



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 083 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, September 21, 2001

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, September 21, 2001

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

•(1000)

[*Translation*]

CUSTOMS ACT

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.) moved that Bill S-23, an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other Acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on Bill S-23, a bill aimed at modernizing the entire administration of Canadian customs operations. It addresses an action plan that will make it possible to have better risk management at Canada's borders and to meet the needs of the entire Canadian population in this modern age, that is the era of globalization, and its realities, of which we are all aware.

As I said earlier this week, it is particularly important that this bill be passed without delay so that we may have the tools we need to enhance our capacity to recognize high-risk individuals and goods at the border before they enter Canada and North America.

I wish to reiterate in the House that the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency takes the security of Canada's borders very seriously. We work in close collaboration with our federal and international partners, sharing information and technologies.

We also have a very close working relationship with our counterparts in U.S. customs and immigration. We are however also aware that border management is a constantly evolving process. That is why we have established a plan on which we have been working for some time.

Thanks to the changes proposed by Bill S-23, the agency will be able to focus its efforts on high risk travellers and goods while simplifying border crossings for those in the low risk category.

We will be in a position, before these reach the border, to combine risk management techniques and the transmission of information obtained with leading-edge technology and through the use of pre-

arrival authorization mechanisms. This will bring about a fundamental change to the way the customs agency operates.

I must reiterate that prior to the tragic events in the United States and even more so since, the agency has always had as its priority the security of Canadians, protection of our border, the integrity of major trade corridors and reinforcement of the North American perimeter.

[*English*]

The risk management approach to border management called for in the customs action plan will enable the government to better uphold these priorities. While we must take measures to enhance the safety and security of Canadians and our border, let us not forget our other important responsibility of ensuring the prosperity of the Canadian economy.

International trade and tourism are considered the lifeblood of the Canadian economy. Let us not forget our accountability to Canadians to ensure their continuity.

In order to support the government's international trade agreements and its agenda for trade and tourism, the agency needs to modernize the way it carries out its customs operations.

In today's ever changing environment, one of our key goals is to maintain the flow of legitimate trade and travel across the border.

As we know, the final elimination of duties between Canada and the U.S. has further stimulated trade and enhanced both our economies. Over the past five years the volume of trade and travel has steadily increased. Every day we process 40,000 commercial entries representing well over \$300 billion worth of import trade each year.

More than 100 million travellers cross our border each year and over 80% of these travellers come from the U.S.

•(1005)

The CCRA has met the challenges of the last decade in responding to globalization, changing business practices and advancing technology. All this economic activity has had a major impact on customs operations on both sides of the border.

We are in good shape today with a range of enforcement initiatives and services that support the protection of Canadians and the competitiveness of business. We are certainly proud of our successes so far.

Government Orders

However, we are also aware of the gap that is growing between the increasing workload and the resources we have available to achieve our goals. This has forced us to re-evaluate how we carry out our dual mandate.

By launching our customs action plan, we have already taken a huge step to meet this challenge. The next step takes place now with the passing of Bill S-23.

[*Translation*]

Our customs action plan is a crucial investment for the future. In proposing innovative solutions to today's problems, the plan ensures that our customs' processes will not stand in the way of Canadians' prosperity.

The action plan provides for a complete risk management system integrating the principles of pre-arrival data input and a system of prior approval, all thanks to technology.

To support this approach we are putting in place a fair and effective system of sanctions. We believe Bill S-23 provides practical measures to deal with non-compliance, from warnings to fines. These measures should have an impact on those who choose not to obey the rules.

Bill S-23 provides options that will facilitate border crossing and make it more productive in today's world. In essence, businesses and individuals with a good history of compliance should be able to benefit.

Compliance with the law is the key to the success of this approach. Bill S-23 aims at improving compliance levels. We believe that improved service and simplified processing will encourage voluntary compliance.

Naturally, in keeping with the other part of our mandate which is to protect Canadian society, we will continue random checks and monitoring periodically to ensure compliance with Canada's customs laws and regulations.

As part of the customs action plan, we will be implementing this fall the customs self-assessment program. This program is a direct result of our consultations with members of the business community who consider it their highest priority. The program is based on the principles of risk management which provide for agreements with proven clients.

Participating importers who have been rigorously selected prior to their approval, will be able to use their own administrative system to meet our requirements for receipts and trade data. This will be a comprehensive self-assessment system supported by our audit activities.

The program will also simplify the customs process by offering increased speed and certainty to pre-approved importers who use the services of pre-approved carriers and drivers to import low risk goods. There is no doubt this is a great step forward in border management.

The monetary penalties set out in Bill S-23 aim to establish fair rules for businesses in Canada. This comprehensive set of penalties will encourage people to observe the law, thanks to a series of

penalties that will vary in severity depending on the type and severity of the offence committed.

In this context, the agency is aware that some of its clients may require a certain amount of time to familiarize themselves with all of the requirements with which they will need to comply. This is why importers will be given a transition period through April 1, 2002.

However, in the case of the customs self-assessment program, some of the penalties will take effect as soon as the program is implemented.

• (1010)

[*English*]

The passing of Bill S-23 would also bring exciting options for travellers. Many people will have heard of the CANPASS highway program which was pilot tested in a number of locations in recent years. Under this permit based program, travellers pre-approved by a rigorous training process are permitted to use designated lanes at border crossings.

Another example is the expedited passenger processing system for travellers. Under this new program, EPPS participants will be able to use an automated kiosk that will confirm their identity and membership in the program.

Another initiative is the harmonized highway pilot, also known as Nexus. Its goal is to provide a seamless service to pre-approved low risk travellers entering Canada and the U.S. at these border points using technology and a common card.

I believe these initiatives will serve Canadians well by improving the flow of people and goods across the border and by strengthening our ability to do job number one: protecting Canadians.

Amendments to the Customs Act proposed in Bill S-23 would allow for the introduction of advanced passenger information and passenger notification record. With those programs, customs officers will receive certain prescribed information from commercial transportation companies and drivers, crew members and passengers in advance of their arrival in Canada.

It is important to clarify to the hon. member that this is not new information. Customs officers can obtain the same information through questioning travellers and examining their travel documents. However, by receiving this information in advance, customs officers will be able to make enlightened decisions prior to the arrival of people thereby making it easier to identify high risk travellers and facilitating the movement of legitimate travellers.

The agency will continue to be vigilant and will conduct random customs examinations. The instincts of our well trained, experienced customs officers will continue to be our guiding force.

Government Orders

•(1015)

[*Translation*]

There are other examples that demonstrate the importance of this bill. This is why I cannot insist enough on the importance of moving forward with Bill S-23. I believe that this legislation is a bold and innovative step in the modernization and management of Canada's borders.

Bill S-23 will help Canadians compete and prosper on international markets. It will allow the agency to help maximize the flow of commercial cargo and travellers in good standing. The bill will also provide us with the tools we need to better protect our borders and our country and it will allow us to ensure the safety of our communities and our families. I am sure we all agree that Canadians expect nothing less.

[*English*]

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of Her Majesty's loyal opposition to address the second reading of Bill S-23, an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other acts. Bill S-23 comes before the House at a great time of crisis when the eyes of Canadians, and indeed the world, are upon our borders.

I wish to thank our customs officers who, in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks, have been under incredible pressure working extra long hours thoroughly checking thousands of travellers seeking entrance to Canada. They are doing a tremendous and extremely valuable job with limited human, technological and financial resources.

I will address the initiatives enacted by Bill S-23 and their impact on our economy and trade relations; and, more important, the importance of our trade relationship with the United States and what is needed to protect and stabilize that relationship.

We are a trading nation. Our economy has positioned itself over the past decade to facilitate, expand and promote our international trade relationships. None of these relationships are as crucial as our relationship with the United States.

As a result of the FTA and NAFTA the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency handles over \$500 billion in cross-border trade and processes more than 108 million travellers each year. These numbers dictate that efficient systems need to be implemented to keep pace.

The Canada-United States accord on our shared border was signed in 1995 with a number of goals: to promote international trade; to streamline processes for legitimate travellers and commercial goods; to provide enhanced protection against drug smuggling and the illegal entrants of people; and to reduce costs to both governments. The initiatives we are debating today were derived to fulfill the accord's goals.

The customs action plan began in 1998 involving nationwide consultations with groups representing trade and traveller groups to streamline the processing of goods and travellers based on risk assessment and a fair, effective sanctions regime. I commend the minister and his department for seeking industry input to reflect its needs and realities in these amendments.

The Canpass permit program contained in the bill allows travellers who frequently cross the border by air or surface for legitimate purposes to register with the government and pass through the border without having to stop for questioning. These participants are thoroughly checked before being accepted to the program and are subject to random spot checks to ensure compliance.

The administrative monetary penalties system, or AMPS, is a new regime to help ensure compliance. In the past, penalties and sanctions were rigid and in many cases too extreme for small infractions. For example, the seizure of a vehicle is hardly an appropriate penalty for a \$100 discrepancy in declared goods.

The AMPS regime sanctions range from simple warnings to punitive fines of \$25,000 to match the severity and frequency of infractions. The flexibility and discretion facilitated by this regime would allow fines to be administered on the basis of fairness.

One of the Canadian Alliance's ongoing concerns with our airports and ports of entry has been the ability of Canadian officials to determine the identity of those arriving and the ability to separate arriving passengers from other people in the plaza. We have called on the government to utilize electronic technology to forward travel document information from departure to destination to deal with those who arrive at customs without identification.

Thousands of refugee claimants have arrived in Canada without travel documents or identification, but they had documents when they boarded a plane to get to Canada. The advance passenger information system, or API, requires commercial carriers to provide information in advance of arrival with respect to drivers, crew members and passengers.

•(1020)

This is a step in the right direction. However much more is needed to adequately meet the needs of Canadian security.

Bill S-23 would allow for the examination of export mail. As a Canadian dedicated to the protection and advancement of personal liberties, I am uncomfortable voting for such an amendment. However I understand the rationale for such procedures.

I am concerned about the frequency and discretion of those who would be permitted to intercept and examine outgoing mail. We have experienced many complaints of overzealous examination of inbound mail.

In my riding of Edmonton—Strathcona, in an area called Old Strathcona, there are a number of import based industries on the retail front. Some of these industries import on a regular basis various artifacts from Africa and Latin America. One of these importers has been in business for over 10 years. They have an ongoing problem with customs at the border when many of their products come into the country.

Government Orders

Some of the changes prescribed in the bill would help to address some of those problems. One of the biggest complaints made by these importers is the fact that when their goods come from customs there is not the required due diligence in respect of their products being in the right condition so they can sell them.

One of my constituents sustained \$60,000 worth of damage to his goods because of the way customs searched through all the products that came through without proper attention to due diligence. That is outrageous. In some cases that can make or break certain businesses, depending upon the kind of business they are in.

This is unfortunate and it is due to certain rules currently in the Customs Act that allow customs officials to check these products. Once they start rifling through them the insurance on these packages is no longer valid. Once damage has been done the recipient cannot get reimbursed for any loss. That is a big problem.

This is one of my concerns that relates to personal liberties because we need to protect the flow of goods coming through. We need to be thorough and do the proper checks. There is no doubt about that. However we must respect people's property, their businesses and their livelihoods. If that is not done effectively then many business owners would potentially lose millions of dollars and unfortunately have products they cannot use or sell.

The initiatives and programs contained in Bill S-23 would benefit many Canadian companies in their administrative tasks by allowing Canadians to import materials and products with greater ease. However reciprocal programs on the part of the United States are lacking. The programs do very little to help Canadian companies access American markets. These initiatives do not help Canadian employees for whom the prosperity of their families and livelihoods are contingent upon unfettered access to the United States.

The Canada-U.S. border is a clash in fundamental philosophies. The U.S. customs service believes that its primary mandate is enforcement, whereas Canada Customs believes that its primary mandate is to liberate trade restrictions and collect revenues.

In light of the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, our border security has come under increased scrutiny. The debate over liberalization of border procedures may only be entertained within a greater debate on national security, in particular border integrity.

We can have it both ways: a border that expedites international trade while closing its doors to terrorism, organized crime and smugglers. What is required is a principled plan and the political will to defy bureaucratic agendas, to ignore special interest interventions and to resist the vices of political expediency.

•(1025)

What is needed is a government that exhibits leadership and resolve, two qualities yet to be displayed by the administration. Since the tragedy of September 11, the Prime Minister has done little more than offer platitudes and deflect blame. To continue along this path would only result in our economic peril. United States Secretary of State Colin Powell said last week:

Some nations need to be more vigilant against terrorism at their borders if they want their relationship with the U.S. to remain the same. We are going to make it

clear to them that this will be a standard against which they are measured with respect to their relationship with the United States.

He also added that for those nations that do a better job of policing their borders the U.S. would work with them. Last night President Bush stated that there is no truer friend to the United States than Great Britain. When Canada markets itself to the world our greatest selling feature is our proximity to the United States and the privilege of being its most favoured nation. What happens if that relationship were to be diminished?

I know that a politician's enemy is a hypothetical question. However I question how hypothetical it actually is. I read in the *National Post* that Honda was reconsidering investing in Canada and was contemplating redirecting that investment to the United States due to the uncertainty surrounding the flow across the Canada-U.S. border.

In light of recent tragedies Canada has been given an opportunity to address our security deficiencies. There is an inherent responsibility on the part of the government to do so. By taking immediate action the government would not be capitulating to American interests but rather responding in a practical and prudent manner.

I emphasize the importance of securing and expanding our trade relationship with the United States. There is no turning back from free trade.

No issue is of greater urgency than the security of the North American perimeter. Our walls must be reinforced and entry and exit security must be improved. By threatening the openness we have enjoyed along the Canada-U.S. border we jeopardize billions of dollars of trade and tens of thousands of Canadian jobs. Our very standard of living is at stake as over 87% of our trade is done with the United States.

This concept is based on common sense. Canada and the United States, through NAFTA and numerous other accords and treaties, are the world's closest allies. We share the longest undefended border in the world. If we want to maintain that relationship we must ascertain who is crossing that border by first of all identifying who is in our respective countries. Only when we can confirm the integrity of our external borders can we minimize the scrutiny of our shared border. A bilateral initiative with the United States to share border integrity is integral.

In terms of immigration, those who argue deceptively that strength in screening approaches are anti-immigrant are mistaken. Our immigration policies must be generous. However they must be rigorous. We can no longer have a policy of admit first, ask questions later.

Our policies and laws must protect the lives and livelihoods of Canadians. We must weigh the concerns about the safety of our citizens and the preservation of an open trade relationship with the United States against our humanitarian responsibility to receive genuine refugees.

Thousands of displaced persons find refuge in Canada every year. The vast majority are legitimate refugees. Many others are seeking to circumvent the immigration system or gain access to Canada for the purpose of criminal and terrorist activity. The latter comprise the minority of those seeking asylum. However they have an astute knowledge of our laws and know how to navigate their way through the system and carry out their agenda to the detriment of Canadian society as a whole. Collateral damage occurs through association by creating a negative impression of their ethnic or religious community in Canada.

● (1030)

The Canadian Alliance does not criticize the federal government's underlying intentions for granting refuge. Our grievances are with the process. We want to help as many legitimate refugees as possible, however, we believe stringent and secure refugee determination processes are in the best interests of genuine refugees seeking entrance to Canada.

In order to have entrance to Canada granted, the identity of applicants must be ascertained. Their whereabouts while in Canada must be monitored. Those whose identities and backgrounds cannot be determined must be detained and those whose applications for asylum are denied must be deported forthwith. When it comes to accountability, this is the bare minimum.

A message must be sent out to the world that Canada is a home for those in genuine need of humanitarian support, however, those attempting to take advantage and abuse our humanitarian generosity will be punished severely and swiftly.

The adjudication of refugee cases must be performed by qualified officers. Political organizers, fundraisers and unsuccessful candidates are not qualified to perform such a rigorous mandate.

As members know, I am quite sensitive to the issue of refugees and Canada opening its arms to refugees. As like many in the House, my family came to Canada as refugees. We fled the dictatorship of Idi Amin in Uganda where our family was unfortunately kicked out in the early 1970s, three generations living in a country we called home, where we built our own wealth, friendship and families. Freedom was ripped away from us overnight without any justification except that we were discriminated against because of the colour of our skin. We did not fit into that particular community.

In that unfortunate event in Uganda, my home country where I was born, we were fortunate that we were able to come to Canada. Canada welcomed us with open arms. If we look at the number of refugees during that period of time from that particular region of the country and see how they have contributed to this country with all the people who are either working now as professionals, adding to the economy and to the community by volunteering, it is fantastic to see those sorts of rewards that Canada was able to reap by having such a generous and humanitarian policy for settling refugees.

That is what we need to focus on. We need to continue to allow Canadians such as my family, who are so thankful that Canada welcomed us here with open arms, and others who want to come to this country, to take advantage of the opportunity and not abuse the laws. As I mentioned, those who abuse the laws are in the minority. We need to make sure that people coming to the country are not done

Government Orders

in by the laws of this country, especially by those who unfortunately want to abuse those laws. I am sensitive to that. I encourage that. As a refugee I feel that we have to do as much as we can, but we have to be rigorous.

Some of the most ardent proponents of reforming Canada's immigration and refugee determination laws are new immigrants themselves. They all went through the hoops and met every requirement. Not only are they upset with those who abuse the refugee system, they are livid with those of their community who abuse the system and commit crimes in Canada, casting a negative light upon their community.

The government is not doing its job properly. This is evident with the backlash experienced by Canada's Islamic and Sikh communities. Government mismanagement of the refugee system is a disservice to the immigrant communities that are working hard to contribute to a country which has given them so much.

In conclusion I would like to state the fact that the bill was first introduced in the Senate, which is unelected and lacks legitimacy to address legislation prior to the House of Commons, and I would like to state the fact that the Canadian Alliance demand is for anti-terrorist legislation to strengthen national security and eradicate terrorist activity within Canada.

● (1035)

I move:

That the motion be amended by replacing all the words after the word that with the following:

this House declines to give second reading to Bill S-23, an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other acts, since the principle of the bill fails to specifically and adequately address national security at Canada's borders with respect to terrorist activities.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to split my time with my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to split his time?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron: Mr. Speaker, in my first speech to the House since the tragic events of September 11, I would like to take a few moments to extend my most sincere condolences to the people who have been saddened by this terrible event, on behalf of the people of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, the people of Quebec and of Canada. I wish to assure them that they are in our hearts, in our thoughts and in our prayers.

Moving now to Bill S-23 which was passed by the Senate on June 7, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of this bill provided certain major amendments are passed.

Government Orders

I would remind hon. members that the Bloc Québécois has always been in favour of the movement of goods and services between countries, and of free trade. The proof of this is, in fact, that the government of Quebec and the Bloc Québécois were the first to approve NAFTA under the Mulroney government. At that time, I would also remind hon. members, our friends across the way were against it.

The Bloc Québécois and the government of Quebec were also in favour of the open skies project. They are in favour of the FTAA. The Bloc Québécois has always been a supporter of free trade, provided individuals' rights and culture are always respected.

I will discuss the background of Bill S-23. This bill started out as a draft bill in the fall of 1998 when Revenue Canada, which has now become the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, published a discussion paper entitled "Customs Blueprint".

In that document the department pledged first to improve the services provided; second, to ensure that businesses and travellers comply with the regulations; third, to identify efforts to end illegal activities and threats to health and safety; fourth, to promote certainty and consistency for travellers and business people.

Following this discussion paper the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency released the customs action plan for the years 2000-04. Customs new approach is based on a comprehensive risk management system that integrates the principles of self-assessment and information collection, as well as special authorizations regarding the main following features: processing techniques based on risks for travellers and business people; streamlined processes when risks are low; more thorough processes when risks are greater or when they are unknown.

Can we include in the unknown risks the new unknown risk for everyone posed by terrorism? I think so. As for the second principle, it was based on a fair and effective sanctions system.

I agree that this new approach is good in itself and implements a way of doing cross-border trading and travel much more expeditiously. It should be noted that the bill seems more geared to Canada-United States transportation. More importantly though, it could be adjusted to international travel in the near or not too distant middle future. I do not remember seeing any mention of marine transport in the bill, but we should start thinking about it.

• (1040)

This bill can therefore be summed up as follows: first, it provides for the expedited movement of persons and goods into Canada; second, it provides for streamlined clearance procedures for low risk passengers by pre-arrival risk assessment of passenger information; third, it provides for new requirements in respect of the provision of information obtained under that act; fourth, it provides for monetary penalties in respect of designated contraventions; fifth, it extends the deadline for requesting reviews and appeals beyond current time limits; sixth, it harmonizes provisions for the collection of amounts owing under that act with those of the Income Tax Act and the Excise Tax Act; seventh, it makes technical and housekeeping amendments; and eighth, it makes related amendments to other acts.

But let us be prudent. I would like the minister responsible for the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency to be very prudent. My

question this morning is this: Will Bill S-23 address all the shortcomings identified by the auditor general in his April 11, 2000 report with respect to the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency? Let us again look at what the auditor general said in his report.

We found that risk assessment is incomplete: Customs does not have important information it needs from a variety of departments and agencies to fully assess the risks its inspectors face. It needs to know where the risks are highest so it can determine the best way to control them. We have recommended that Customs work more diligently to obtain information on the risks arising from the responsibilities it carries out at ports of entry on behalf of other departments—Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Health Canada and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, for example—and include them in its national risk assessment. It also needs to have up-to-date memoranda of understanding with those departments, setting out their respective roles and responsibilities.

This is a bit worrisome.

Another aspect of this legislation concerns us considerably, and I refer to mail searches. The bill provides a means for searches of all mail of more than 30 grams in weight. This is disturbing because it is a form of interfering with people's fundamental rights. When the bill was under consideration in Senate committee, the Canadian bar submitted an excellent brief on March 15, 2001 and I invite the Minister responsible for the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency to note the position taken by the Canadian Bar Association. The points it makes are certainly important.

In closing, one point in this bill is of concern. It is the power accorded the minister. The bill also contains many regulations. Most of the points of law will be resolved by regulations.

• (1045)

The minister will have to define and make public the regulations he intends to make on security at Canadian customs so that they may be debated here.

The Bloc Québécois supports the principle of the law. Indeed, goods and people must be expedited through customs, but not at all cost. I think the minister will have to make certain changes to his bill for us to support it completely.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address this bill which is of critical importance to the future of international trade.

The bill provides for:

—the expedited movement of persons and goods into Canada;

(b) streamlined clearance procedures for low risk passengers by pre-arrival risk assessment of passenger information;

(c) new requirements in respect of the provision of information obtained under that Act;

(d) monetary penalties in respect of designated contraventions;

Government Orders

We can only support any government initiative designed to facilitate trade and speed up customs procedures. We can only support a bill that can improve these aspects and thus ensure that our country can export its goods and services more easily to the United States and even elsewhere in the world while promoting cordial relations with our trading partners.

This is why we support in principle Bill S-23 introduced by our learned colleague the hon. member for Outremont.

However we must be extremely careful because the government has the unfortunate tendency to introduce bills that refer to all sorts of provisions and regulations that have yet to be drafted. When regulations can be twice as long as the bill itself, it is cause for concern because we are not getting the full picture.

Several of the bills introduced by the government in recent years had this unfortunate feature. For example, the Bank Act provides that regulations will come later. In the case of certain provisions, we are still waiting for these regulations.

Another problem with Bill S-23 that also existed with the Bank Act is the very broad discretionary powers given to the minister responsible, in this case the Minister of National Revenue, who is in charge of customs.

We must avoid this kind of situation since we can only evaluate a bill on its merits if it includes specific provisions. In the bill before us, there are at least three issues that deserve a much more indepth review than is now possible without the regulations.

First, when the government talks about expanding the CANPASS program so that more exporters and importers can move their goods more rapidly through customs simply by showing their CANPASS membership card, we may well wonder how we can evaluate the fairness and impact of this measure if we do not know what criteria is used when deciding whether certain exporters or importers should be allowed to qualify for the CANPASS program. They will be able to pass through Canadian and U.S. customs more quickly. Another category will be refused CANPASS accreditation after their cases are considered.

How are we to evaluate the fairness of this decision? What avenues of appeal are open to exporters and importers? It is important that the criteria for accreditation be clearly known.

Why? Because those who qualify under the CANPASS program will have a competitive advantage over their competitors. Why? Because they will be able to point to their CANPASS accreditation as a business advantage and tell their clients "I guarantee you that there will be no wait at Canadian customs. I will be able to clear the goods, and you will receive them faster than if you use my competitor who does not have a CANPASS".

• (1050)

It becomes a bit like the ISO standard in industry. It becomes a symbol of recognition of the performance of these exporters or importers. If a company obtains CANPASS accreditation and another company in the same sector or in another Canadian province does not, we need to know why. Because the former has an advantage over the latter, as it would in the case of ISO standards,

because it can show that it is able to expedite its shipping contracts for its clients.

The second example concerns the system for expediting passenger movement. We have no indication of the criteria which will be used. It is a bit disturbing when the minister is being given discretionary power, or we are waiting for regulations yet to come, but we do not know the criteria that will be used in awarding these accreditations.

This would also allow—and the privacy commissioner highlighted this problem with Bill S-23—Canada Customs agents to open packages weighing over 30 grams. Once again this raises some issues. Surely there is some way to limit this power to open mail without a warrant and without any legal reason. Surely there is some way to better define this aspect of the bill. This is what we will work on in the coming weeks.

While we support this bill in theory since it will help simplify trade, we have some serious concerns with regard to provisions contained within the bill. To this end, we are asking—and I am sure that we will have the co-operation of the minister responsible—that the minister provide us with the bulk of the regulations at the same time as we are studying the bill in committee specifically, so that we can get the whole picture of the situation.

Incidentally, I would invite the minister responsible for the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency to come up with a work plan to review new provisions regarding international trade, as well as the existing ones, in light of the new circumstances, that is, the tragedy that took place some ten days ago in the United States.

Obviously, increasing security means tightening certain customs regulations and increasing the resources allocated to border surveillance. I hope the minister already has a work plan to review how Canada protects its borders and to ensure that this is improved in view of the new and terrifying events that took place in the United States the week before last.

Finally, I would ask the minister responsible, because this is part of his mandate, to try to see how we could neutralize, in the near future, the work of money laundering organizations that conduct their activities all over the world and often have a base of operations in Canada. I would ask the minister—because it is ultimately his responsibility—to review, in co-operation with the Minister of Finance, even though it is the Minister of National Revenue who is responsible for their implementation, the tax treaties signed with some countries that are deemed to be tax havens.

S. O. 31

Since 1993 we have been asking the government to review these tax treaties, to provide more resources so as to put pressure on these tax havens to stop their unfair way of processing tax resources and particularly money laundering activities, given what happened in the United States and given the statements made by the western world regarding the fight against tax havens and money laundering, which are the source of wealth of terrorist groups. The government should take a serious look at this issue. I will complete my speech after oral question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

•(1055)
[English]

RECYCLING

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask hon. members of the House to join with me today in recognizing the 20th anniversary of Ontario's blue box recycling program.

The blue box was the brainchild of Kitchener resident Nyle Ludolph, a garbage collector with Laidlaw, who helped launch the program in 1981. Two hundred and fifty Kitchener homes received the first blue boxes and the program was soon expanded to 34,000 homes.

Ontario residents were eager to make use of the blue box in their efforts to reduce, recycle and reuse. Today approximately four million Ontario households have curb or depot access to recycling. In 1999 successful recycling helped divert 658,000 tonnes of waste from Ontario landfill sites.

The blue box idea has been adopted by numerous homes throughout Canada, the United States, France, Australia and the U. K. Recycling is one of the simple ways Canadians can build a healthier and cleaner environment.

I ask hon. members of the House to join me in recognizing this important anniversary.

* * *

•(1100)

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, British Columbians are critical of the Liberal government's poor response to the tragedies of September 11 and its reluctance to take the security of our nation seriously.

British Columbians want strong anti-terrorist legislation to protect our citizens. We want our coastline, ports and airlines secured. We want immediate action to detain and deport anyone illegally in Canada or failed refugee claimants linked to terrorist organizations. We want our military and law enforcement agencies to have the resources they need to get the job done when it comes to fighting terrorism.

The horrendous events of September 11 showed us the folly of depleting B.C.'s emergency response capabilities. The government closed CFB Chilliwack and crippled our military, naval and coast guard resources. It has given British Columbia meaningless promises

about emergency assistance being dispatched from Edmonton. That is not good enough.

British Columbia is giving fair warning to the government to get serious about protecting the security of all Canadians.

* * *

TERRORISM

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, Lib.): [Editor's Note: Member spoke in Cree]

Mr. Speaker, I stand today with a heavy heart to extend our condolences to the people whose lives were tragically violated on the island of the Mannhattans. I pray that our nation and all nations of the world find peace regardless of the tests and obstacles that confront us. We must be united as nations to find true peace.

In this reflection I must acknowledge that the constitution of the United States of America was virtually based on the great law of peace of the Haudenosaunee, the Iroquois Confederacy.

The gifts and responsibilities of the indigenous nations of our country and our continent can help us in our time of need. We have no greater need now than peace and security when the threat is at our doorstep and our campfires.

I draw to the attention of all Canadians that we have a responsibility to future generations. Let us recognize Canada as a nation of rivers, for water is a source of life. Canada is a river of nations and it is in those relations that we will find true peace.

* * *

TERRORISM

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the recent tragedy in the United States caused by the unthinkable terrorist attacks has shocked North America. I know I speak for all my constituents of Vancouver Kingsway in condemning the terrorists who caused the death and destruction.

Before we identify the responsible terrorists we must not project our anger toward innocent people. I remind Canadians that racism and violence against Arab Canadians will not be tolerated in our humanistic society. This is a time for all of us to come together to condemn violence and strengthen our freedoms and democratic values.

On behalf of my constituents of Vancouver Kingsway I extend our support and compassion to the United States during this dark period in its history.

* * *

INTERFAITH PRAYER SERVICE

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after the events of September 11 many people of faith were left bereft of comfort. Some were wondering whether the powerful need to seek justice would unfairly target a certain faith or certain ethnicities. Indeed there was evidence to support those fears.

The Parliament of Canada gave tangible support to those voices of faith yesterday by suspending its sittings for two hours. Parliamentarians, members of the diplomatic corps and others filled to overflowing the largest room on Parliament Hill to listen to prayers and reflection from a variety of faith groups.

I thank Ambassador Cellucci for his attendance. I thank the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa, the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Speaker's office for their generous support.

Canada is a multi-ethnic and multi-religious nation. Yesterday parliament walked the walk instead of talking the talk. I have never been more proud of my colleagues in the House and Senate.

* * *

•(1105)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last night George Bush gave what may be the most important speech of our lifetime. He did not include Canada in his list of countries that are friends. Meanwhile our Prime Minister's priorities are clear. Last night he went to a Liberal fundraiser in Toronto while Tony Blair was at the U.S. congress with his unequivocal support.

Ten days after the terrorist attacks our Prime Minister has still not been to Washington or New York. Canadians are embarrassed by this lack of leadership. It is setting a negative tone for trade and other relations with our best friend and neighbour.

The government is behaving as if there is no crisis, no need for critical action and no urgency. The drift and empty rhetoric go on.

* * *

TERRORISM

Ms. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of Winnipeg South Centre I too extend condolences to those who lost loved ones in the recent tragedy in the United States. Such horrific acts of aggression and malevolence defy comprehension.

It is human nature to immediately seek revenge by inflicting damage on those who sought to damage us. However we must, as the Prime Minister has said, proceed with balance.

This was not just an act of terrorism against the United States. It was a tidal wave of terrorism against every citizen of the world, and those responsible should be accountable to the world for their actions.

Through bodies like the International Criminal Court and international institutions and alliances, terrorists can be made to answer for their crimes and the world can seek justice for the injustices committed against innocents. Global co-operation and global solutions must be a priority.

Over the coming months and years Canada must continue to show leadership. We must act with wisdom, tolerance and patience as we contend with the profound implications and effects of terrorism.

S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, throughout Quebec, as well as Canada and the rest of the world, thousands of women and men will be marching today to mark the Day of Action Against Violence Against Women.

Any form of violence, whether against women, men or children, and whether verbal, physical or psychological, must be condemned and opposed with the utmost vigour.

According to the Regroupement québécois des centres d'aide et de lutte contre les agressions à caractère sexuel, 85% of reported violence is against women, and 34% of women aged 16 or over have experienced a sexual assault at some time in their life.

I salute community organizations in my riding as well as those everywhere else in the world, for their unflagging efforts which make it possible for women to come together and to provide each other with support.

Let us hold on to the dream that in the very near future, such organizations will no longer be needed as hate and violence gives way to peace and serenity.

* * *

[*English*]

TERRORISM

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the apocalyptic events which occurred last week shocked the world as terrorists waged a premeditated attack on the United States.

President Bush called the attack the first war of the 21st century but noted that it was not just an attack against Americans; it was an attack on freedom and democracy everywhere.

Combating elusive terrorists is not nearly as straightforward as fighting a conventional war. What is needed is a measured and concentrated international response by a strike force comprising as many nations as possible and standing up for a way of life and a set of shared beliefs that define mankind.

Targeting refugee claimants and immigrants is not the answer. Those who have attacked Muslim Canadians are as mindless as those who danced with joy at the news of the misfortune of the United States.

I remind Canadians what the Prime Minister said on Monday:

We will allow no one to force us to sacrifice our values or traditions under the pressure of urgent circumstances.

* * *

•(1110)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the terrorist attacks on the United States last week should remind us all that anti-Americanism is far too prevalent in this country.

S. O. 31

Throughout the last century the United States was a positive force for freedom and democracy in the world. Through mechanisms like the Marshall plan, NATO and NORAD the United States has successfully revitalized national economies and helped guarantee international security.

Yet just last week, after being subject to an unprovoked attack by vicious killers, our American allies were subjected to a repugnant attack in a CBC townhall meeting where an audience brimming with anti-American fanatics tried to suggest America was to blame for the tragedy because of its policies.

This sort of doublethink must be challenged. The cavalier assumptions of superiority must stop. Americans must know that the vast majority of Canadians are behind our closest allies as we prepare for this war against terrorism.

* * *

WALK OF HOPE

Mr. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a former president of the United Way, it gives me great pleasure to inform the House that at noon today a Walk of Hope will take place. We are walking in memory of the victims of the tragedy of September 11. We will leave from the Centennial Flame and will cross the Interprovincial and Portage bridges, covering a route of five kilometres.

We ask that people wear red, white and blue and carry Canadian and American flags. Please come and walk to show support and solidarity with all those who have been affected by this terrible tragedy.

I want to thank the United Way committee for organizing and leading this demonstration. I want to thank the many volunteers who will collect donations for the Canadian Red Cross Society relief effort and I encourage people to donate generously.

Let us stand and walk together in this demonstration of our common stand for peace, justice and humanity.

* * *

TERRORISM

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last night we held a special debate to provide counsel to the Prime Minister before Monday's meeting with President Bush in the wake of last week's events. We stood together and tried to articulate our horror. We conveyed our love to the shattered families, condemned the evil and called to bring these criminals to justice.

In the midst of our debate George Bush made his address to America and announced "You are either with us or with the terrorists." He forgot that there is another way and that is to stand shoulder to shoulder with all communities desiring to bring these criminals to justice.

Let us seize the opportunity to build new international courts and stronger international law. Let us expose the roots of violence and not extend the terror with our own hands.

A survivor of the 1993 World Trade Center bomb blast said:

If we fail to wage peace instead of war, if we do not learn to value all life as fervently as we value our own, then their deaths will mean nothing and terror and violence will remain our dark companions.

Let us choose life.

* * *

[*Translation*]**TERRORISM**

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière—L'Érable, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions this week we have called upon the Prime Minister to consult parliament and to take advantage of the opportunity to democratically adopt within the House the government's participation in this fight against international terrorism.

Every time the Prime Minister has remained vague, accepting consultation perhaps, but not allowing a vote in the House. His attitude is in total contradiction to the objective he is pursuing as are we all: to promote freedom and democracy.

Does the Prime Minister realize that he cannot claim to promote these fundamental values when he is not attaching the necessary importance to the institution that is the embodiment of those values and to the elected representatives who sit there?

On behalf of democracy and freedom, we are calling upon him to respond to our legitimate demands and to take advantage of the consensual strength of this parliament in order to add weight to his international undertakings.

* * *

[*English*]**DYSTONIA**

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, October 14 to 21 is National Dystonia Awareness Week and volunteers around the country will be active in their own communities to help those suffering from this serious disorder.

Dystonia is a neurological disorder that affects nearly 10,000 Canadians. It is difficult to diagnose and can affect the whole body causing abnormal movement and postures. Often those afflicted by dystonia can go a long period of time without seeking medical assistance because they are unaware of the disorder.

Fortunately there are organizations such as the Dystonia Support Group that is working to promote a greater awareness of dystonia and providing support to known sufferers within the community.

I congratulate all the volunteers and extend my appreciation and gratitude for their dedication and selfless giving.

* * *

●(1115)

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, in June the finance minister said he would introduce a fall budget if the economy worsened. Clearly the minister recognizes that the economy has indeed worsened.

Oral Questions

Since June, 27,000 Canadians have lost their jobs. We have seen the worst quarter in terms of economic growth in six years. Universally economists are speaking of a global recession. Additionally, in light of recent events, we now need to ensure more military and security resources to defend the security of our borders, the safety of our citizens and ultimately to meet our commitment to our allies.

Cabinet is now proposing an economic stimulus package that could run the country into deficit. Canadians deserve a full budget so that their elected members of parliament can play a role in making the tough economic decisions that lie ahead. Canadians want their priorities protected, even if it means reducing frivolous and unnecessary Liberal spending. Canadians do not want an unnecessary budget deficit.

We call on the finance minister to honour his June commitment and to table a full budget this fall.

* * *

TERRORISM

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the attack on the United States last week not only warned Americans of the destruction that terrorists can cause, but Canadians have realized for the first time that no one is safe from terrorism, including ourselves.

Given this very real danger, what do Canadians have the right to expect of their government? First, they have the right to expect strong anti-terrorism legislation that would ensure that Canada does not harbour terrorists or terrorist groups. Such legislation would define terrorism in a comprehensive manner, name and outlaw specific terrorist groups and would ban fundraising and other support activities on behalf of terrorist groups.

These changes would need to be combined with legislative changes to existing laws, including amending our laws so that we can extradite suspected terrorists.

In addition to legislative changes, Canadians also have the right to expect more resources to be directed toward enforcement. Adequate staffing is crucial at organizations such as CSIS, the RCMP and national defence. The good men and women who work in these organizations must have the tools they need to get the job done.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

TERRORISM

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general has repeatedly denied that there was a Canadian connection to the terrible events of September 11. Yesterday however, the FBI apprehended Nabil Al-Marabh, a man who lived in and was wanted in Canada. U.S. authorities handed him over to Canadian immigration officials but they let him loose.

How can the government continue to deny a Canadian connection?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday that I was aware that an individual who spent some time in Canada was arrested by U.S. authorities.

I think all members of the House need to remember this is a worldwide manhunt, and the RCMP and CSIS are working with their counterparts in the U.S. to make sure the people responsible are brought to justice.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that Canada's immigration and refugee board freed this man and let him out on bail, even after the adjudicator said that he might not show up for bail. That is tough for us to understand. That is exactly what happened. In the interim, the FBI believes that this man may have had a hand in last week's tragic events.

How does releasing a failed refugee claimant with this kind of history keep us safe from terrorism in Canada? I would like to know that.

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): First, Mr. Speaker, the member is wrong in his facts. Second, it is very important that we not compromise any investigations, nor should we participate in trial by innuendo.

In Canada we believe in the rule of law. We know that terrorist activities are international in their scope. There have been arrests in France and the United States. If and when we have evidence in Canada, we move to detain. If we have evidence, the RCMP moves to arrest.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the evidence was very plain. This man was apprehended with a false Canadian passport and false documents. He was turned over to Canadian authorities by the U.S. What did they do with him? They let him out on bail and in the interim he may have been involved.

Once again, and this is in the broad context now, not about this specific individual, how does releasing an individual like this help us in the war against terrorism? How?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that we can and do detain individuals who are security threats when we have that evidence. He should also know that we do not detain individuals on whispers or innuendo. We need to have that evidence. When we do, we take action and we take it immediately.

I would say to the member that in democratic countries like Canada we are governed by the rule of law.

• (1120)

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the events of last week, including the arrest in the U.S. of Mr. Al-Marabh, have underscored the pressing need for anti-terrorism legislation in the country.

Oral Questions

Yesterday the 15 member countries of the European Union came together and adopted tough new measures that would give their police and security forces the tools they need to arrest and extradite suspected terrorists. The European Union acted quickly to ensure that it had the tools needed to fight the war against terrorism.

When will the government do the same thing?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister has said a number of times and I have said in the House, the changes that need to be made will be made to make sure that this country remains one of the safest countries in the world to live. We will make sure of that.

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, they say they will make sure but their members are walking out of committees, so we cannot have votes to bring people to committee to explain to them what is happening.

The member countries of the European Union know something about fighting terrorism. Far too many of them have faced this challenge for years and the safety and security of their citizens is a daily concern. That is why they moved quickly to adopt anti-terrorism legislation.

Last week the Prime Minister said he would follow the example of the European Union when it came to mourning the dead. Why can this government not now follow the example of the European Union in honouring those who have fallen by moving swiftly to enact anti-terrorism legislation in this country?

Mr. Stephen Owen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have an extensive list of criminal legislation in the country to deal with acts of terrorists, including all the major offences under the criminal code.

The Minister of Justice mentioned that we will be moving quickly to bring in legislation that will allow us to implement the two remaining of 12 anti-terrorist conventions which Canada has already signed on to. We have money laundering legislation which is being extended through Bill C-24, which will have a much broader scope to take control of the proceeds of crime and the proceeds that may go to—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his address to the nation yesterday President Bush called on each country to join the United States in defending freedom. This is central to our concerns about the establishment of a broad coalition to fight terrorism.

President Bush also said, and I quote “Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists”.

In terms of creating a vast international coalition, will the Liberals agree that choosing the American camp, the camp of freedom, does not mean giving them *carte blanche*?

[*English*]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have made it abundantly clear, and let me repeat what

the Prime Minister and what so many others have said in this government. We stand with the United States in this campaign against international terrorism. The safety and security of our people, the people of the United States and indeed freedom loving people right around the world, depends on this coalition coming together.

No one has said that anyone would get *carte blanche*. We have said that we want to work together to suppress terrorism.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is what I wanted to hear.

In his speech yesterday, President Bush did not however refer to the role of international institutions such as the UN in the developing fight against terrorism.

Will the Prime Minister use his visit to Washington to remind President Bush that the UN must play an important role in the international fight against terrorism?

[*English*]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the United Nations and the United Nations Security Council have already been engaged in this. Of course the right of a country to defend itself is set out quite clearly in article 51 of the UN charter.

We have had our neighbour under attack. This act of terrorism is a threat to them, to us and everyone. We intend to act with our United States partners in this matter, as well as the UN and the UN Security Council. NATO will also be a key part of all that.

● (1125)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a growing number of voices can be heard calling for the establishment of a broad coalition to fight terrorism effectively.

Yesterday President Bush called for the leaders of the al-Qaeda to be handed over to American authorities only.

If everyone acknowledges the relevance of such a coalition to fight terrorism, will the government acknowledge that international justice must also intervene as quickly to judge the perpetrators of the crimes committed last week?

[*English*]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has been a strong supporter of international justice and a supporter of the international court system, which is still waiting for sufficient ratification to be put into effect. It has also done so with respect to the former Yugoslavia as well as Rwanda. We have had a very strong track record of supporting these international justice systems.

What is needed is for these people to be brought to justice as quickly as possible. The president of the United States has indicated that that needs to be done now.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to prevent the security council from acting quickly to create an ad hoc international criminal tribunal.

Oral Questions

We must not forget that the call for an international coalition means for many countries and for all sorts of reasons, that justice must be of an international nature as was the case in the former Yugoslavia with Milosevic who had struck in Kosovo, Bosnia and Croatia.

Is the government prepared now to support the creation of a special international criminal tribunal?

[*English*]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the court system in the United States, as in Canada and many other democracies that operate on the rule of law, can quite well handle this kind of case.

There is a strong body of evidence in the United States with respect to this terrorist attack. That is the country it took place in. I have confidence that in the absence of an international court system which does not exist at this point in time, that the justice system is quite adequate to deal with the matter.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, much has been made about President Bush's failure to mention Canada in his speech last night. However that is not what Canadians care about. What they care about is that President Bush and the world hear Canada's view that the first line of attack on terrorism must be a truly international one, that we work through the United Nations and that we do it on the basis of the rule of law.

Will the Prime Minister deliver that message loud and clear when he goes to Washington on Monday?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, quite clearly, Canada respects and abides by the rule of law. If there is any discussion of that matter with the president on Monday, I am sure both the president and the Prime Minister will find considerable agreement on that.

What will hopefully come out of the discussion on Monday is a way ahead in terms of our two countries moving together. Canada has made it clear that it is committed to working with the U.S. in this campaign against terrorism. We are willing to put up our assets and provide assistance in whatever way we possibly can. That is certainly the message that the Prime Minister will be delivering to the president on Monday.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is up to the U.S. and Canada and all other countries to work together through the United Nations. In the 1960s the world faced a terrifying threat with the Cuban missile crisis. What did the president of the day, John F. Kennedy, do? He invoked the UN charter. He called upon the UN to call an emergency meeting of the security council and to deploy UN personnel.

Will the Prime Minister go to Washington and urge President Bush to embrace the John F. Kennedy approach?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every circumstance of every conflict is different. What is important is that we bring together a coalition of countries from around the world to fight terrorism. It is important that the countries which harbour terrorists cease to do that. It is important that they rid their countries of the terrorist cells that exist.

The UN has a major role to play in all this. The UN has already played a major role in indicating that the United States has a right to defend itself under article 51. The UN Security Council will continue to be engaged in this matter on behalf of all UN countries.

• (1130)

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last night during President Bush's address to the nation, Canadians could not help but get the impression that our American friends must be underwhelmed with Canadian government reaction.

While President Bush and other world leaders have outlined specific proposals, like strengthening intelligence gathering agencies, proactively building the international coalition and enacting strong, anti-terrorist measures, Canada has said the comforting words but has failed to produce a real action plan.

When can we expect the Prime Minister to address our nation to tell Canadians what part Canada is prepared to play in the war against terrorism?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on September 11 the first request to any foreign country from the United States came to Canada. We were asked if we would take 200 planes out of its skies and take them into our airports and deal with 33,000 people in those aircraft. We said yes to that. President Bush, in one of his first public statements, thanked Canada. How many times does the hon. member think he needs to thank Canada? He knows we are there with them.

The Americans further asked us to put CF-18s into the NORAD system. We have done that. They asked us to increase intelligence analysis. We have done it. We have done all that we have been asked.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, following President Bush's address last night, it is obvious that Canada will be involved in a prolonged campaign against terrorism. Years of Liberal cuts to CSIS, Canada Customs, immigration and our military may have produced a surplus but there are questions regarding our internal security and our military capability.

Canadians demand leadership at this time. We know cabinet finally met on Tuesday yet no plan has emerged. Are additional resources being allotted to protect our country and meet our obligations so that we can truly stand shoulder to shoulder with our American allies?

Would the solicitor general tell us what the plan is?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. colleague heard the Prime Minister when he said that we would be with the United States every step of the way. Every measure that needs to be taken will be taken.

Oral Questions

What we must do is review and decide where funds need to be allocated. The Minister of Finance indicated quite clearly that financing would be available. The director of CSIS has indicated that he has the money to fulfill his mandate. We put \$1.5 billion in the public safety envelope. We put \$584 million toward the RCMP over the next three years. We will do more to make sure this great nation remains the safest place in the world.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, like many who watched it, I was cheered to see President Bush last night praising the United Kingdom and its prime minister, Tony Blair, for pledging to fight with the United States.

Indeed, even the president of France, Jacques Chirac, was quoted yesterday as saying that France will be there with the U.S. too.

Will the government work with our friends and allies to build a military force to destroy the military capability of any terrorist of any country that supports international terrorism?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the prime minister of the U.K. was in the room at the time. It is logical that he would have been pointed out by the president. Again, the president talked about a number of countries that he wants to come on side and be part of building the coalition.

As I indicated previously, Canada has already been thanked by Mr. Bush and, most important, we have made it abundantly clear that we do stand with him and that we are committed to this campaign. We have provided all the requests and the assets for which the Americans have asked. We have told them that we stand ready to be with them in this entire campaign, militarily or in other ways.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the U.S. ambassador and President Bush have made it clear that the U.S. is looking for military support. Canadians want Canada to commit to the fight against terrorism. The government must answer the call.

When will the Government of Canada join with our allies, the United Kingdom and France, to show a real military commitment in the coming fight? Where is the government's action plan? What exactly will the government deliver to the fight against terrorism?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we continually get a Rambo style of commentary coming from the Alliance.

There is more than just a military involvement. The president of the United States and others have made it clear that this is a multidimensional campaign against terrorism.

In terms of the military aspect of it, we have made it clear to the United States. It knows what our assets are. We have said that we will consider the use of any of those assets in terms of any military campaign.

The Alliance seems to want to get off to war awfully fast. What we want to do is try to settle the campaign against terrorism with the least loss of life to our troops or to any civilians.

• (1135)

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's newspapers the Prime Minister may present a

certain number of military scenarios to President Bush during their meeting on Monday.

Will the Minister of National Defence confirm that the government has planned different military scenarios, some of which involve deploying thousands of Canadian soldiers abroad?

[English]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times before, the United States is still in a planning phase, determining what the full nature of the campaign will be. It will consult with us and with other allies. It knows our assets and the capability of our personnel. It knows what we are capable of doing. It saw what we did in Kosovo and what we have done in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

We have told the Americans that our assets and our personnel are there and available. This is more than just a military effort. It is a diplomatic and economic effort and an effort in many other respects to try to deal with the campaign against terrorism.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I imagine that we too know what our assets are. We know what we have and the Americans know it. That is not what we want to know.

We are asking if military scenarios have been planned involving the deployment of thousands of Canadians abroad. This is quite specific. This is what we would like to know.

[English]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times before, of course there are options that are being prepared in that regard. No decision has been made on any specific element of the Canadian Forces. Indeed, the United States has not made a decision on what is totally needed and what it would request of Canada or other countries.

Certainly we are working out a wide range of options that could be used in terms of support.

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House I asked the Minister of Transport whether he could confirm a *Sun* media report that knives and box cutters were found aboard a Toronto-New York carrier flight the same day terrorists hijacked four planes with the same weapons and crashed three of them into buildings in the United States.

The minister told me to check my facts and that is exactly what I am trying to do. I am seeking the information directly from the person who should know whether or not this happened.

I ask the question again. Could the minister confirm that those weapons were found on planes that left the Canadian airport?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before September 11 security was rigorous both at airports and onboard planes. Certainly after that time things have been tightened up considerably.

Oral Questions

We do not talk about specific planes or specific incidences of transport for obvious reasons. However, I wish to say that the hon. member does not have his facts correct.

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, since the minister is not giving any facts it is awfully hard for Canadians to piece the puzzle together.

This week we have seen very little action from the Minister of Transport to improve air security. He asked airlines to lock the cockpit doors but most of them were already doing that. He was asked to provide air marshals by Air Canada and he refused, even though he is considering a \$3 billion to \$4 billion bailout of Air Canada.

We have seen that bombs and weapons can be smuggled through airport security. The minister has known for months of these security risks and has done nothing.

What kind of attack will it take to force the minister to take the kind of action that is necessary to make sure that our planes are safe in the skies?

Hon. David Collette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): I do not know where the hon. member has been for the last week, Mr. Speaker. He must have travelled from his constituency. The fact is that we have put in place extremely tight security measures. I have said that we do not preclude bringing in further measures.

I met yesterday with members of the Air Transport Association who have been working with us. This is a group that represents the airline industry and we are working, not just on a daily basis but on an hourly basis, to evaluate security and to ensure that whatever measures need to be taken are put in place.

* * *

[Translation]

BUDGET SURPLUSES

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the first four months of this year the federal government has accumulated surpluses in excess of \$10 billion. Yesterday the Minister of Finance told us that because of the anti-terrorism effort and security measures, these surpluses could disappear and our way of life could change.

Does the government agree with the disturbing comments of the Minister of Finance, which, to make matters worse, contradict those of the Prime Minister who said this week that there was no question of the terrorists dictating how we lived our lives?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have all seen there is considerable economic uncertainty globally. That having been said however we know that there will be costs associated with the fight against terrorism. I must reiterate that, as he said the other day, the minister is going to be providing Canadians with a comprehensive statement of our fiscal situation in the fall.

• (1140)

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the situation is cause for concern, but there is no need to make matters worse. That is what the Minister of Finance did yesterday.

There can have been only two reasons why he said what he did: either he is telling us whatever comes into his head about the surpluses as he has done for the past five years, or the minister of defence has asked him for billions of dollars to take part in the war effort and to finance his scenarios.

Will the minister of defence inform the House about the nature of these extraordinary demands for billions of dollars?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the minister said yesterday, our priority is to protect Canada, which involves two things: national security and our economic security. I can assure the member that nobody in the world will fight harder than we will against a deficit.

* * *

[English]

TERRORISM

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister finally meets President Bush next week to tell him what Canada can contribute to the war against terrorism. However he has an equally important measure to deliver regarding Canada's border integrity.

What message is the Prime Minister bringing to President Bush to ease his fears and protect the Canadian economy?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to our shared border, all members of the House know that Canada and the U.S. have been working together to ensure that our businesses keep working. We know as well that part of the mandate of Canada Customs is the question of the protection of Canadian society. We have been working with the United States. Back in 1995 we signed an agreement on our shared border. We must continue to co-operate with the United States.

Bill S-23 is before the House. The principles we have in the bill must be enacted as soon as possible. I am counting on the support of the opposition parties to make sure we move ahead with the bill.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the words of the U.S. administration should be setting off alarm bells at the PMO. Colin Powell criticized our border integrity. President Bush has stated that the most important relationship the U.S. has is with Mexico. Last night he stated that the U.S. has no truer friend than Great Britain. Canada once enjoyed these designations.

With billions of dollars in trade and thousands of Canadian jobs contingent upon our trading relationship with the U.S., what measures has the Prime Minister actually taken to strengthen Canada's borders and fortify our trade links?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we all know, following the tragic events of last week Canada Customs officers have been fantastic and deserve a good round of applause.

Oral Questions

When we began reforming the system a year and a half ago the opposition of course was not there because it was not interested in Canadian security, safety or in the customs system. However this government was very interested and that is why we began the process a year and a half ago.

Bill S-23 is before the House. This is what we need in order to make sure that we have and keep a safe country, and I count on the opposition's support.

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions.

Canadians as we know, are very concerned about terrorism and how it is financed. Given that money is the fuel and food for terrorism, will the government be introducing amendments to our recently enacted anti-money laundering legislation to combat terrorism?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for that very important question.

We are considering that at this very moment. We have had discussions with Fintrac on our money laundering legislation and we certainly are looking at that measure. It is also important to tell Canadians what else we are doing currently. Pursuant to UN Security Council resolution 1333, on February 22 Canada passed regulations to "freeze without delay funds and other financial assets of Osama bin Laden and individuals and entities associated with him, including those of al-Qaeda".

• (1145)

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

While Canadians strongly condemn the terrorist attacks on September 11, many Canadians are also deeply concerned and reject George Bush's dangerous new war that ignores the United Nations and international law.

Will the Prime Minister tell George Bush on Monday that there are not only two choices, the choice between the United States and terrorism, but that there is a third choice, the choice of respect for international law and the United Nations? Will the Prime Minister make it clear that we reject George Bush's war?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this country respects international law. The Prime Minister has made that very clear. We are a country that is a democracy, that respects the rule of law. I am sure President Bush knows that. What needs to be done though within that framework, within the rule of law and within the framework of the United Nations is to deal with terrorism effectively. It is a threat to the United States. It is a threat to us. It is a threat throughout the world.

The two men will get together on Monday and discuss how we can work together to effectively do that.

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, George Bush's new war is in fact in contempt of international law and will result in the deaths of thousands of innocent Afghani civilians, just as we have seen over half a million Iraqi children die innocently.

George Bush has said that he will use all necessary weapons in this war. Will the Prime Minister make it very clear to President George Bush that Canada utterly rejects any suggestion of the use of tactical nuclear weapons in any war at all?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is going way out on a limb. He is getting very extreme and is fearmongering on this particular issue.

What has been made clear by the president of the United States, by the Prime Minister and all of us is that this is a campaign against terrorism. It is not just going to be fought on the basis of military means. It is not going to be fought with conventional warfare means by and large. There are many different ways we must come together in this fight against terrorism. That is what we are going to talk about doing.

Let me also remind the hon. member that the United Nations, in particular the UN Security Council, has said under article 51 that the United States does have a right to defend itself. It has been attacked.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, intelligence reports from CSIS, *Jane's* and the U.S. congress all cite Canada as a country where terrorist cells are operating, yet the solicitor general continues to evade questions regarding their existence.

How many times do we have to ask this question before we get an answer? We have been asking it all week. Why will the minister not come clean with Canadians and tell us whether there are terrorist cells in Canada and whether he has secured new additional funds to adequately deal with them?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have addressed this question a number of times.

The Prime Minister and I have said a number of times that all measures will be reviewed. If measures need to be put in place, they will be put in place. The director of CSIS has indicated quite clearly he has the financing to fulfill his mandate. The RCMP had a major infusion of dollars. The Minister of Finance has indicated quite clearly that we are going to do what is right for the long term to fight terrorism and make sure the country remains one of the safest countries in the world in which to live.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday and again today the transport minister was asked about box cutters found on a flight out of Pearson airport. His only response was to admonish the member for asking such a question.

After question period yesterday I spoke to an Air Canada employee who was outraged at the minister's flippant response.

It was confirmed that the box cutters were indeed found on an aborted Air Canada flight destined for New York on September 11. How is it that the American government can be open and honest with its citizens while this government hides behind a cloak of denial?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member criticizes my answer to the hon. member from the Alliance who posed the question initially. All I said was that he had his facts wrong.

Oral Questions

• (1150)

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Nabil Al-Marabh, who had been connected with two of the World Trade Center hijackers, was under arrest in Canada but the IRB released him.

The minister said that we cannot detain or deport persons on the basis of what she calls rumour and innuendo. The evidence against Mr. Al-Marabh was that he had been arrested on stabbing charges in Boston, that he had attempted to illegally enter the United States, that he had illegally re-entered Canada, that he was carrying a forged passport, that he was carrying a forged citizenship card and that he was carrying a forged social insurance card.

Why was this real evidence and not rumour or innuendo, not enough to detain or deport this suspected terrorist?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remind the member that the campaign against terrorism is an international struggle. Canadians demand responsible actions. I will not in any way compromise any investigation nor will I participate in trial by innuendo. In Canada we have the rule of law. We rely on the rule of law when making decisions which are appropriate at the time.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what the minister refers to as rumour and innuendo. This individual had been deported from Canada, had re-entered the country illegally, had been arrested carrying a false Canadian passport, citizenship card and SIN card and had been charged by U.S. authorities for a stabbing in Boston.

The IRB adjudicator in the case admitted that he was not someone who could be trusted to simply appear at a future hearing but released him anyway. Why will the government not agree to detain or deport immediately any failed refugee claimant with links to terrorism who break Canadian laws?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is wrong to equate all failed refugee claimants with terrorism. That is clearly wrong. It is also important for the hon. member and all people to know that when we have evidence that someone poses a security threat, we take action immediately. The person is detained and we then argue for continued detention.

Similarly, we do not detain people on mere whispers. Neither do we detain on suspicion. When we have the facts and the evidence and hard information, we take the action Canadians expect us to take.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a while ago the minister of defence informed the House that the government had drawn up a number of different military scenarios.

I believe it is absolutely normal for a certain number of military scenarios for a response to terrorism to be contemplated within a broad coalition. In fact, if they were not it would be a cause for concern.

I would however like to find out from the minister of defence whether any figures have been attached to these military scenarios. Has the cost of these actions been assessed, which would be evidence of responsibility?

[*English*]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I indicated in answer to a previous question that the military were working on options. The government has not set out scenarios at this point in time. It is working on options and yes, costing will also be a part of those options.

At the same time, the United States knows what we are capable of doing. The Americans know what capacity we have. They are designing the program and will ask us in terms of what they think the needs are. They are the ones quite logically who are co-ordinating this entire effort, but nothing has been finalized. It is still in process.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am not inquiring as to whether a final decision has been reached. I trust that the minister is working with the military and that the military is not the only one involved in these scenarios. There is a political aspect. There is a certain control that has to be exercised in this regard.

What I am asking, therefore, is not to wait until the United States tells us what we can do. Instead, the Prime Minister needs to be able to tell them what we could do.

In any logical, realistic and responsible assessment, costs are evaluated in order to determine capabilities and possibilities. Has there been a cost assessment of these operations?

[*English*]

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are no costs I can talk about at this point in time. Yes, all of these matters are being assessed. There is regular day to day, ongoing communications with the United States which is preparing the plan.

We told the Americans of our capabilities. We are looking at how we can reshape some of those capabilities in view of the circumstances post-September 11. We are in frequent communication with them. They know that. They know that we want to be of help.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, as a consequence of the terrorist attack on the United States ordinary Canadians are expressing concern over their personal safety.

While Canadians appreciate the need to exercise discretion when discussing plans for security, our citizens need to know that the military bases and our nuclear power facilities are secure.

People want to help. What plans does the government have to involve the public in this fight against international terrorism?

• (1155)

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I cannot understand is why opposition members continually ask government members sensitive information on security issues.

They want information on investigations. They want information on security measures. I can assure my hon. colleague that all the measures that need to be taken will be taken by the government.

Oral Questions

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, involving the people of Canada in the security of our nation does not mean divulging state secrets.

Even though the Prime Minister has fallen short during this crisis, the people of Canada have not.

When will the minister table a plan in the House to respond to the concerns of all Canadians whom we all want to help?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we said many times what we are going to do. We are going to walk every step with the United States on this issue. We are going to take what measures need to be taken to increase security in this country.

The Minister of Finance has indicated quite clearly that financing will be made available for extra security measures. The Minister of Transport has indicated extra measures are being considered. All appropriate measures are being taken by the government to make sure this country remains one of the safest countries in the world in which to live.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

Extreme weather was evident during the 2001 growing season worldwide. Drought in particular is having a serious impact on Canadian farmers.

Can the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food tell the House what the extent of the drought is and whether the government has programs in place to help farmers through this crisis?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no question that many farmers in Canada are going through one of the most severe droughts in decades.

We are monitoring that. However I remind everyone that we have a range of programs and safety nets. More farmers purchased crop insurance coverage for more acres. There is a total coverage of over \$6.5 billion. We estimate that after farmers' 30% of the premium, crop insurance alone will pay out over \$1 billion.

There is the net income stabilization account. There is the Canada farm income program. We estimate at this stage that between the federal and provincial governments there will be close to \$4 billion in—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Elk Island.

* * *

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told us on Monday that committees would be informed and involved in finding solutions to the present threat by terrorists.

We gave notice and had motions prepared to call the Minister of National Revenue and the commissioner of Canada Customs and Revenue Agency to the finance committee. However instead of

receiving, debating and voting on our motions, the government pulled all Liberal members away so that quorum was lost.

Why does the government not want these officials at committee?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have indicated our full co-operation insofar as committee structures are concerned. The hon. member will know that.

I do not know when the incident he referred to specifically occurred. I know yesterday we adjourned committees. We even suspended the House in order to attend a ceremony that members organized. Perhaps that is when the event occurred. If it occurred otherwise, I will endeavour to work with him and indeed all members.

Finally, we even asked for a vote in the House to refer a particular issue to committee earlier this week and unanimous consent was denied.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, this was not a case of members not knowing where the committee room was. They were already there. This was a case where well before the time of the gathering in room 200, west block, committee members walked out. It was quite clear that it was at the call of the whip or some other official from the government.

My question is very simple. The Liberals defeated our supply day motion to produce anti-terrorist legislation. Now they will not let us work through committees. How and when will Canadians ever get some answers to this serious issue?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the hon. member and indeed all hon. members that I would work in co-operation with them to do everything we could to make the committee work available.

We are in the process. I even had an informal consultation with the hon. member's House leader about the restarting of committees, because under the standing orders they do expire 10 days after the House comes back in September.

To the extent that we can co-operate, get them fully going and studying all issues relating not only to this but anything else, the hon. member will get my full co-operation.

• (1200)

[Translation]

STOCK MARKET SPECULATION

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a number of countries are currently looking into the movement of capital and dubious stock market speculation orders made shortly before the September 11 strikes. Terrorists might have speculated knowing the events that would occur.

Could the solicitor general tell us whether such an investigation was undertaken in Canada as well and specifically at the Toronto stock exchange?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, we had discussions with the stock exchanges on this.

We also had discussions with the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions. Discussions are now taking place between it and our financial institutions in order to obtain their full co-operation in working with the authorities of our two countries to combat terrorism.

* * *

[English]

INTERNATIONAL AID

Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are still hundreds of thousands of human beings on the verge of starvation all over the world. Recently the Minister for International Cooperation consulted with over 1,000 groups and individuals across Canada on how we could make our foreign aid more effective.

Could she report to the House on how at the G-8 conference this year she will be able to present a more effective plan to help these people?

Hon. Maria Minna (Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have held consultations in 10 Canadian cities and met with 1,100 organizations and individuals across Canada.

Some of the issues we discussed that will help us to prepare our position for the G-8 are strategic co-ordinated local ownership, which is very important to many NGOs and countries, and stronger democratic sustainable governance, another issue which was discussed and is very important.

There is also the importance of education in developing countries to assist them to lift themselves out of poverty, especially education for women and girls, and of market access and economic development. These were some of the very major issues discussed which will help us tremendously.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. In a statement prior to question period today the member for Vancouver Island North said, among other things, that last night the Prime Minister was at a Liberal fundraiser in Toronto. This is totally false.

Routine Proceedings

I know the hon. member would not want to mislead the House and give false information. I would ask that he withdraw that comment.

The Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Vancouver Island North would like to say something in response. I am not sure this is a question of privilege, but we will hear from the hon. member for Vancouver Island North.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify that if that is the case I obviously withdraw it. I think the important point is we know where he was not and where he was is another question.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. After consultation among all parties and with the full support of all party leaders I ask that you seek consent of the House to move and adopt without debate the following motion. I move:

That this House:

(a) Issue an urgent and immediate plea to political, community and faith leaders to speak out against violence, intolerance, or hatred of any kind, directed at Muslims, Arabs and other visible minorities: and

(b) In the name of the Canadian people, reassert our country's fundamental adherence to the rule of law, and to preserving and protecting our human rights as outlined in our charter.

• (1205)

The Speaker: Does the hon. member for Halifax have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Joe Jordan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 (8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 11 petitions.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga Centre, Lib.): With your permission, Madam Speaker, I have two reports. Pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Canadian-NATO Parliamentary Association which represented Canada at the meeting of the subcommittee on the future security and defence capabilities of the NATO parliamentary assembly held in Belgium and the Netherlands from May 6 to May 11, 2001.

Routine Proceedings

Pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) as well, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Canadian-NATO Parliamentary Association which represented Canada at the spring session of the NATO parliamentary assembly held in Vilnius, Lithuania, from May 27 to May 31, 2001.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Joe Jordan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Question No. 58 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 58—**Mr. Randy White:**

With respect to the net impact on Canada's medical system and social programs of the family reunification class of immigration over the latest year period for which data is available, has the net impact been increasing or decreasing, and has the family reunification class been a net contributor to, or a net beneficiary of, Canada's medical system and social programs over that same period?

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to Human Resources Development Canada, since provincial governments administer social programs, it is difficult to ascertain, with any degree of certainty, the impact of the family reunification class of immigration.

Among immigrant families that have been in Canada for 10 to 15 years, the incidence of poverty, defined as the percentage falling below the low income cut off, is comparable to that for Canadian-born families: 13% for immigrant families v. 14% for Canadian-born families in 1997.

However, immigrants tend to have a higher level of education and skills than other Canadians. In 1999, 57% of working-age immigrants at landing had a post-secondary degree, compared to about 42% of the Canadian working age population. Moreover, research shows that once immigrants adapt to Canada and the demands of the labour market, the average income of immigrant families exceeds that of Canadian families.

There are a number of reasons why immigrants may experience problems integrating successfully into the labour market. For example, individuals trained in a foreign country often encounter obstacles having their education, experience, skills, training and credentials assessed or recognised in Canada. This is why the January 2001 Speech from the Throne outlined the need to attract skilled workers to Canada, and the government's intent to work in co-operation with the provinces and territories to secure better recognition of the foreign credentials of immigrants and to ease their integration into Canadian society.

It is important to note, however, that the share of immigrants in the family class has actually been declining. Immigrants are divided into three main groups: economic class, family class and refugees. Between 1980 and 1999, the share of immigrants coming to Canada in the family class fell from 34% to 29%, while the share of immigrants in the economic class rose from 32% to 56%. Accounting for more than one-half of all immigrants in 1999, the economic class is much less likely to need to use social programs, relative to the family class or refugees.

Human Resources Development Canada is unable to provide an assessment of the net impact over the last 10 years of the family reunification class of immigration on Canada's old age security, OAS, program and the Canada pension plan, CPP, as statistics are not collected on immigrants who come to Canada to join family members already established in Canada.

However, newcomers to Canada must earn the right to benefits just like any other Canadian. Social security agreements with other countries can help people to qualify for OAS and CPP benefits.

Eligibility for the OAS pension is based on age and residence in Canada. Newcomers to Canada have never been eligible for full OAS benefits immediately upon arrival. Most individuals must live in Canada at least 10 years after age 18 in order to get a partial OAS pension. However, people who move from one country to another to live or work can qualify in less than 10 years for Canadian pension benefits through the application of international social security agreements. These agreements co-ordinate the operation of the OAS program with comparable programs in other countries, and enable individuals to maintain continuity in their social security coverage. Through these agreements, an individual may qualify for a partial OAS pension by adding together periods of residence in Canada and periods of residence and/or coverage, credits, under the program(s) of another country to meet the minimum residence requirement.

In March 1996 the rules applicable to some immigrants from countries with social security agreements with Canada were modified in two ways. First, sponsored immigrants from a country with which Canada has an international agreement are not eligible for the guaranteed income supplement or allowance benefits during their sponsorship period, up to a maximum of 10 years, except in specific circumstances. The supplement and the allowance are income tested benefits provided to people who are largely dependent on the OAS pension. This change recognizes the responsibility of sponsors to support immigrants during that time. Second, non-sponsored immigrants from these same countries can earn the supplement or allowance benefit at a rate of 1/10 for each year of residence in Canada after age 18.

Government Orders

Eligibility for CPP benefits is based on participation in the Canadian workforce. The CPP is designed to replace a portion of the earnings from employment or self-employment that are no longer available to contributors and their families due to retirement, disability, or death. To qualify for a CPP retirement pension, a person has to have made at least one valid contribution to the CPP. However, the pension would be very small. A newcomer to Canada would have to contribute for several years to qualify for a CPP disability benefit. A person has to have made contributions for at least four years in the last six years. Survivors benefits are based on the contributions of the deceased. Social security agreements can help people who come from countries with social programs comparable to the CPP to qualify for disability and survivors benefits. Each country pays in proportion to the number of years or credits built up in the respective plans.

With respect to Citizenship and Immigration Canada, no data is available as to the net impact of family reunification on Canada's medical system and social programs. Although it is difficult to quantify their contribution to Canada, family class immigrants do contribute to Canada's economy. Parents and grandparents may serve as caregivers to working parents, and other family class members may assist in family operated businesses which creates employment for all Canadians.

Countries are made up of individual families and this reality is enshrined in the Immigration Act, which has as one its objectives to facilitate the reunion in Canada of Canadian citizens and permanent residents with their close relatives from abroad.

With respect to Health Canada, it does not maintain such information.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Joe Jordan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if Questions Nos. 44, 50, 55, 57 and 61 could be made orders for returns, the returns would be tabled immediately.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 44—**Ms. Christiane Gagnon:**

What advertising, promotional and information campaigns (exhaustive list) have been broadcast on television and radio since January 1, 2001, by each federal department and agency, and how much has each of these campaigns cost?

Return tabled.

Question No. 50—**Mr. Leon Benoit:**

What amounts were paid by government departments and agencies to the McMillan Binch law firm for professional services during each fiscal year since 1991?

Return tabled.

Question No. 55—**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold:**

For the fiscal year 1999-2000, can the government provide a detailed list of all grants awarded by the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec in Quebec's 75 federal ridings?

Return tabled.

Questions No. 57—**Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance):**

Has the government formulated a national housing policy and, if so, what definitions has it given the following terms in regard to single persons: (a) "affordable housing"; (b) "poverty"; (c) "rooming house"; and (d) "homeless"?

Return tabled.

Questions No. 61—**Mr. John Cummins:**

With regard to the fishing industry and infrastructure necessary to support it on a riding basis for the fiscal years 1997-98 to 2000-01 inclusive: (a) what was the funding for fishing harbours under the Small Craft Harbours Program; and (b) what was the value of fish landings?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Joe Jordan: I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CUSTOMS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill S-23, an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other acts, be now read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Madam Speaker, as I was saying before being interrupted for oral question period, we had certain reservations about the bill. These were threefold.

First of all, regulations are needed for certain matters that strike us as crucial, including the criteria for accreditation of Canadian or American individuals or companies, so that when CANPASS accreditation is refused, the reasons for that refusal are known and corrective action is taken in order to maintain healthy competition between Canadian and American companies in the same sector.

Second, we also have certain reservations about the minister's discretionary power in certain cases. It is a failing of the government that it always includes several provisions in a bill referring to the minister's discretion. At some point everything is up to the minister's discretion and this concerns us.

As for giving customs officers increased authority to open mail in the case of envelopes weighing 30 grams or more, we question the appropriateness of such a measure. Customs officers already have certain powers, but it would be excessive to open mail without an arrest warrant or serious doubts about the nature of a parcel. Even the Canadian Bar Association questions these stepped up measures.

Government Orders

Following discussions with the Minister of National Revenue, who is responsible for the economic development agency, it wanted us to have some assurances regarding the possibility of having regulations with the bill, especially when it is examined in committee or at least of our having a statement of principle or a political statement for certain parts of the bill. It will be especially important to have a larger picture than that of the bill in which we find incredible gaps that prevent our understanding things properly.

We got this assurance and I think we will watch how things develop because the Minister of National Revenue and minister responsible for economic development is not in the habit of saying just anything. We will therefore await further developments in the hope that the minister will provide the clarification we seek.

In principle, at this second reading stage my party is going to support this bill, but we will be waiting for developments from the minister responsible who, let us hope, will meet our expectations. If at the end of the process we are not satisfied with respect to the concerns we have mentioned throughout this speech, we would have to oppose the bill unless there are amendments.

So far, we are in support of the bill's principles at second reading because international trade could benefit. The administrative problems encountered by certain companies and individuals in conducting business with the United States in particular, could be reduced. This could be a positive thing in the circumstances.

● (1210)

[*English*]

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, the NDP caucus feels that Bill S-23 is less about providing for the expedited movement of persons and goods into Canada, or even about making technical or housekeeping changes to the current practices, and more about economic sovereignty. It is about the larger issue of the whole subject of North American integration and the ultimate disappearance of our borders.

The bill, like many others introduced by the Liberal government, is like a Trojan horse. The government introduces some fairly innocuous bills or aspects to an issue but with a secondary objective. The primary goal in this bill is masked around the issue of making sure that there is a free movement of goods and services between Canada and the United States, our major trading partner.

There are some positive changes in Bill S-23, particularly the lengthening of the period of time within which a person can appeal a ruling by the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency.

That was a necessary change to make given, for example, the practice of people leaving the country to be married and then coming back with gifts or jewellery stemming from that marriage. Many people did not realize that there were huge customs duties on that material and there were only 30 days to appeal. There have been cases where the opportunity to appeal was lost. Changes in Bill S-23 will remedy this situation.

The larger issue pertains to our economic sovereignty and about the move toward the integration of the North American economy with the whole western hemispheric economy. Recent comments made by the ambassador to Canada from the United States have given us even greater cause for concern along these lines.

There have been those who advocate the idea of expediting the process by making comparisons with the European Union. It has made recent changes to the movement across borders between its partners to make the free flow of goods and services easier and less cumbersome.

The relationship among Canada, the United States and Mexico does not resemble the member states of the European Union. It has done a much greater job to harmonize other necessary things even before contemplating the harmonization of immigration policies, customs practices or shared practices such as electronic passes that are being contemplated with retina identification or palm prints.

These are fundamental shifts in the way that we do things. The Americans are saying we should harmonize with American immigration laws and then enter into this new relationship. It is far more than a technical change in the way people are processed as they cross the border. It does belie a fundamental shift in the way that we view ourselves.

There is a saying in the Holy Bible that the lion shall lie down with the lamb. In that case the lamb does not get very much sleep. We are very concerned that as we enter into this relationship with the United States it will be hugely to the benefit of the Americans and lesser to us.

In light of the recent World Trade Center tragedy Bill S-23 should be put on hold and frozen in its place until such time as we deal with the issue of international security stemming from the WTC tragedy.

It is the wrong time to be dealing with issues of economic sovereignty when we are so wholly dominated by the tragedy that happened in New York. It is the wrong time to redefine our relationship with the United States or to redefine our position as part of the North American hemisphere. Bill S-23 would force us to enter into that argument and debate long before we are ready.

● (1215)

We were reminded recently of the dangers of letting our economic sovereignty slip away. The recent trend in the past 20 years has been toward a branch plant economy. As we predicted, the development of a branch plant type economic base is coming to fruition.

For example, we said that if we lost control of our industries and let the Americans dominate or foreign ownership take over, Canadian industries would lose the ability to chart their own destiny. A graphic example is at our doorstep.

Frustrated Americans are saying that if Canada does not fall into a complete goose step with the United States in its current military exercises then they would reconsider allowing their plants to continue manufacturing in Canada. They would withdraw their Canadian branch plants of American companies costing Canada jobs.

Government Orders

That is a perfect illustration of what we warned about. If we lose our economic sovereignty we will lose our ability to have national sovereignty and to chart our destiny as we choose instead of becoming part of the American manifest destiny.

It is ultimately what western hemispheric integration is all about. The Americans are deemed to be the inevitable and chosen ideal that there should be one force in the western hemisphere and that it should be the American economy and culture.

We are opposed to that. I am a fiercely proud Canadian nationalist. When I look around the room for others with the same mindset I do not see very many on either side of the House at this time.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. How can the NDP speaker compare the goose stepping of Hitler to America's attack on terrorism?

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The Chair is not here to censor the words of the hon. member, but if the hon. member would like to continue his debate he may.

Mr. Pat Martin: Madam Speaker, I am not trying to offend anyone with the point that I am striving to make. Our primary concern as Canadians should be to maintain our economic and national sovereignty. As a fiercely proud Canadian nationalist I see very few other people speaking in those terms. We used to hear that kind of argument from the Liberal benches back in the days of Walter Gordon and Paul Martin Senior, and when the current member from Windsor used to espouse those lines.

We used to hear Liberal members talking about ensuring that too much foreign ownership does not dominate Canadian industries. That used to be a popular theme for them. Laws and regulations were put in place to make sure that did not happen. Part of their argument was that if our economic sovereignty was lost we would lose the ability to be a sovereign nation.

The most paramount idea about being a sovereign nation is to be able to chart our own destiny and control matters such as international military exercises like the one we are about to see the Americans embark on.

We have been essentially threatened. President Bush told us in his speech last night that countries are either shoulder to shoulder with America or they are with the terrorists. I find that offensive as a Canadian who is not unquestionably shoulder to shoulder with the Americans but that does not make me shoulder to shoulder with the terrorists.

We are advocating a third way to deal with the international tragedy that happened at the World Trade Center within the parameters of the international community, and that is to bring these criminals to justice without embarking on a unilateral military exercise such as that being contemplated by the U.S.

Canada must be cautious not to drift along with the particular exercise. Unless we have control of our economic sovereignty we are subject to the coercion associated with the threat of branch plants closing and the border being sealed up.

Those are the issues that concern us about Bill S-23. The legislation should not be up for consideration in the House of Commons at this sensitive time in our nation's history. The bill

should be put back on ice. The flow of goods and services across our border should be dealt with at some less sensitive time.

We are hearing all the typical and familiar buzzwords in the news that give us cause for concern about what is the real agenda. The current ambassador of the United States to Canada is talking about the need for a NAFTA plus. Bill S-23 is the Liberal government's answer to a NAFTA plus.

I remind the House that sometimes the wishes of Americans are brought about in a circular way for procedural reasons. In 1983 the previous ambassador of the United States to Canada, Mr. Paul Robinson, in a *Maclean's* magazine article stated:

—Back in January of 1983, I asked my embassy staff to see what we could do to initiate a free trade deal with Canada. I realized, of course, that the public initiative had to come from Canada, because if it came from us it would look as if we were trying to gobble up our neighbour.

He had to get a Canadian entity to start calling for the trade agreement, knowing full well that it was hugely to their advantage. However the Americans wanted it to come from Canada. Otherwise Canadians would see, in a very transparent way, that it was really their intention to gobble up their neighbour.

● (1220)

The Toronto *Star* reports that then U.S. Ambassador Robinson took the idea to Thomas d'Aquino, president of the Business Council on National Issues and unofficial prime minister, at his Ottawa home. He was exactly who the Americans needed to promote the idea of the free trade agreement, an agreement that would be hugely in their favour.

Interestingly enough, when the president of BCNI talks about those days he reverses what history tells us and says it is important to remember that it was Canadians who took the first step and asked for the free trade agreement. It was in fact the U.S. ambassador visiting d'Aquino in his home who asked for it, and d'Aquino dutifully delivered over the next number of years.

We in the NDP believe the issue of North American integration is cause for great concern. It is a subject we should be debating. We are not afraid of having the debate but we do not think it should be in this context. It should not be wrapped in the envelope of the issue of customs and excise. That is crazy.

This is a Trojan horse idea. We are ostensibly here today to debate the idea of free movement of goods and services across the international border between Canada and the United States, but the debate is really about western hemispheric integration into one United States of America from the Arctic Ocean to Tierra del Fuego.

It worries us when we hear the Liberal chair of the finance committee saying that no one can deny that North American integration is taking place. The newspaper article reports that he has emerged as the chief advocate for a no holds barred debate on integration, an issue which did not appear in Liberal election campaign literature in 2000.

Government Orders

I do not think the Liberal Party campaigned to trade away what little is left of our economic sovereignty. I do not think its intention upon re-election for a third term was to start passing legislation specifically asked for by the U.S. ambassador, that would see us lose our ability to chart our own destiny. I do not think the Liberals intended to embark on such an agenda. I did not notice it anywhere in their party's year 2000 election campaign literature.

We are not against having a more open border at some point. We are not against free movement of goods and services between us and our neighbour to the south. However let us do it on equal terms. Let us do it in a way similar to the way the European Union undertook integration. It had a bigger problem. It has 15 nation states but it took care of basic social issues first. It took care of the social charter that would equalize the standard of living.

There is a huge historic imbalance in the power relationship between Canada and the United States. That is why this is like the lion laying down with the lamb. It is not a deal between two equals. It is a deal between Canada and the largest economy in the world which happens to own 88% of Canadian industry. The U.S. already has a huge stake in Canada. It is the remaining 12% of Canadian ownership of our industries that we are bargaining with.

Some of us are not ready to give up on the idea of a sovereign nation state in Canada that is unique and different and does not need to harmonize with all things American.

The Canadian Alliance Party since it has been here has thought that all things American are good and all things Canadian are retarded. That is what we hear from the Canadian Alliance. It gets all its inspiration from the right wing evangelical movement in the United States. Whatever Pat Buchanan and Pat Robinson say in the United States, the Alliance brings here and tries to sell to the Canadian public.

However we are not buying it. We are not interested. There are still enough of us intent on preserving a distinct identity that Canada will not buy into that mindless idea.

I hate to say it but there are those who would exploit the tragedy in New York to expedite their vision of a single, integrated western hemispheric identity. It is not fair to exploit the tragedy in New York. The issue must be dealt with independently and not within the parameters of a simpler debate about the free movement of goods and services.

• (1225)

There are those of us who still care about the issue. I hate to sound like a Liberal but I probably sound like a Liberal from 1967 when Walter Gordon, Paul Martin Senior and others who had a vision of a unique Canadian identity used to stand proudly in the House of Commons and argue that we should not be economically dominated by foreign nations. They used to set rules and regulations about foreign ownership.

Where are the champions today? The only person outside the NDP who has spoken out in a loud and clear way is David Orchard of the Progressive Conservative Party. He asks those questions. Hardly anyone else seems to. Members seem to have resigned themselves to the benign indifference of the universe. They feel that

American manifest destiny is inevitable and that there is no point in fighting it because we cannot resist it.

I put it to the House that we must have this debate without the emotional veil that has been thrust upon it by the tragedy at the World Trade Center in New York City. There will come a time when we must make a choice. Are we prepared to turn out the lights on the last shred of Canadian nationalism? Are we prepared to resign ourselves to the belief that we are merely Americans who are a little different?

The U.S. has sensed there is a difference today in that our Prime Minister did not rush automatically into the vengeance mode the Americans are justifiably feeling. No one blames the American government for speaking in strong terms about the need to avenge the assault on New York City. However our Prime Minister, to his credit, in the first reactions to the tragedy at the World Trade Center did not jump immediately into line with the American call for violent military intervention and revenge.

We are now paying the price for that. A significant number of Americans are disappointed with us. We first got snubbed when the U.S. president met with the president of Mexico before meeting with the Prime Minister of Canada. The second snub was in yesterday's speech, the single most important speech the president has ever given and arguably one of the most important speeches any U.S. president has given since the Checkers speech.

The speech did not contain one mention of Canada. Canada was shut out and snubbed. We were chastised in a diplomatic way for not being aggressive enough and falling into step, I would call it goose stepping, with the military initiative with which the Americans have seen fit to avenge the attack on their country.

I have pointed out some of the necessary and beneficial points of Bill S-23. However we in the NDP request that the Liberals delay consideration of the legislation until the World Trade Center tragedy has settled. We ask the government to freeze Bill S-23 pending investigation into its ramifications for western hemispheric integration.

• (1230)

Ms. Sophia Leung (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre recognizes that supporting business, especially Canadian business, is important.

We all know that about 85% of our trade is with the U.S. Bill S-23 is aimed at reducing costs for business by facilitating cross-border travel and business shipments. The bill also aims to protect the country from risk in terms of illegal shipping, including the passage into Canada of undesirable individuals.

I am sure the hon. member recognizes that we are trying to strengthen our border security, reduce risks for Canada and protect our business interests.

Government Orders

Mr. Pat Martin: Madam Speaker, I think I made it clear that NDP members recognize the value of free and easy movement of goods and services between our two countries. That is clear. However we are concerned because when the U.S. ambassador to Canada calls for a more open border he is calling for retina and palm scanners to identify people. He is calling for electronic boxes on the bottoms of trucks that frequently cross the border so they can speed through without being interrupted. If we adopt such changes the U.S. might also want integrated immigration and perimeter security systems; in other words, North America-wide shared security.

It is a package deal. If we buy into what we see as housekeeping changes to the way we process goods and people crossing the border we must also buy into the idea of harmonizing our immigration system, customs enforcement procedures and border security along our water perimeter. The NDP is not prepared to go that far to accommodate the quicker movement of goods and services.

• (1235)

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, could the NDP member clarify or perhaps withdraw his remarks? How could an NDP member of the House possibly compare the contemplated actions of the Americans, of which we do not know all the details, to Hitler's goose stepping? How could he compare their response against terrorism to that?

The American's current assertiveness is due to their concern about the terrible things that happened to them last week. How could the hon. member possibly speak of that in the same breath as Hitler's goose stepping? I cannot comprehend why the NDP member or his party would do that. Perhaps he misspoke himself when he said it.

Could the member withdraw his remarks and indicate that he misspoke himself?

Mr. Pat Martin: Madam Speaker, President George Bush stated in his speech last night that we are either shoulder to shoulder with the United States or shoulder to shoulder with terrorists. That is what led to my remarks.

We in the NDP see a third alternative which the Prime Minister and other ministers have also articulated or tried to get across. There are international and multilateral options we can explore.

I was trying to convey the sentiment that Canada should not fall automatically into line and goose step behind the most simplistic solution, which is a strong military strike at this time. We should resist and oppose that. That is an example of how differently I would like to believe our country is treating the issue. It is a graphic illustration of how Canada seeks to solve problems somewhat differently than the United States.

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, however well intentioned the member for Winnipeg Centre might be, I wonder if he has read the bill. Bill S-23 has nothing to do with economic nationalism or grandiose philosophical themes. It has nothing to do with harmonization.

Has the member turned on his television recently and seen the huge lineups of trucks at the border trying to get goods into the U.S. market? We know that many of the trucks and individuals trying to get through are low risk or no risk.

The whole intent of Bill S-23 is to try to streamline those processes and look at pre-approval or self-assessment with sanctions for non-compliance. That is what the bill is all about. That is why it is needed today more than ever.

I know that members on this side of the House met with business people in Sarnia and Windsor not too long ago. This is exactly the kind of thing they need because trucks are getting stuck at the border. If there was ever a time when we needed this bill it is today. It has nothing to do with integration with the United States.

Has the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre read the bill? If he has not, will he undertake to do so?

• (1240)

Mr. Pat Martin: Madam Speaker, we are quite aware of what is in the bill. The negatives that we pointed out were things such as Canada not being ready for the debate on automation of our border. There are a number of other more practical aspects that I perhaps could have pointed out, such as the job loss associated with the automation of the border crossings. That has not been raised in the House and it probably should be.

Also the hon. member's intervention tries to lead us to believe that the bill was put forward as a result of the tragedy of the World Trade Center. It was not. It originated in the Senate long before this emergency took place.

I would ask the hon. member or representatives of the Liberal Party this. If this bill has such great merit and there is no subterfuge going on, why did it not originate in the House of Commons, as does most government business? We could then have debated these things openly, upfront and not have worried about what kind of a secondary objective the government was trying to achieve.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I object to the entire direction that the hon. member took during his speech; his references to goose stepping and American militarism. Maybe he was watching a different television feed than I was last week, but the United States was attacked. Several thousand Americans did die in an unprovoked attack upon civilian targets, people who went about their peaceful business. People of all races, all colours and all religions were killed. We are hearing that attempts to deal with this are somehow comparable to the sorts of things that Adolf Hitler did. For goodness, sake this is an offence. This should be withdrawn.

Mr. Pat Martin: Madam Speaker, let me be clear. There was no reference to Adolf Hitler. When I mentioned the word goose stepping, I said that Canada should not be quick to goose step behind one point of view without exploring other avenues of recourse to settle this international tragedy.

Government Orders

It should be settled in an international venue. The United Nations has been raised as the logical place to deal with this. This is not the same situation. There is no parallel in military or world history to draw from in terms of a terrorist attacking a nation state with such a degree of devastation. When we declare war, we declare war on another country, another nation state.

This is a unique situation that calls for a unique resolve. The NDP is calling for the Canadian government to find that third choice. It is not a choice of shoulder to shoulder with the United States or shoulder to shoulder with the terrorists. There is a third middle ground that we should be seeking, and I am pleased to see that in most cases our government is in fact following that voice of reason.

When I raised it in the context of losing our economic sovereignty, I used it as an example of one of the situations where we would be less able to control our own destiny and where we would be bound to rush to the aid, in an unquestionable way, of our dominant economic partner as we lost our economic sovereignty and our ability to chart our own destiny as a nation.

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, PC/DR): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to speak on behalf of the PC/DR coalition. I will begin my remarks by rebutting some of the comments made by my colleague from the New Democratic Party. I count him as a colleague. We worked together on the immigration committee, but I profoundly disagree with the assertions he made in his speech today.

I will begin by rebutting the statement that can be construed as being anti-American. At this time in our history this is not the time to proceed along this way of thinking. The United States has been looking for diplomatic solutions to the problem. It has not retaliated with a quick strike. Are the Americans responding? Yes they are and so they should, and we should be supporting them and be with them as well.

They are looking at economic and multilateral solutions to this crisis. They are bringing people along with them rather than striking quickly in some act of revenge as the member seems to be portraying.

The United States is a country that has welcomed immigrants from around the world. That was evident in the fact that there were individuals tragically taken from 62 different countries in the event in New York City. Let us not kid ourselves or try to pretend that our American friends and very close family are not a strong country, a welcoming country or a tolerant society because they are a tolerant and welcoming society. We have more in common with our friends from the United States than the member seems to know.

I want to rebut that way of thinking, particularly at this time, and send a message to our American friends that all members in this place would not be in sympathy with that kind of thinking because this is a time for action.

I want to turn to the bill before us today, Mr. Speaker. It is good to see you in the chair. I know that you are a learned and wise member of the House. I congratulate you on your ascendancy to the chair.

I might add that I was disappointed in some of the comments made by the Minister of National Revenue this morning. In the face of what has happened in the world, it seems the government is carrying on as though nothing has changed. We are living in a

different world now because of the tragic events that happened on September 11. It appears as though the government has simply blown the dust off a bill it had before this place previously, added a few comments in the minister's speech at the beginning and end, and has continued on as though nothing has changed.

The Americans' response to this tragic event was to gather congress together. They put together in 24 hours a detailed bill that reflected the new realities of what was happening in the United States, the amount of money that would be required to rebuild in New York and to increase security. Within 24 hours there was a detail coming together and response of America's leaders.

What do we have today in this place? A dusted off bill that does not address the new realities as a result of the tragic events of September 11. That is a shame. It demonstrates a lack of leadership from the government to address the details that need to be addressed.

I agree with my colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona who proposed an amendment that the bill be withdrawn for reconsideration because it does not adequately address the new realities before us in our world, in our country and in dealing with our biggest trading partner and closest friend, the United States.

● (1245)

The minister today in the House talked about the management of our borders as an evolving process. I agree. It is going to evolve very quickly in ways that Canada needs to be engaged in and prepared to act together with. The evolving processes could very well be that the Americans say to us that they are moving on, that they want a secure border and perimeter around North America because our systems are so integrated. Individuals who come to Canada do have easy access to the United States. I do not think it is unreasonable for our neighbours to the south to ask us to work together with them. We need to do that and do it in more than just words. We need to commit by action.

I would submit that the bill demonstrates the level of commitment that the government has to making substantive changes that will make an effect.

One of my Liberal colleagues mentioned that there were long border lineups. Yes, there are and that will continue for a while.

The minister talked about a CANPASS program, a NEXUS program and a kiosk program to help speed up trade. We had better give our heads a shake if we think that the Americans will not look at those programs to see if they need to be revised. We had better get into the game with our good friend and closest ally because very quickly we could find ourselves on the outside looking in. Should that happen, that will have a huge impact on our economy, on our way of life and on our values.

I do not know if other members heard the speech by the president last night. One thing I noticed was that he was firm in his resolve. He has the American people, a united congress, the senate and the leadership of the entire nation solidly behind him and he is moving ahead to gather that kind of support worldwide.

Government Orders

I submitted earlier this week to the government that it had the same environment within Canada in terms of people wanting to support our friends and allies. The polls showed that approximately 80% of the people wanted us to help and support our closest ally. Yet we see very little concrete action. We hear words. We helped out at the very beginning. I acknowledge that and I congratulate those involved. It is time to continue on helping in concrete practical ways.

The bill fails to address those realities. We have many border crossings in our country that are not open 24 hours a day. They have remote cameras and close at 10 o'clock at night or midnight. Those are things that have to be considered in this new reality.

Are there many access points from Canada to the United States? Yes, there are. Do we want freer trade with America? Yes, of course we do. However, to ignore the new realities of what has happened in our world is just simply wrong. To ignore those new realities borders on negligence from the government because our country's economy is so integrated with the United States.

I and members of our coalition would liked to have seen, and I think all opposition members would have liked to have seen, some leadership from the minister on this bill in a way that would address these kinds of concerns that I am bringing forward.

I want to focus on one particular aspect of the bill called voluntary compliance. The minister talked about it this morning.

●(1250)

Let us spell out for people what that actually means. What that means is that on the Atlantic coast and on the coast of British Columbia ships arriving with goods are to call into a customs branch. That is what voluntary compliance means. We do have large unprotected borders.

If people were abusing the goodwill and freedoms of this country by engaging in an illegal activity, would they, as they arrived on our shores, pick up the phone and say that they are here, that they are bringing in illegal contraband and that they will be moving through the United States? No, that will not happen. We have a system in place that does not address those kinds of things in light of the new realities that happened as a result of September 11.

Last night in this place one of my colleagues from the Liberal side mentioned that we should not be talking about this as a battle of good and evil, that we just need to address the root causes and concerns of this issue. The real issue is about those who would do things that are evil. It is about a battle between good and evil. Though there may be just a few engaged in that, those few can wreak havoc among the many, as we sorely found out. For us to put our head in the sand and continue on as though nothing has changed is simply wrong.

Another colleague from the Liberal side quoted President Roosevelt, in a time of similar circumstances, going into World War II. He drew on the famous comment made that Americans should walk softly and carry a big stick. It seems as though the motto of this government has become to walk blindly and carry an empty bag of promises because there is a lot of talk but not enough action.

The actions we have seen from the government during its eight years in power are slowly starving the resources of our intelligence

division, CSIS, within the RCMP, the RCMP and immigration funding, and an integrated approach to sharing intelligence information between those different agencies. It has had an impact and we are reaping the benefits of what the government's policies have been in those areas for these past eight years.

We would hope there would be quick response, in light of the events of September 11, to put more resources into those areas and to consider working closely with our friends in the United States. We need to look at the idea of a perimeter in which we are on the inside instead of a perimeter where we are on the outside looking in, as my colleague from the NDP would seem to want.

I want to touch on something my colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona mentioned in his speech. He eloquently described his own experience as a refugee fleeing from Uganda under the regime of Idi Amin.

I want to disavow the false argument that to consider increasing security within our nation has to go hand in hand with the notion that we no longer welcome immigrants or refugees to our country. Nothing could be further from the truth. The two are not mutually exclusive. We can look at increasing security in this country, and we must, but at the same time we can remain a country with a very strong immigration policy that supports the foundation of our country which was built on immigration.

At the same time, not to address security issues in that area and others is simply negligent and cannot be done.

●(1255)

Over the last seven to ten days many of us have been taken with the events that have happened and how they have changed our world forever. There is a lot of concern for many people, but there is concern on this side of the House that the government will handle this situation as it has handled others over and over again, and that is to sit and wait.

We have heard the talking points of taking a balanced approach. Yes, that is good. However, what has happened too often with the Liberal government is that a balanced approach has become a catch phrase for doing absolutely nothing when something needs to be done and leadership needs to be shown. If there were ever a time in our nation when our country, our neighbour's country and our world were looking for leadership, it is now.

I regret that the Minister of National Revenue has simply dusted off the bill from whence it came and reintroduced it without considering the new realities that happened as a result of September 11.

I will read some commentary from a news article of today in the *Toronto Star*. It says:

But nothing in the proposed bill, which goes back to the Commons for second reading today, is new. Nor have amendments or tighter border controls been introduced to the bill since last Tuesday's terror attacks on the U.S. It was first tabled and passed in the Senate last spring in a bid to speed trade over the border.

Further on in the article it states:

Top customs officials admitted to reporters it would be difficult to refuse a CANPASS to anyone who was, like "sleeper" terrorists in the U.S., perfectly integrated into the community with no criminal history.

Government Orders

A CANPASS is an expedited pass to get people back and forth across the border.

The above article is part of this new reality. If we think we can continue on without some implications of the events that have occurred in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania, we are dreaming. The government is sleepwalking.

A better approach would have been to get the experts in this area together, to consult with our colleagues across the border to address the new concerns that have arisen as a result of last week's events. That has not happened. It certainly is not reflected in the actions of the bill before us. It is beyond me how we can pretend to continue on in this place without taking concrete actions to address these problems.

It is my hope that we as leaders in this place get on with striking committees quickly and with getting the people involved in trade to the table here. We must make the concrete changes necessary to address the new realities. We hope the government's motto will not be to walk blindly and carry a bag of empty promises. It must take concrete action. It has the will of the people and the support of the opposition parties to make these changes.

We implore the government to do the right thing and not pass this bill, which does not address the concerns, but get on with making the concrete changes that are necessary.

• (1300)

Mr. John O'Reilly (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague questions whether the U.S. would support the programs contained in Bill S-23.

I point out to the member and to anyone else who cares to listen that these programs, CANPASS, EPPS, NEXUS, are all similar to programs that currently exist in the United States. We are joint partners with the United States in the NEXUS program. The member talks as though we have no connection whatsoever or that somehow we have not consulted and that we are acting in isolation. This is not true.

How can the member say that the United States is not aware of these programs when we are joint partners with the United States? The member knows that. Trying to score a few cheap political points is inappropriate. I would like him to withdraw the fact that the United States is not aware of these programs. It is well aware of them. It is our partner.

Mr. Grant McNally: Madam Speaker, the member is wrong. I never said that. He can check *Hansard*. The United States is clearly aware of these programs. What I said, and perhaps I will say it louder so he can hear it this time, is that if we do not take into account the new realities that happened on September 11, and that it is business as usual, and all the programs that we have negotiated with our friends are just going to continue on, were are in a dream world.

Mr. John O'Reilly: You are in a dream world.

Mr. Grant McNally: The member says that he is in a dream world. Of course he is because he has not taken into consideration one of the main points in my speech. If we do not get to the table with our partners now after the changes of September 11 and start

talking about these kinds of things, a 12 hour border lineup is going to look like a short one for those who are exporting goods from our country to the United States.

We had better get involved. The member says that this is scaremongering. This is an honest question. It is something that the government needs to consider. If it does not think about these things, it is negligent and shame on the government.

• (1305)

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened to most of the hon. member's speech, although I was out of the room for part of it, but I did not hear him answer the question that was raised by the Alliance member in the form of a motion about putting Bill S-23 away for the time being to deal with the larger issue of the international tragedy that happened at the World Trade Center.

Is it the position of the PC/DR coalition that it would like to see Bill S-23 go ahead but with the changes that he spoke about? Or is he in favour of our position and, I believe, the position of the motion, that Bill S-23 should not be considered at this time, at least until such time as the World Trade Center tragedy has been dealt with and the other issues of national security are dealt with?

Mr. Grant McNally: Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for the question and perhaps it was at the time when he had other business to attend to that I actually did say that as an individual member I do support the motion.

Let me read the amendment as proposed by my colleague from the Alliance. It reads:

that this House declines to give second reading to Bill S-23, an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other acts, since the principle of the bill fails to specifically and adequately address national security at Canada's borders with respect to terrorist activities.

What I said throughout my speech was that I was disappointed that the Minister of National Revenue took out the old bill, blew the dust off of it and brought it in here. It sounded like the same kind of speech that has been given in this place before, as though nothing has changed in our world.

I do not think the minister has looked at changes that reflect the new realities based on the tragic events of September 11.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, another matter comes to mind. The hon. member may have noticed in the *National Post* of yesterday, I believe, an article about the U.S. seeking common immigration rules.

It states that the U.S. ambassador to Canada yesterday sketched out the Bush administration's vision of a North American security perimeter that would go beyond the use of technology to speed up border crossings and go into the delicate substance of national refugee and immigration policies. In other words, as I mentioned in my speech, the U.S. ambassador is promoting the harmonization of immigration and refugee policies as a subject to sharing the new technological advances to speed up the transfer of goods and services across the border.

What is the position of the PC/DR coalition on the integration and harmonization of immigration and refugee policies as an aspect of improving the border crossings?

Mr. Grant McNally: Madam Speaker, I reflected on this in my speech. I will remind my colleague again that those are things we need to consider, talk about and debate. To reject them out of hand at the beginning of the discussion is unwise. We will have the possibility of the reality of our biggest trading partner keeping us on the outside looking in if we do not look at those kinds of questions.

Let me paint a practical application. Imagine that the United States puts in place some regulations having to do with air travel such that all flights in the United States have an air marshal on them. We have already heard the Minister of Transport reject that in this place as a radical notion. Let us say that our government decides we will not have air marshals on our flights to the United States which originate in Canada. A very real, practical application is that those flights would not get into American air space any more.

For us not to talk with our closest trading partner, ally and friend would be negligent. We must talk about these things. We must consider them and take concrete action to work together. It will have a devastating impact within our own economy and on our own way of life in Canada if we take an anti-American, holier than thou attitude on these kinds of things. We cannot do that. We have to get rid of that kind of rhetoric and openly, honestly and in a bipartisan way work together to solve these problems.

It will impact all of us as members because it will impact all of our constituents, no matter what region of the country we represent. As we know, approximately 80% of our population lives within an hour's drive of the border. To not ask these questions and not consider them at the beginning of these kinds of debates would be irresponsible. We must consider these kinds of questions raised by the member.

• (1310)

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I will begin by saying that I consider the comments with references to goose stepping made by the member for Winnipeg Centre are a stain on the House. They should have been withdrawn and I regret that the member chose not to do so.

Bill S-23 is an act to amend the Customs Act and other related acts. The fact that we are even talking about the bill today is symptomatic of everything that is wrong with our government's priorities given the tragic events of September 11.

As I said last night, the government is behaving as if there is no crisis, no urgency and no need for critical action. There is every appearance that the government's posture is to defend the status quo on every front.

The events of September 11 have been taken seriously by other countries, but our government's priorities are clear. Given what we witnessed last night with the speech from George Bush and given the absence of our Prime Minister, I can only say that the message we as a country are continuing to send out is doing a great disservice to Canadians, to Canada's national interests and to the international community.

Government Orders

The bill is essentially unchanged from earlier bills that have been kicked around. It is based on the 1995 Canada-U.S. shared border accord. What we are doing with this legislation is unilateral action. We are being boy scouts. This will speed passage. It focuses on frequent users and it is a one way item for people going from the U. S. to Canada.

The timing is all wrong. It is wrong to approach this unilaterally. For example, yesterday I met with representatives from the Canadian Trucking Association. It clearly sees this bill in the very same way. We heard comments from the U.S. ambassador to Canada and from Colin Powell, the U.S. secretary of state. Canadians and Canadian industry in general know intrinsically that the real issue here is not what is represented by Bill S-23. The real issue here is anti-terrorism.

Earlier this week the government defeated an Alliance motion which was very simple and straightforward. I will repeat it for the benefit of Canadians because I think it is important that they understand what we were trying to accomplish and how reasonable it is given our current critical circumstances.

We called upon the government to introduce anti-terrorism legislation "similar in principle to the United Kingdom's Terrorism Act, 2000". Let me add that there is also anti-terrorism legislation in the United States.

• (1315)

The legislation we are asking for would: name all known international terrorist organizations operating in Canada; call for a complete ban on fundraising activities in support of terrorism; and provide provisions for the seizure of assets belonging to terrorists or terrorist organizations. It would also call for the immediate ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. Canada signed that convention years ago but it has never been ratified because the government has not brought it before the House.

The legislation would call also for the creation of specific crimes for engaging in terrorist training activities in Canada or inciting from Canada terrorist acts abroad. It calls for the prompt extradition of foreign nationals charged with acts of terrorism, even if the charges are capital offences, and the detention and deportation to their country of origin of any people illegally in Canada or failed refugee claimants who have been linked to terrorist organizations.

I doubt if we could find 10% of Canadians who would disagree with the contents of that motion, but the government closed ranks and defeated it. More troubling than that are the games that have been played since that time on another front in this place.

Government Orders

The Canadian Alliance asked for a list of officials to be summoned before committees. For example, for the justice committee, the solicitor general, the director of CSIS and the commissioner of the RCMP were asked to appear. For the foreign affairs committee the Minister of Foreign Affairs was asked to appear. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was asked to appear at the citizenship and immigration committee. For the transport committee we asked for the minister and the president of Air Canada. We asked that the Minister of National Defence, the chief of defence staff and the chief of the Communications Security Establishment appear at the defence committee. For the revenue and customs committee we asked for the Minister of National Revenue and the head of Canada Customs and Revenue Agency to appear as witnesses.

That is a fairly comprehensive list of witnesses we asked to have come before committees. This would be considered perfectly reasonable, rational and responsible in most parliamentary and western democracies. Anything less would be considered or construed to be a dereliction.

What has happened since that time? At two of those committee meetings Liberals pulled out of the meetings one at a time until quorum could no longer be reached, to disallow the proceeding of those motions to have those people come before committee. The government is trying to deny this occurred but it did occur and it is simply unacceptable behaviour, particularly at a time when we should not be playing games. If there is one time when we want to empower our parliamentarians, it is at a time like this. Instead, the government is doing the complete opposite. This is such a stark contrast to what is happening in the U.S. congress, for example, where there is a coming together and a national will, not only in congress, which is showing leadership, but in the population as well.

If we held a mirror up to Canada, we would see that the direction the government has taken on this issue is reflected in divisions appearing in our population at large even though 81% of Canadians, according to very recent polling this week, are very supportive of complete support for the U.S. in terms of military engagement and other activities.

• (1320)

It is clear that the Canadian public is far and away much further ahead than the government on this whole issue. The Canadian public has been done a great disservice by the government's actions to date. We are at the end of week one of a parliamentary session following the tragedy of September 11 and we have yet to see clear direction from the government. We have yet to see our Prime Minister even set foot in Washington or New York.

I would like to quote U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell. I am not the first one to quote him in this place. As a matter of fact, I quoted him last night when we stayed in this place until midnight. Colin Powell said: "Some nations need to be more vigilant against terrorism at their borders if they want their relationship with the U.S. to remain the same. We are going to make it clear to them that this will be a standard against which they are measured with respect to their relationship with the United States".

There are ties that bind us with the United States: family ties, business ties, historical ties, the fact that we have aided each other in

times of war and in times of adversity. Given all of that, friendship has to be earned. I can certainly call America our best friend because it has earned and deserves that title. Right now Americans are questioning whether we deserve that title. It will be based on performance, not rhetoric and empty promises.

What is essential now is not what is in Bill S-23. I do not know what it signals other than the government has no important priority to achieving anything real in terms of what is required in order to address the current crisis that we are all in together in terms of anti-terrorism.

If we want to talk about a perimeter security strategy, some unilateral boy scout border crossing ideas are out of place in the current context in terms of timing and are not currently supported by Canadian industry because the timing is wrong. Canadian industry and everyone is calling for us to toughen up our perimeter security through an effective strategy. We have to work with our American colleagues on achieving that.

We must take a step back, look where we are headed on passage of people and goods between Canada and the U.S., and make some very essential changes.

There is no question that since NAFTA has come into effect, trade and passage of people has increased tremendously between the two countries. It has had a positive influence. I think the government has actually taken a lot of the beneficial effects for granted. As soon as we do that, we forget that there are responsibilities that go with all of that.

• (1325)

We have a huge industry that is potentially affected by the lack of a perimeter security strategy and that could lead to problems with delays at our border crossings. The government is not saying that we do not have U.S. government buy-in on the direction of the bill. It is not prepared to go there. It has not been prepared to go there even before September 11. Unless we are in lockstep with the U.S. on this, then it is the wrong thing to do. It is the wrong thing to do at this time anyway.

There is a dichotomy here. The primary function of customs border crossing officials under U.S. jurisdiction is enforcement. The primary function and the reporting mechanism for our officials is collection of revenue through duties and taxes. We have simply got it all wrong. Many, if not most, of our border crossing customs officials agree that they are in the wrong department. They should not be reporting to Canada Customs and Revenue Agency. They are finding more and more that their job is dealing with criminal code infractions, not taxes and tariffs. NAFTA did dispose of many of those. That is not to say that we still do not have some tariffs and taxes to collect, but that is no longer the primary function. If we have an anti-terrorism stance, that is obviously one area where we could change everything.

Government Orders

The U.S. has its well recorded continuing concerns about security risks emanating from Canadian jurisdiction. It is the opinion of many people who are looking at this whole border crossing issue from an academic perspective and it was clear even before the events of September 11 that there would have to be some major changes. We thought we had maybe a three or five year window to make those changes. I always got the feeling that the government thought maybe we had a five or a ten year window. The events of September 11 have telescoped that time. We no longer have the ability to look at the border crossing issue and perimeter security in that kind of time frame. We need a sense of urgency. It virtually has to be one of our prime considerations right now. It is a prime role of parliament and the government to do this. Instead there is silence from the government and it is business as usual. The bill makes no sense given the current context and the government is pretending it is business as usual.

We clearly need to ensure that it is as hard or harder for a terrorist to get into Canada than it is to go directly to the United States. Nothing less is acceptable. This will be good for the security and safety of Canadians and the security and safety of our neighbours. It will be positive for international trade and it will be positive in every other fashion as well. That is where we must go. We must do it with urgency.

• (1330)

Mr. Joe Jordan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague's argument seems to be rooted in the notion that the American authorities have criticized the security at Canadian borders. I have listened to this debate all morning. This is the fourth reference made to criticisms by Colin Powell. Sometimes I get nervous that if something gets repeated often enough, it becomes fact.

I am fully aware of an interview that the American secretary of state gave to ABC News in which he spoke the almost identical words that the member referred to. For anyone who reads the transcript or heard that interview, there is absolutely no misunderstanding that he was referring to Afghanistan and Pakistan. That interview transcript appeared in an article in the *Toronto Star*, subsequently followed by a columnist's paraphrasing of it.

The member has stated that Colin Powell, the secretary of state of the United States, is critical of and has concerns with Canadian border security. Is he prepared to table a document in the House, and I am not talking about a columnist's paraphrase of an interview, which demonstrates that the secretary of state for the United States has made a direct criticism of Canadian border security?

The member has made a very serious accusation here. I think that this is an important time to clear this up. I therefore ask that if he has such a document to table it. If he does not, then stand and admit that he does not. Let us deal in fact not myth because I believe that is one of the problems we are faced with when we are dealing with this crisis.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Joe Jordan: He said it and he does not have one.

Mr. Philip Mayfield: Turn on your fax machine.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Order please. Are we going to debate each other? Members have to address the Chair and I will name a member.

The hon. member for Vancouver Island North.

Mr. John Duncan: Madam Speaker, I see that I have hit a nerve on the government side.

I think if they were to review *Hansard*, I said that the United States has concerns regarding security risks emanating from Canada. In aid of that I did cite a quote by Colin Powell which was reported in the news media, but I could have chosen other quotes from other American authorities, including the U.S. ambassador to Canada.

I am not sure what the member's point is. If he is trying to suggest that Canada is not perceived to be a security risk in the United States, then I would say that he is sorely misinformed. The whole issue of perimeter security strategy is what I would like to focus on, not some red herring that the government member wants to throw out to try to obfuscate the primary issue. The government should focus on what is at risk, what is urgent and what is critical, not on some other aspect to obfuscate, to support its tendency, which is to completely hold the status quo because that is where it is most comfortable.

• (1335)

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, in the early 1990s if I recall correctly, there were some serious imbalances in the province of Ontario. I think at one point one million people were on unemployment in this province and it had a double digit unemployment rate. Fortunately, through the free trade agreement and other things that started to take root, we probably had a much better political climate in this province somewhere in the mid-1990s. It was pro economic security and social security.

As a result of free trade and a different policy at the provincial level, companies such as Honda Motor Corporation, Toyota and other auto companies have made major commitments to the province of Ontario. However, the other day I was disturbed to hear the president of Honda Motor Corporation say that he was concerned because of the border problems that we have in this country. It is not the flow out of the U.S. into Canada that is the problem right now, it is the flow the other way. The Honda people are really questioning their commitment to this country and any future investments here. If they are thinking that way, I think a lot of other people are as well.

People are concerned about economic and social security, not just national security. This is a very big issue. I would ask my hon. colleague to respond to these kinds of problems which seem to be emerging.

Mr. John Duncan: Madam Speaker, the hon. member is asking about the world of economic reality. It is important to recognize that industry recognizes exactly what was said and that is that the current cross-border uncertainties for investors and others relates to going from north to south and not from south to north.

Government Orders

The implications of the bill, should it be implemented, would exacerbate that. It would make the flow from south to north even more readily available and that would work against Canadian manufacturing interests. We want to see a legitimate free flow of goods in an expedited fashion, but we cannot be boy scouts in this regard. We cannot do it without political buy-in from both sides of the border, and we do not have it.

• (1340)

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, many Canadians are disappointed that the Prime Minister has not yet set foot in the U.S. We know he is going on Monday. They wonder why he has not travelled to ground zero when so many world leaders have crossed oceans to go to the United States. Would the member like to comment on that?

Mr. John Duncan: Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister and the government have sent the worst possible message to the U.S. by the demonstrable non-actions of the Prime Minister. A trip to the U.S., specifically to Washington and New York, would be a crucial element.

Many other world leaders have preceded our Prime Minister to Washington and some to New York. We are the closest neighbour and a traditional ally. The logistics for getting from our capital to their capital are much simpler for the Canadian Prime Minister than for the prime minister or president of any of the nations that we are making comparisons with right now. This is what makes it all the more passing strange.

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, before I begin my remarks on Bill S-23 I want to comment on the speech that was made by the NDP member from Winnipeg. He was asked to clarify his comments regarding Canada's agreement to participate with the American retaliation against terrorism. He referred to it as goose stepping with the United States, a clear reference to Nazism.

The member for Dewdney—Alouette and the member for Vancouver Island North are right that the Prime Minister has not responded with the due leadership Canadians want. However the Prime Minister is on his way to the United States. While he is not meeting with the president of the United States the Chamber needs to support the Prime Minister when he states that Canada will support the United States in its response to the recent terrorist acts.

It is absolutely and thoroughly irresponsible for any member of this Chamber to think it is Nazi-like behaviour. That is utterly irresponsible on the part of the member from the NDP and I would urge him to consider withdrawing that remark. Canada needs to stand united against terrorism.

We do not take pot shots at the United States by saying that we are endeavouring to rid the world of terrorism and those who would destroy the very pluralism the NDP says it was founded to protect. The hon. member dares to say that the behaviour of standing united with the forces of freedom and democracy is Nazi-like. That is intolerable and his constituents will be ashamed of those comments. It is astonishing how we can be distracted by some insufferable comments that drag the country down.

Bill S-23 is an act to amend the Customs Act and to make related amendments to other acts. I am in favour of what is contained in Bill

S-23. However it does not effectively achieve its stated goal of modernizing and simplifying border operations and providing a new vision for border management and trade administration.

Members on the other side of the House might be surprised by those comments. If they read the same overview I did, they are probably wondering how one could possibly say that it does not achieve its stated goal.

Could it be that I am not in favour of simplifying border procedures or that I am opposed to reducing bureaucracy? Could it be that I am ignorant of the fact that many of the proposed changes of Canpass, EPPS, Nexus and customs self-assessment have already been successfully tested in pilot projects? Was I unaware of the fact that Canada Customs and Revenue Agency is planning to phase in the implementation of these initiatives at the end of October and that the private sector is largely in favour of them? The answer to all three questions is a very strong no.

If these were ordinary times I would be more strongly in support of this initiative but after the events of Tuesday, September 11, we are not living in ordinary times. If all the initiatives in the bill were implemented flawlessly the result would be to dramatically improve customs and immigration procedures at Canadian points of entry. Specifically it would facilitate the entry into Canada of preapproved travellers and it would reduce border waiting times for Canada bound trucks.

Bill S-23 would make it much simpler for Canadians to import goods from the United States and for Americans to visit Canada. These are both positive developments. However, unless Bill S-23 is mirrored by reciprocal legislation in the United States, the end result will be to make it easier to import U.S. goods into Canada than to import Canadian goods into the United States.

In a country whose standard of living is largely dependent on a \$90 billion plus trade surplus with the United States any policy that would promote imports while discouraging exports should not be supported.

If it is easier to be based in the United States and export to Canada than it is to be based in Canada and export to the United States, businesses will choose to locate in the United States. The United States offers manufacturers lower taxes than we do and the stability of a huge 300 million person domestic market with a per capital GDP of over \$31,000. We are now granting them easier access into Canada through Bill S-23.

Bill S-23, unless it is mirrored by similar legislation in the United States, gives manufacturers one more reason to pick a U.S. location over a Canadian one with tariff free, hassle free access to the markets of the other country.

If Bill S-23 were mirrored by U.S. legislation the result would be terrific for Canadian businesses. The Canada-U.S. border would be more similar to the national borders within the European Union and would give Canadians further proof that NAFTA does indeed work.

Government Orders

•(1345)

It would allow just in time manufacturing operations to span both sides of the border. This is important because just in time manufacturing is a growing part of our economy, particularly in the auto sector.

For example, the GM plant in Oshawa buys its car seats from Lear Corporation's seating plant in nearby Whitby. The Lear plant is located beside a foam manufacturing plant. When GM decides to make a blue sedan, the order for the seats is sent, usually in block orders, to Lear which then sends the orders for foam. The foam company makes the seats and ships them to GM. There is a loading dock at the GM plant right at the point of assembly where they are installed. Within an hour of the time at which GM orders the seats they are being unloaded right onto the assembly line and installed into the cars. There is no warehousing and no inventory. This is manufacturing perfection.

In this example the entire operation is based in Ontario. Bill S-23 would allow a Windsor auto plant to enter into a similar arrangement with an American supplier by drastically simplifying the importation into Canada of products shipped by reliable carriers and being imported by reliable persons.

Bill S-23 would allow an American manufacturer to enter into a just in time contract with a Canadian buyer. Unless Bill S-23 is mirrored by comparable U.S. legislation, a Canadian manufacturer would not be in a position to enter into a just in time contract with a U.S. buyer no matter how efficient the Canadian manufacturer is.

This is just one example of how Bill S-23 could potentially make the playing field uneven. Recent border shutdowns which caused a parts shortage at 10 vehicle assembly plants in southern Ontario showed how crucial free access across the Canada-U.S. border has become to the automotive sector and to our economy as a whole.

The *National Post* of Wednesday reported that the shutdown prompted Honda Motor Company president Hiroyuki Yoshino to suggest that Honda may build more plants in the U.S. to avoid similar future delays in the movement of parts. Honda employs 2,200 at its plant in Alliston, Ontario. We need to have policies to encourage it to expand, not retract. While Bill S-23 may make it easier for Honda to import seats from Michigan it does not make it easier for it to sell transmissions or subassemblies to the United States Honda operations in Ohio.

Unless Bill S-23 is mirrored by U.S. legislation, the message that other companies will get is to locate in the United States because they will have no trouble getting parts from U.S. suppliers and exporting their products to Canada will be a snap. Already past border simplifications have made it easier to import U.S. goods into Canada than Canadian goods into the United States.

If we surf the web we will likely find that many of the more sophisticated U.S. web merchants have GST registration numbers. They can promise overnight delivery to Canada because as long as the GST is paid and the product originates in the United States, Canada customs formalities have been simplified greatly. It is not quite as simple for people shipping to the U.S.

With the passage of Bill S-23 we would be one more step down the road to making Canada's border with the United States even more open, accessible, efficient and business friendly. We are building an autobahn into Canada but unless we encourage the United States to reciprocate by building an autobahn into the United States from Canada we will have an uneven playing field, a situation in which Canada's balance of trade with the United States would gradually decline, and with it our standard of living would also decline.

Frankly I am not confident that the United States will be building this trade autobahn any time soon. The home page of the U.S. customs service has a banner that reads "America's front line". They do not consider it, as Canada does, a Canada Customs and Revenue Agency. They consider their border people a front line. That sounds more like a fence than an autobahn to me. After the events of September 11, I certainly cannot blame them for wanting to defend that front line. Their buildings and institutions were attacked and destroyed and their citizens murdered.

We can tell ourselves that we feel their pain and many Canadians, including me, do feel a sense of loss and outrage at what happened. However there are two basic realities. First, none of our buildings collapsed and no Canadian institution was attacked. Indeed we may take solace from the fact that most international terrorists probably could not find NDHQ, our equivalent of the Pentagon, on a map of downtown Ottawa. Second, there are reasons to suspect the possibility of a Canadian link with some of the terrorists or their supporters who caused such devastation in New York and Washington.

America was attacked and Americans want a fortress to defend itself against further attacks. The words America front line reassure Americans much more than open border with Canada.

•(1350)

If anyone has any doubt about that, just ask 10 Americans whether they would want an open border with Canada right now or if they would rather have a front line, as advertised on the American customs website.

Right now Americans have a sense of fear and that is the mentality which we are dealing with. In other words, while Bill S-23 opens trade from Canada to the United States, it does not do it reciprocally because mirror legislation has not been developed in the United States, and a heightened sense of security in the United States will not make it likely that such legislation will see the light of day any time soon, at least not to the extent that we would like it.

This basic reality gives us one very simple choice. We could either be within America's frontline or outside of it. If we are outside of it, I would not expect to see the U.S. congress pass mirror legislation such as Bill S-23 during my lifetime frankly.

Government Orders

If we are inside the front line, it makes so much sense for America to facilitate reciprocal trade with Canada, let their assembly plants be fed by competing suppliers on both sides of the border and hope that Wall Street and Washington will be working hard to create a U.S. equivalent to Bill S-23. We all know that the more efficiently the border operates, the more our collective economies will prosper. We must understand that if we see borders as ways to collect revenue, the Americans see borders as a line of defence, a crucial element in the defence of their republic.

In short, the official opposition does have amendments to this legislation. We hope that they will pass. We also hope that the government sends a clear message to the United States that Canada hopes it will announce similar legislation to Bill S-23 so we can expand free trade in a broader context much beyond what we have and do it on a level playing field. I fear that by enacting this legislation without the appropriate amendments and guidelines, the government is sending Canada down the road to an uneven playing field with trade in the United States. We want to make sure that does not happen.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I listened very attentively to my colleague from the Canadian Alliance speak. He brought forward quite a number of very relative points.

Being a fellow member from British Columbia, I know he is very aware of the situation with the softwood lumber agreement. He hears, as I am sure all British Columbia MPs do, the concerns expressed by our constituents who really question NAFTA and the whole commitment by the Americans to free trade right now, given the ongoing dispute over softwood lumber.

Given the context of his remarks that without reciprocal legislation on the part of the Americans the bill once enacted will have the potential to increase the brain drain or expansion of companies in the United States in competition to Canadian companies, how is he going to communicate this problem to British Columbians in particular, given the problems we see developing with NAFTA?

• (1355)

Mr. James Moore: Madam Speaker, as I said, the communication strategy for this particular piece of legislation would be difficult without it being properly amended. The hon. member for Prince George is right. As a former Prince Georgian, I know that there is a heightened sense of insecurity with regard to trade with the United States, particularly because of the forestry sector in north and central British Columbia.

How is this going to be communicated? It is going to be very difficult in the sense of how this legislation has unfolded and whether or not we do get a signal from the United States about whether we will see reciprocal legislation. That is why the bill needs to be amended. We need to make sure that we have those sorts of safeguards in place.

Last night on ABC, after President Bush's speech, J.D. Hayworth, who is a republican member of congress, I believe from Tucson, Arizona, and on the international trade committees in the United States, spoke. He happens to believe, unlike the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, that some of these attacks may have

been based from Canada. These are the sorts of questions he will be asking in the United States congress, and we need to address them.

Mr. Hayworth made a very interesting remark, especially coming from a leading member of the republican side which is the majority in the U.S. house of representatives. He said that he believed in free trade. Just as it was important for our borders to facilitate free trade, and we must encourage that, we also have a constitutional requirement to ensure America's security. He said that in these times we could not ignore that first obligation.

The United States first responsibility and need in these heightened times, which is appropriate given the polls in the United States and the insecurity that people feel, is to have a heightened sense of security at borders, not a heightened sense of trade efficiency. In that sense I believe the finance minister, the international minister and the Prime Minister should go to British Columbia, when the time is right and appropriate given the current national security preoccupations, to ensure that those fears are met.

The Prime Minister, while he cannot to it legislatively, needs to send a strong diplomatic signal to the United States that reciprocal legislation will be expected. If it does not happen, then I believe that down the line we may have to look at rescinding Bill S-23, amending it and moving motions forward. This is another reason why in these times the appropriate committees of the House of Commons should be reconstituted as soon as possible.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, based on what took place on September 11, I want to say for the record that I was very impressed by the Minister of National Revenue in his response and the kind of work he did in light of those horrific events. Also, I know for a fact that he instructed his officials to see whether or not we could accelerate some of the implementation of the very initiatives we are talking about today.

The fact remains that we need to pass this in order to get those initiatives into play and start to move in the appropriate direction, given the circumstances at hand. It is very important that we proceed and proceed accordingly and, more to the point, proceed in a very quick way given all the events that have transpired.

His comments and the fearmongering naturally go with members of his party with respect to lost jobs, the so-called border issues and that Canada is somehow to blame for this. It is too bad those people opposite always show negativity.

Does the member not think it would be much better to have a co-operative non-partisan approach? In the United States we see Democrats and Republicans working very closely in light of the kind of concerns that have taken place. Instead of playing cheap politics, as the Canadian Alliance is doing in this very grave matter, does he not think it would be more appropriate to co-operate, roll up their sleeves and assist the government to ensure that what we do in this very important matter is done on behalf of all the people in Canada?

It is easy to score cheap political points. Members of the Canadian Alliance are always good at that, whether it be matters of immigration or the porous border. They are waiting for something they can hang their hats on with respect to somebody in Canada being part of the so-called bin Laden effort.

Government Orders

It is a sad state of affairs when they have to delve to these depths and go to this length to try to drag the country down, when in reality what they should be doing is assisting and making sure that we work in a co-operative effort.

Does the member opposite not think that it would be an appropriate gesture to work together in the best interests of Canada because it is in the best interests for us to support the Americans in this time of need? Does he not think, from a philosophical point of view, that would be the best way to go? It would be interesting to hear his response.

• (1400)

Mr. James Moore: Madam Speaker, no rhetorical farce is ever fully complete without a rhetorical intervention from the member for Waterloo—Wellington. That having been said, it would be more helpful if the member was in the House to get the full gist of my comments. In fact I gave stern rebuke to the NDP member from Winnipeg for his comments about Canada goose stepping with the United States and engaging in neo-Nazism for daring to stand in line with the United States. So I agree fully with the comment from the member for Waterloo—Wellington.

We degrade debate in the House of Commons when we are asked not to be partisan and then in the same breath, without even finishing a sentence, make a partisan slam against the Canadian Alliance by daring to say that we are engaging in partisanship, and comparing our system of government to that of the United States.

As was mentioned the other day in question period, there is a reason why there is perhaps a heightened sense of partisanship and there is a good reason. It is because Canadians are damn angry right now.

Why did it take the Prime Minister of this country one week to reconvene his cabinet? Why did it take us six days to reconvene the House? Why have committees not been struck yet? Why has meaningful legislation not been put forward?

Why has the Minister of Transport not answered the question about whether or not a plane that flew out of Toronto's Pearson airport on September 11, with knives and box cutters on it and headed to Newark, New Jersey, the same place the terrorist attacks took place, was turned around? Why would he not answer the question about whether or not that was a security failure at the airport and whether or not there was a Canadian connection to these attacks?

Why has the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration not clearly answered the questions about the security at our borders in the long term, and the passport situation?

There is a reason why there is a heightened sense of partisanship. It is because his government is not answering clear questions in the House.

For the hon. member's information, there is a difference between the American system of government and the Canadian system of government. In the American system the chief executive of that country reached out to people with different political stripes and political values and asked how together they could put forward a

front. It took six days for the House to reconvene before the Prime Minister even gave any other party in the House the time of day.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, in the last week we have heard a great deal about national security. I intend to direct my comments today to economic security and social security.

What is the intent or the purpose of Bill S-23? The purpose is to enhance economic security in Canada. Some time ago Canada entered a free trade agreement with our American friends. Since that time we have participated in an impressive economic expansion in North America.

In the 1980s we experienced double digit unemployment rates in Canada and in the U.S. Even Canada, with a slowdown, has a 7% rate. Our American friends are in the 4% category.

We have seen a dramatic increase in real disposable net income across the board and a dramatic increase in productivity, especially in the United States. I think it is a fair comment to say Canada has really dragged in those areas.

The economic expansion has permitted our federal government, in a fair comment, to deal with some fairly major fiscal imbalances. The economic growth has enhanced the revenues that are flowing into the government, which has allowed the government to timidly reduce the burden of taxation and to finance important government programs and some that are not so important.

The net result is that our economic security and our social security have been enhanced.

Modern economists understand that we cannot have social security with a second rate or third rate economy. Economic security, national security and social security are inseparable. They are joined at the hip.

Today our economic, social and national security are at peril. Why is this so? Our military is weak, the product of a decade of decline and neglect by the government. We have serious problems with terrorist groups in this country. Some people are in denial in regard to that, but the experts are not. This is a product of a decade of decline and neglect by our national government in terms of immigration and refugee policy. Loose, naive, and I will use this term, politically correct policies have made Canada a safe and comfortable haven for dangerous individuals.

The bill opens up one lane on a two lane highway. It frees up the movement of goods from this country to the U.S. What we do have is a serious problem in the other lane. It is getting clogged up and blocked up and there are serious questions as to whether that lane is ever going to open up given the situation we are in right now.

Our decade of decline and neglect on the part of government has had the effect of essentially closing down that other lane. In order to protect our economic security and our social security, we must free up that blocked lane.

Government Orders

●(1405)

Quite simply we should be looking very seriously at harmonizing our immigration and our refugee policies with those of our friends in the United States. I can see some immediate benefits from this. I know that government bureaucracies and a lot of politicians who want to protect their turf do not see the advantages but taxpayers do. We would have a much more efficient system. Our public servants in the United States and Canada could work together as a team in a co-operative manner, and if we did reduce the risk of dangerous people coming into North America we would both win. Nobody would lose. Our economic security would be improved, our social security would be improved and our national security would be improved. By taking this step we would improve security in a lot of respects.

The bill is designed to enhance trade between our two great nations. Through decisions made by this government, certain sectors do not participate in North American free trade. They are outside the parameters of that arrangement. Transportation, culture, banking and certain elements of agriculture are protected by the government.

I am a member of parliament from Saskatchewan. That province is almost totally dependent on foreign international markets and American markets. We do not have the luxury of protection.

I am very concerned about a projected bailout for Air Canada. In my view any step by the government to bail out Air Canada would be a confirmation that the government is perpetuating 19th century, family compact, upper and lower Canada policies.

As a western Canadian I am extremely proud that a strong air carrier has emerged in the west, a company called WestJet. It has continued to increase revenues and profits even with this downturn. It has raised its financing from private investors. It has not been in the pocket of HRDC. It has not been knocking on the door of the department of industry and commerce. It has won its customers from a giant, bloated, government protected monopoly by giving customers a superior product at more attractive prices.

I will illustrate that with one example. Three weeks ago I flew by Air Canada to Ottawa via Toronto on a hospitality charge seat of \$1,044. With the crisis on I was discouraged from flying with Air Canada, so I tried the competitor, WestJet, direct from Saskatoon to Ottawa at a fare of \$444, a net saving for the taxpayer of \$600. I was surprised that in the rider service the government is engaged in we almost have to fight with those people to get a ticket with WestJet.

What is the solution? Air Canada is sinking under its own weight. It is a product of government protection. This is not a time for its pals in Ottawa to bail it out. It is a time for policy makers to back off and let the market sort it out.

Another solution is to bring transportation under the umbrella of the free trade agreement and let our companies fully participate in the North American economy, like we do in most other sectors. One minor benefit we might get out of that is that customers in this country might get the benefits of competition and some real choice.

●(1410)

There is a point I would like to emphasize. This family compact thing is well entrenched in this part of the world, but where I come from we are sick and tired of family compact arrangements.

In conclusion, I encourage our government to reverse this decade of decline and neglect in terms of investing in our military and our national security. I urge the government to seriously pursue a harmonization approach with our American friends and allies in terms of immigration and refugee policy. We are in a time of war and things have to change, but if we want to preserve our national, economic and social security we will have to change the way we do things. The old practices will not work.

Something that I really find offensive in this whole debate is the argument that a balanced, moderate way of dealing with terrorism will be used. I have heard that term a lot. I wonder if Churchill, Roosevelt and the allies said they would use a balanced, moderate approach to fighting Hitler. That is nonsense. We have an evil force here and this is not the time for some balanced, moderate approach. We are not talking about some social policy in Canada. We are talking about a very evil force that is out to destroy western civilization as we know it.

This is the time to take a stand with the president of the United States, decisively. I am really disappointed that our Prime Minister was not sitting in the house of representatives side by side with Mr. Blair last night. As a Canadian I found it embarrassing.

●(1415)

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, PC/DR): Madam Speaker, I have just a short comment and then a question for my hon. colleague from the Canadian Alliance.

Earlier we heard from one of his colleagues in a presentation to the House in which he talked about the \$90 billion plus net trade surplus that Canada enjoys with our neighbour to the south and how important that is. Certainly that is one of the reasons why I do support free trade and why I think most Canadians have seen the benefits of free trade.

However there are obviously some problems with NAFTA and with free trade with our American neighbours. Given some of the problems with Bill S-23, in that, as was stated earlier, without reciprocal legislation from the Americans to allow easier access to their market by our corporations and producers, we could see yet a greater impact on that trade surplus we enjoy today and which is of such tremendous benefit to our Canadian economy.

Problems have developed at our borders, with much justification I might add, given the tragic and terrible events of last week. Nevertheless, given the problems that we have seen over this past week at the borders, why would we move at this particular time to allow easier access to importing goods from the United States when U.S. intentions are obvious? There are some very real reasons why it is being forced to heighten its security at the borders, and of course that does damage to our exports.

I wonder if the hon. member would comment on why we would proceed at this time without a commitment from the Americans to bring forward comparable legislation in the United States.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Madam Speaker, that is a very good question.

Government Orders

There are many aspects to it. The events that have occurred recently are changing the way things are being done. We are in a state of war. Many people do not understand that. If they watched the president of the United States last night delivering his address, it was a wartime speech. We are not going to be immune from it. It is global. And the president said, "You are either with us or you are against us".

That is my point of view. The timid response this week by the government in this whole area bothers me. The United States is going to change its policies. It is in a state of war. Business as usual is not going to carry on. Maybe the Americans had some sort of agreement where they would reciprocate on this issue, but until we get our house in order in terms of immigration and refugee policies, they will be difficult to deal with at the borders. It is as simple as that and I do not blame them.

There is something we have to understand. I do not know all the statistics on it, however, some 40% of our GDP or something in that region is based on trade with our American friends. This is very disturbing to me because if we lose a substantial portion of that, the government should realize what that equates to. It means unemployment, increased spending on social programs and real strains on employment programs.

I can see four or five ministers in the House right now and we could basically trim their departments right down to nothing in this situation in the interests of getting national, social and economic security in place and protecting it. However, the government is just doing things the same old way. It does not seem to think there is a war or a problem, but that it is someone else's problem. I know it is not someone else's problem. This is a world problem and we had better wake up.

I just thought of one example that would hit the nail on the head. I mentioned Honda and other ones. I was thinking of Magna International, one of the world's largest auto parts producers. I am quite sure many plants in Ontario produce parts that flow into the United States from this just in time inventory system. With the borders being clogged and jammed by American security interests, how long is that going to last? Assembly plants in the U.S. are not going to use our plants as suppliers if they cannot get the parts.

We have to bring this issue into perspective. It is more than just national security. It is social security and it is economic security. If we are not here trying to enhance all three of these things, I really wonder what we are doing in this place.

●(1420)

Ms. Sophia Leung (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the member for Prince Albert recognized the importance of Canadian economics and trade.

May I point out that Bill S-23 not only expedites business and increased trade, it also tries to increase security at the border. We all know there is such a blockage now recently after the tragedy. We have to respond quickly to try to improve the situation without sacrificing our trade and business, and in the meantime provide protection for Canadians and Americans.

We all recognize how important Bill S-23 is. We need to put that in action as soon as we can. I wonder why the hon. member and his party cannot just simply say that this is a good bill and that they will try to support it.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Madam Speaker, I will reiterate my point. The events that have taken place have been so extraordinary that the policy directives we might have had six months or a year ago will be dramatically changed.

I want to be very emphatic with the government. Ressam was headed for Los Angeles bent on doing the same sort of things that happened in New York. The American people apprehended him. Because of our politically correct refugee system, the man lived in our country for six years. The Algerians wanted him because they knew how dangerous he was. My understanding was that we could not send him back because the Algerians may have done something that we might have found offensive in dealing with terrorists. Canada let him go back to Afghanistan for two years while he was waiting here in limbo. We even allowed him to change his name. This is not an isolated case. The king of Jordan has pointed out seven or eight of Ressam's teammates.

I have a problem with the harmonization of our refugee and immigration system. It seems to me that the government has permitted one province to build a firewall and build its own immigration system within the country. I am not exactly sure how that will all fit into the equation if it becomes necessary but it is another sign of decay and decline on the part of the leadership of the government.

That is not the end of it. Interpol's most wanted criminal came back and forth to Canada about 17 times and nobody bothered him. We could not even ask his wife whether she had a husband because the minister of immigration found that offensive and sexist.

The Tamil tigers have something like 40 countries in which they could seek asylum but they like our country. We have that warm, cozy feeling here and once they are here they are pretty safe.

The Americans know these things. I would be really surprised if anyone on the government side did not know that American officials, whether it is the ambassador or whoever, are concerned about the security in our country. It will impact on our border. If they had confidence in our external border system it would eliminate a lot of problems on our internal border. It would be more like the European situation. For years people on the government side and I think my NDP friends have emphasized that we should be doing what Europe does.

Countries in Europe do have very tight perimeters. As much as business is being done inside countries, things move around pretty freely, including labour. Maybe we should be looking at enhancing these same things.

●(1425)

Mr. Joe Jordan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I realize there are just a few minutes left but I would like to make some comments in reference to the speech we just heard. I listened intently to the member's speech. He made a lot of good points.

Government Orders

If the hon. member was concerned about a potential response by the government to Air Canada, I would suggest that he have a chat with his own transport critic. I was taken aback by the quick stand that was taken, and then a 180 was done a day later.

Clearly the market forces are probably one of the solutions we have to give serious attention to, or if we are going to compensate businesses for costs incurred through this crisis, we have to look at compensating all businesses. I do not think we can pick one over another.

I listened quite intently to the debate. There are a number of issues.

There has been talk about perimeter and harmonization. The bill deals with uses of various technologies—and this has been the subject of ridicule, given the events that happened—to speed up things like pre-clearance, things like going through one detailed security clearance process and getting either a visa or some sort of instrument that allows people to pass freely if they commute back and forth, things like that. These things have been discussed. I remember having discussions with Congressman Lamar Smith four years ago on these.

Clearly if they do not have confidence in the perimeter, they are not going to go ahead with these processes. That goes without saying.

On the issue of the common perimeter, let us not kid ourselves. Harmonization means Canada going to American rules. Then the member says that is not an issue, that there is no downside to that. We are two separate countries. Clearly this sovereignty versus security argument is a very false dichotomy. We do not need to put it

in those terms because what I am hearing from various members is that there is a price for sovereignty. The member from Peace River mentioned \$90 billion. The economic impact is \$90 billion so sovereignty was pushed aside.

We have to give this some thought. We absolutely have to look at the perimeter argument. However I think the better way to approach it is to say what are our objectives are. We do not want undesirables in our country.

I would remind members that with respect to the crisis that we are dealing with now, 16 of the 19, and it is undecided on two others, did not slip through some porous bed and breakfast called Canada. They walked in the front door of the U.S. with legal visas and their actual ID. Perhaps all western countries were asleep at the switch on this issue, or the events as they unfolded redefined or shifted the paradigm a little on us. But to stand here and somehow claim that Canada was responsible, this was the most planned terrorist attack in the history of the worlds. If the preferred route was Canada, they would have used it. We have very little evidence of that. I am not saying that some of these people may not have spent some time in Canada, but they slipped by American authorities too. Therefore I do not think it is a time to be pointing fingers. I think it is a time to be directing our energies at solutions.

● (1430)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): 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 SECRETARY**

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. DON BOUDRIA

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

MR. PIERRE BRIEN

MR. RICHARD HARRIS

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bulte, Sarmite, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Parkdale—High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Burton, Andy	Skeena	British Columbia	CA
Byrne, Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	British Columbia	CA
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Caplan, Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Quebec	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Quebec	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	Nova Scotia	PC/DR
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	CA
Castonguay, Jeannot, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Madawaska—Restigouche	New Brunswick	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph—Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	Lib.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	CA
Chrétien, Jean, Prime Minister of Canada	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Clark, Joe	Calgary Centre	Alberta	PC/DR
Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Quebec	Lib.
Collenette, David, Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—St. Clair	Ontario	NDP
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, 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 the Minister of Finance	Markham	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta—South Richmond	British Columbia	CA
Cuzner, Rodger	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
Day, Stockwell, Leader of the Opposition	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CA
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière-L'Érable	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Herb, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South—Burnaby	British Columbia	Lib.
Dion, Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland	PC/DR

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Claude, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	Quebec	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Ronald, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CA
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Art, Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	CA
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	CA
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CA
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby	British Columbia	CA
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Ontario	CA
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton Centre-East	Alberta	CA
Goodale, Ralph, Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan	British Columbia	CA
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	CA
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	PC/DR
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CA
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Harris, Richard	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	CA
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James— Assiniboia	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Quebec	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	Newfoundland	PC/DR
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	New Brunswick	PC/DR
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	CA
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	PC/DR
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CA
Hinton, Betty	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	British Columbia	CA
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	CA
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce— Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CA
Jordan, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC/DR
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CA
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont—Dundas— Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau— Mirabel	Quebec	BQ
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lancôt, Robert	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint- Paul—Pointe Saint-Charles	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
LeBlanc, Dominic	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Leung, Sophia, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	PC/DR
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CA
MacAulay, Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC/DR
Macklin, Paul Harold	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour	Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CA
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	Quebec	BQ
Marcil, Serge	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Quebec	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Manitoba	PC/DR
Marleau, Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	CA
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	British Columbia	CA
McCallum, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Markham	Ontario	Lib.
McCormick, Larry, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	British Columbia	PC/DR
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	British Columbia	PC/DR
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	Alberta	CA
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	CA
Mills, Dennis	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches—East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Moore, James	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	CA
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Myers, Lynn, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada	Waterloo—Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Neville, Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Normand, Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse—Étchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nystrom, Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	London—Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Reilly, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Haliburton—Victoria—Brock ..	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	CA
Owen, Stephen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	Manitoba	CA
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	PC/DR
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	CA
Peric, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	Quebec	BQ
Peschisolido, Joe	Richmond	British Columbia	CA
Peterson, Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Pierre, Minister for International Trade	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham—Kent Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet— Bécancour	Quebec	BQ
Pratt, David	Nepean—Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	Quebec	Lib.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Rajotte, James	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	CA
Redman, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Carleton	Ontario	CA
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	CA
Richardson, John	Perth—Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CA
Robillard, Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	Quebec	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Savoy, Andy	Tobique—Mactaquac	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	CA
Scott, Andy	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Serré, Benoît, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Skelton, Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CA
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CA
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	Alberta	CA
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Spencer, Larry	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	CA
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik	Quebec	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	British Columbia	CA
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	PC/DR
Szabo, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibault, Robert, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	PC/DR
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	CA
Tirabassi, Tony	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Tobin, Brian, Minister of Industry	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Toews, Vic	Provencher	Manitoba	CA
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Ontario	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CA
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC/DR
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	British Columbia	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CA

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John.....	St. Albert	Alberta	CA
Wood, Bob.....	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
Yelich, Lynne.....	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CA

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib. - Liberal; CA - Canadian Alliance; BQ - Bloc Quebecois; NDP - New Democratic Party;
PC/DR - Progressive Conservative Party / Democratic Representative Caucus Coalition; Ind. - Independent

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hinton, Betty	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	CA
Leung, Sophia, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	PC/DR
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CA
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	CA
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	CA
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	PC/DR
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	PC/DR
Moore, James	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	CA
Owen, Stephen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Peschisolido, Joe	Richmond	CA
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	CA
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	CA
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	CA
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	PC/DR
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	CA
MANITOBA (14)		
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC/DR
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Ronald, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	CA
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	PC/DR
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	CA
Toews, Vic	Provencher	CA
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Bradshaw, Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
Castonguay, Jeannot, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Madawaska—Restigouche	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC/DR
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
LeBlanc, Dominic	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	Lib.
Savoy, Andy	Tobique—Mactaquac	Lib.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	PC/DR
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC/DR

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, George	Gander—Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC/DR
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	PC/DR
Matthews, Bill, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Burin—St. George's	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Lib.
Tobin, Brian, Minister of Industry	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Blondin-Andrew, Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC/DR
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC/DR
Cuzner, Rodger	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Lib.
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC/DR
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC/DR
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley— Eastern Shore	NDP
Thibault, Robert, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	West Nova	Lib.
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
ONTARIO (103)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Ray	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Don, Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bryden, John	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.
Collenette, David, Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—St. Clair	NDP
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Lib.
Copps, Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Markham	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Art, Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CA
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Lib.
Jordan, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Macklin, Paul Harold	Northumberland	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour	Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Lib.
Marleau, Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
McCallum, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Markham	Lib.
McCormick, Larry, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
QUEBEC (75)		
Allard, Carole-Marie	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC/DR
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Lib.
Cauchon, Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean, Prime Minister of Canada	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
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
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière-L'Érable	BQ
Dion, Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans ..	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la- Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de- Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	BQ
Marcil, Serge	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Lib.
Martin, Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	BQ
Normand, Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny— L'Islet	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Pierre, Minister for International Trade	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Anderson, David	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CA
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CA
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CA
Goodale, Ralph, Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Lib.
Nystrom, Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	PC/DR
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CA

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Skelton, Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	CA
Spencer, Larry	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	CA
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	CA
Yelich, Lynne	Blackstrap	CA
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Larry	Yukon	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of September 21, 2001 — 1st Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Vice-Chairs:	John Godfrey Maurice Vellacott	
Larry Bagnell G�rard Binet Serge Cardin Jean-Guy Carignan	David Chatters Rodger Cuzner Reed Elley	John Finlay Gerald Keddy Richard Marceau	Pat Martin Beno�t Serr� Guy St-Julien	(16)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson G�rard Asselin Claude Bachand Roy Bailey Leon Benoit Bernard Bigras Rick Borotsik Garry Breitzkreuz Pierre Brien Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Rick Casson Joe Comartin John Cummins Stockwell Day Bev Desjarlais John Duncan	Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Paul Forseth Ghislain Fournier Cheryl Gallant Yvon Godin Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Richard Harris Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton Rahim Jaffer Dale Johnston Jason Kenney Robert Lanct�t	Gary Lunn James Lunney Preston Manning Inky Mark Keith Martin Philip Mayfield Grant McNally Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Lorne Nystrom Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Jim Pankiw Pierre Paquette Charlie Penson Gilles-A. Perron Joe Peschisolido	David Price James Rajotte Scott Reid John Reynolds Gerry Ritz Jean-Yves Roy Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Darrel Stinson Chuck Strahl Myron Thompson Vic Toews Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich
---	---	---	---

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Charles Hubbard

Vice-Chairs:
Murray Calder
Howard HilstromDavid Anderson
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Claude DuplainMark Eyking
Marcel Gagnon
Rick LaliberteLarry McCormick
Dick Proctor
Bob SpellerPaul Steckle
Suzanne Tremblay
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Comartin
Paul Crête
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
John Duncan
Wayne Easter
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian FitzpatrickPaul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Paul Harold MacklinJohn Maloney
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
Joe Peschisolido
David PriceJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Jean-Yves Roy
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs: Inky Mark
John McCallum

Mark Assad	Gurmant Grewal	John McCallum	Stéphan Tremblay	(18)
Jean Augustine	John Herron	Anita Neville	Judy Wasylcia-Leis	
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Steve Mahoney	Jerry Pickard	Lynne Yelich	
Joe Fontana	Gurbax Malhi	Yolande Thibeault		

Associated Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Francine Lalonde	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	James Lunney	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	Preston Manning	Gerry Ritz
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Richard Marceau	Werner Schmidt
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Keith Martin	Carol Skelton
Bernard Bigras	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Monte Solberg
Bill Blaikie	Jim Gouk	Grant McNally	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Larry Spencer
Andy Burton	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Darrel Stinson
Chuck Cadman	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Chuck Strahl
Serge Cardin	Grant Hill	James Moore	Myron Thompson
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Vic Toews
David Chatters	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Maurice Vellacott
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	Charlie Penson	Randy White
Libby Davies	Rahim Jaffer	Joe Peschisolido	Ted White
Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston	David Price	John Williams
Norman Doyle	Dale Johnston		

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairs:
Karen Kraft Sloan
Bob MillsBernard Bigras
Aileen Carroll
Joe Comartin
Paul ForsethMarcel Gagnon
John Herron
Gar KnutsonRick Laliberte
James Moore
Karen RedmanJulian Reed
Andy Savoy
Hélène Scherrer

(16)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Garry Breitzkreuz
Pierre Brien
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Rick Casson
David Chatters
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Bev Desjarlais
John Duncan
Reed ElleyKen Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Clifford Lincoln
Gary LunnJames Lunney
John Maloney
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
David Price
James Rajotte
Scott ReidJohn Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Alan Tonks
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:	Bill Graham	Vice-Chairs:	Colleen Beaumier Monte Solberg	
Jean Augustine	John Harvard	Keith Martin	Denis Paradis	(18)
George Baker	Stan Keyes	Pat O'Brien	Bernard Patry	
Bill Casey	Francine Lalonde	Deepak Obhrai	Svend Robinson	
Rick Casson	Diane Marleau	Pierre Paquette		

Associated Members

Jim Abbott	Stan Dromisky	Jason Kenney	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Antoine Dubé	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	John Duncan	James Lunney	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Claude Duplain	John Maloney	Gerry Ritz
Sarkis Assadourian	Wayne Easter	Preston Manning	Yves Rocheleau
Claude Bachand	Reed Elley	Richard Marceau	Benoît Sauvageau
Roy Bailey	Ken Epp	Inky Mark	Hélène Scherrer
Eugène Bellemare	Mark Eyking	Pat Martin	Werner Schmidt
Leon Benoit	Brian Fitzpatrick	Philip Mayfield	Carol Skelton
Bernard Bigras	Raymonde Folco	Grant McNally	Kevin Sorenson
Bill Blaikie	Paul Forseth	Val Meredith	Bob Speller
Garry Breitkreuz	Cheryl Gallant	Rob Merrifield	Larry Spencer
Andy Burton	Peter Goldring	Bob Mills	Diane St-Jacques
Chuck Cadman	Jim Gouk	James Moore	Darrel Stinson
Serge Cardin	Gurmant Grewal	Lorne Nystrom	Chuck Strahl
David Chatters	Deborah Grey	Brian Pallister	Myron Thompson
Irwin Cotler	Art Hanger	Jim Pankiw	Vic Toews
Paul Crête	Mac Harb	Charlie Penson	Stéphan Tremblay
John Cummins	Richard Harris	Joe Peschisolido	Tony Valeri
Stockwell Day	Grant Hill	Beth Phinney	Maurice Vellacott
Norman Doyle	Dale Johnston	David Price	Randy White

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair:	Mac Harb	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Casey	Mark Eyking	Pierre Paquette	Bob Speller	(9)
Rick Casson	Pat O'Brien	Svend Robinson	Tony Valeri	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Beth Phinney	Vice-Chair:		
Sarkis Assadourian	Eugène Bellemare	Irwin Cotler	Deepak Obhrai	(9)
Colleen Beaumier	Bill Casey	Antoine Dubé	Svend Robinson	

FINANCE

Chair:	Maurizio Bevilacqua	Vice-Chairs:	Scott Brison Nick Discepola	
Sue Barnes	Nick Discepola	Jason Kenney	Lorne Nystrom	(21)
Carolyn Bennett	Ken Epp	Sophia Leung	Joe Peschisolido	
Maurizio Bevilacqua	Roger Gallaway	Yvan Loubier	Pauline Picard	
Scott Brison	Albina Guarnieri	John McCallum	Gary Pillitteri	
Roy Cullen	Richard Harris			

Associated Members

Jim Abbott	Paul Forseth	James Lunney	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Christiane Gagnon	Preston Manning	John Reynolds
Rob Anders	Cheryl Gallant	Richard Marceau	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Inky Mark	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Yvon Godin	Keith Martin	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Jim Gouk	Alexa McDonough	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Pierre Brien	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Guy St-Julien
Andy Burton	Monique Guay	Rob Merrifield	Darrel Stinson
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Chuck Strahl
Rick Casson	John Herron	James Moore	Myron Thompson
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Vic Toews
John Cummins	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Stéphan Tremblay
Stockwell Day	Howard Hilstrom	Jim Pankiw	Maurice Vellacott
Odina Desrochers	Betty Hinton	Pierre Paquette	Randy White
Antoine Dubé	Charles Hubbard	Charlie Penson	Ted White
John Duncan	Rahim Jaffer	Gilles-A. Perron	John Williams
Reed Elley	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn		

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	
Sarkis Assadourian	Dominic LeBlanc	Lawrence O'Brien	Peter Stoffer
John Cummins	James Lunney	Jean-Yves Roy	Suzanne Tremblay
John Cummins	Bill Matthews	Guy St-Julien	Tom Wappel
John Duncan	Bill Matthews	Paul Steckle	

(16)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott	Ghislain Fournier	Preston Manning	Gerry Ritz
Diane Ablonczy	Marcel Gagnon	Inky Mark	Svend Robinson
Rob Anders	Cheryl Gallant	Keith Martin	Yves Rocheleau
David Anderson	Yvon Godin	Philip Mayfield	Werner Schmidt
G�rard Asselin	Peter Goldring	Grant McNally	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Jim Gouk	Val Meredith	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Gurmant Grewal	Rob Merrifield	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Deborah Grey	Bob Mills	Larry Spencer
Andy Burton	Art Hanger	James Moore	Darrel Stinson
Chuck Cadman	Richard Harris	Deepak Obhrai	Chuck Strahl
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	Brian Pallister	Myron Thompson
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Jim Pankiw	Vic Toews
Rodger Cuzner	Jay Hill	Charlie Penson	Maurice Vellacott
Stockwell Day	Howard Hilstrom	Joe Peschisolido	Randy White
Reed Elley	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte	Ted White
Ken Epp	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid	John Williams
Brian Fitzpatrick	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds	Lynne Yelich
Paul Forseth	Jason Kenney		

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Derek Lee	Vice-Chairs:	John Reynolds Jacques Saada
St�phane Bergeron	Yvon Godin	Joe Jordan	Geoff Regan
Rick Borotsik	Michel Guimond	Paul Harold Macklin	John Richardson
Marlene Catterall	Richard Harris	Carolyn Parrish	Tony Tirabassi
Cheryl Gallant			

(16)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott	Ken Epp	Peter MacKay	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Brian Fitzpatrick	Preston Manning	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Paul Forseth	Inky Mark	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Carol Skelton
Michel Bellehumeur	Gurmant Grewal	R�al M�nard	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Kevin Sorenson
Bill Blaikie	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitzkreuz	Grant Hill	Bob Mills	Caroline St-Hilaire
Andy Burton	Jay Hill	James Moore	Darrel Stinson
Chuck Cadman	Howard Hilstrom	Lorne Nystrom	Myron Thompson
Rick Casson	Betty Hinton	Deepak Obhrai	Vic Toews
David Chatters	Rahim Jaffer	Brian Pallister	Maurice Vellacott
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Jim Pankiw	Randy White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Jason Kenney	Charlie Penson	Ted White
Stockwell Day	Gary Lunn	Joe Peschisolido	John Williams
John Duncan	James Lunney	Marcel Proulx	Lynne Yelich
Reed Elley			

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY CALENDAR

Chair:	Marlene Catterall	Vice-Chair:	
Stéphane Bergeron	Rick Borotsik	Yvon Godin	John Reynolds (5)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Carolyn Parrish	Vice-Chair:	
Bill Blaikie Rick Borotsik	Garry Breitkreuz	Michel Guimond	Marcel Proulx (6)

HEALTH

Chair:	Bonnie Brown	Vice-Chairs:	Rob Merrifield Judy Sgro
Diane Ablonczy André Bachand Ray Bonin Diane Bourgeois	Jeannot Castonguay Yvon Charbonneau Stan Dromisky	James Lunney Réal Ménard Stephen Owen	Carolyn Parrish Hélène Scherrer Judy Wasylcyia-Leis (16)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott	Brian Fitzpatrick	Preston Manning	John Reynolds
Rob Anders	Paul Forseth	Richard Marceau	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Keith Martin	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Pat Martin	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitkreuz	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Diane St-Jacques
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Darrel Stinson
Rick Casson	Richard Harris	James Moore	Chuck Strahl
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Greg Thompson
John Cummins	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Myron Thompson
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Howard Hilstrom	Jim Pankiw	Vic Toews
Libby Davies	Betty Hinton	Charlie Penson	Maurice Vellacott
Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	Joe Peschisolido	Randy White
Nick Discepola	Dale Johnston	Pauline Picard	Ted White
John Duncan	Jason Kenney	James Rajotte	John Williams
Reed Elley	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid	Lynne Yelich
Ken Epp	John Maloney		

CANADIAN HERITAGE**Chair:**

Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairs:Cheryl Gallant
Dennis MillsJim Abbott
Paul Bonwick
Sarmite Bulte
Rodger CuznerChristiane Gagnon
Gurmant Grewal
John HarvardAndré Harvey
Loyola Hearn
Wendy LillShawn Murphy
Caroline St-Hilaire
Bryon Wilfert

(16)

Associated MembersDiane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Pierre Brien
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Antoine Dubé
John Duncan
Reed ElleyKen Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Preston ManningRichard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
David Price
Dick Proctor
James Rajotte
Scott ReidJohn Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Diane St-Jacques
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Peter Adams	Vice-Chairs:	Val Meredith Diane St-Jacques	
Jeannot Castonguay	Raymonde Folco	Dale Johnston	Carol Skelton	(18)
Paul Crête	Jim Gouk	Judi Longfield	Greg Thompson	
Libby Davies	Monique Guay	Joe McGuire	Alan Tonks	
Georges Farrah	Tony Ianno	Anita Neville		

Associated Members

Jim Abbott	Christiane Gagnon	John Maloney	John Reynolds
Diane Ablonczy	Marcel Gagnon	Preston Manning	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Richard Marceau	Jean-Yves Roy
David Anderson	John Godfrey	Inky Mark	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Yvon Godin	Keith Martin	Andy Scott
Carolyn Bennett	Peter Goldring	Pat Martin	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Gurmant Grewal	Philip Mayfield	Kevin Sorenson
Diane Bourgeois	Deborah Grey	Larry McCormick	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitzkreuz	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Darrel Stinson
Andy Burton	Richard Harris	Réal Ménard	Chuck Strahl
Chuck Cadman	Grant Hill	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Bob Mills	Tony Tirabassi
David Chatters	Howard Hilstrom	James Moore	Vic Toews
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	Deepak Obhrai	Stéphan Tremblay
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Rahim Jaffer	Brian Pallister	Maurice Vellacott
Stockwell Day	Joe Jordan	Jim Pankiw	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Antoine Dubé	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Charlie Penson	Elsie Wayne
John Duncan	Jason Kenney	Janko Peric	Randy White
Reed Elley	Robert Lanctôt	Joe Peschisolido	Ted White
Ken Epp	Wendy Lill	James Rajotte	John Williams
Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid	Lynne Yelich
Paul Forseth	James Lunney		

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

Chair:	John Godfrey	Vice-Chair:		
Roy Bailey	Monique Guay	Diane St-Jacques	Tony Tirabassi	(9)
Libby Davies	Anita Neville	Greg Thompson	Alan Tonks	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Carolyn Bennett	Vice-Chair:		
Reed Elley	Wendy Lill	Janko Peric	Greg Thompson	(9)
Robert Lanctôt	John Maloney	Karen Redman	Tony Tirabassi	

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:

Susan Whelan

Vice-Chairs:
Walt Lastewka
Charlie PensonReg Alcock
Mauril Bélanger
Pierre Brien
Scott BrisonJohn Cannis
Bev Desjarlais
Jocelyne Girard-BujoldMarlene Jennings
Preston Manning
Dan McTeagueJames Rajotte
Andy Savoy
Paddy Torsney

(16)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Rick Casson
David Chatters
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Antoine Dubé
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken EppBrian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Mario LaframboiseGary Lunn
James Lunney
John Maloney
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Joe PeschisolidoDick Proctor
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Guy St-Julien
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chairs:	Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Andy Scott	Vice-Chairs:	Chuck Cadman Ivan Grose	
Carole-Marie Allard Michel Bellehumeur Bill Blaikie Irwin Cotler	Paul DeVillers Peter MacKay John Maloney Keith Martin	John McKay Lynn Myers Stephen Owen Judy Sgro	Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Vic Toews Pierrette Venne	(20)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson André Bachand Roy Bailey Leon Benoit Bernard Bigras Diane Bourgeois Garry Breitzkreuz Andy Burton Jean-Guy Carignan Rick Casson David Chatters Joe Comartin John Cummins Stockwell Day Bev Desjarlais John Duncan	Reed Elley Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Paul Forseth Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Richard Harris Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton Rahim Jaffer Dale Johnston Jason Kenney Gary Lunn	James Lunney Preston Manning Richard Marceau Inky Mark Philip Mayfield Grant McNally Réal Ménard Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Jim Pankiw Pierre Paquette Charlie Penson Joe Peschisolido James Rajotte	Scott Reid John Reynolds Gerry Ritz Svend Robinson Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Diane St-Jacques Darrel Stinson Chuck Strahl Myron Thompson Suzanne Tremblay Maurice Vellacott Judy Wasylcyia-Leis Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich
---	---	--	--

LIAISON

Chair:	Bill Graham	Vice-Chair:	Susan Whelan	
Peter Adams Mauril Bélanger Maurizio Bevilacqua Bonnie Brown Charles Caccia	Wayne Easter Joe Fontana Charles Hubbard Ovid Jackson	Nancy Karetak-Lindell Raymond Lavigne Derek Lee Clifford Lincoln	David Pratt Werner Schmidt Andy Scott John Williams	(19)

BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Chair:	Bill Graham	Vice-Chair:		
Bonnie Brown Wayne Easter	Clifford Lincoln David Pratt	Susan Whelan	John Williams	(7)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

John Williams

Vice-Chairs:

Mac Harb

Marlene Jennings

Robert Bertrand
John Bryden
Gerry Byrne
Odina Desrochers

John Finlay
Sophia Leung
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield

Shawn Murphy
Brian Pallister
Gilles-A. Perron

Joe Peschisolido
Alex Shepherd
Greg Thompson

(17)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Leon Benoit
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Roy Cullen
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Bev Desjarlais
John Duncan

Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston

Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds

Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
Lynne Yelich

TRANSPORT AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair:	Ovid Jackson	Vice-Chairs:	Jay Hill Marcel Proulx	
Larry Bagnell	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dominic LeBlanc	Brent St. Denis	(18)
Andy Burton	Ovid Jackson	Serge Marcil	Paul Szabo	
Bev Desjarlais	Mario Laframboise	Marcel Proulx	Tony Tirabassi	
Norman Doyle	Ghislain Lebel	Alex Shepherd		

Associated Members

Jim Abbott	Ken Epp	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Paul Forseth	James Lunney	John Reynolds
Reg Alcock	Ghislain Fournier	John Maloney	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	Christiane Gagnon	Preston Manning	Werner Schmidt
David Anderson	Cheryl Gallant	Richard Marceau	Judy Sgro
G�rard Asselin	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Kevin Sorenson
Bernard Bigras	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitreuz	Deborah Grey	R�al M�nard	Guy St-Julien
Chuck Cadman	Monique Guay	Val Meredith	Darrel Stinson
Serge Cardin	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Peter Stoffer
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Chuck Strahl
Rick Casson	Grant Hill	James Moore	Yolande Thibeault
David Chatters	Jay Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Myron Thompson
Paul Cr�te	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Vic Toews
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	Jim Pankiw	Maurice Vellacott
Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	Charlie Penson	Randy White
Odina Desrochers	Dale Johnston	Joe Peschisolido	Ted White
John Duncan	Jason Kenney	Dick Proctor	John Williams
Wayne Easter	Rick Laliberte	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Reed Elley	Raymond Lavigne		

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMBATING CORRUPTION

Chair:	John Williams	Vice-Chair:		
John Bryden	Marlene Jennings	Philip Mayfield	Alex Shepherd	(10)
Roy Cullen	Pat Martin	Shawn Murphy	Greg Thompson	
Odina Desrochers				

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Chair:	Paddy Torsney	Vice-Chairs:	Carole-Marie Allard Randy White	
Andr� Bachand	Mac Harb	R�al M�nard	Jacques Saada	(13)
Bernard Bigras	Dominic LeBlanc	Stephen Owen	Carol Skelton	
Libby Davies	Derek Lee			

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Mauril Bélanger
Shirley Maheu

Joint Vice-Chairs: Scott Reid
Yolande Thibeault

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

André Bachand
Gérald Beaudoin
Eugène Bellemare
Leon Benoit
Gérard Binet
Sarmite Bulte
Claude Drouin
Joan Fraser
Christiane Gagnon
Jean-Robert Gauthier

John Godfrey
Yvon Godin
Rahim Jaffer
Raymond Lavigne
Rose-Marie Losier-Cool
Dan McTeague
Jean-Claude Rivest
Benoît Sauvageau
Raymond Setlakwe

(23)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Garry Breitkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Stéphane Dion
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp

Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Dale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney

Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
Louis Plamondon

James Rajotte
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: John Bryden
Raymond Lavigne

Joint Vice-Chair: Carolyn Bennett

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Robert Bertrand
Rick Borotsik
Marlene Catterall
Brenda Chamberlain
Jane Marie Cordy
Marcel Gagnon
Grant Hill
Betty Hinton

Jim Karygiannis
Wendy Lill
Gurbax Malhi
Donald Oliver
Jerry Pickard
Louis Plamondon
Vivienne Poy
Jacques Saada
Darrel Stinson

(21)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Garry Breitkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Rick Casson
David Chatters
John Cummins
Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp

Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay

Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Céline Hervieux-Payette
Werner Schmidt

Joint Vice-Chair: Tom Wappel

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Sue Barnes
Paul Bonwick
John Bryden
Jean-Guy Carignan
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Sheila Finestone
Michel Guimond
Richard Harris
Noël Kinsella

Gar Knutson
Robert Lanctôt
Derek Lee
Paul Harold Macklin
Wilfred Moore
Lynn Myers
Pierre Claude Nolin
Lorne Nystrom
Greg Thompson
Ted White

(23)

Associated Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Michel Bellehumeur
Leon Benoit
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Stockwell Day
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp

Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Ghislain Lebel

Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Pierrette Venne
Randy White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panels of Chairman of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister of Canada
Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
Hon. David Collenette	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
Hon. Brian Tobin	Minister of Industry
Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry
Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
Hon. Art Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Ronald Duhamel	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
Hon. Robert Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Maria Minna	Minister for International Cooperation
Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Robert Thibault	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
Hon. Jim Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
Hon. Denis Coderre	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Joe Jordan	to the Prime Minister
Mr. André Harvey	to the Minister of Transport
Mrs. Karen Redman	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Benoît Serré	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Claude Drouin	to the Minister of Industry
Ms. Sarmite Bulte	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. John McCallum	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. John O'Reilly	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Stephen Owen	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Lynn Myers	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Paul Szabo	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Mr. Alex Shepherd	to the President of the Treasury Board
Ms. Sophia Leung	to the Minister of National Revenue
Ms. Raymonde Folco	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Pat O'Brien	to the Minister of International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Larry McCormick	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Carmen Provenzano	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. John Finlay	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Minister for International Cooperation
Mr. Mark Assad	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration

CONTENTS

Friday, September 21, 2001

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Customs Act

Mr. Cauchon	5419
Mr. Jaffer	5421
Mr. Perron	5423
Mr. Loubier	5424

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Recycling

Mrs. Redman	5426
-------------------	------

National Security

Mr. Mayfield	5426
--------------------	------

Terrorism

Mr. Laliberte	5426
---------------------	------

Terrorism

Ms. Leung	5426
-----------------	------

Interfaith Prayer Service

Mr. McKay	5426
-----------------	------

United States of America

Mr. Duncan	5427
------------------	------

Terrorism

Ms. Neville	5427
-------------------	------

Violence Against Women

Ms. Guay	5427
----------------	------

Terrorism

Ms. Bulte	5427
-----------------	------

United States of America

Mr. Fitzpatrick	5427
-----------------------	------

Walk of Hope

Mr. Bagnell	5428
-------------------	------

Terrorism

Ms. Lill	5428
----------------	------

Terrorism

Mr. Desrochers	5428
----------------------	------

Dystonia

Mr. Harb	5428
----------------	------

The Economy

Mr. Brison	5428
------------------	------

Terrorism

Mr. Vellacott	5429
---------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Terrorism

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	5429
Mr. MacAulay	5429
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	5429

Ms. Caplan	5429
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	5429
Ms. Caplan	5429
Mr. Reynolds	5429
Mr. MacAulay	5430
Mr. Reynolds	5430
Mr. Owen	5430
Mr. Duceppe	5430
Mr. Eggleton	5430
Mr. Duceppe	5430
Mr. Eggleton	5430
Ms. Lalonde	5430
Mr. Eggleton	5430
Ms. Lalonde	5430
Mr. Eggleton	5431
Ms. McDonough	5431
Mr. Eggleton	5431
Ms. McDonough	5431
Mr. Eggleton	5431
Mr. Strahl	5431
Mr. Eggleton	5431
Mr. MacKay	5431
Mr. MacAulay	5431
Mr. Benoit	5432
Mr. Eggleton	5432
Mr. Benoit	5432
Mr. Eggleton	5432
Mr. Brien	5432
Mr. Eggleton	5432
Mr. Brien	5432
Mr. Eggleton	5432
Mr. Moore	5432
Mr. Collenette	5432
Mr. Moore	5433
Mr. Collenette	5433

Budget Surpluses

Mr. Loubier	5433
Mr. Peterson	5433
Mr. Loubier	5433
Mr. Peterson	5433

Terrorism

Mr. Jaffer	5433
Mr. Cauchon	5433
Mr. Jaffer	5433
Mr. Cauchon	5433
Mr. Cullen	5434
Mr. Peterson	5434
Mr. Robinson	5434
Mr. Eggleton	5434
Mr. Robinson	5434
Mr. Eggleton	5434
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5434

Mr. MacAulay	5434
Ms. Meredith	5434
Mr. Collette	5434
Mr. Reid	5435
Ms. Caplan	5435
Mr. Reid	5435
Ms. Caplan	5435
Mr. Duceppe	5435
Mr. Eggleton	5435
Mr. Duceppe	5435
Mr. Eggleton	5435
Mrs. Gallant	5435
Mr. MacAulay	5435
Mrs. Gallant	5436
Mr. MacAulay	5436
Agriculture	
Mr. Laliberte	5436
Mr. Vanclief	5436
Standing Committee on Finance	
Mr. Epp	5436
Mr. Boudria	5436
Mr. Epp	5436
Mr. Boudria	5436
Stock Market Speculation	
Mr. Bellehumeur	5437
Mr. Peterson	5437
International Aid	
Mrs. Parrish	5437
Ms. Minna	5437
Privilege	
Statements by Members	
Mr. Myers	5437
Mr. Duncan	5437
Points of Order	
Human Rights	
Ms. McDonough	5437
(Motion agreed to)	5437

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Jordan	5437
Interparliamentary Delegations	
Mrs. Parrish	5437
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Jordan	5438
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Jordan	5439

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Customs Act	
Mr. Loubier	5439
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	5440
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos)	5441
Ms. Leung	5442
Mr. Vellacott	5443
Mr. Cullen	5443
Mr. Reid	5443
Mr. McNally	5444
Mr. O'Reilly	5446
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	5446
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	5446
Mr. Duncan	5447
Mr. Jordan	5449
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos)	5449
Mr. Fitzpatrick	5449
Mr. McNally	5450
Mr. Moore	5450
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5452
Mr. Myers	5452
Mr. Fitzpatrick	5453
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5454
Ms. Leung	5455
Mr. Jordan	5455
The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos)	5456

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :

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

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Communication Canada - Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9**