today by denying the rights of parliamentarians to bring their own witnesses before the committee and to express at length their position on this question so vital to Quebec and Canada—I have in my hand an excellent article of the prestigious *La Tribune* of Sherbrooke in which Mr. Dumont describes Mr. Chrétien's action as pointless.

I consider it important to read you a few quotes from statements by Mr. Dumont, who spoke very well on the issue. Mr. Dumont is the president and leader of the ADQ. He has some importance in the debate before us.

This is his second visit to Victoriaville. Even though it is Sherbrooke's prestigious paper, the facts I am going to quote for you took place in Victoriaville. It mentions that the debate is underway and that the Prime Minister should not continue his actions, because—

Points of Order

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not questioning your judgment, which we know to be sound, but my colleague from Saint-Jean had not yet asked for the unanimous consent of the House when you rose to ask if he had it. He must have the opportunity and the time to seek it, before you ask whether he has it.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The Chair is given certain discretion and were the Chair to have to wait for the request for unanimous consent to come from the member, we could be here until tomorrow or the next day waiting for the member to ask that. So it is understood why the member is reading from the document and therefore the Chair has exercised judgment, provided the opportunity for a succinct description of the document to be tabled and then to ask the House for its consideration.

In my estimation, the rules were completely and fully applied.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, you never cease to amaze me. I see that you are even more talented and gifted than I thought. You are now able to predict what one of our colleagues is about to do. You are truly extraordinary, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I thank the hon. member for his vote of confidence.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude Bachand: Mr. Speaker, I wish to come back to your ruling.

It is not that I wish to challenge it, but I would like you to at least tell me which standing order states that you have complete discretion in this regard.

• (1235)

I do not wish to question your discretion, but neither can you predict what I am going to request. I did not say I was calling for unanimous consent because you did not leave me the time.

I would like you to indicate to which standing order you are referring. I think it is important that we know. When parliamentarians rise to speak, you may not, in your capacity as Speaker, presume to know what they will request. I did not have the time to formulate a request.

I therefore ask you to tell me which standing order you had in mind.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I think that is a very appropriate question, one that is often asked of members and one that Chair occupants also have to ask themselves.

The reason is the authority vested in the Chair to maintain order, decorum and the smooth running of the affairs of the House to assure that all members of the House are given respect and the opportunity to make their case. It is also to ensure that at the end of the day the affairs of governance are concluded or are able to reach conclusion in a fair and orderly manner. The authority is not necessarily vested in a particular statute. The authority is vested in the Chair after 500 years of parliamentary tradition.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of this debate, I would like to table an article which was published in *Le Devoir* on December 4, about six weeks ago, and is still as pertinent today.

This article was entitled “Quebecers do not want Ottawa to interfere”. Let me read the first paragraph of this excellent article: “If Ottawa proceeds with a bill on the Quebec referendum, the people from Quebec will not accept it, says premier Bouchard, who is also asking the Canadian Prime Minister to calm down. Before heading off for the capital city of Quebec earlier today, Mr. Bouchard said that his federal colleague is always looking for support, but mainly in English Canada.”

I think all this is pertinent. It is at the heart of the debate. I request the unanimous consent of the House to table this document that could certainly serve as food for thought for our colleagues opposite. It is just one more attempt by the Prime Minister, through his gofer, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, to play petty politics on the backs of the people of Quebec, always on the backs of the people of Quebec, we will never repeat it often enough.

This article is thus still very pertinent. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to use all your wisdom and try to control all those people, because we are obviously changing the rules of the game without any mandate to do so.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon member for Trois-Rivières has requested the unanimous consent of the House to table a document. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

*Points of Order**[Translation]*

Mr. Maurice Dumas: Mr. Speaker, when unanimous consent is sought, the hon. members answering must be at their seats.

I have noticed that some members opposite are not in their usual place, particularly the hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington who just walked out but who was not in his place earlier.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: He could not say no from the seat he was occupying.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The rules and the precedence of the Chair are quite clear. When the Chair asks for unanimous consent on this or any other motion, it is not necessary for the members to be in their places. It is only necessary for the Chair to recognize a member anywhere in the Chamber. That can be behind the curtain. It can be anywhere in the purview or the sight of the Chair. It can be anywhere that the Speaker can see that the member is a sitting member.

In order to vote it is a completely different story. Members must be in their seats at the time the question is read. It is an interesting and a good question, but that is the reason.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have here part of the report entitled “Rapport sur l’intégrité territoriale du Québec dans l’hypothèse de l’accession à la souveraineté”, a document that was tabled with the Commission d’étude des questions afférentes à la souveraineté, in May 1992, in the Quebec National Assembly.

It reads “The territory is well defined. The existing limits constitute the borders of the new nation”.

I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table this document.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Rosemont has asked for the unanimous consent of the House to table a document. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1240)

[Translation]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I know you are very interested in my area, and that is why I would like to read to you a quotation from an article in *Le*

Soleil of December 12, under the title “The Blues of the Insurance Salesman”.

It reads “With a little bit of luck, obviously, the intergovernmental affairs minister could have done an amazing number of things in life. In the national hockey league, he would have had the videocam set up inside the net to see whether the puck gets across the thin red line or not. In the gardening business, his success would have been even more immediate. The intergovernmental affairs minister would have made a phenomenal lawnmower. Not a single blade of grass would have been left sticking out of the lawn—”

[English]

Mr. Derek Lee: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with a view to guiding us back to the straight and narrow. It is completely unnecessary for an hon. member to read the document that he is requesting consent to table.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I thank the member for that. I do understand that it is unnecessary, but it is the purview of the Chair to determine how far they go along. When the Chair has a sense of where this is going, the Chair will intervene.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, in the context of the comments by my hon. colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, I would like to get some advice from you.

Is it possible, under the Standing Orders, to rise on a point of order during another point of order? Because, if I understand correctly what has just happened, my hon. colleague for Lévis had the floor on a point of order and, during his point of order, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons rose on a point of order, and you recognized him.

So, is it possible, under the Standing Orders, to rise on a point of order during another point of order?

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It depends on the point of order. A point of order obviously has to relate to the order of the proceedings of the legislation before the House.

If a point of order is raised because a point of order in progress is out of order, perhaps because it is going on too long, then it would be in order. However, if it were a short distinct point of order then it would not be in order. To keep order, the Chair must determine which point of order is or is not in order.

In this instance, that point of order was in order, as well as the one the member raised. However, the point of order of the whip is not in order.

Points of Order

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, my point of order was not intended to call anyone to order, but to ask you what it was possible to do or not to do in the circumstances. By your answer, you have shown, once again, and once again I am impressed, that you are gifted with divinatory talents.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, so that he can conclude.

Mr. Antoine Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I felt that the December 12 article by Mr. Gagné was very interesting because it dealt with the Canadian Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

I ask, in accordance with the rules, for unanimous consent to table this very interesting document.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, being encouraged by the unanimous consent given to the hon. member for Laval East to table a document explaining how a majority of 50% plus one was adequate, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table a newspaper article.

• (1245)

This article, entitled “Sovereignty: Chrétien is shadow boxing”, will help convince other Liberal members that a majority of 50% plus one is the only majority acceptable in democracy.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mrs. Pauline Picard: Mr. Speaker, following the announcement by the government of its intention to introduce a bill which will change referendum rules in Quebec, I would like to table an extract of the Referendum Act—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but she may not ask to table more than one document today.

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, following the introduction by the infamous Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of a bill denying all the fundamental rights of Quebecers, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table this document that will certainly

enlighten members opposite. It is an article published in *Le Devoir* on February 10 last and entitled “Quebec made its nest in Davos”.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry, but I missed what the hon. member had to say, as I was speaking with the clerk.

[English]

Is the member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles asking a question of me?

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to wake you up or to distract you from your intelligent discussion with your colleague, but I have asked permission to table a document and I sincerely believe that all members will give their consent.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Does the hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles have unanimous consent to table a document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand an article that appeared in *Le Soleil* of November 29 entitled “Chrétien Haggling” and written by Jean-Jacques Samson, which says:

Jean Chrétien can wait until the next Parti Québécois convention in May 2000 to do anything about setting the parameters of another referendum on Quebec sovereignty. The Prime Minister of Canada proposed a swap yesterday to Lucien Bouchard. If Mr. Bouchard says he will not hold another referendum during his present term of office, Mr. Chrétien promises to make no further reference to referendums, the clarity of the question or the decision by the supreme court. In short, if you don't move, I won't.

Coming from anyone else, who had devoted the first part of his speech before 1,000 delegates from the Quebec section of his party to citing his duty and his responsibilities as the head of the Government of Canada in order to justify his having no choice but to intervene, this would have looked like a crudely set trap. But coming from Jean Chrétien, he is simply showing his true colours once again.

Mr. Chrétien is not motivated by a desire to settle this issue once and for all before passing on the leadership, as some said he would last week, he is apparently ready for a dirty deal—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): As we all know, we do not refer to members by name, even if we are quoting from someone else. The rules of the House indicate that we refer to members by their official titles or by their constituencies and not by their names. The idea is that we cannot take in the back door what we cannot bring in the front door.

Points of Order

That is just a general admonishment, but we need to get to the point because we should not be reading from the total document. If the hon. member for Quebec East wishes to table the document, would the member ask for consent of the House and then we will get on with it?

• (1250)

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I will change a few words. “The Prime Minister can wait until the next Parti Québécois convention in May 2000 to do anything about setting the parameters of another referendum on Quebec sovereignty. The Prime Minister of Canada has proposed a swap. If Mr. Bouchard says he will not hold another referendum during—”

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Does the hon. member for Quebec East have unanimous consent of the House to deposit the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have in hand an article from *Le Monde* of February 10, written by Louise Beaudoin. Its title is “Quebecers and sovereignty”.

Further to the introduction of Bill C-20, we have learned that the committee—which was meant to be the most democratic tool in the world, allowing Quebecers and Canadians to be heard—is refusing to accept briefs because they will not be appearing in person. I have never seen anything so democratic.

Mrs. Beaudoin begins her article as follows. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you at least listen to the first paragraph and you will see how very important this is. She writes:

There must always be agreement on what words mean. Many words have a number of different meanings attached. In France today, a person described as a liberal can be, pick one, a supporter of economic deregulation or a supporter of changing morality. That same word in the 1950s and 1960s would have been applied to a supporter of decolonization.

While such differences exist within France, they are even more marked between France and Quebec.

I am seeking unanimous consent to table this document, as I am sure that Canada would then finally understand what it is to be a sovereignist in Quebec.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Is there unanimous consent for the tabling of this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Transport, who is in this House, to do something about the speed at which the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is proceeding with passage of Bill C-20.

I am asking the Minister of Transport to approach the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs immediately, because what is going on right now does not make any sense.

This bill is destroying democracy in Quebec. Also I am indignant at the cavalier attitude of the legislative committee since it started its consideration of the bill, and at the procedure of the committee, which is embracing the undemocratic and arrogant principles of the current Prime Minister and his lackey, the member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville.

On this matter—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Fair is fair. When I am in the chair I do not like to hear any member being addressed by another member, even in a backhanded manner such as to call someone else the valet of another member. It is just not nice, so we are not going to do it. Would the hon. member for Lotbinière please finish his point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Odina Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, my comments regarding the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs were because, to me, the way he behaves makes him a lackey. A lackey is someone in the service of the king—

• (1255)

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All right, we are finished. The hon. member for Chambly.

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the member for Lotbinière had nearly finished his remarks. I was hanging on to his

Points of Order

every word. He has only a couple of words left to say, so could you—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I was listening very carefully as well. I asked the hon. member not to refer to another member in the manner that he did. When he referred to the hon. member in the same way he was finished. I stood and recognized the next member.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I can understand that you found my colleague's remarks a bit too long. I can understand that you found the terms he was using somewhat inappropriate, but once again I call on your divinatory talents to ask for the unanimous consent of the House for the tabling of the document he did not have the time to ask to table.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): No, with great respect I will not. I asked the member for Lotbinière not to refer to another member as a valet. When he did so a second time I interrupted so that he would not have the floor. That is why I went on to the next member.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: Mr. Speaker, again on a point of order. I was listening to my colleague very carefully, but I do not know which member he was referring to. Could you tell us, Mr. Speaker?

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I could but I will not. Are there any other points of order? We are proceeding now to the daily routine of business with the tabling of documents.

Does the hon. member wish to rise on a point of order? We would have to have unanimous consent to do so. The hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If you will allow me, and I do not want to push you because you have always served the House well, with your permission, following the introduction, by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, of a bill—not just any bill—denying the fundamental rights of Quebecers, whom you like so much, I ask for unanimous consent, which I am about to get, to table a document entitled “Le maintien d’une union monétaire avec un Québec séparé” —

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): With respect, the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve has already been on his feet, so I will not recognize him again for the tabling of that document under a point of order.

The House has proceeded to the daily routine of business. We are on tabling of documents. We would require unanimous consent of the House to go back.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, also on a point of order. I know that during these multiple points of order we have witnessed some interesting exchanges. Nevertheless, my colleague from Chambly rose to ask for unanimous consent to table a document.

For reasons that I just cannot understand, you did not recognize him. Could you explain to me, Mr. Speaker, why you did not allow my colleague from Chambly to go through with his request for unanimous consent to table a document?

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I think that is a fair request. After we finished our exchanges I rose again and I asked twice, not once but twice with an interval, if there were any other points of order. No one stood, so I went on then to the daily routine of business.

● (1300)

I understand that the hon. member for Chambly had not made his request, but when I stood and no one rose there was nothing I could do about it. We can revert, but it would require the unanimous consent of the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With all due respect, unless I do not understand the standing orders of the House, unanimous consent is not required for a member to rise on a point of order.

A member may at any time, except during Oral Question Period, rise on a point of order. That is what the member for Chambly wishes to do now and he does not need unanimous consent to proceed.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I want to make it clear that as the Assistant Deputy Speaker I am not setting a precedent. This may be reviewed by the Speaker.

The informal procedure of accepting these multiple points of order falls under the purview of the Speaker. Normally it is done during Routine Proceedings. This week it was not.

Routine Proceedings

The whip of the Bloc is quite correct. A member may at any time rise on a point of order. The Chair may or may not recognize a member rising on a point of order based on the discretion of the Chair, depending upon what is going on in the House.

It is possible for the hon. member for Chambly to rise on a point of order at any time, and then it will be up to the Chair. But this Chair at this time would like to get through Routine Proceedings, and I would be happy to recognize the hon. member for Chambly on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier, we went around and it was my turn to ask for unanimous consent. That is when you stood up. When you did—the rule in this place is that we sit down when the Speaker stands up—I took my seat. But once you had stood up, you said that the member for Chambly was seated and had not asked for the floor, when all I was doing was complying with the standing orders.

I wish to know whether I am entitled to request unanimous consent to table something.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Chambly has the floor.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: Mr. Speaker, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table a document which will be of great interest to my friends across the way regarding the passage—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The Chair is exercising its discretion and will put the question to the House. Does the hon. member for Chambly have the unanimous consent of the House to deposit the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1305)

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-433, an act to amend the Criminal Code (search and seizure without warrant).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to table this private member's bill on search and seizure without a warrant.

The purpose of this bill is to ensure that if during the process of a search and seizure property is damaged or lost, the people who own the property will be compensated for that loss. It makes sense. In the existing law there is a provision that the judge who issues the warrant must be presented with the date of the search and seizure, a description of what was seized and the extent of the search. This bill would add to that a report on any damage done for compensation purposes.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

EQUALITY

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today I take great pride in presenting a petition put forth by 1,551 concerned Canadians, mostly from the province of Quebec.

The petitioners ask the government to affirm that all Canadians are equal under all circumstances and without exception in the province of Quebec and throughout Canada. They wish to remind the government only to enact legislation that affirms the equality of each and every individual under the laws of Canada.

MERCHANT NAVY VETERANS

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition which I would like to present. Unfortunately this petition arrived late. It is signed by many Canadians who are concerned about the plight of merchant navy veterans.

As we know, after 55 years of being ignored, this issue has finally come to fruition and has been settled. I wish to compliment and thank the government very much for bringing this sordid issue to an end.

I present this petition on behalf of merchant navy veterans.

[*Translation*]

GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOODS

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions, one seven pages long and the other ten.

These petitions concern genetically modified products and express the concern of citizens in the riding of Laurentides, many of whom signed in order to indicate their desire to see these products labelled, so that they may choose between natural products and those that are genetically modified.

[*English*]

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition which draws

to the attention of the House that Canadians are horrified by child pornography and are astounded by the legal determination that possession of child pornography is not a criminal offence. It is the duty of parliament, through the enactment and enforcement of the criminal code, to protect the most vulnerable members of our society from sexual abuse.

Therefore, the petitioners pray that parliament take all measures necessary to ensure that the possession of child pornography remains a serious criminal offence and that federal police forces be directed to give priority to enforcing this law for the protection of children.

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present two petitions today. The first petition is signed by residents of the Vernon and Armstrong areas of my riding of Okanagan—Shuswap.

These Canadians ask parliament to take all measures necessary to ensure that the possession of child pornography remains a serious criminal offence.

• (1310)

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I will table today has been signed by 192 people from my riding of Okanagan—Shuswap.

The petitioners call upon parliament to prioritize funding for the national highway system in the 2000 budget to reduce fatalities, alleviate congestion, reduce emissions and improve Canada's overall economic prosperity.

[Translation]

GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD LABELLING

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table in the House a petition from people in the riding of Drummond and the area. The riding of Drummond being located in the center of Quebec, there are also people from the Montérégie who signed this petition. I am now tabling my third petition on this issue, for a total of over 2,000 signatures.

The petitioners call on parliament to quickly pass legislation to make it mandatory to label all foods that are totally or partially genetically modified.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to present a petition from people of the Mauricie region, in the ridings of Champlain, Saint-Maurice, the Prime Minister's riding, and Trois-Rivières.

This petition was signed by about 700 citizens who call on parliament to quickly pass legislation to make it mandatory to label all foods that are totally or partially genetically modified.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to table. The first petition deals with illegal migrants from China and illegal refugee claimants.

Because of the hardship which these individuals cause to genuine refugees, the petitioners state that the law must be changed to allow for the quick deportation of those who come to our country illegally to abuse the system.

I support this petition.

TAXATION

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition has to do with taxation.

Because taxes have increased 30% under this government and because high taxes kill jobs, the petitioners call upon parliament to reduce taxes by 25% in the near future.

I fully support this petition.

[Translation]

GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD LABELLING

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table in the House a petition that was signed mainly by people from my riding, the beautiful region of Rimouski—Mitis.

These petitioners call on the Government of Canada to pass as soon and as quickly as possible legislation on the labelling of foods containing, partially or totally, genetically modified organisms, which would make labelling mandatory in all cases.

CANADA POST CORPORATION

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition that I am pleased to table in this House.

The petitioners are asking that rural postal carriers, who often earn less than minimum wage, be allowed to succeed in having section 13(5) of the Canada Post Corporation Act repealed.

It is my hope that these carriers, who work in our regions and ensure that mail is delivered in areas often a little more remote, can win their case.

GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD LABELLING

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table a petition signed mainly by constituents of my riding of Québec, calling on parliament to quickly pass legislation making it mandatory to label all fully or partially genetically modified foods.

Government Orders

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Ms. Carolyn Parrish (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

MUNICIPAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved that Bill C-10, an act to amend the Municipal Grants Act, be read the third time and passed.

• (1315)

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely delighted today to have the opportunity to speak to Bill C-10, an act to amend the Municipal Grants Act.

We do not want to mislead the population. We talk about grants, but my colleague from Saint-Jean asked last week why we called it grants since they are basically payments of property taxes. As we used to say in law, and my colleagues who have studied in that field have heard it often enough “The King can do no wrong”. That is what is taught to law students on the very first lesson of their very first day in school. Then I could add to that saying that the King does not pay property taxes either.

That is the reason why there is a little subterfuge and the act talks about grants instead of taxes. However, if we look at it more closely, it could very well be real grants. Usually, when we talk about grants, we talk about the discretionary power of a minister. The minister can decide to give or to refuse a grant. In this case, the title Municipal Grants Act is not misleading since the discretionary power of the minister is mentioned in clause 3 of the bill.

There is nothing more scary than the discretionary power of a minister. Seldom do we see a minister having discretionary power who does not end up dirtying his or her hands. We really do not see it often. We have a very good example right now with all the mess at HRDC involving two ministers, one who was there earlier but has left since then and the other one who was not there earlier but is in the middle of things right now. This shows what discretionary power can do.

At the discretion of the Minister of Human Resources Development, \$500,000 was given to Wal-Mart. Poor Wal-Mart. It is sad how little money they have. And they are not alone.

The Minister of Human Resources Development and her officials do have discretionary power, and I see the member opposite shaking her head, but it is really a discretionary power even if, under the legislation, the minister has the authority to give grants or to fund programs, there is a highly discretionary component to all these things.

Here is an example. I know I am not a minister and I have no such pretension, but here is an example. Officials at Human Resources Development Canada divided my riding, the beautiful riding of Chambly—and I take this opportunity to say hello to the people of Chambly—into areas, such as area 37 or 38. For these areas to be eligible for the transitional jobs fund, their unemployment rate had to be over 12%.

The county town of Marieville is located in my riding, in the middle of a vast countryside, a largely agricultural area, where of course there is practically no unemployment. You may have a father, a mother and even a son working on a farm, so no one is unemployed.

The unemployed move to the county seat, the city of Marieville, which has high unemployment, in excess of 12%. For a year now, we have been asking the minister to transfer Marieville to the adjacent area, Chambly, so that it could qualify for grants under the transitional jobs fund, thus allowing people living in Marieville to benefit from this program.

This request was made a year ago. It was made not only by myself, but also by the municipal authorities, by Sylvain Lapointe, the mayor of Marieville, whom I take this opportunity to salute and who does an excellent job as a mayor, by the chamber of commerce and by the MNA.

• (1320)

Every stakeholder told the minister that it made no sense to include Marieville in a rural area, while this city which has between 5,000 and 6,000 residents and has high unemployment, but cannot benefit from the transitional jobs fund.

I learned, during oral question period, that the minister have given grants in her riding, where unemployment is clearly lower than 12%. It is not always true that the shoemaker's children are the worst shod, the minister's riding being proof of that. The minister gave transitional jobs fund grants, even though her riding does not seem to qualify for them.

To this she says “Yes, but in my riding, there are some pockets where unemployment is higher than 12%”. The law does not give her that authority. The law says that if in a particular area, which is clearly defined, the unemployment rate is below 12%, that is 11.99%, it does not qualify for transitory job fund grants.

Government Orders

The same applies to the riding of the Prime Minister, who used the same argument during oral question period last week or at the beginning of this week. He says that in his riding there are places—a street, a neighbourhood, a corner—where unemployment is over 12%. But this is not what the law says. It says that in the area as a whole unemployment must be 12% and above.

So members can see what discretionary power is. These people will stop at nothing to meet their ends. Fortunately, once in a while, they get caught, as it happened to the minister.

Do not ask me to show any pity, because what management at the Department of Human Resources Development did is really dishonest. I could give many examples and my friend, the member for Trois-Rivières, has just as many of his own.

An hon. member: Especially concerning her predecessor.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: The current minister's predecessor is a sorry figure. He is the true culprit in this whole affair, but the minister is trying to cover up for him. As my father used to say "The one who is holding the bag is just as guilty as the one who is filling it up".

If discretionary powers do not offend these people any more than that, I will give them a few examples.

A young nurse worked night shifts at the hospital, and when she did, she got a 35 or 45 cent an hour premium for an eight hour shift. She became unemployed, but she did not refuse any calls. From time to time, she got a call to come to work, and the young woman, who had just graduated from nursing school and who wanted to gain experience and eventually find a full time job, said yes. Whether it was a day shift, an evening shift or a night shift, she went to work.

When she filled out her employment insurance card, she reported working on that particular day. Her hourly wage at that time was, say, \$15 an hour. She wrote on the card that on that particular day she worked an eight hour shift and earned eight times \$15, or \$120. Human Resources Development Canada realized that it was not true, that she did not earn \$120 but \$122 because she had a premium for working the night shift.

She received notices and was given fines. She had a public servant after her for six months and had to pay penalties. She was not given any chance even though the mistake was made in good faith and her hourly wage was indeed, say, \$15, as it is generally the case for nurses.

An hon. member: They have quotas to meet.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: These people have quotas to meet, probably like the minister responsible for administering this act. Perhaps he will be more generous with his friends than with his enemies. When the mayor of a nice town is a potential Liberal

candidate in the next election, as was the case with some members now sitting in the House, then the minister can be more generous. That is what discretionary powers are all about, and that is what is dangerous in our system.

• (1325)

At second reading, and in committee, I recall that we asked for the discretionary powers given to the minister in this bill to be delineated. My colleague, also on the committee, went to speak to the Chair, no doubt to ask him to intervene, because they do not like to hear people say such things, to hear about abuse of discretionary powers.

I will give another example. In my riding there is a man who has worked on an on-call basis for many years. He is a mover. When a strong pair of arms are needed, they call him up, because he is a pretty strong, pretty sturdy individual. Sometimes he works a day or two, sometimes not at all. Every two weeks he fills out his employment insurance card.

He made a mistake. For one week, he marked that he had not worked Monday and Tuesday, and for the second week that he did work Monday and Tuesday, when he had not worked that week. He simply reversed the two weeks—

Mr. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Could the hon. member over there please tell us what this story he is telling us has to do with the bill we have before us?

An hon. member: He is getting to it. This is his introduction.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: Mr. Speaker, it is not up to the member opposite to decide what I will say in my speeches. I know he did not understand anything.

I am showing you the meaning of the abuse of discretionary powers and where it can lead. For those who are not friends of the government, who are not members of the Liberal Party of Canada, it becomes dangerous.

So, my mover muddles his weeks. He did not intend to do anything wrong and there is no benefit for him in doing so. He says he did not work two days he worked, but he says he worked two days the next week he did not work. It amounts to the same thing. He was fined \$800. The cheque was recovered, interest was charged and the man was threatened with a charge of fraud. This is how the management of the Department of Human Resources Development dealt with him.

An hon. member: To give it to whom? To Wal-Mart.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: To give it to whom? To give it to Wal-Mart, to Bombardier, to Pratt & Whitney, to Vidéotron or other such companies under the transitional jobs fund. Do you not think that is disgusting?

Private Members' Business

An hon. member: It is scandalous.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel: A widow came to see me after her husband died. The Department of Revenue had begun to bug him for some paltry amount, a pittance. They went after her husband right to his grave. He was dead, and the letters kept coming.

I am saying that it is not normal when you look into the system, and the Prime Minister wants us to believe there was only about \$251 in fraud at the Department of Human Resources Development. It is totally criminal to change and alter truth like that: \$251.50. Are we a pack of lunatics here? Tie up parliament for \$251.50.

My colleague, the member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles calculated it on a pro rata basis, the rule of three. The figure involved is \$2.8 billion or more exactly \$2,750,754—

[*English*]

Ms. Carolyn Parrish: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek the unanimous consent of the House to consider this bill having been read a third time so that we can vote it in and the municipalities can get their money.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. parliamentary secretary has requested the unanimous consent of the House to see the bill as read a third time. Is there unanimous consent?

An hon. member: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wish to point out to hon. members and those now listening that it is not at all because we feel that this bill is not important, but I think that the member for Chambly has some important things to say about it. I would like him to be allowed to continue.

• (1330)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): When the bill next comes before the House the hon. member for Chambly will have 25 minutes and 54 seconds to add to the debate. The time provided for Government Orders has now expired.

It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

WESTRAY MINE

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Criminal Code or other appropriate federal statutes should be amended in accordance with Recommendation 73 of the Province of Nova Scotia's Public Inquiry into the Westray disaster, specifically with the goal of ensuring that corporate executives and directors are held properly accountable for workplace safety.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Tobique—Mactaquac for seconding this very important motion.

Briefly, to recall, importantly of course, that on May 9, 1992 an explosion occurred at the Westray mine in Plymouth, Nova Scotia, killing 26 men. It was a horrible tragedy and one that was felt throughout the province of Nova Scotia, and indeed across the country.

Many Nova Scotians acted in a very heroic fashion that deadly day in May 1992. To those creative draggermen who were so directly involved in the efforts to locate the 26 miners who lost their lives, we will be forever grateful. Many of those draggermen came from across Nova Scotia, and indeed across the country. They worked, sadly in vain, to rescue the 26 men.

Coal mining and the coal industry in northeastern Nova Scotia has been very important for generations. *Pictou County Colliers*, by James Mr. Cameron, chronicles the history of coal mining in that part of Canada.

The devastation of the Mother's Day disaster at Westray mine nearly eight years ago has left a very long and painful memory in the hearts and minds of miners and people generally across the province.

The explosion at the Westray Coal mine sent a very chilling message to people. That message was that haste and financial gain can put individual lives at risk. Many owed their livelihood, gave their lives and lost their lives underground during the past 150 years.

Many in Nova Scotia, in particular, recall the bump at Spring Hill or the cave-ins and explosions in Pictou county and in Cape Breton. Artists, such as Rita MacNeil and the Men of the Deep, have sung poignant songs in remembrance of those lost souls.

The death of the 26 coal miners came as very unexpected and very sad to the peaceful community of Plymouth, that, from the very second that those fathers, brothers and sons were taken away from their families, people were left immediately with having to come to grips with the tragedy, and a tragedy that could have been avoided.

Private Members' Business

That is why it is so incumbent upon us as legislators to ensure that there are safe working environments for all workers engaged in labour activity, whether it is a mine, a fish plant, an automotive factory or any other work environment. It is incumbent upon us as legislators to move toward making those work places safe.

Days after the Westray explosion, on May 15 the Government of Nova Scotia appointed Mr. Justice Peter Richard to act as the head of a commission to inquire, under the public inquiries act, into what took place at the Westray mine.

The commission had a very broad mandate, so as to shed light on the explosion and all the related circumstances that led up to that tragic day. In fact, Nova Scotia's premier at the time, Donald Cameron, was very clear about that mandate. He said:

Mr. Justice Richard's inquiry will not be limited to the events of the early morning of May 9th. Nothing and no person with any light to shed on this tragedy will escape the scrutiny of the inquiry.

The commission's work began almost immediately to prepare for the public hearings set to begin in October 1992.

Curragh Resources Inc. and Westray's management challenged the validity of the order in council establishing the commission of inquiry. This, as members can imagine, led to numerous legal proceedings. Because of the delays, the report from Mr. Justice Richard was tabled five years later, in November 1997.

• (1335)

There was an incredible amount of wrangling that went on in the criminal courts and charges laid under the workers' safety act also led to much of the delay and much of the frustration that occurred as a result of the wranglings.

This is a very important matter for all and I would appreciate the attention of members who are in the Chamber.

The Westray story is one that is very complex and a mosaic of actions, omissions, mistakes, incompetence, apathy, cynicism and downright stupidity were viewed in context. These seemingly isolated incidents constituted a mindset of operating philosophy that appeared to favour expediency over intelligent planning that trivializes safety concerns. Indeed, management at Westray displayed a certain disdain for safety and appeared to regard safety conscious workers as wimps in the organization.

To its discredit, the management at Westray, through either incompetence or ignorance, lost sight of the basic tenet of coal mining that safe mining is good business. These words came directly from the report of Mr. Justice Richard, a report that was entitled "The Westray Story: A Predictable Path to Disaster". It contained 74 recommendations and concluded in its final analysis that the tragedy could have been avoided if minimal occupational safety standards had been adhered to.

There are always ways to prevent tragedies. Sometimes they cannot be avoided, but there are ways to eliminate the risk and the environment which costs people's lives or often leaves them injured for the remainder of their lives. There are ways to attach criminal responsibility to those actions that put people's lives at risk. Sometimes corporations and those at the head end and the head office of these corporations should, I suggest, be brought into some degree of culpability and accountability by our legislation, particular in the criminal code.

There are ways that this can be done: through amendments and through legislative initiatives. Some of those were proposed by Justice Richard. One proposal in particular would be to create a new criminal offence that would impose criminal liability on the directors or those responsible for failing to ensure that their corporation maintains an appropriate standard of occupational health and safety in the workplace. This is precisely what this motion hopes to achieve.

In Nova Scotia mining is regulated by three pieces of legislation: the mineral resources act, the occupational health and safety act and the coal mines regulation act. Mr. Justice Richard in his report reviewed all of these provincial acts and concluded that the main purpose was to ensure safety.

Unfortunately we have seen in recent years examples of occupational safety in the workplace taking second spot behind the bottom line, the financial line, which is especially true in the mining industry where the very nature of the work involves a great deal of risk and a great deal of danger just as a course of the type of work that is done underground. It is the duty of company officers to ensure that work is done in the safest of all possible conditions.

We want to ensure that individuals inside and outside corporate Canada will be dealt with equitably and fairly under the law, but we want to ensure that there is that degree of accountability, that executives will not be able to hide behind the corporate veil and the job titles in the commission of their duties.

Corporate Canada understandably has two related functions: to make a profit and to create jobs. Profit is a good thing but the balance has to be struck between the profit and the cost that is sometimes incurred by reckless behaviour. There must be a balance between making a profit and the means by which to get there.

Section 220 of the criminal code currently refers specifically to criminal negligence causing death and there are sections under section 234 of the criminal code pertaining to manslaughter. There may be a need to introduce amendments to these sections that would broaden the scope of culpability or perhaps even go so far as to make a specific reference to executives, directors or persons in management positions when pertaining to acts which result in the loss of life.

Private Members' Business

• (1340)

I brought this motion forward with the hope that the devastation of the Westray disaster will not be forgotten. I can assure the House and Canadians generally that those in Pictou county and in all of Nova Scotia recall with horror that period of time between May 1992 and the current has left in the minds of all.

It is as important today to ensure that the recommendations of the inquiry are not forgotten. Sadly, all Canadians have borne witness to reports that have been completed; the white papers that have been completed by royal commissions that have done their work. These reports wind up on a shelf gathering dust with no action.

Words are not enough when it comes to protecting lives in this instance. It is important that we follow the recommendations of this report, that we actually act with a great deal of strength in responding to the work that has already been done.

The fundamental and basic responsibility of safe operation of an underground coal mine is an industrial undertaking that rests very much with the owners and the managers. Westray management, starting with the chief executive officer, was required by law, by good business practice and good conscience, to design and operate a mine safely. Westray management came under attack in the ensuing days after the explosion for being lax in that responsibility.

The significance of that failure cannot be overstated. Simply because others were abdicating their responsibility is not a satisfactory response. Shared responsibility can be said to be implicit in the recommendations that came from the report.

Not only in the mining industry but also in any business venture, corporate executives sometimes seem less interested in the merits of workplace safety and simply in the pursuit of profit. This is a very dangerous situation. We must be mindful of the situation that can evolve and can result in tragedy. This mindset itself is precisely what set the dangerous tone in the workplace of the mine at Westray.

Businesses must also ensure that their employees are adequately supervised and constantly updated as to safe work practices. In the case of Westray, labour safety standards, particularly minimal safety standards, were not adhered to to the extent that they should have been.

Looking at this issue in the larger context, there must also be a recognition of the role of government to ensure that these proper standards are being met. If they are not being met, the government must intervene through its inspectors and simply see that the workplace is closed until those minimal standards are adhered to.

In the case of Westray, many trades persons were prone to perform unsafe tasks and take shortcuts in their daily routines, never once being told by management of the dangers of such

actions given that the mine was very gassy and potentially explosive, as the Foord seam has been known to be throughout its history. In many cases there was no question that the management may have been aware or ought to have been aware that the workers were not performing safe mining practices underground.

As stated in Mr. Justice Richard's report, there was a strong indication that the Westray management was aware of the levels of methane underground, which the coal miners were exposed to, and that these levels of methane were very hazardous and potentially explosive. Under section 72 of the Coal Mines Regulation Act, such conditions should have resulted in the workers being withdrawn from affected areas. That, of course, was one method of preventing the tragedy that resulted.

It stands to reason that when weighing business goals versus those of safety, sometimes businesses find themselves pulled by many factors. They have to meet production deadlines, competition to out-perform bottom lines and, in this case, there were government moneys involved that increased the pressure.

This is where the human element of safety must also enter into the equation. Far too often businesses, and indeed heads of corporations, may be tempted by that financial gain and put the safety of workers second. That type of short term gain for long term pain, as we have seen in the Westray example, is something that we seek to avoid by this motion. Of course, I speak to the injury of death that can result. It is a sad, sad scenario that we should learn from.

Tough economic times that exist in the country put further pressure on workers. This is why this motion, I suggest, is very timely. The economic impact of having to shut down corporations inevitably affects everyone in that region. The employees, the management, the board of directors, anyone associated with that business feels the negative impact of an operational shutdown.

• (1345)

This is the cost of doing business. If we have to shut down these businesses to ensure that lives are protected, that is what has to happen.

Companies must do everything in their power, and I suggest that we as legislators similarly are mandated to do everything in our power to ensure that hazardous workplaces are dealt with in a proactive way as opposed to reactive, as we have seen in Westray. If companies have not acted properly, have not adhered to the legislation, both provincial and federal, there must be consequences.

Ethics and the results of this tragedy dictate that we should go further, that we have to now act, pick up the report and move this matter forward. This is a very serious instance. Business executives find themselves in a position where they are insulated from the consequences of their potential negligence and potential lax control over what is taking place on the ground. Business executives must

Private Members' Business

promote and nurture safe work ethics and have an open and approachable attitude toward their employees. No one ever wants to feel the effects of what took place in Plymouth at the Westray mine again.

I appreciate the non-partisan tone that has taken place on previous occasions on the debate of this particular motion. I would suggest that there is a great deal of impact that all members can have in this area. We must hold to account individuals who behave recklessly and without conscience that results in lost lives.

We are empowered here with the knowledge, the know-how and the ability to make legislation that can have effect, very real effect on workplace safety. We are empowered as officials to exercise our discretion to ensure that those who are operating businesses and those who have the final say over what takes place in the work world are adhering to safe practice.

I appreciate the support that all members thus far have shown for this motion. I am very concerned that we are only paying lip service to this issue. I very much look forward to the comments and the support of all members of the House to ensure that we move forward and do everything within our power to ensure that workplace safety is a priority in this country. It is something that we in parliament are very concerned about and are prepared to take positive action toward improving.

Mr. John Maloney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Motion No. 79.

The motion from the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough recommends that this House express its opinion that the criminal code should be amended to address the issue of the criminal liability of corporate executives and directors. I commend the member opposite for again bringing this issue before the House. It is one which requires our serious consideration.

It is evident that this motion has its origins in a tragic explosion in the Westray mine on May 9, 1992 in which 26 miners were killed. The subsequent public inquiry set up by the Nova Scotia government clearly established that mismanagement created an unsafe working environment that was a direct cause of the disaster. Throughout the inquiry and the prosecutions that followed from the investigation into the tragedy the responsibility of Westray officers and the Westray Corporation itself emerged as important and contentious issues.

The inquiry, chaired by Mr. Justice Peter Richard, produced the four volume report "The Westray Story: A Predictable Path to Disaster". Judge Richard's report set out 74 recommendations aimed at improving mine safety so that such incidents never happen again, so that mining operations never again, in his words, go down that path to disaster.

I would like to read into the record recommendation 73 of Mr. Justice Richard's report as it forms the basis of the motion we are debating today:

The Government of Canada, through the Department of Justice, should institute a study of the accountability of corporate executives and directors for the wrongful or negligent acts of the corporation and should introduce in the Parliament of Canada such amendments to legislation as are necessary to ensure that corporate executives and directors are properly accountable for workplace safety.

I agree there is merit in examining the criminal law as it deals with the criminal responsibility of corporations. However, it is much more likely that we will need a combination of preventive, remedial and punitive measures in order to keep us from going down that path of disaster again. The solutions to the problem of corporate responsibility therefore will be found in a mix of criminal law, labour code regulation and the regulation of business activity.

• (1350)

Before I address the role of the criminal law in such a system, I will give an example of how preventive and remedial measures outside the criminal code can advance the objectives of workplace safety.

On October 28 last year the Minister of Labour introduced Bill C-12, a package of amendments to part II of the Canada Labour Code designed to improve workplace safety in industries under federal jurisdiction.

This legislation expands the responsibilities of both employers and employees in creating a safe work environment. It establishes three fundamental rights for employees: the right to know about hazards in the workplace; the right to participate in correcting the hazards; and the right to refuse dangerous work.

There is no point in having a right without a remedy. Therefore, Bill C-12 expands the role of workplace health and safety committees in inspecting workplaces and in investigating complaints. Similarly when an employee refuses to perform tasks that are considered dangerous, the legislation will streamline the complaint resolution process.

The Canada Labour Code also makes it an offence to contravene any of these rules and creates sanctions in the form of fines and terms of imprisonment.

We can leave the debate on Bill C-12 to another day but I urge colleagues to keep in mind that initiatives such as Bill C-12 serve many of the same objectives as the criminal law changes suggested by Judge Richard in the Westray report.

The motion before us today does not actually identify a particular amendment to the criminal code. Therefore, I would like to point out some of the factors involved in creating a criminal law sanction for corporate misconduct in the workplace. Any examination of the criminal law in this area must consider both the

Government Orders

responsibility of a corporation itself and the liability of the people who are employed by that company.

On the first point, it should be understood that under the current law, it is already possible to charge a corporation with a crime. Section 2 of the criminal code includes companies in the definition of person and there have been instances where corporations have been charged with crimes. In fact in the Westray case, charges of manslaughter and criminal negligence causing death were laid against Curragh, Inc., the owner and operator of the mine, as well as individual employees of the company.

It is also important to note that the Supreme Court of Canada held in a 1985 case that a corporation will generally be liable for a criminal offence if a corporate director or officer commits an offence for the benefit of the corporation in the course of his or her employment.

In 1993 a subcommittee of the House Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General, as it was then called, issued a report on the recodification of the general part of the criminal code. This is the part that deals with fundamental components of criminal offences such as culpability and defences.

The subcommittee took the view that express rules on the liability of corporations should be added to the general part in a way that makes a sharper distinction between the company's liability and that of its employees. The subcommittee recommended as follows:

A corporation [should be] liable for conduct committed on its behalf by its directors, officers or employees acting within the scope of their authority and identifiable as persons with authority over the formulation or implementation of corporate policy, notwithstanding that no director, officer or employee may be held individually liable for the same offence.

If we want to change the current law, there are other approaches that deserve consideration.

Australian law makes it possible for a company to be charged with offences requiring intention, knowledge, recklessness or negligence. The Australian statute focuses on actions by the company's board of directors and its agents that tacitly or expressly authorize or permit the commission of a criminal offence.

I will turn briefly to the criminal liability of individual employees of a corporation as opposed to the corporation itself. As individuals the employees can be charged with any criminal offence they commit and for which they are morally responsible. Section 23 of the criminal code also creates criminal liability for anyone who is a party to an offence, which means doing or omitting to do anything for the purpose of aiding someone to commit that offence, or abetting that person in committing the offence. Section 23 also makes it an offence to counsel another person to be a party to a crime. Therefore, there is already a way of getting at individual

employees whose misconduct in the course of their duties amounts to a crime.

These provisions in the criminal code are important because if the corporation has a general duty to comply with the law, individual directors and officers also have a duty to take into account interests beyond those of shareholders and beyond the balance sheet.

I understand that in the aftermath of the Westray inquiry the attorney general for Nova Scotia requested that the Minister of Justice for Canada address recommendation 73 of the Westray report and that the minister has agreed to do so. This step having been taken, I would suggest that the motion before us today does not advance the process.

• (1355)

Finally, criminal laws created by parliament should also recognize the role of provinces in the area of workplace safety. In this regard I note that the Westray report also recommends that the province of Nova Scotia undertake a review of its occupational health and safety legislation and take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that officers and directors of corporations doing business in the province are held properly accountable for the failure of the corporation to secure and maintain a secure workplace.

For these reasons I oppose this motion as it does not further the study of criminal law in this area.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

MODERNIZATION OF BENEFITS AND OBLIGATIONS ACT

BILL C-23—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the second reading stage of Bill C-23, an act to modernize the Statutes of Canada in relation to benefits and obligations.

[Translation]

Under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice that a minister of the crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stage.

Some hon. members: Shame, shame.

*Private Members' Business***PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS***[English]***WESTRAY MINE**

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to participate in this debate.

I have great respect for the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough. It is imperative that I read the motion followed by recommendation 73 from the Westray report which has precipitated the member's motion.

Motion No. 79 reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Criminal Code or other appropriate federal statutes should be amended in accordance with Recommendation 73 of the Province of Nova Scotia's Public Inquiry into the Westray disaster, specifically with the goal of ensuring that corporate executives and directors are held properly accountable for workplace safety.

Recommendation 73 of the Westray inquiry reads:

The Government of Canada, through the Department of Justice, should institute a study—

I emphasize the word study.

—of the accountability of corporate executives and directors for the wrongful or negligent acts of the corporation and should introduce in the Parliament of Canada such amendments to legislation as are necessary to ensure that corporate executives and directors are held properly accountable for workplace safety.

Recommendation 73 clearly calls upon the Government of Canada through the justice department to institute a study to ensure the accountability of corporate executives. I have no problem with this.

Let us take a closer look at this issue. Motion No. 79 calls for immediate amendment to the Criminal Code of Canada or other appropriate federal statutes without first studying the parameters of corporate responsibility. I say with the greatest respect for the member from Nova Scotia who I understand is very sincere in what he is trying to do that it is a bit premature. I want to get into the specifics and I offer this as a constructive criticism.

The ramifications of the criminal code changes are immense and in many cases final. My objection to the member's initiative in no way is meant to diminish what he is trying to do. We cannot diminish the extent of this tragedy and the loss of 26 lives.

We should follow the guidance of recommendation 73 before making that quantum leap to amend the criminal code.

The issue of corporate responsibility is a shifting paradigm. The composition of corporations and the roles of directors who sit on their boards are in constant evolution. I am uncertain how much empirical evidence and resources are at our disposal to adequately understand corporate responsibility, specifically the role of accountability which we assign to directors.

• (1400)

The law has some guidelines and statutory parameters regarding business organization. The corporate form of business organization is intended to protect shareholders from personal liability for civil debts of the corporation. Executives, directors or other officers and employees of the corporation enjoy no special immunity from either criminal or quasi-criminal liability. Such persons are legally accountable for their own personal wrongdoing and negligence. Corporations can be held criminally liable in their own right.

In the case of offences of absolute or strict liability, a corporation is subject to penal liability for unlawful acts or omissions of the corporation per se or for those employees and agents in the context of corporate duties. In the case of an actual criminal offence, corporations are liable for the acts and omissions of such persons who by reason of their relevant position or authority in the corporation may be said to constitute the "directing mind" of the corporation.

In the November 1997 report on the Westray disaster, Mr. Justice Peter Richard recommended that applicable federal and provincial laws should be reviewed and amended to ensure that corporate directors and executives are held properly accountable for workplace safety. I do not disagree on the magnitude of this disaster and the 26 lives that were lost. I do not want to diminish that, but it is important that when we make these changes we get them right.

The member's motion wants to go much further. It would ostensibly make it easier to fix criminal liability on corporations by calling for a new criminal offence. Mr. Justice Richard did not go that far. He wanted to proceed in steps. Justice Richard called for a study of corporate responsibility, recognizing the shifting and evolving nature of corporations, their composition and the role of directors.

Allow me to identify what I see as some of the real problems with this motion. Corporations would have a major problem attracting viable candidates who want to sit on a board with such criminal code penalties affixed to them as called for in Motion No. 79. I dare say no one would want the job but the implications for corporations without boards is obvious under commercial and corporate laws. Smaller or struggling companies would be at a greater disadvantage if such standards for accountability were applied to them.

Private Members' Business

I am not saying there should not be responsibility and I am not saying directors should be able to hide from their duties and social responsibilities. I do not want to see punitive and debilitating roadblocks to growth thrown in their path and consequently that of the corporation.

I for one believe that the majority of corporations serve a social purpose and are concerned with workplace safety. I say this with some credibility. I was a safety officer for a forestry company in British Columbia and I can attest that although accidents happen they were taken very seriously. I am sure they do not want to see accidents happen.

A blanket criminal code amendment would do little to foster economic growth and jobs. There must be a balance between making a profit and operating as an ethical and socially responsible enterprise. That balance can be precarious. The impacts criminal censure can have must be weighed carefully. Furthermore, I have to ask what the responsibilities and consequences would be for shop stewards on the floor. I am not suggesting by any means that we should be looking at imposing criminal sanctions on them, but they also play a very important role in workplace safety. This has to be evaluated at the same time.

I would further ask whether the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough has given any thought to the responsibilities of federal and provincial labour inspectors. Motion No. 79 could have devastating consequences for doing business in Canada. It would have a serious impact on investment and would add dramatically to operating costs and consequently the profits and the motivation to expand. Employment levels in corporations would no doubt be reduced. The less people, the less chance for accidents. Would production levels not also be reduced?

It would be unreasonable to expect each and every director of every corporation to be cognizant of every aspect of health and safety within any given corporation. It is very important to have every director involved in day to day operations.

I appreciate in the example of Westray that obviously there was a massive problem. Twenty-six lives were lost and I do not want to minimize that. If every prospective member is expected to assume this type of responsibility there would be no candidates to sit on a board.

• (1405)

I concur with the member in his genuine concern for the welfare of the miners and in his hopes that such a tragedy will never be repeated. However, despite the honourable intentions of this motion I fear he has not taken the full picture into account. Without question Westray was a reprehensible disaster. No one can diminish the human tragedy that descended upon that community and its people.

However, it is important to recognize that the crown currently has powers under the criminal code to charge negligent mine managers who were on site and who were responsible. Let us follow the direction contained in recommendation 73 of the Westray inquiry and review the responsibilities of directors before we move to criminal code amendments.

In short, I am saying let us not make that quantum leap. Let us do a very comprehensive study because it will have a serious impact on corporations across the country. Let us make sure what we are doing is absolutely right. There are provisions right now for the people in the day to day management positions.

I commend the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough for bringing the motion forward. It is a very important one, but we want to make sure we get it watertight and we get it right because it could have some very negative consequences on the corporate and business communities of Canada. This seems to be the direction in which the member for Erie—Lincoln was going as well.

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to stand here today as a coal miner's daughter and as a coal miner's granddaughter to speak to this private member's motion. It is a subject that is very close to my heart. My colleagues in the New Democratic Party and I support the motion in principle.

The hon. member for Halifax has a bill on the order paper, Bill C-259. Its intent and purpose are the same as those of the motion before us today. However it is more legal in nature and takes the intent of this motion one step further to legislate changes. We in the NDP have long been involved in the process and in lobbying for that step.

We would like to see the criminal code amended to ensure that corporate executives and directors are held properly accountable for workplace safety. We in the NDP caucus have been actively involved with the United Steelworkers of America in its lobbying for accountability in workplace health and safety issues. The impetus for the work we have been doing with the steelworkers union was the tragedy at the Westray coal mine in 1992 that killed 26 miners.

The tragedy at Westray was caused by a spark from a continuous mining machine that ignited methane gas, which then caused a coal dust explosion. Following this tragedy we in the NDP, our sisters and brothers in the United Steelworkers of America and the families of the miners killed in that explosion have worked to make the law clear and prevent deaths and injuries. We have to send a message to decision makers that they will be held accountable for their decisions.

I made very clear when I stood before the House to address this motion before, and I will make it perfectly clear again, that we have reached a stage of evolution in society. We will no longer allow people to use the excuse that we were just following orders as a

defence for knowingly and willingly causing harm of any kind to others. We as a parliament must take our responsibility to ensure that we live up to the most basic foundation of law and order that people are responsible for their own actions.

After the disaster at Westray a public inquiry was established through the efforts of United Steelworkers of America. The inquiry was given a simple mandate to probe whether or not the explosion was preventable. After 76 days of testimony over a 14 month period the Westray inquiry, headed by Mr. Justice Richard of the Nova Scotia supreme court, released its report.

The report cannot be called anything less than a condemnation of the way in which Westray executives operated the mine prior to the explosion. Mr. Richard was very clear in his report that the actions and attitudes of the management at Westray sent the message that worker safety was not a priority. The miners at Westray, including those who were killed in the explosion in 1992, were expected to produce coal at the expense of worker safety.

• (1410)

This motion is in essence to adopt recommendation No. 73 of the Westray report. I would like to take the opportunity to read the recommendation to the House:

The Government of Canada, through the Department of Justice, should institute a study of the accountability of corporate executives and directors for the wrongful or negligent acts of the corporations and should introduce in the Parliament of Canada such amendments to legislation as are necessary to ensure that corporate executives and directors are held accountable for workplace safety.

The intent of Mr. Richard and the commission is clear. As federal parliamentarians we must take the initiative and introduce changes to the criminal code to ensure corporate accountability in the workplace.

The motion allows us to try to rise above the daily hullabaloo of partisan politics of late. If the motion is passed or adopted by the House, it would be the first step on the road to ensuring that those firms, mining or other, which run their businesses in a responsible way are rewarded. Their reward would come from the punishment of those firms that run their businesses in unsafe ways in their shameful attempt to cut prices. Those businesses that put their workers in danger would not be allowed to operate.

We in Cape Breton know only too well about these kinds of unscrupulous businesses. We do not have to look much further than at the coal industry to provide what should be enough examples to give all my hon. colleagues in the House enough reason to adopt the motion and then go the next step and change the criminal code.

Let me be perfectly clear. This is not about bashing business but about legislating responsible business practice. Responsible business practice means that employers, especially those who run businesses that involve elements of physical or mental risk to their

Private Members' Business

employees, must be accountable if things go wrong. That is precisely what Justice Richard, the families of the miners who died at Westray, the steelworkers and we in the NDP caucus have been trying to do: legislate a framework for responsible business practices as it relates to health and safety of workers.

We as members of parliament must take the lead on this issue, which is why I commend my hon. colleague from Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough on his efforts to have this important motion brought before the House. If we could then see our way to legislating the recommendation of Justice Richard's report, we could help prevent disasters like the one we saw at Westray from ever happening again. It would also not just be in cases of such catastrophic events. This type of legislation would help in creating safer and healthier working environments on a daily basis.

In Westray's case, only two of the executives of the corporation ever appeared before the inquiry. The other executives did not want to give evidence of their crime and resisted all attempts to get them to appear as witnesses. Criminal proceedings against some of the executives had to be dropped because the lawyers concluded that there was no reasonable chance that a conviction could result.

It was not that the lawyers found nothing criminal about their activities. No, the truth was that the evidence was there but the laws were not. There were no laws to prevent the deaths and injuries of the miners at Westray. There were no laws to make the people who caused those deaths accountable to their families.

May I say on a personal note that I am one of those family members who have lost a relative in the mines. It is a sad state of affairs when we have our family members killed in industrial accidents, but may I say that what is more tragic in these deaths at Westray, and as was with my uncle's, is that he was sealed as some of the men at Westray were and will forever remain under the Atlantic Ocean. We have the opportunity to change all of that for miners' families, and today can be the beginning of that process.

• (1415)

I would like to once again return to recommendation 73 of the Westray report. Mr. Justice Richard was very clear in his intent when he wrote:

—in the Parliament of Canada such amendments to legislation as are necessary to ensure that corporate executives and directors are held accountable for workplace safety.

Recent events have shown that even in this House of Commons, where we sit to represent our constituents, it is difficult to achieve accountability and responsibility for one's actions. If it is difficult here, we cannot just expect it from private companies. We must use this motion as the first step to legislating corporate responsibility so that we can prevent further deaths and injuries so tragically revealed by the Westray disaster, and we must do it now.

Private Members' Business

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to Motion No. 79. I commend the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough for his comments as well as the member for Bras d'Or—Cape Breton for her thoughtful remarks.

The motion states that we should amend federal statutes, including the criminal code, to address the issues of accountability and liability for safety in the workplace in relation to recommendation 73 of the province of Nova Scotia's public inquiry into the Westray disaster. There would not be anyone in the House who would not share the member's concern for the victims and for the families of the victims of those who were so tragically affected by the Westray disaster.

The Westray disaster was a tragedy that captured the attention of the whole nation. Although it happened some time ago, it remains in our minds and underlines the need for all of us in public office to be sensitive to the concerns of workers and to the need to ensure safe and secure workplaces.

Workers are the backbone of our economy. Fatalities, injuries and illnesses in the workplace cause them and their families to suffer both in human terms as well as in economic terms. It is estimated that on top of the terrific human cost the dollar cost to our economy is as much as \$10 million a year. These costs are too high and we need to look at ways to bring them down.

This motion provides us with an opportunity to look at the situation of workplace safety in Canada and to consider what needs to be done by the federal government to provide safe and healthy workplaces for Canadians. The motion before us proposes that we need a new legislative approach to workplace safety. Legislation is clearly one option, but so is education.

Having worked in factories and on a railway, I know how important it is that workers be secure in their knowledge of what are the best practices in the workplace as well as management. There are many experts in the field of occupational health and safety who feel that prevention through education and training is every bit as important as intervention through legislation. These people understand the value of promoting education and training in order to reduce the incidence of illness and accidents in the workplace.

A national day of mourning was held on April 28 last year and will be held again this year. I am proud to say that in my town of Elliot Lake, in my riding of Algoma—Manitoulin, we honour our lost workers on this very special day each year.

We have asked Canadians to remember workers who were killed or injured as a result of occupational accidents or illness. The

Canadian flag was flown at half-mast on Parliament Hill in memory of those workers who lost their lives or who were injured on the job.

Also each year organizations throughout North America co-operate to hold North American Occupational Safety and Health Week. This past year the North American Occupational Safety and Health Week was held from May 17 to 23, and I expect it will be again this year.

As part of this occasion the Government of Canada joins with the governments of the United States and Mexico to promote awareness of workplace safety throughout North America.

• (1420)

In addition, Canadian organizations such as the Canadian Society of Safety Engineering and the Canadian Centre for Occupational Safety and Health are working in partnership with the federal government and others in Canadian society to promote safe work practices.

These organizations produce excellent material to help labour, business, governments and others interested in occupational health and safety to learn about working together to identify and implement new approaches to promote workplace safety.

The educational information they produce is distributed broadly to employers and employees, and the Canadian Centre for Occupational Safety and Health has created a very useful website that has gained an international reputation. It is important to underline the importance of education as it relates to workplace safety.

The labour program is very supportive of these activities. Indeed, for the last several years the labour program has played a leading role in emphasizing education and awareness as a means of promoting better workplace safety.

Thus there is a wide variety of initiatives under way, under the leadership of Canada's Minister of Labour, with the help of her parliamentary secretary, the member for Whitby—Ajax, which provide useful information to focus the attention of employers, employees and the general public on the importance of preventing injury and illness in the workplace through education and awareness.

Although the motion does not talk about the use of information to create safer work environments, it is important to keep in mind that education and awareness are also important aspects of our existing approach to promoting workplace safety.

The second part of the approach, of course, is legislative.

It was some 30 years ago that the federal government developed the first occupational safety and health legislation to cover employees and workplaces under federal jurisdiction. Over the years

federal legislation and regulations relating to occupational safety and health have been consolidated under the Canada Labour Code.

As we consider the motion, we need also to consider what is in place under the Canada Labour Code, especially under part II of the code, because it is part II of the code which governs occupational safety and health for employees working in organizations under federal jurisdiction.

The Canada Labour Code establishes three fundamental rights for workers: first, the right to know about unsafe conditions; second, the right to participate in workplace decisions relating to safety; and third, the right to refuse dangerous work.

The code also includes a set of occupational safety and health regulations that prescribes standards and procedures for both employers and employees to follow.

Federal government inspectors visit workplaces, respond to complaints, conduct investigations, prohibit access to workplaces deemed hazardous and can impose fines for non-compliance. In other words, with the Canada Labour Code we already have a model in place to cover the enforcement of safety in the workplace.

The problem is that the Canada Labour Code covers only those employees who are working in industries or organizations that are subject to federal legislation. That is only a small part of the working population of Canada. Therefore, while we have an effective model in the Canada Labour Code, it does not cover the whole population of workers, most of whom are under provincial or territorial jurisdiction.

The difficulty with the idea of extending the federal model to include workers outside the federal jurisdiction is that, constitutionally, workplace safety is also a provincial concern. Any moves at the federal level to encroach on provincial or territorial legislative turf, so to speak, on workers' rights may not be viewed positively by those other levels of government.

We have to find an approach that would accommodate federal-provincial interests and would also combine the educational and legislative approaches. This issue requires further study by the Minister of Justice, as recommended by the Westray inquiry report.

I would like to emphasize a point made by my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, that corporate criminal liability is part of the larger goal of improving workplace safety. Bill C-12, now before the House, amends part II of the Canada Labour Code to reinforce the obligations of employers and the rights of employees in respect of safety in federally regulated workplaces.

Although the emphasis is on preventive measures, various remedies, including penalties, are provided for in the labour code for violations of standards. Bill C-12 deserves the early attention

Private Members' Business

of the House, while the government continues to examine potential legislative amendments to address corporate criminal liability.

• (1425)

This motion, while extremely well intentioned, merely calls upon the House to support the idea of amending the criminal code, but does not specify what kind of amendment is needed. As such, the motion does not advance significantly the study of the complex issue of corporate criminal liability.

We on this side of the House support the idea of a study. I believe that the member who proposed this motion, having done so with the best of intentions, fails to recognize the important jurisdiction the provinces have when it comes to workplace health and safety. I encourage him to co-operate with the government. I am sure that the outcome of a study would be the best possible for workers from coast to coast. We know that federal workers are well protected. We would hope that our provincial counterparts will see the wisdom of participating in any kind of study to make things better for workers across the country.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, having heard the hon. member from the government say that it is not interested in supporting this recommendation is disappointing. It has thrown me off my remarks. I really thought there would be broad interest and support for such a good motion and for the type of language that was put together.

I can tell members that Canadians were absolutely horrified when 26 miners were killed at the Westray mine, but they were even more horrified when they discovered that the crown prosecutor for Nova Scotia had to stay the charges because, under the current criminal code of Canada, in spite of overwhelming evidence of gross negligence, he could not make those charges stick. That is what Canadians were seriously horrified about.

That is what led to Judge Richard making recommendations in the Westray report. Recommendation 73 specifically called for the criminal code and other legislation to be amended to introduce the concept of corporate manslaughter or corporate murder. Now corporations can be charged with a violation of the Canada Labour Code if workers' lives are put at risk through gross negligence, but they cannot be charged with manslaughter or murder because the current criminal code does not contemplate that. That is what recommendation 73 called for. That is what the motion from the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough calls for. That is what the private member's bill introduced by our leader, the member for Halifax, called for in a very specific way.

We would be able to criminally charge company owners, CEOs, members of boards of directors of any enterprise who knowingly risk workers' lives in the same way that we would be able to charge someone with criminal negligence who drank a full bottle of

Private Members' Business

whiskey and then drove a car and killed somebody. That person could be charged under the Motor Vehicles Act, but also under the criminal code because a person's life was put at risk through criminal negligence. The same should apply to workplaces. Nobody should be injured, butchered or maimed on behalf of some arbitrary production schedule. Canadians have matured far beyond that point.

We still have startling statistics though. Three Canadian workers a day are killed at work. One thousand Canadians a year are killed on the job and hundreds of thousands of others suffer lost time due to injuries.

We have looked at the moral and ethical reasons why we have to stop this. Let us now look at the financial reasons.

Every year in my home province of Manitoba 50,000 person days are lost due to strikes and lockouts, and the right wing of the chamber of commerce screams bloody murder that unions are causing a lack of productivity. In the same period of time, 500,000 person days are lost due to injuries, accidents, lost time, sickness due to injury, et cetera. If we are serious about productivity, if we are serious about workers or profits due to productivity, the first place to clean up is the workplace.

There are all kinds of good reasons why this particular motion should get unanimous support from the House. Under the guidance of the motion we would go on to pass the private member's bill dealing with Westray, get it into the criminal code and amend part II of the Canada Labour Code. No one should be injured, butchered or maimed on behalf of an arbitrary production schedule in this country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): When the motion next comes before the House the member for Winnipeg Centre will have six minutes for debate.

[*Translation*]

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

[*English*]

It being 2.30 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.30 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN MCCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

MR. STÉPHANE BERGERON

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. JAY HILL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session — Thirty-sixth Parliament

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Abbott, Jim | Kootenay — Columbia | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Ablonczy, Diane | Calgary — Nose Hill | Alberta | Ref. |
| Adams, Peter | Peterborough | Ontario | Lib. |
| Alarie, H  l  ne | Louis-H  bert | Quebec | BQ |
| Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs | Winnipeg South | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Anders, Rob | Calgary West | Alberta | Ref. |
| Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment | Victoria | British Columbia | Lib. |
| Assad, Mark | Gatineau | Quebec | Lib. |
| Assadourian, Sarkis | Brampton Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Asselin, G  rard | Charlevoix | Quebec | BQ |
| Augustine, Jean | Etobicoke — Lakeshore | Ontario | Lib. |
| Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs | Winnipeg South Centre | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Bachand, Andr   | Richmond — Arthabaska | Quebec | PC |
| Bachand, Claude | Saint-Jean | Quebec | BQ |
| Bailey, Roy | Souris — Moose Mountain | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency) | Gander — Grand Falls | Newfoundland | Lib. |
| Bakopanos, Eleni | Ahuntsic | Quebec | Lib. |
| Barnes, Sue | London West | Ontario | Lib. |
| Beaumier, Colleen | Brampton West — Mississauga | Ontario | Lib. |
| B  lair, R  ginald | Timmins — James Bay | Ontario | Lib. |
| B  langer, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage | Ottawa — Vanier | Ontario | Lib. |
| Bellehumeur, Michel | Berthier — Montcalm | Quebec | BQ |
| Bellemare, Eug  ne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation | Carleton — Gloucester | Ontario | Lib. |
| Bennett, Carolyn | St. Paul's | Ontario | Lib. |
| Benoit, Leon E. | Lakeland | Alberta | Ref. |
| Bergeron, St  phane | Verch  res — Les-Patriotes | Quebec | BQ |
| Bernier, Gilles | Tobique — Mactaquac | New Brunswick | PC |
| Bernier, Yvan | Bonaventure — Gasp   —   les- de-la-Madeleine — Pabok | Quebec | BQ |
| Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence | Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle | Quebec | Lib. |
| Bevilacqua, Maurizio | Vaughan — King — Aurora | Ontario | Lib. |
| Bigras, Bernard | Rosemont | Quebec | BQ |
| Blaikie, Bill | Winnipeg — Transcona | Manitoba | NDP |
| Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth) | Western Arctic | Northwest Territories | Lib. |
| Bonin, Raymond | Nickel Belt | Ontario | Lib. |
| Bonwick, Paul | Simcoe — Grey | Ontario | Lib. |
| Borotsik, Rick | Brandon — Souris | Manitoba | PC |
| Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons | Glengarry — Prescott — Russell | Ontario | Lib. |
| Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour | Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe | New Brunswick | Lib. |
| Breitkreuz, Cliff | Yellowhead | Alberta | Ref. |
| Breitkreuz, Garry | Yorkton — Melville | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Brien, Pierre | T  miscamingue | Quebec | BQ |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Brison, Scott | Kings — Hants | Nova Scotia | PC |
| Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development | Oakville | Ontario | Lib. |
| Bryden, John | Wentworth — Burlington | Ontario | Lib. |
| Bulte, Sarmite | Parkdale — High Park | Ontario | Lib. |
| Byrne, Gerry | Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte | Newfoundland | Lib. |
| Caccia, Hon. Charles | Davenport | Ontario | Lib. |
| Cadman, Chuck | Surrey North | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Calder, Murray | Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey | Ontario | Lib. |
| Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry | Scarborough Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Canuel, René | Matapédia — Matane | Quebec | BQ |
| Caplan, Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration | Thornhill | Ontario | Lib. |
| Cardin, Serge | Sherbrooke | Quebec | BQ |
| Carroll, Aileen | Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford | Ontario | Lib. |
| Casey, Bill | Cumberland — Colchester | Nova Scotia | PC |
| Casson, Rick | Lethbridge | Alberta | Ref. |
| Catterall, Marlene | Ottawa West — Nepean | Ontario | Lib. |
| Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec) | Outremont | Quebec | Lib. |
| Chamberlain, Brenda | Guelph — Wellington | Ontario | Lib. |
| Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific) | Richmond | British Columbia | Lib. |
| Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health | Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies | Quebec | Lib. |
| Chatters, David | Athabasca | Alberta | Ref. |
| Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister | Saint-Maurice | Quebec | Lib. |
| Chrétien, Jean-Guy | Frontenac — Mégantic | Quebec | BQ |
| Clouthier, Hec | Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke | Ontario | Lib. |
| Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) | Bourassa | Quebec | Lib. |
| Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport | Don Valley East | Ontario | Lib. |
| 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, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance | Etobicoke North | Ontario | Lib. |
| Cummins, John | Delta — South Richmond | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine | Laval Centre | Quebec | BQ |
| Davies, Libby | Vancouver East | British Columbia | NDP |
| de Savoye, Pierre | Portneuf | Quebec | BQ |
| Debien, Maud | Laval East | Quebec | BQ |
| Desjarlais, Bev | Churchill | Manitoba | NDP |
| Desrochers, Odina | Lotbinière | Quebec | BQ |
| DeVillers, Paul | Simcoe North | Ontario | Lib. |
| Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans | Vancouver South — Burnaby | British Columbia | Lib. |
| Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs | Saint-Laurent — Cartierville | Quebec | Lib. |
| Discepolo, Nick | Vaudreuil — Soulanges | Quebec | Lib. |
| Dockrill, Michelle | Bras d'Or — Cape Breton | Nova Scotia | NDP |
| Doyle, Norman | St. John's East | Newfoundland | PC |
| Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport | Thunder Bay — Atikokan | Ontario | Lib. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Drouin, Claude | Beauce | Quebec | Lib. |
| Dubé, Antoine | Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la- Chaudière | Quebec | BQ |
| Dubé, Jean | Madawaska — Restigouche | New Brunswick | PC |
| Duceppe, Gilles | Laurier — Sainte-Marie | Quebec | BQ |
| Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie) | Saint Boniface | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Dumas, Maurice | Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel | Quebec | BQ |
| Duncan, John | Vancouver Island North | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Earle, Gordon | Halifax West | Nova Scotia | NDP |
| Easter, Wayne | Malpeque | Prince Edward Island | Lib. |
| Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence | York Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Elley, Reed | Nanaimo — Cowichan | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Epp, Ken | Elk Island | Alberta | Ref. |
| Finlay, John | Oxford | Ontario | Lib. |
| Folco, Raymonde | Laval West | Quebec | Lib. |
| Fontana, Joe | London North Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Forseth, Paul | New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Fournier, Ghislain | Manicouagan | Quebec | BQ |
| Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women) | Vancouver Centre | British Columbia | Lib. |
| Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services | Saint-Léonard — Saint- Michel | Quebec | Lib. |
| Gagnon, Christiane | Québec | Quebec | BQ |
| Galloway, Roger | Sarnia — Lambton | Ontario | Lib. |
| Gauthier, Michel | Roberval | Quebec | BQ |
| Gilmour, Bill | Nanaimo — Alberni | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne | Jonquière | Quebec | BQ |
| Godfrey, John | Don Valley West | Ontario | Lib. |
| Godin, Maurice | Châteauguay | Quebec | BQ |
| Godin, Yvon | Acadie — Bathurst | New Brunswick | NDP |
| Goldring, Peter | Edmonton East | Alberta | Ref. |
| Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board | Wascana | Saskatchewan | Lib. |
| Gouk, Jim | Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Graham, Bill | Toronto Centre — Rosedale | Ontario | Lib. |
| Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister | Windsor West | Ontario | Lib. |
| Grewal, Gurmant | Surrey Central | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Grey, Deborah | Edmonton North | Alberta | Ref. |
| Grose, Ivan | Oshawa | Ontario | Lib. |
| Gruending, Dennis | Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar | Saskatchewan | NDP |
| Guarnieri, Albina | Mississauga East | Ontario | Lib. |
| Guay, Monique | Laurentides | Quebec | BQ |
| Guimond, Michel | Beauport — Montmorency — Côte-de-Beaupré — Île- d'Orléans | Quebec | BQ |
| Hanger, Art | Calgary Northeast | Alberta | Ref. |
| Harb, Mac | Ottawa Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Hardy, Louise | Yukon | Yukon | NDP |
| Harris, Richard M. | Prince George — Bulkley Valley | British Columbia | Ref. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Hart, Jim | Okanagan — Coquihalla | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Harvard, John | Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Harvey, André | Chicoutimi | Quebec | PC |
| Herron, John | Fundy — Royal | New Brunswick | PC |
| Hill, Grant | Macleod | Alberta | Ref. |
| Hill, Jay | Prince George — Peace River | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Hilstrom, Howard | Selkirk — Interlake | Manitoba | Ref. |
| Hoepfner, Jake E. | Portage — Lisgar | Manitoba | Ind. Ref. |
| Hubbard, Charles | Miramichi | New Brunswick | Lib. |
| Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board | Trinity — Spadina | Ontario | Lib. |
| Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development | Provencher | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Jackson, Ovid L. | Bruce — Grey | Ontario | Lib. |
| Jaffer, Rahim | Edmonton — Strathcona | Alberta | Ref. |
| Jennings, Marlene | Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine | Quebec | Lib. |
| Johnston, Dale | Wetaskiwin | Alberta | Ref. |
| Jones, Jim | Markham | Ontario | PC |
| Jordan, Joe | Leeds — Grenville | Ontario | Lib. |
| Karetak-Lindell, Nancy | Nunavut | Nunavut | Lib. |
| Karygiannis, Jim | Scarborough — Agincourt | Ontario | Lib. |
| Keddy, Gerald | South Shore | Nova Scotia | PC |
| Kenney, Jason | Calgary Southeast | Alberta | Ref. |
| Kerpan, Allan | Blackstrap | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Keyes, Stan | Hamilton West | Ontario | Lib. |
| Kilger, Bob | Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh | Ontario | Lib. |
| Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) | Edmonton Southeast | Alberta | Lib. |
| Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister | Elgin — Middlesex — London | Ontario | Lib. |
| Konrad, Derrek | Prince Albert | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Kraft Sloan, Karen | York North | Ontario | Lib. |
| Laliberte, Rick | Churchill River | Saskatchewan | NDP |
| Lalonde, Francine | Mercier | Quebec | BQ |
| Lastewka, Walt | St. Catharines | Ontario | Lib. |
| Laurin, René | Joliette | Quebec | BQ |
| Lavigne, Raymond | Verdun — Saint-Henri | Quebec | Lib. |
| Lebel, Ghislain | Chambly | Quebec | BQ |
| Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons | Scarborough — Rouge River | Ontario | Lib. |
| Lefebvre, Réjean | Champlain | Quebec | Ind. |
| Leung, Sophia | Vancouver Kingsway | British Columbia | Lib. |
| Lill, Wendy | Dartmouth | Nova Scotia | NDP |
| Limoges, Rick | Windsor — St. Clair | Ontario | Lib. |
| Lincoln, Clifford | Lac-Saint-Louis | Quebec | Lib. |
| Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour | Whitby — Ajax | Ontario | Lib. |
| Loubier, Yvan | Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot | Quebec | BQ |
| Lowther, Eric | Calgary Centre | Alberta | Ref. |
| Lunn, Gary | Saanich — Gulf Islands | British Columbia | Ref. |
| MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada | Cardigan | Prince Edward Island | Lib. |
| MacKay, Peter | Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough | Nova Scotia | PC |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Mahoney, Steve | Mississauga West | Ontario | Lib. |
| Malhi, Gurbax Singh | Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale | Ontario | Lib. |
| Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada | Erie — Lincoln | Ontario | Lib. |
| Mancini, Peter | Sydney — Victoria | Nova Scotia | NDP |
| Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry | Ottawa South | Ontario | Lib. |
| Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition | Calgary Southwest | Alberta | Ref. |
| Marceau, Richard | Charlesbourg | Quebec | BQ |
| Marchand, Jean-Paul | Québec East | Quebec | BQ |
| Mark, Inky | Dauphin — Swan River | Manitoba | Ref. |
| Marleau, Hon. Diane | Sudbury | Ontario | Lib. |
| Martin, Keith | Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Martin, Pat | Winnipeg Centre | Manitoba | NDP |
| Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance | LaSalle — Émard | Quebec | Lib. |
| Matthews, Bill | Burin — St. George's | Newfoundland | Lib. |
| Mayfield, Philip | Cariboo — Chilcotin | British Columbia | Ref. |
| McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole | Edmonton Southwest | Alberta | Ref. |
| McCormick, Larry | Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington | Ontario | Lib. |
| McDonough, Alexa | Halifax | Nova Scotia | NDP |
| McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food | Egmont | Prince Edward Island | Lib. |
| McKay, John | Scarborough East | Ontario | Lib. |
| McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada | Edmonton West | Alberta | Lib. |
| McNally, Grant | Dewdney — Alouette | British Columbia | Ref. |
| McTeague, Dan | Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge | Ontario | Lib. |
| McWhinney, Ted | Vancouver Quadra | British Columbia | Lib. |
| Ménard, Réal | Hochelaga — Maisonneuve | Quebec | BQ |
| Mercier, Paul | Terrebonne — Blainville | Quebec | BQ |
| Meredith, Val | South Surrey — White Rock — Langley | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Mifflin, Hon. Fred | Bonavista — Trinity — Conception | Newfoundland | Lib. |
| Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole | Kingston and the Islands | Ontario | Lib. |
| Mills, Bob | Red Deer | Alberta | Ref. |
| Mills, Dennis J. | Broadview — Greenwood | Ontario | Lib. |
| Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation | Beaches — East York | Ontario | Lib. |
| Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario) | Parry Sound — Muskoka | Ontario | Lib. |
| Morrison, Lee | Cypress Hills — Grasslands | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Muise, Mark | West Nova | Nova Scotia | PC |
| Murray, Ian | Lanark — Carleton | Ontario | Lib. |
| Myers, Lynn | Waterloo — Wellington | Ontario | Lib. |
| Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development | Kenora — Rainy River | Ontario | Lib. |
| Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) | Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet | Quebec | Lib. |
| Nunziata, John | York South — Weston | Ontario | Ind. |
| Nystrom, Hon. Lorne | Regina — Qu'Appelle | Saskatchewan | NDP |
| O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans | Labrador | Newfoundland | Lib. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| O'Brien, Pat | London — Fanshawe | Ontario | Lib. |
| O'Reilly, John | Haliburton — Victoria — Brock | Ontario | Lib. |
| Obhrai, Deepak | Calgary East | Alberta | Ref. |
| Pagtakhan, Rey D. | Winnipeg North — St. Paul | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Pankiw, Jim | Saskatoon — Humboldt | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs | Brome — Missisquoi | Quebec | Lib. |
| Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker | Niagara Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services | Mississauga Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Patry, Bernard | Pierrefonds — Dollard | Quebec | Lib. |
| Penson, Charlie | Peace River | Alberta | Ref. |
| Perić, Janko | Cambridge | Ontario | Lib. |
| Perron, Gilles—A. | Rivière—des—Mille—Îles | Quebec | BQ |
| Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions) | Willowdale | Ontario | Lib. |
| Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade | Papineau — Saint—Denis | Quebec | Lib. |
| Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue | 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 |
| Power, Charlie | St. John's West | Newfoundland | PC |
| Pratt, David | Nepean — Carleton | Ontario | Lib. |
| Price, David | Compton — Stanstead | Quebec | PC |
| Proctor, Dick | Palliser | Saskatchewan | NDP |
| Proud, George | Hillsborough | Prince Edward Island | Lib. |
| Proulx, Marcel | Hull — Aylmer | Quebec | Lib. |
| Provenzano, Carmen | Sault Ste. Marie | Ontario | Lib. |
| Ramsay, Jack | Crowfoot | Alberta | Ref. |
| Redman, Karen | Kitchener Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Reed, Julian | Halton | Ontario | Lib. |
| Reynolds, John | West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Richardson, John | Perth — Middlesex | Ontario | Lib. |
| Riis, Nelson | Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys | British Columbia | NDP |
| Ritz, Gerry | Battlefords — Lloydminster | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure | Westmount — Ville—Marie | Quebec | Lib. |
| Robinson, Svend J. | Burnaby — Douglas | British Columbia | NDP |
| Rocheleau, Yves | Trois—Rivières | Quebec | BQ |
| Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health | Etobicoke Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada | Brossard — La Prairie | Quebec | Lib. |
| Sauvageau, Benoît | Repentigny | Quebec | BQ |
| Schmidt, Werner | Kelowna | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Scott, Hon. Andy | Fredericton | New Brunswick | Lib. |
| Scott, Mike | Skeena | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Sekora, Lou | Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam | British Columbia | Lib. |
| Serré, Benoît | Timiskaming — Cochrane | Ontario | Lib. |
| Sgro, Judy | York West | Ontario | Lib. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Shepherd, Alex | Durham | Ontario | Lib. |
| Solberg, Monte | Medicine Hat | Alberta | Ref. |
| Solomon, John | Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre | Saskatchewan | NDP |
| Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade | Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant | Ontario | Lib. |
| St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources | Algoma — Manitoulin | Ontario | Lib. |
| St-Hilaire, Caroline | Longueuil | Quebec | BQ |
| St-Jacques, Diane | Shefford | Quebec | PC |
| St-Julien, Guy | Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik | Quebec | Lib. |
| Steckle, Paul | Huron — Bruce | Ontario | Lib. |
| Stewart, Hon. Christine | Northumberland | Ontario | Lib. |
| Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development | Brant | Ontario | Lib. |
| Stinson, Darrel | Okanagan — Shuswap | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Stoffer, Peter | Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore | Nova Scotia | NDP |
| Strahl, Chuck | Fraser Valley | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Szabo, Paul | Mississauga South | Ontario | Lib. |
| Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration | Kitchener — Waterloo | Ontario | Lib. |
| Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole | Saint-Lambert | Quebec | Lib. |
| Thompson, Greg | New Brunswick Southwest | New Brunswick | PC |
| Thompson, Myron | Wild Rose | Alberta | Ref. |
| Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment | Burlington | Ontario | Lib. |
| Tremblay, Stéphan | Lac-Saint-Jean | Quebec | BQ |
| Tremblay, Suzanne | Rimouski — Mitis | Quebec | BQ |
| Turp, Daniel | Beauharnois — Salaberry | Quebec | BQ |
| Ur, Rose-Marie | Lambton — Kent — Middlesex | Ontario | Lib. |
| Valeri, Tony | Stoney Creek | Ontario | Lib. |
| Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food | Prince Edward — Hastings | Ontario | Lib. |
| Vautour, Angela | Beauséjour — Petitcodiac | New Brunswick | PC |
| Vellacott, Maurice | Wanuskewin | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Venne, Pierrette | Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert | Quebec | BQ |
| Volpe, Joseph | Eglinton — Lawrence | Ontario | Lib. |
| Wappel, Tom | Scarborough Southwest | Ontario | Lib. |
| Wasylycia-Leis, Judy | Winnipeg North Centre | Manitoba | NDP |
| Wayne, Elsie | Saint John | New Brunswick | PC |
| Whelan, Susan | Essex | Ontario | Lib. |
| White, Randy | Langley — Abbotsford | British Columbia | Ref. |
| White, Ted | North Vancouver | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Wilfert, Bryon | Oak Ridges | Ontario | Lib. |
| Williams, John | St. Albert | Alberta | Ref. |
| Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs | Nipissing | Ontario | Lib. |

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| ALBERTA (26) | | |
| Ablonczy, Diane | Calgary — Nose Hill | Ref. |
| Anders, Rob | Calgary West | Ref. |
| Benoit, Leon E. | Lakeland | Ref. |
| Breitkreuz, Cliff | Yellowhead | Ref. |
| Casson, Rick | Lethbridge | Ref. |
| Chatters, David | Athabasca | Ref. |
| Epp, Ken | Elk Island | Ref. |
| Goldring, Peter | Edmonton East | Ref. |
| Grey, Deborah | Edmonton North | Ref. |
| Hanger, Art | Calgary Northeast | Ref. |
| Hill, Grant | Macleod | Ref. |
| Jaffer, Rahim | Edmonton — Strathcona | Ref. |
| Johnston, Dale | Wetaskiwin | Ref. |
| Kenney, Jason | Calgary Southeast | Ref. |
| Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) | Edmonton Southeast | Lib. |
| Lowther, Eric | Calgary Centre | Ref. |
| Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition | Calgary Southwest | Ref. |
| McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole | Edmonton Southwest | Ref. |
| McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada | Edmonton West | Lib. |
| Mills, Bob | Red Deer | Ref. |
| Obhrai, Deepak | Calgary East | Ref. |
| Penson, Charlie | Peace River | Ref. |
| Ramsay, Jack | Crowfoot | Ref. |
| Solberg, Monte | Medicine Hat | Ref. |
| Thompson, Myron | Wild Rose | Ref. |
| Williams, John | St. Albert | Ref. |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA (34) | | |
| Abbott, Jim | Kootenay — Columbia | Ref. |
| Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment | Victoria | Lib. |
| Cadman, Chuck | Surrey North | Ref. |
| Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific) | Richmond | Lib. |
| Cummins, John | Delta — South Richmond | Ref. |
| Davies, Libby | Vancouver East | NDP |
| Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans | Vancouver South — Burnaby | Lib. |
| Duncan, John | Vancouver Island North | Ref. |
| Elley, Reed | Nanaimo — Cowichan | Ref. |
| Forseth, Paul | New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby | Ref. |
| Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women) | Vancouver Centre | Lib. |
| Gilmour, Bill | Nanaimo — Alberni | Ref. |
| Gouk, Jim | Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan | Ref. |
| Grewal, Gurmant | Surrey Central | Ref. |
| Harris, Richard M. | Prince George — Bulkley Valley | Ref. |
| Hart, Jim | Okanagan — Coquihalla | Ref. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Hill, Jay | Prince George — Peace River | Ref. |
| Leung, Sophia | Vancouver Kingsway | Lib. |
| Lunn, Gary | Saanich — Gulf Islands | Ref. |
| Martin, Keith | Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca | Ref. |
| Mayfield, Philip | Cariboo — Chilcotin | Ref. |
| McNally, Grant | Dewdney — Alouette | Ref. |
| McWhinney, Ted | Vancouver Quadra | Lib. |
| Meredith, Val | South Surrey — White Rock — Langley | Ref. |
| Reynolds, John | West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast | Ref. |
| Riis, Nelson | Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys | NDP |
| Robinson, Svend J. | Burnaby — Douglas | NDP |
| Schmidt, Werner | Kelowna | Ref. |
| Scott, Mike | Skeena | Ref. |
| Sekora, Lou | Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam | Lib. |
| Stinson, Darrel | Okanagan — Shuswap | Ref. |
| Strahl, Chuck | Fraser Valley | Ref. |
| White, Randy | Langley — Abbotsford | Ref. |
| White, Ted | North Vancouver | Ref. |

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs | Winnipeg South | Lib. |
| Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs | Winnipeg South Centre | Lib. |
| Blaikie, Bill | Winnipeg — Transcona | NDP |
| Borotsik, Rick | Brandon — Souris | PC |
| Desjarlais, Bev | Churchill | NDP |
| Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie) | Saint Boniface | Lib. |
| Harvard, John | Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia | Lib. |
| Hilstrom, Howard | Selkirk — Interlake | Ref. |
| Hoeppner, Jake E. | Portage — Lisgar | Ind. Ref. |
| Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development | Provencher | Lib. |
| Mark, Inky | Dauphin — Swan River | Ref. |
| Martin, Pat | Winnipeg Centre | NDP |
| Pagtakhan, Rey D. | Winnipeg North — St. Paul | Lib. |
| Wasylycia-Leis, Judy | Winnipeg North Centre | NDP |

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|------|
| Bernier, Gilles | Tobique — Mactaquac | PC |
| Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour | Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe | Lib. |
| Dubé, Jean | Madawaska — Restigouche | PC |
| Godin, Yvon | Acadie — Bathurst | NDP |
| Herron, John | Fundy — Royal | PC |
| Hubbard, Charles | Miramichi | Lib. |
| Scott, Hon. Andy | Fredericton | Lib. |
| Thompson, Greg | New Brunswick Southwest | PC |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Vautour, Angela | Beauséjour — Petitcodiac | PC |
| Wayne, Elsie | Saint John | PC |
| NEWFOUNDLAND (7) | | |
| Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency) | Gander — Grand Falls | Lib. |
| Byrne, Gerry | Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte | Lib. |
| Doyle, Norman | St. John's East | PC |
| Matthews, Bill | Burin — St. George's | Lib. |
| Mifflin, Hon. Fred | Bonavista — Trinity — Conception | Lib. |
| O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans | Labrador | Lib. |
| Power, Charlie | St. John's West | PC |
| NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1) | | |
| Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth) | Western Arctic | Lib. |
| NOVA SCOTIA (11) | | |
| Brison, Scott | Kings — Hants | PC |
| Casey, Bill | Cumberland — Colchester | PC |
| Dockrill, Michelle | Bras d'Or — Cape Breton | NDP |
| Earle, Gordon | Halifax West | NDP |
| Keddy, Gerald | South Shore | PC |
| Lill, Wendy | Dartmouth | NDP |
| MacKay, Peter | Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough | PC |
| Mancini, Peter | Sydney — Victoria | NDP |
| McDonough, Alexa | Halifax | NDP |
| Muise, Mark | West Nova | PC |
| Stoffer, Peter | Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore | NDP |
| NUNAVUT (1) | | |
| Karetak—Lindell, Nancy | Nunavut | Lib. |
| ONTARIO (103) | | |
| Adams, Peter | Peterborough | Lib. |
| Assadourian, Sarkis | Brampton Centre | Lib. |
| Augustine, Jean | Etobicoke — Lakeshore | Lib. |
| Barnes, Sue | London West | Lib. |
| Beaumier, Colleen | Brampton West — Mississauga | Lib. |
| Bélaïr, Réginald | Timmins — James Bay | Lib. |
| Bélangier, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage | Ottawa — Vanier | Lib. |
| Bellemare, Eugène, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation | Carleton — Gloucester | Lib. |
| Bennett, Carolyn | St. Paul's | Lib. |
| Bevilacqua, Maurizio | Vaughan — King — Aurora | Lib. |
| Bonin, Raymond | Nickel Belt | Lib. |
| Bonwick, Paul | Simcoe — Grey | Lib. |
| Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons | Glengarry — Prescott — Russell | Lib. |
| Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development | Oakville | Lib. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Bryden, John | Wentworth — Burlington | Lib. |
| Bulte, Sarmite | Parkdale — High Park | Lib. |
| Caccia, Hon. Charles | Davenport | Lib. |
| Calder, Murray | Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey | Lib. |
| Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry | Scarborough Centre | Lib. |
| Caplan, Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration | Thornhill | Lib. |
| Carroll, Aileen | Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford | Lib. |
| Catterall, Marlene | Ottawa West — Nepean | Lib. |
| Chamberlain, Brenda | Guelph — Wellington | Lib. |
| Clouthier, Hec | Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke | Lib. |
| Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport | Don Valley East | Lib. |
| Comuzzi, Joe | Thunder Bay — Superior North | Lib. |
| Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage | Hamilton East | Lib. |
| Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance | Etobicoke North | Lib. |
| DeVillers, Paul | Simcoe North | Lib. |
| Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport | Thunder Bay — Atikokan | Lib. |
| Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence | York Centre | Lib. |
| Finlay, John | Oxford | Lib. |
| Fontana, Joe | London North Centre | Lib. |
| Galloway, Roger | Sarnia — Lambton | Lib. |
| Godfrey, John | Don Valley West | Lib. |
| Graham, Bill | Toronto Centre — Rosedale | Lib. |
| Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister | Windsor West | Lib. |
| Grose, Ivan | Oshawa | Lib. |
| Guarnieri, Albina | Mississauga East | Lib. |
| Harb, Mac | Ottawa Centre | Lib. |
| Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board | Trinity — Spadina | Lib. |
| Jackson, Ovid L. | Bruce — Grey | Lib. |
| Jones, Jim | Markham | PC |
| Jordan, Joe | Leeds — Grenville | Lib. |
| Karygiannis, Jim | Scarborough — Agincourt | Lib. |
| Keyes, Stan | Hamilton West | Lib. |
| Kilger, Bob | Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh | Lib. |
| Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister | Elgin — Middlesex — London | Lib. |
| Kraft Sloan, Karen | York North | Lib. |
| Lastewka, Walt | St. Catharines | Lib. |
| Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons | Scarborough — Rouge River | Lib. |
| Limoges, Rick | Windsor — St. Clair | Lib. |
| Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour | Whitby — Ajax | Lib. |
| Mahoney, Steve | Mississauga West | Lib. |
| Malhi, Gurbax Singh | Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale | Lib. |
| Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada | Erie — Lincoln | Lib. |
| Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry | Ottawa South | Lib. |
| Marleau, Hon. Diane | Sudbury | Lib. |
| McCormick, Larry | Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington | Lib. |
| McKay, John | Scarborough East | Lib. |
| McTeague, Dan | Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge | Lib. |
| Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole | Kingston and the Islands | Lib. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Mills, Dennis J. | Broadview — Greenwood | Lib. |
| Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation | Beaches — East York | Lib. |
| Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario) | Parry Sound — Muskoka | Lib. |
| Murray, Ian | Lanark — Carleton | Lib. |
| Myers, Lynn | Waterloo — Wellington | Lib. |
| Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development | Kenora — Rainy River | Lib. |
| Nunziata, John | York South — Weston | Ind. |
| O'Brien, Pat | London — Fanshawe | Lib. |
| O'Reilly, John | Haliburton — Victoria — Brock | Lib. |
| Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker | Niagara Centre | Lib. |
| Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services | Mississauga Centre | Lib. |
| Perić, Janko | Cambridge | Lib. |
| Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions) | Willowdale | Lib. |
| Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue | 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. |
| Richardson, John | Perth — Middlesex | Lib. |
| Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health | Etobicoke Centre | Lib. |
| Serré, Benoît | Timiskaming — Cochrane | Lib. |
| Sgro, Judy | York West | Lib. |
| Shepherd, Alex | Durham | Lib. |
| Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade | Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant | Lib. |
| St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources | Algoma — Manitoulin | Lib. |
| Steckle, Paul | Huron — Bruce | Lib. |
| Stewart, Hon. Christine | Northumberland | Lib. |
| Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development | Brant | Lib. |
| Szabo, Paul | Mississauga South | Lib. |
| Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration | Kitchener — Waterloo | Lib. |
| Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment | Burlington | Lib. |
| Ur, Rose-Marie | Lambton — Kent — Middlesex | Lib. |
| Valeri, Tony | Stoney Creek | Lib. |
| Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food | Prince Edward — Hastings | Lib. |
| Volpe, Joseph | Eglinton — Lawrence | Lib. |
| Wappel, Tom | Scarborough Southwest | Lib. |
| Whelan, Susan | Essex | Lib. |
| Wilfert, Bryon | Oak Ridges | Lib. |
| Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs | Nipissing | Lib. |

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

| | | |
|--|--------------|------|
| Easter, Wayne | Malpeque | Lib. |
| MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada | Cardigan | Lib. |
| McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food | Egmont | Lib. |
| Proud, George | Hillsborough | Lib. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| QUEBEC (75) | | |
| Alarie, Hélène | Louis-Hébert | BQ |
| Assad, Mark | Gatineau | Lib. |
| Asselin, Gérard | Charlevoix | BQ |
| Bachand, André | Richmond — Arthabaska | PC |
| Bachand, Claude | Saint-Jean | BQ |
| Bakopanos, Eleni | Ahuntsic | Lib. |
| Bellehumeur, Michel | Berthier — Montcalm | BQ |
| Bergeron, Stéphane | Verchères — Les-Patriotes | BQ |
| Bernier, Yvan | Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok | BQ |
| Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence | Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle | Lib. |
| Bigras, Bernard | Rosemont | BQ |
| Brien, Pierre | Témiscamingue | BQ |
| Canuel, René | Matapédia — Matane | BQ |
| Cardin, Serge | Sherbrooke | BQ |
| Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec) | Outremont | Lib. |
| Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health | Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies | Lib. |
| Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister | Saint-Maurice | Lib. |
| Chrétien, Jean-Guy | Frontenac — Mégantic | BQ |
| Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) | Bourassa | Lib. |
| Cotler, Irwin | Mount Royal | Lib. |
| Crête, Paul | Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup — Témiscouata — Les Basques | BQ |
| Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine | Laval Centre | BQ |
| de Savoye, Pierre | Portneuf | BQ |
| Debien, Maud | Laval East | BQ |
| Desrochers, Odina | Lotbinière | BQ |
| Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs | Saint-Laurent — Cartierville | Lib. |
| Discepola, Nick | Vaudreuil — Soulanges | Lib. |
| Drouin, Claude | Beauce | Lib. |
| Dubé, Antoine | Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière | BQ |
| Duceppe, Gilles | Laurier — Sainte-Marie | BQ |
| Dumas, Maurice | Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel | BQ |
| Folco, Raymonde | Laval West | Lib. |
| Fournier, Ghislain | Manicouagan | BQ |
| Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services | Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel | Lib. |
| Gagnon, Christiane | Québec | BQ |
| Gauthier, Michel | Roberval | BQ |
| Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne | Jonquière | BQ |
| Godin, Maurice | Châteauguay | BQ |
| Guay, Monique | Laurentides | BQ |
| Guimond, Michel | Beauport — Montmorency — Côte-de-Beaupré — Île-d'Orléans | BQ |
| Harvey, André | Chicoutimi | PC |
| Jennings, Marlene | Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine | Lib. |
| Lalonde, Francine | Mercier | BQ |
| Laurin, René | Joliette | BQ |
| Lavigne, Raymond | Verdun — Saint-Henri | Lib. |
| Lebel, Ghislain | Chambly | BQ |
| Lefebvre, Réjean | Champlain | Ind. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Lincoln, Clifford | Lac-Saint-Louis | Lib. |
| Loubier, Yvan | Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot | BQ |
| Marceau, Richard | Charlesbourg | BQ |
| Marchand, Jean-Paul | Québec East | BQ |
| Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance | LaSalle — Émard | Lib. |
| Ménard, Réal | Hochelaga — Maisonneuve | BQ |
| Mercier, Paul | Terrebonne — Blainville | BQ |
| Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) | Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet | Lib. |
| Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs | Brome — Missisquoi | Lib. |
| Patry, Bernard | Pierrefonds — Dollard | Lib. |
| Perron, Gilles-A. | Rivière-des-Mille-Îles | BQ |
| Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade | Papineau — Saint-Denis | Lib. |
| Picard, Pauline | Drummond | BQ |
| Plamondon, Louis | Bas-Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancour | BQ |
| Price, David | Compton — Stanstead | PC |
| Proulx, Marcel | Hull — Aylmer | Lib. |
| Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure | Westmount — Ville-Marie | Lib. |
| Rocheleau, Yves | Trois-Rivières | BQ |
| Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada | Brossard — La Prairie | Lib. |
| Sauvageau, Benoît | Repentigny | BQ |
| St-Hilaire, Caroline | Longueuil | BQ |
| St-Jacques, Diane | Shefford | PC |
| St-Julien, Guy | Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik | Lib. |
| Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole | Saint-Lambert | Lib. |
| Tremblay, Stéphane | Lac-Saint-Jean | BQ |
| Tremblay, Suzanne | Rimouski — Mitis | BQ |
| Turp, Daniel | Beauharnois — Salaberry | BQ |
| Venne, Pierrette | Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert | BQ |

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

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

YUKON (1)

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

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of February 18th, 2000 — 2nd Session, 36th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|------|
| Chair: | Sue Barnes | Vice-Chairs: | John Finlay Derrek Konrad | |
| Claude Bachand Ray Bonin Paul DeVillers Ghislain Fournier | Jim Gouk Ivan Grose Louise Hardy | David Iftody Nancy Karetak-Lindell Gerald Keddy | John O'Reilly Mike Scott Guy St-Julien | (16) |

Associate Members

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Carolyn Bennett Cliff Breitzkreuz René Canuel Serge Cardin | Bill Casey Pierre de Savoye Gordon Earle Reed Elley | Maurice Godin Richard Harris Rick Laliberte | Gilles-A. Perron Daniel Turp Maurice Vellacott |
|---|--|---|--|

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|------|
| Chair: | John Harvard | Vice-Chairs: | Murray Calder Howard Hilstrom | |
| Hélène Alarie Mark Assad Rick Borotsik Garry Breitzkreuz | Odina Desrochers Gar Knutson Larry McCormick | Joe McGuire Ian Murray Dick Proctor | Gerry Ritz Paul Steckle Rose-Marie Ur | (16) |

Associate Members

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Peter Adams Roy Bailey Leon Benoit Rick Casson | Michelle Dockrill Jocelyne Girard-Bujold John Maloney Lee Morrison | Lynn Myers Lorne Nystrom John Solomon Guy St-Julien | Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp |
|---|---|--|--|

CANADIAN HERITAGE

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|------|
| Chair: | Clifford Lincoln | Vice-Chairs: | Inky Mark Dennis Mills | |
| Mauril Bélanger Paul Bonwick Cliff Breitzkreuz Sarmite Bulte | Irwin Cotler Pierre de Savoye Wendy Lill | Rick Limoges Eric Lowther Mark Muise | Alex Shepherd Caroline St-Hilaire Bryon Wilfert | (16) |

Associate Members

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Jim Abbott André Bachand Claude Bachand Carolyn Bennett Rick Borotsik | Pierre Brien Serge Cardin Antoine Dubé Maurice Dumas Gordon Earle | Paul Forseth Christiane Gagnon Rick Laliberte Peter MacKay Louis Plamondon | Benoît Sauvageau Guy St-Julien Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Elsie Wayne |
|---|---|--|---|

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs: Leon Benoit
Steve Mahoney

Rob Anders
Jean Augustine
Bernard Bigras
Paul Bonwick

John Bryden
Sophia Leung
Rick Limoges

Pat Martin
John McKay
Grant McNally

Pauline Picard
David Price
Andrew Telegdi

(16)

Associate Members

Claude Bachand
Serge Cardin
Libby Davies

Gordon Earle
Louise Hardy
Francine Lalonde

Réal Ménard
Deepak Obhrai
Diane St-Jacques

Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairs: Rahim Jaffer
Karen Kraft Sloan

Marlene Catterall
David Chatters
Jean-Guy Chrétien
Nick Discepola

Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Gurmant Grewal
Dennis Gruending

John Herron
Joe Jordan
Walt Lastewka

David Pratt
Julian Reed
Paddy Torsney

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Peter Adams
Hélène Alarie
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Pierre Brien

Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Aileen Carroll
John Duncan
Louise Hardy

Rick Laliberte
Clifford Lincoln
Peter Mancini
David Price
Nelson Riis

Judy Sgro
Guy St-Julien
Peter Stoffer
Stéphan Tremblay
Daniel Turp

FINANCE

Chair: Maurizio Bevilacqua

Vice-Chairs: Nick Discepola
Richard Harris

Scott Brison
Roy Cullen
Ken Epp
Roger Gallaway

Albina Guarnieri
Sophia Leung
Yvan Loubier

Richard Marceau
Lorne Nystrom
Gary Pillitteri

Karen Redman
Monte Solberg
Paul Szabo

(16)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
Carolyn Bennett
Rick Borotsik
Pierre Brien
Serge Cardin
Joe Comuzzi
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé

Joe Fontana
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Monique Guay
John Herron
Dale Johnston
Jim Jones
Jason Kenney

Rick Limoges
Gary Lunn
Peter MacKay
Alexa McDonough
Bob Mills
Lynn Myers
Gilles-A. Perron
Pauline Picard
Charlie Power

Nelson Riis
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Alex Shepherd
John Solomon
Guy St-Julien
Stéphan Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Tony Valeri

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Wayne Easter **Vice-Chairs:** John Duncan
Carmen Provenzano

Sarkis Assadourian Claude Drouin Gerald Keddy Lou Sekora (16)
G rard Asselin Bill Gilmour Bill Matthews Paul Steckle
Yvan Bernier Nancy Karetak-Lindell Lawrence O'Brien Peter Stoffer
John Cummins

Associate Members

Gilles Bernier Ghislain Fournier Svend Robinson Mike Scott
Ren  Canuel Yvon Godin Yves Rocheleau Suzanne Tremblay
Paul Forseth Philip Mayfield

SUB-COMMITTEE ON AQUACULTURE AND OCEANS ACT

Chair: Carmen Provenzano **Vice-Chair:**

Yvan Bernier Bill Gilmour Charlie Power Peter Stoffer (5)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair: Bill Graham **Vice-Chairs:** Colleen Beaumier
Deepak Obhrai

Sarkis Assadourian Francine Lalonde Fred Mifflin Yves Rocheleau (18)
Jean Augustine Diane Marleau Denis Paradis Bob Speller
Andr  Bachand Keith Martin Bernard Patry Darrel Stinson
Maud Debien Ted McWhinney Svend Robinson

Associate Members

Claude Bachand Irwin Cotler Sophia Leung Marcel Proulx
Eleni Bakopanos Paul Cr te Gurbax Malhi Nelson Riis
Eug ne Bellemare Maurice Dumas Richard Marceau Alex Shepherd
Carolyn Bennett Raymonde Folco Pat Martin John Solomon
Bill Blaikie Gurmant Grewal Paul Mercier Diane St-Jacques
Sarmite Bulte Dennis Gruending Lee Morrison Chuck Strahl
Murray Calder Jim Hart Lorne Nystrom St phan Tremblay
Serge Cardin Jason Kenney Pauline Picard Suzanne Tremblay
Aileen Carroll Ren  Laurin Charlie Power Daniel Turp
Rick Casson

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Colleen Beaumier **Vice-Chair:**

Jean Augustine Eug ne Bellemare Maud Debien Svend Robinson (9)
Eleni Bakopanos Aileen Carroll Keith Martin Diane St-Jacques

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair: Sarmite Bulte

Vice-Chair:

Sarkis Assadourian
André Bachand

Bill Blaikie
Murray Calder

Richard Marceau
Deepak Obhrai

Alex Shepherd
Bob Speller

(9)

HEALTH

Chair: Lynn Myers

Vice-Chairs:

Reed Elley
Ovid Jackson

Yvon Charbonneau
Christiane Gagnon
Bill Matthews
Ted McWhinney

Réal Ménard
Bob Mills
Marcel Proulx

Karen Redman
Paul Szabo
Greg Thompson

Rose-Marie Ur
Maurice Vellacott
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis

(16)

Associate Members

Carolyn Bennett
Bernard Bigras
Serge Cardin
Jean-Guy Chrétien

Libby Davies
Pierre de Savoye
Michelle Dockrill
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold

John Herron
Grant Hill
Sophia Leung
John Maloney

Pauline Picard
Guy St-Julien
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair: Peter Adams

Vice-Chairs:

Maurice Vellacott
Bryon Wilfert

Diane Ablonczy
Bonnie Brown
Paul Crête
Libby Davies

Jean Dubé
Raymonde Folco
Christiane Gagnon
John Godfrey

Dale Johnston
Judi Longfield
Larry McCormick
Rey Pagtakhan

Andy Scott
Judy Sgro
Stéphan Tremblay

(18)

Associate Members

Carolyn Bennett
Yvan Bernier
Bernard Bigras
Serge Cardin
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Bev Desjarlais
Michelle Dockrill
Norman Doyle

Antoine Dubé
Maurice Dumas
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Ovid Jackson

Joe Jordan
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Wendy Lill
Eric Lowther
Diane Marleau
Pat Martin
Réal Ménard

Mark Muise
Lorne Nystrom
Diane St-Jacques
Guy St-Julien
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Angela Vautour

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

Chair: John Godfrey

Vice-Chair:

Carolyn Bennett
Libby Davies

Raymonde Folco
Christiane Gagnon

Ovid Jackson
Eric Lowther

Diane Marleau
Diane St-Jacques

(9)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair: Carolyn Bennett

Vice-Chair:

Joe Jordan
Nancy Karetak-Lindell

Wendy Lill
Mark Muise

Karen Redman
Andy Scott

Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott

(9)

INDUSTRY

Chair: Susan Whelan **Vice-Chairs:** Walt Lastewka
Charlie Penson

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|------|
| Pierre Brien Gerry Byrne John Cannis Antoine Dubé | Jim Hart Marlene Jennings Jim Jones | Gurbax Malhi Dan McTeague Ian Murray | Jerry Pickard Nelson Riis Werner Schmidt | (16) |
|--|---|--|--|------|

Associate Members

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Peter Adams Hélène Alarie Gérard Asselin Bernard Bigras Chuck Cadman | Serge Cardin Pierre de Savoye Odina Desrochers Jean Dubé Joe Fontana | Christiane Gagnon Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Rahim Jaffer Richard Marceau Philip Mayfield | Alex Shepherd John Solomon Guy St-Julien Peter Stoffer Daniel Turp |
|--|--|---|--|

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Andy Scott **Vice-Chairs:** Chuck Cadman
Ivan Grose

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|------|
| Jim Abbott Reg Alcock Michel Bellehumeur Carolyn Bennett | Aileen Carroll Paul DeVillers Peter MacKay | John Maloney Peter Mancini John McKay | John Reynolds Jacques Saada Pierrette Venne | (16) |
|---|--|---|---|------|

Associate Members

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Bernard Bigras Irwin Cotler Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Pierre de Savoye Jim Gouk Dennis Gruending Michel Guimond | Louise Hardy Richard Harris Jay Hill Richard Marceau Keith Martin Réal Ménard Lee Morrison | Mark Muise Lynn Myers Jack Ramsay Svend Robinson Judy Sgro Caroline St-Hilaire Diane St-Jacques | Darrel Stinson Myron Thompson Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Tom Wappel Randy White |
|---|--|---|--|

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

Chair: Paul DeVillers **Vice-Chair:**

| | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|
| Jim Gouk Ivan Grose | Rick Laliberte Peter MacKay | Lynn Myers Jacques Saada | Pierrette Venne Tom Wappel | (9) |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair: Pat O'Brien **Vice-Chairs:** Jim Hart
David Pratt

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|------|
| Robert Bertrand Hec Clouthier Gordon Earle Peter Goldring | Art Hanger René Laurin Judi Longfield | Paul Mercier John O'Reilly Janko Peric | George Proud Elsie Wayne Bob Wood | (16) |
|--|---|--|---|------|

Associate Members

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------------|
| Rob Anders Leon Benoit Pierre Brien | Serge Cardin John Duncan Monique Guay | Francine Lalonde Ghislain Lebel Peter Mancini | Pat Martin Daniel Turp |
|---|---|---|---------------------------|

NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|------|
| Chair: | Joseph Volpe | Vice-Chairs: | David Chatters Julian Reed | |
| Réginald Bélair Gilles Bernier Serge Cardin John Duncan | Yvon Godin Tony Ianno Ghislain Lebel | Carolyn Parrish Carmen Provenzano Werner Schmidt | Guy St-Julien Brent St. Denis Tony Valeri | (16) |

Associate Members

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Jim Abbott Hélène Alarie Rob Anders Pierre Brien René Canuel | Jean-Guy Chrétien Michelle Dockrill Ghislain Fournier Christiane Gagnon Jocelyne Girard-Bujold | Jim Jones Gerald Keddy Derrek Konrad Gilles-A. Perron Nelson Riis | Benoît Sauvageau Caroline St-Hilaire Darrel Stinson Daniel Turp |
|--|--|---|--|

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|------|
| Chair: | Derek Lee | Vice-Chairs: | Marlene Catterall Chuck Strahl | |
| Eleni Bakopanos Stéphane Bergeron Ray Bonin Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral | Yvon Godin André Harvey Jay Hill | Bob Kilger Gar Knutson Grant McNally | Carolyn Parrish Jerry Pickard John Richardson | (16) |

Associate Members

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Peter Adams Michel Bellehumeur Bill Blaikie Michelle Dockrill | Norman Doyle Deborah Grey Joe Jordan René Laurin | Eric Lowther Larry McCormick Réal Ménard Lorne Nystrom | John Solomon Suzanne Tremblay Randy White Ted White |
|--|---|---|--|

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|------------|-----|
| Chair: | Larry McCormick | Vice-Chair: | | |
| Bill Blaikie Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral | Deborah Grey | André Harvey | Joe Jordan | (6) |

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|------|
| Chair: | John Williams | Vice-Chairs: | Steve Mahoney John Richardson | |
| Hec Clouthier Michelle Dockrill John Finlay Paul Forseth | Mac Harb Marlene Jennings Jason Kenney Philip Mayfield | Gilles-A. Perron Beth Phinney Benoît Sauvageau | Judy Sgro Alex Shepherd Elsie Wayne | (17) |

Associate Members

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Roy Bailey Garry Breitkreuz Scott Brison Rick Casson | Bev Desjarlais Odina Desrochers Christiane Gagnon Jocelyne Girard-Bujold | Gurmant Grewal Jim Jones Derrek Konrad Ghislain Lebel | Lorne Nystrom Peter Stoffer Suzanne Tremblay |
|---|---|--|--|

SUB-COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL REPORTING

Chair:

Michelle Dockrill
Mac Harb

Vice-Chair:

Steve Mahoney
Beth Phinney

John Richardson
Benoît Sauvageau

Elsie Wayne
John Williams

(8)

TRANSPORT

Chair:

Stan Keyes

Vice-Chairs:

Joe Comuzzi
Val Meredith

Gérard Asselin
Roy Bailey
Murray Calder
Bill Casey

Bev Desjarlais
Stan Dromisky
Claude Drouin

Joe Fontana
Michel Guimond
Charles Hubbard

Ovid Jackson
Dale Johnston
Lou Sekora

(16)

Associate Members

Yvan Bernier
Rick Borotsik
Serge Cardin
David Chatters

Paul Crête
Maurice Dumas
John Duncan
Ghislain Fournier

Rick Laliberte
Lee Morrison
Gerry Ritz
John Solomon

Guy St-Julien
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Elsie Wayne

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs:

Raymond Lavigne
Louis Robichaud

Joint Vice-Chair:

Deborah Grey

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Norman Atkins
Isobel Finnerty
Jerahmiel Grafstein

Normand Grimard
Vivienne Poy
Calvin Ruck

Mark Assad
Roy Bailey
Marlene Catterall
Hec Clouthier
John Finlay
Mac Harb
Jim Karygiannis

Wendy Lill
Rick Limoges
Philip Mayfield
Paul Mercier
Louis Plamondon
David Price
Karen Redman

(23)

Associate Members

Libby Davies
Maurice Dumas

Suzanne Tremblay

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs:

Raymonde Folco
Rose-Marie Losier-Cool

Joint Vice-Chairs:

Grant Hill
Benoît Serré

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Joan Fraser
Jean-Robert Gauthier
Michael Meighen

Lucie Pépin
Jean-Claude Rivest
Louis Robichaud

Mauril Bélanger
Eugène Bellemare
Brenda Chamberlain
Pierre de Savoye
Yvon Godin
Bob Kilger

Raymond Lavigne
Inky Mark
Dan McTeague
Ted McWhinney
Val Meredith
Louis Plamondon

(23)

Associate Members

Maurice Dumas
Paul Mercier
Lorne Nystrom

Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS**Chair:**

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Ethel Cochrane
Sheila Finestone
George Furey
Normand Grimard

Céline Hervieux-Payette
Wilfred Moore
Melvin Perry
Jean-Claude Rivest

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the House of Commons:

Mark Assad
Paul Bonwick
John Bryden
Bill Casey
Joe Comuzzi
Paul DeVillers
Ken Epp
Gurmant Grewal
Ghislain Lebel

Ian Murray
Lorne Nystrom
Jim Pankiw
Gary Pillitteri
Jacques Saada
Pierrette Venne
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(25)

Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur
Michelle Dockrill

Michel Guimond
Suzanne Tremblay

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panel of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

(As of February 18th, 2000 — 2nd Session, 36th Parliament)

BILL C-20,
AN ACT TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLARITY AS SET OUT IN THE OPINION
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA IN THE QUEBEC SECESSION REFERENCE

Chair: Peter Milliken**Vice-Chair:**Reg Alcock
André Bachand
Bill Blaikie
Ray BoninIrwin Cotler
Claude Drouin
Michel Guimond
Grant HillRahim Jaffer
Val Meredith
Dennis Mills
Bernard PatryKaren Redman
Andy Scott
Daniel Turp(16)

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

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

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Gar Knutson | to Prime Minister |
| Denis Paradis | to Minister of Foreign Affairs |
| Stan Dromisky | to Minister of Transport |
| Paddy Torsney | to Minister of the Environment |
| Brent St. Denis | to Minister of Natural Resources |
| Mauril Bélanger | to Minister of Canadian Heritage |
| John Cannis | to Minister of Industry |
| Roy Cullen | to Minister of Finance |
| Robert Bertrand | to Minister of National Defence |
| John Maloney | to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada |
| Yvon Charbonneau | to Minister of Health |
| Jacques Saada | to Solicitor General of Canada |
| Carolyn Parrish | to Minister of Public Works and Government Services |
| Tony Ianno | to President of the Treasury Board |
| Beth Phinney | to Minister of National Revenue |
| Bonnie Brown | to Minister of Human Resources Development |
| Reg Alcock | to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs |
| Bob Speller | to Minister for International Trade |
| Derek Lee | to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons |
| Joe McGuire | to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food |
| Lawrence O'Brien | to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans |
| Judi Longfield | to Minister of Labour |
| Bob Wood | to Minister of Veterans Affairs |
| David Iftody | to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development |
| Eugène Bellemare | to Minister for International Cooperation |
| Andrew Telegdi | to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration |

CONTENTS

Friday, February 18, 2000

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Citizenship of Canada Act

| | |
|---------------------------------|------|
| Bill C-16. Second reading | 3711 |
| Mr. Cauchon | 3711 |
| Mr. Telegdi | 3711 |
| Mr. Benoit | 3713 |
| Mr. Benoit | 3716 |
| Mr. Bigras | 3718 |

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Immigration

| | |
|------------------|------|
| Mr. Proulx | 3718 |
|------------------|------|

Refugees

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| Mr. White (North Vancouver) | 3718 |
|-----------------------------------|------|

Nortel Networks

| | |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Pratt | 3719 |
|-----------------|------|

The Late Charles Schulz

| | |
|---------------------|------|
| Mr. Bellemare | 3719 |
|---------------------|------|

Meningitis

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Goldring | 3719 |
|--------------------|------|

The Environment

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| Ms. Torsney | 3719 |
|-------------------|------|

“Chartrand et Simone” Miniseries

| | |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Dumas | 3720 |
|-----------------|------|

Molson Breweries

| | |
|----------------|------|
| Mr. Harb | 3720 |
|----------------|------|

Government Grants

| | |
|------------------|------|
| Mr. Grewal | 3720 |
|------------------|------|

Lebanon

| | |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Assad | 3720 |
|-----------------|------|

Farmers

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| Mr. Nystrom | 3721 |
|-------------------|------|

Human Resources Development

| | |
|------------------|------|
| Ms. Alarie | 3721 |
|------------------|------|

Harness Racing

| | |
|---------------------|------|
| Mr. Clouthier | 3721 |
|---------------------|------|

Lighthouses

| | |
|------------------|------|
| Mr. MacKay | 3721 |
|------------------|------|

Whitby, Ontario

| | |
|----------------------|------|
| Mrs. Longfield | 3722 |
|----------------------|------|

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Human Resources Development

| | |
|--|------|
| Mrs. Ablonczy | 3722 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3722 |
| Mrs. Ablonczy | 3722 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3722 |
| Mrs. Ablonczy | 3722 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3722 |
| Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) | 3722 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3722 |
| Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) | 3722 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3723 |
| Mr. Duceppe | 3723 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3723 |
| Mr. Duceppe | 3723 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3723 |
| Mr. Crête | 3723 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3723 |
| Mr. Crête | 3723 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3723 |
| Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) | 3723 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3724 |
| Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) | 3724 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3724 |
| Mr. MacKay | 3724 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3724 |
| Mr. MacKay | 3724 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3724 |
| Ms. Meredith | 3724 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3724 |
| Ms. Meredith | 3725 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3725 |
| Mrs. Tremblay | 3725 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3725 |
| Mrs. Tremblay | 3725 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3725 |
| Mr. McNally | 3725 |
| Mr. Gray | 3725 |
| Mr. Penson | 3725 |
| Mr. Gray | 3726 |

Heritage Canada

| | |
|----------------------|------|
| Ms. St-Hilaire | 3726 |
| Ms. Copps | 3726 |
| Ms. St-Hilaire | 3726 |
| Ms. Copps | 3726 |

Human Resources Development

| | |
|----------------------------|------|
| Mr. Mayfield | 3726 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3726 |
| Mr. Gilmour | 3726 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3726 |

Parental Leave

| | |
|----------------------------|------|
| Mrs. Gagnon | 3726 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3727 |

Research and Development

| | |
|-----------------------|------|
| Ms. Sgro | 3727 |
| Mr. Charbonneau | 3727 |

Agriculture

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Hilstrom | 3727 |
| Mr. Gray | 3727 |

Human Resources Development

| | |
|----------------------------|------|
| Mr. Bailey | 3727 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3727 |
| Mrs. Dockrill | 3727 |
| Mr. Baker | 3727 |
| Mrs. Dockrill | 3728 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Mr. Baker | 3728 |
| Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) | 3728 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3728 |
| Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) | 3728 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3728 |
| The Environment | |
| Mr. Limoges | 3728 |
| Mr. Anderson | 3728 |
| Human Resources Development | |
| Mr. Lunn | 3728 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3729 |
| Audiovisual Productions | |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3729 |
| Ms. Copps | 3729 |
| Agriculture | |
| Mr. Nystrom | 3729 |
| Mr. Gray | 3729 |
| Human Resources Development | |
| Mr. MacKay | 3729 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3729 |
| Airline Industry | |
| Mr. Proulx | 3729 |
| Mr. Collenette | 3729 |
| Human Resources Development | |
| Mr. Williams | 3730 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3730 |
| Acid Rain | |
| Ms. Girard-Bujold | 3730 |
| Mr. Anderson | 3730 |
| Human Resources Development | |
| Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) | 3730 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3730 |
| Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) | 3730 |
| Mr. Gray | 3730 |
| Homelessness | |
| Ms. Catterall | 3731 |
| Ms. Parrish | 3731 |
| Human Resources Development | |
| Mrs. Ablonczy | 3731 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3731 |
| Bill C-20 | |
| Mr. Turp | 3731 |
| Mr. Boudria | 3731 |
| Points of Order | |
| Oral Question Period | |
| Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) | 3731 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3732 |
| Mr. Boudria | 3732 |
| Mr. Williams | 3732 |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3732 |
| Mr. Boudria | 3732 |
| Mr. Duceppe | 3732 |
| Mr. Duceppe | 3733 |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3733 |
| Mr. Duceppe | 3733 |
| Mr. Duceppe | 3734 |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3734 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Tabling of documents | |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3734 |
| Mr. Ménard | 3734 |
| Mr. Loubier | 3735 |
| Mr. Sauvageau | 3735 |
| Human Resources Development | |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) | 3735 |
| Tabling of Documents | |
| Mr. Laurin | 3735 |
| Mrs. Guay | 3735 |
| Ms. Girard-Bujold | 3735 |
| Mrs. Picard | 3735 |
| Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) | 3735 |
| Mrs. Gagnon | 3736 |
| Mr. Lebel | 3736 |
| Mrs. Debien | 3736 |
| Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) | 3736 |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3737 |
| Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean) | 3737 |
| Mr. Rocheleau | 3737 |
| Mr. Dumas | 3738 |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3738 |
| Mr. Bigras | 3738 |
| Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) | 3738 |
| Mr. Lee | 3738 |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3738 |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3739 |
| Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) | 3739 |
| Mr. Crête | 3739 |
| Mrs. Picard | 3739 |
| Mr. Perron | 3739 |
| Mr. Marchand | 3739 |
| Mr. Marchand | 3740 |
| Mrs. Tremblay | 3740 |
| Mr. Desrochers | 3740 |
| Mr. Lebel | 3740 |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3741 |
| Mr. Lebel | 3741 |
| Mr. Ménard | 3741 |
| Mr. Bergeron | 3741 |
| Mr. Lebel | 3742 |

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

| | |
|--|------|
| Criminal Code | |
| Bill C-433. Introduction and first reading | 3742 |
| Mr. Benoit | 3742 |
| (Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) | 3742 |
| Petitions | |
| Equality | |
| Mr. Goldring | 3742 |
| Merchant Navy Veterans | |
| Mr. Goldring | 3742 |
| Genetically Engineered Foods | |
| Mrs. Guay | 3742 |
| Child Pornography | |
| Mr. Maloney | 3742 |
| Mr. Stinson | 3743 |
| National Highways | |
| Mr. Stinson | 3743 |
| Genetically Engineered Food Labelling | |
| Mrs. Picard | 3743 |
| Mr. Rocheleau | 3743 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Immigration | |
| Mr. Benoit | 3743 |
| Taxation | |
| Mr. Benoit | 3743 |
| Genetically engineered Food Labelling | |
| Mrs. Tremblay | 3743 |
| Canada Post Corporation | |
| Mr. Marceau | 3743 |
| Genetically Engineered Food Labelling | |
| Mrs. Gagnon | 3743 |
| Questions on the Order Paper | |
| Ms. Parrish | 3744 |

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

| | |
|--------------------------------|------|
| Municipal Grants Act | |
| Bill C-10. Third Reading | 3744 |
| Mr. Collenette | 3744 |
| Mr. Lebel | 3744 |
| Mr. Lebel | 3745 |
| Mr. Bélanger | 3745 |
| Mr. Lebel | 3745 |
| Ms. Parrish | 3746 |

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Bergeron | 3746 |
|--------------------|------|

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

| | |
|---------------------|------|
| Westray Mine | |
| Mr. MacKay | 3746 |
| Motion | 3746 |
| Mr. MacKay | 3747 |
| Mr. Maloney | 3749 |

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

| | |
|--|------|
| Modernization of Benefits and Obligations Act | |
| Bill C-23—Notice of time allocation | |
| Mr. Boudria | 3750 |

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Westray Mine | |
| Motion | 3751 |
| Mr. Lunn | 3751 |
| Mrs. Dockrill | 3752 |
| Mr. St. Denis | 3754 |
| Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) | 3755 |

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :

<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9