



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 086 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, April 14, 2000

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 14, 2000

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1010)

[Translation]

CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY ACT

The House resumed from April 6 consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, an act respecting genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes and to implement the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Madam Speaker, this second reading of Bill C-19 is an opportunity to say how long it took this bill to appear. It is not that Canada was long in the preparation of it, but this bill is of a very particular nature, because it is the translation into law of an international agreement to create an international criminal court for global concerns.

I will take the liberty of reading a text by Philippe Weckel, a professor at the University of Nice-Sofia-Antipolis, which summarizes well, it seems to me, the realization of the Rome statute in Bill C-19.

The Rome conference opened on June 15 and closed July 18 following the adoption of a treaty on the statutes of the first international criminal jurisdiction of a permanent and universal nature.

An old utopian idea is achieved paradoxically with the help of realism. This success, uncertain to the last minute, will not enthruse those who wanted to proceed much more quickly and go further.

However, the balanced compromise finally reached, after the laborious negotiations of the night of July 16-17, gives the new institution a chance to survive—

I repeat “gives the new institution a chance to survive”.

—and to progressively develop its activities and authority. In other words, this historic moment signals an achievement, causes certain frustrations but gives rise to cautious optimism.

This introduction expresses both the hope raised by the Rome Treaty creating, once the signing and international ratification conditions have been met, an international criminal court, and the difficulties connected with it.

The famous conference of July 17 and 18 ended, it must be said, in confusion. On July 18, 23 states, including France, signed a document that had been hastily put together and not reread. Two months later, the true and authentic instrument of the Rome Treaty was still an unknown quantity.

As the bill tells us, this treaty was adopted on July 17, or the morning of July 18, corrected by the protocols of November 10, 1998 and July 12, 1999. This speaks to all the difficulties surrounding the birth of something on which thinkers had focused a half-century of efforts.

• (1015)

The term “international criminal court” is an unusual one in itself. Any viewer who has not yet given up on such a complicated subject, knows what a court is, and there is nothing new and different about the words international and criminal either.

The truly revolutionary aspect of it is the combination of the three. Until this treaty, a criminal court was an instrument, within a state, which judged individuals who had committed offences of a criminal or other nature. The international court was in place to judge conflicts between states or between groups and a state.

For the first time, a court will be called the “international criminal court” to ensure—this is the objective—that certain categories of extremely serious crimes will no longer go unpunished, as has been the case until now. This is our hope and objective.

What crimes will the international criminal court deal with? There are four different types. There is the genocide, which is defined as follows:

—acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such—

Government Orders

Crimes against humanity are also included. A crime against humanity is defined as follows:

—acts...committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack—

War crimes are defined as:

(a) grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949—

Such breaches include attacks against civilian populations, deportation, hostage takings, the intentional destruction or the pillaging of civilian property, including towns, villages, dwellings or buildings which are undefended and which are not military objectives, and employing poison or poisoned weapons.

Finally, there is the crime of aggression, which could not be specifically defined in the Rome Statute. The court will have authority over the crime of aggression only when this crime has been properly defined under a new treaty.

As members can see, and also our viewers, the future international criminal court will have a huge responsibility.

Throughout history, and until the creation and operation of that court, these crimes were often not defined or named as such, but they were recognized in foreign policy and in history as actions taken by certain states in their quest for power. We know that, over the centuries, that quest for power has been a quest by one country to dominate another. It can also be domination over groups or confrontation with other nations. All manner of horrors were perpetrated.

● (1020)

This was how political tyrants and dictators behaved, but their actions were not judged. People might be revolted by the ensuing millions of deaths, but there was no other way to judge, and worse, no other way to try them.

How did this idea of an international court arise therefore? Several individuals must have had the same idea over the years, centuries even, but it was actually in the aftermath of World War II and specifically the crimes against the Jews that the Nuremberg tribunal was set up. In fact, it was the first international criminal justice organization.

It is clear when we look back on these events that this tribunal caused many problems, particularly from a legal perspective. Right up to the beginning of the trial, genocide was not considered a crime. At Nuremberg, victims were only witnesses, not complainants or civil parties. It was the states that judged.

It has not been possible to rid this tribunal of its image as a court of victors. Very often, as we know, history is written by the victors, and much time must pass before it can be rewritten, I might add, since my background is in history.

The idea of an international court arose at the same time as the Nuremberg tribunal was created. This idea first came up at the UN over 50 years ago. On December 9, 1948, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, with its article 6 providing for the possibility of the future establishment of an international criminal court, was adopted by the UN National Assembly.

Article 6 provided that persons charged with genocide would be tried by a competent tribunal of the state in the territory of which the crime had been committed or by such international penal tribunal as might have jurisdiction.

How is it then that the treaty launching the process of adoption was not signed until July 1998? Because even though this idea was adopted by the UN, it ran into tremendous difficulties, the first being that the sovereign states could not agree to the creation of a court whose jurisdiction exceeded their own and which could try actions committed by the powers in control of a state at some point in their history.

● (1025)

The project was the result of certain events, it must be said. The international law commission was making no progress. The work was resumed in 1989, but what really hastened progress was the events in Bosnia and later Rwanda, and the Security Council's decision to use its powers to create the international criminal tribunal to judge the crimes committed in Bosnia and Rwanda to which we have referred.

The mere mention of these two courts shows how difficult it is to have a true international court. After everything that has been done, we know that 65 individuals have been charged, 35 are presently imprisoned, and 14 have been sentenced. This shows how lengthy proceedings are, that it takes a long time to ensure justice and the appearance of justice. No one, however, would say it was not worthwhile.

Unlike the international criminal tribunal created for Bosnia and Rwanda, the international criminal court will have two main elements. There will be a permanent court with nine justices, in the Hague. States ratifying the Rome Statute will be required to work in collaboration with this court. How? Mainly by delivering up the accused and the witnesses, or evidence in their possession.

The court will operate along the same lines as the international criminal tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. As well, the international criminal court will be able to delegate its powers to national judicial systems, which is what interests us even more in Canada.

Courts in countries that have ratified the statute could judge accused persons themselves, in accordance with the rules of law recognized by the court. This latter mechanism is what is termed application of—and this is a term that will come up a great

Government Orders

deal—"universal jurisdiction", which confers upon national courts in countries such as Canada jurisdiction over serious crimes committed outside their territory and not involving any of their nationals.

It is important to keep these two conditions in mind. They are rather surprising as principal conditions, because—I would need to go into detail on amendments to Canadian statutes here—a Canadian court could have been empowered to judge in Canada criminals who were not Canadians or had committed crimes against persons who were not Canadians.

• (1030)

The minister of the time did not consider it appropriate to enforce the law of Canada, so that the jurisprudence is such that, without the passage of Bill C-19, no court in Canada can judge criminals who are not Canadian or who did not allegedly commit crimes against Canadian nationals.

The fact of being able to delegate to other national courts the attributes of the permanent court at The Hague—this is the hope—will take a load off this international court, and lighten its operations and its costs, two sources of criticism against the international court of justice and against the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, whose mandate was expanded to include Rwanda.

I have spoken of the long history behind this Rome Statute, but I have not yet said why many base their hopes for world peace on the creation of such a court. The first reason given is to ensure justice for all.

I will quote Kofi Annan:

For nearly half a century—almost as long as the United Nations has been in existence—the General Assembly has recognized the need to establish such a court to prosecute and punish persons responsible for crimes such as genocide. Many thought, no doubt, that the horrors of the Second World War—the camps, the cruelty, the exterminations, the Holocaust—could never happen again. And yet they have. In Cambodia, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Rwanda. Our time—this decade even—has shown us that man's capacity for evil knows no limits. Genocide. . . is now a word of our time, too, a heinous reality that calls for a historic response.

As a corollary, we can add that this court aims at putting an end to impunity. Justice for all means the end of impunity.

Jose Lasso, the former UN commissioner for human rights said, and we should bear this in mind:

We run a greater risk of being brought to justice and sentenced for the killing of one man than for the killing of 100,000.

That is what impunity is all about.

That impunity has resulted in a rapid increase in the number of conflicts in several regions of the world. Perhaps we get that impression of a rapid increase because we are immediately aware of these conflicts, through our modern media. In any case, we are

aware of an increasing number of conflicts and of the fact that many of those who committed terrible crimes escape justice through power, wealth and honours. There is nothing that we can do against these people.

• (1035)

If such a situation is generally accepted in this day and age, it will undermine the moral order. Some think that the Rome Statute, which parliament will ask Canada to ratify, will help put an end to conflicts. How can they say that? There can be no peace without justice, no justice without laws, no laws worthy of that name without a court responsible for ruling on what is fair and legal under specific circumstances, including in situations of ethnic conflicts.

It is clear that not everyone shares the same hopes regarding this bill or, I should say, this treaty until it becomes law.

The international criminal court will try to remedy the inadequacies of special tribunals and will take over when national institutions, in the area of criminal justice, do not have the will or the ability to act. I should point out that those who have already signed this treaty, or who will sign it, are committed to do everything in their power— but, as we will see, this power does not have enough teeth—to ensure that country leaders who do not ratify the statutes and may have committed crimes against humanity can be prosecuted. If these people leave their territory, they could be extradited and tried in another country.

Some claim that the Rome Statute could deter future war criminals. Perhaps, but, as far as I am concerned, that argument is not any more valid than another one that we reject, namely that imposing capital punishment in a country has a deterrent effect on criminals. I believe this is why Canada decided to abolish the death penalty.

Many hopes are pinned on this international criminal court, but let us be clear. Before we get to the stage where this universal jurisdiction can be exercised, 60 countries must ratify the Rome treaty. What progress has been made to date? Eight countries have made the move.

Naturally a number of countries whose leaders might be targeted by this court will not be rushing to add their signature.

• (1040)

As William Chabase said in a presentation to the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, those countries which are in the position of disapproving of the actions of leaders of other countries will rush to sign the accords and the Rome convention.

Which countries have ratified this treaty? Belgium, the Fiji Islands, Ghana, Italy, Norway, San Marino, Senegal, and Trinidad and Tobago.

Government Orders

There is a long road ahead before the Rome treaty is fully implemented. It should be emphasized that the United States has serious reservations about this international criminal court. Other countries, such as France, may also drag their heels because of the influence of the military and their assessment of the impact of the international criminal court. I mention these two countries because they are important, but there are undoubtedly many others.

Earlier I said that there has been criticism, even from experts and politicians who are in favour of the international criminal court, but who fear that it will not be able to completely meet our expectations, and in certain cases not be able to meet them at all.

I wish to cite Lise Bissonnette, an editor who has now moved on to other equally noble functions. On July 20, two days after the treaty was adopted, she wrote the following:

The new international criminal court is a very incomplete step in the fight against impunity.

She poses a number of questions. These are very certainly the same questions we will be asking ourselves when we begin our deliberations in committee.

She goes on to say:

Beyond the classic definition of genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, must these offences be broadened to include enslavement, sexual offences, the use of chemical or biological weapons? Will the court have automatic and universal jurisdiction and could it pursue nationals of a state that had refused to sign the treaty? Where would the jurisdiction of national courts end and that of the international court begin?

Some responses have been forthcoming since the writing of this editorial, but other questions remain unanswered.

Again quoting Lise Bissonnette:

The zeal focussed by numerous countries, which eventually led to the creation of the international criminal court, paradoxically shows how readily the international community could prevent war crimes, genocide and aggression. As history has shown, from Latin America to Africa, only the democratization of nations put an end to abuse, to reprisals against civilian populations, to political murders, to the violent crushing of minorities and dissidents. The most scandalous of impunities is not, therefore, that allowed to dictators and their underlings when they are allowed to get off scot-free because there is no international tribunal before which they can be judged—

● (1045)

I will raise my voice here and repeat what Lise Bissonnette said “—the most scandalous of impunities is that guaranteed to them at the very moment they are leading their reign of terror”.

The most sordid recent example—

It dates back to 1998.

—was that of Indonesia and of former President Suharto, whom the international community has just let off for economic rather than moral reasons, he who had on his conscience the proven genocide of one third of the population of East Timor. This

was perpetrated before the very eyes of the country's trading partners, and with their full knowledge, for over twenty years.

As far as the warm, and self-serving friendship Canadian Prime Minister Chrétien had for this murderer (a minimum of 200,000 people killed during his regime and on his orders) is concerned, the fact that our Minister of Foreign Affairs was at the same time agitating for the creation of an international criminal court makes our diplomacy look pretty calculating and cynical.

This is a harsh judgment, but one that is worthwhile. The example of the relative effectiveness of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia justifies such questions, which need to be asked today, as the committee begins its deliberations.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs' global position on human security is an important component of this international criminal court to ensure the protection of children and civilian populations, but are we not, at the moment, in international terms, agreeing that the only role of the international community is to ensure order within existing borders?

We are giving ourselves the means to punish the heads of states once we catch them. Madam Justice Arbour's charge against Milosevic, who remains the President of the Yugoslav Federation, served as a signal, but at the moment, and I will point this out in committee, almost all the peacekeeping measures we refer to, the ones we invest in, are means of repression, when we must accept that the vast majority of current conflicts are conflicts within countries and due to various causes.

These causes, which may be the unrecognized but disputed self-determination of peoples, may underlie the huge problems we see and, in this area, the international community is much less active.

There is a whole side to this activity by the international community that must be raised during committee debates.

As my speaking time is drawing to a close, I can say that at second reading, the Bloc Québécois supports this bill, but we have some concerns, including the fact that the treaty was signed without prior debate in parliament, as we have been calling for prior to the implementation stage, when we cannot change much.

● (1050)

I point out that my colleague from Beauharnois—Salaberry has a private member's bill calling for international treaties to be put before parliament prior to the ratification stage and not when an enacting bill is under consideration, such as this one.

The subject is a difficult one for ordinary citizens, but the House of Commons must be the place to explain difficult issues, the place for instruction on democracy and on international democracy vital to future peace.

Government Orders

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased today to be able to speak to Bill C-19, an act respecting genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes and to implement the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, and to make consequential amendments to other acts.

The Progressive Conservative Party supports and applauds this excellent initiative by the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The purpose of Bill C-19 is to implement Canada's obligations under the Rome Statute, which was adopted on July 17, 1998 by the United Nations Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court.

[*English*]

As has been previously mentioned, this piece of legislation forces us to examine some very disturbing matters throughout the world and oftentimes within our own borders.

Once the ICC has been set up it will be the first permanent international court empowered to investigate the most serious of crimes under international law. These include genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. We can all be assured that although Canada is showing great leadership by making sure that war criminals will be prosecuted and punished for their awful crimes against humanity during a war, there is more that we can and must do. The legislation lays the groundwork to empower those officials within our borders to do just that.

Too many lives have been taken. It is time for the international community to work together to ensure that something is done to provoke positive change in this area to bring about greater accountability and to bring to justice those individuals who have performed and partaken in these atrocities.

Canada's leadership throughout the century has been one for which we can all be proud. With Bill C-19 we have an opportunity to do more. Canada is one of many countries taking steps to implement statutes within a framework of national and international systems of law.

Although six states have already ratified the statute, Fiji, Italy, San Marino, Senegal, Trinidad and Tobago, in light of the legislative initiatives brought forward by the federal government last December 10, the Conservative Party is glad to say that Canada is one of the first countries to take overall comprehensive legislative steps to implement the Statute of Rome.

I again congratulate the minister for his efforts and his leadership in pursuit of justice for war criminals, and certainly on behalf of victims.

According to justice department statistics, there are presently 400 people living within the boundaries of Canada who have

allegedly been involved in the commission of war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide. It is simply unacceptable that many war criminals are able to live out their quiet lives here as if nothing had happened, as if nothing they had done was wrong and escape prosecution for terrible atrocities.

Most of these individuals in question hail from the Balkans, Africa and Central or South America. Canada must not ever become or be seen to be a safe haven for war criminals. In response to this problem, Bill C-19 is a great achievement.

• (1055)

Sadly Canadians and the world will have to wait until the international community gets together to implement a permanent institution that can have genuine and necessary judicial capacity to fulfill the mission to address the problem.

In the meantime we have witnessed the carnage in Kosovo, in Rwanda and in other countries around the world, which makes this legislation all the more important and all the more timely.

Basically Bill C-19 would implement the Rome Statute and replace the current provisions in the criminal code with respect to war crimes. It creates two kinds of offences: offences within Canada and offences outside our borders. Offences within Canada are encompassed in clause 4 of the bill. Pursuant to clause 4, every person is guilty of an indictable offence who commits, in Canada, genocide, a crime against humanity or war crimes.

These definitions provided for the three offences are based on those found in sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Rome Statute. This is in addition to the criminal code where a person, if convicted of one of these offences, shall be sentenced to life imprisonment if the crime was committed intentionally. Obviously there is the burden of proof on the crown. In any other case, a person is liable to life imprisonment, a very serious and appropriate response.

These provisions would apply to conduct committed in Canada and permit Canada to either prosecute these offences or extradite individuals to the country where the atrocities occurred and face prosecution in those lands.

This is a great addition since it was extremely difficult for the justice department in the past to prosecute war criminals who had taken refuge here as a result of the supreme court ruling, the now very infamous and famous ruling of *R v Finta*. In that decision, many will recall that Imre Finta, who was legally trained as a captain in the Royal Hungarian Gendarmerie was in command of an investigative unit at Szegeed during the second world war.

It is documented that during that time over 8,000 Jewish people were detained in a brickyard, forcibly stripped of their valuables and deported to horrendous, dreadful conditions in a concentration camp as part of the Nazi final solution. This order for execution,

S. O. 31

the final solution, was on the gendarmerie and certain police forces to carry out.

After the war, Mr. Finta fled to Canada. In the early 1990s the Canadian courts challenged the respondent under the Canadian Criminal Code war crime provisions with unlawful confinement, robbery, kidnapping and manslaughter of the victims at that horrible death camp.

In his client's defence, Mr. Finta's lawyer argued correctly that the defence of obedience to superior orders and the peace officer's defence were available under the criminal code, which was the case for members of the military or police forces in prosecutions for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

These defences are weighed by the courts, subject to the manifest illegality test. This test basically refers to defences that are not available when the orders in question are manifestly unlawful. The burden of proof here relies very much on the qualification of the unlawful act.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member will have 12 minutes remaining after question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

NATIONAL DAY OF MOURNING

Mr. Rick Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, April 28 is a National Day of Mourning, a day to commemorate those who have been injured or who have died in the workplace.

I rise to remind all Canadians of the importance of preventing work related injuries and death. Work related accidents cause more than 800 deaths and some 800,000 injuries every year. I encourage all Canadians to help prevent workplace accidents so that all workers can enjoy safe and healthy work environments.

On April 28 the Canadian flag will be flown at half-mast on Parliament Hill to mark the National Day of Mourning. I encourage all Canadians to please set aside some time to remember the workers who lost their lives or who have been injured on the job. Our thoughts and prayers are with their families and friends.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the current grain handling and transportation system in western Canada is rigid, unaccountable and does not efficiently serve the needs of farmers.

The Prairie Farm Commodity Coalition estimates that reforms to the system could save farmers over \$300 million annually. The savings from reform would give the average farmer an extra \$15,000 per year. This is \$4,000 more than the government's failed AIDA program.

• (1100)

In two separate reports the government's own experts have recommended that the Liberals eliminate the Canadian Wheat Board's stranglehold over farmers, grain companies and the railways. The presidents of Canada's five major grain companies have joined the call for grain transportation reform. However, this government appears to be deaf. The Liberals still refuse to act.

Preserving the control of the Canadian Wheat Board is far more important to these Liberals than preserving farm families. This government is denying farmers millions of dollars by letting the Canadian Wheat Board dictate national transportation policy.

* * *

JOSEPH DEKORT

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a community leader and constituent, Joseph DeKort, who died suddenly two weeks ago. Joe served five terms as a councillor in the former City of Scarborough. Throughout his career in public life, he put the interests of his constituents first and helped guide Scarborough through the transformation of the neighbourhoods of Agincourt and Malvern from the mid 1950s to full-fledged cities in the mid eighties.

He was a man whose abilities allowed him to serve in capacities going beyond those of a councillor. After a bid to become mayor of Scarborough, Joe easily assumed new roles of leadership in our local community, living up to his election motto: Let's build a better community together.

He worked tirelessly on many election campaigns at all levels. We all knew we could count on his good advice and election expertise, especially in the sign campaigns. Joe also worked for both the Scarborough General Hospital and the March of Dimes.

To his wife Mary Jane and his children, my constituents and I extend our condolences on their loss.

* * *

CHARLTON HESTON

Mr. John Harvard (Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, National Rifle Association president Charlton Heston came to Canada yesterday and demonstrated his ignorance of Canada and Canadian values. Heston told Canadians "We are North Americans by birth on either side of the line. The rest is just survey stakes and politics". He could not be more wrong.

Canadians are not Americans. Our west was opened with treaties, not wars. Our health care system responds to the depth of an illness, not a wallet. Our gun laws keep guns out of the hands of the wrong people.

Heston says “We share a border that’s more a myth than a fact”. Canadians see the effect of American gun violence on television every day.

We joined with the world in sorrow after Columbine, Jonesboro and too many other tragedies to mention.

Charlton Heston may think that our shared border is a myth. Canadians do not. We do not want the American gun culture crossing that line.

* * *

VIA RAIL

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week the transport minister announced a funding package of \$400 million to improve and modernize VIA Rail’s infrastructure and rolling stock. This is great news for rail passenger service in Canada. Indeed, I hope that it will lead to new infrastructure to make riding the rails more convenient and more attractive to those in the southwest part of the national capital region.

For at least a decade the idea of constructing a combined VIA Rail and local Ottawa-Carleton transitway station in south Nepean has been around. Unfortunately, every time the regional municipality went to talk to VIA Rail in the past, the railway was always pleading poverty, that it had no capital funds. This is no longer the case.

It is my hope that VIA Rail will give very serious consideration to this combined use facility. It could be a wonderful showcase of a multimodal transportation facility combining bus, automobile, heavy rail and eventually light rail facilities.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today is day five of the Shawinigan shenanigans in the Middle East. The tired and bruised Prime Minister is in Jordan, apologizing for missing the late King Hussein’s funeral. His Gaza gaffes are headlines all over the world. His spin doctors are panicking and working overtime. They cannot keep up with the Prime Minister’s lack of preparation and the remarks he bleeds into the Middle East media every day.

The Prime Minister does not understand what he is talking about. After four days of saying what he was not supposed to say, now he says “Listen. I do not have to discuss the situation between those two countries”. Which countries? For him, any two countries in the region.

S. O. 31

Why has he not been saying that since the beginning when he realized he could not be helpful to the peace process and he could not be a statesman?

Canadians are ashamed of the damage he has done to three different sets of sensitive negotiations that have forced him with his tail between his legs to ask if he was still welcome in Syria.

* * *

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday night, as part of National Volunteer Week, Centraide Outaouais handed out its Bénévolat 2000 award, honouring the commitment and devotion of a volunteer in one of its member organizations.

I would like to congratulate this year’s winner, Michel Guimond, a volunteer with Grands-Frères et Grandes-Sœurs de l’Outaouais.

Mr. Guimond has been a Big Brother to Nicholas for eight years, and also headed the organization’s board from 1995 to 1998.

Despite heavy job pressures, he has also been a provincial and national board member of Big Brothers and Sisters, as well as a volunteer member of the campaign board for Centraide Outaouais.

May I take this opportunity to salute the commitment, not only of Michel Guimond, but also of all the volunteers who make a contribution to improving the quality of life in the Outaouais.

* * *

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURES

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, the hon. member for Chicoutimi criticized the Government of Quebec for not investing sufficiently in the development of highway infrastructures in the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean and Quebec City regions.

I would like to remind the hon. member that the Government of Quebec invests close to 72% of its fuel tax revenue in highway infrastructures, unlike the federal government, which collects over \$6 billion yearly in excise tax but invests only 17.4% of it. The rest of that revenue goes to swell the already over-inflated budget surplus.

The hon. member for Chicoutimi will agree with me that the level of government responsible for our poor road conditions is none other than the federal. With its surpluses, it could renew strategic agreements for highway improvements with the provinces.

S. O. 31

The Government of Quebec is once again the only one bearing the burden of highway development. I trust that the hon. member for Chicoutimi will have a better idea which direction to take with his steamroller, the next time he takes the floor in this House.

* * *

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I came to the House as an environmentalist and today I still call myself an environmentalist.

I realize that our world is magnificent and that it is incumbent upon each of us to do all we can to protect the earth and the species that live upon it.

With this in mind, I was delighted to hear the Minister of the Environment introduce the species at risk act earlier this week. The act covers all wildlife species listed as being at risk and their critical habitats. As well, the act recognizes for the first time the Council on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. The minister will have to report annually to parliament on the council's assessment of species at risk in Canada.

This is a strong step forward to protect the biodiversity of our natural environment. I congratulate the minister for his work thus far.

* * *

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, on April 29, Dan Dillon of Medicine Hat, Alberta, will launch his canoe into the Bow River west of Calgary to begin a journey to Lake Winnipeg.

This in itself would not be particularly noteworthy except that Mr. Dillon suffers from multiple sclerosis. He plans to do the trip with minimal assistance and he will, in fact, be doing most of his own portaging. He is doing this not only for personal satisfaction, but to raise money for the Multiple Sclerosis Society.

Donations can be directed to the Multiple Sclerosis River Run in care of Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada, Royal Bank, 2901-13th Avenue S.E., Medicine Hat, Alberta.

Please join me in a show of appreciation for this gutsy individual.

* * *

PEACEKEEPING

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has been a leader in forging peace in the Middle East.

Canada's involvement in international affairs to secure peace in the Middle East dates back almost 50 years to when Lester B. Pearson won the Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts during the Suez crisis in 1956. Canadian peacekeepers have participated in every UN peacekeeping effort in the region and Canadian troops are currently serving on the Golan Heights.

Canada is playing a pivotal role in the Middle East peace process as the chair of the Refugee Working Group. Contributing toward an effective multilateral track is helping to build confidence and trust among the parties. The efforts of the group have brought tangible improvements to the lives of Palestinian refugees and peace in the Middle East.

Furthermore, since the launch of the Ottawa process in October 1996, Canada has been engaged internationally in building momentum for a global ban on land mines. In the Middle East these activities have resulted in an effort by Canada, Norway, Israel and Jordan to rid the Jordan Valley of land mines.

• (1110)

Canada has a sincere interest and a deep commitment to securing a lasting peace in the Middle East and will continue to take a leadership role.

* * *

“THE TRUE NAMES OF BIRDS”

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this week in the House New Democrats have read the works of poets from across the country. Today I am honoured to read “The True Names of Birds” by Susan Goyette of Dartmouth, who was nominated for the Governor General's Award in 1999:

There are more ways to abandon a child
than to leave them at the mouth of the woods
Sometimes, by the time you find them they've made up names
for all of the birds and constellations and they've broken
their reflections in the lake with sticks
With my daughter came promises and vows
that unfolded through time like a roadmap and led me
to myself as a child, filled with wonder for my father
who could make sound from a wide blade of grass
and this breath. Here, in the stillness of the forest,
the sun columning before me temple-ancient,
that wonder is what I regret losing most, that wonder
and the true name of birds

It is through poetry and wonder that we make sense of the unknown and find the strength to face it. And it is culture which truly legislates the heart and soul of a nation.

S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

DIABETES

PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, “You may see problems, I do not see any”. Those are the words of our Prime Minister in his travels in the Middle East. “I have not seen a word in the press here, and there has been no negative comment on TV”, he added.

The Prime Minister has certainly not seen the middle eastern press, which is echoing his remarks, and he should not phone home, like the words in the song, to find out what the press reviews are saying here. The headlines are saying “A blunder a day”; “Chaos reigns”; “Prime Minister’s gaffes embarrass Ottawa”. Never have we seen the cartoonists having such a heyday.

All is well.

We would laugh, if it were not so pathetic. Quebecers have known for a long time that the Prime Minister has no sense of the delicacy of relations between peoples. The rest of the world can now bear witness to the fact.

* * *

[*English*]

COMMUNITY POLICING

Mr. Bill Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to acknowledge the careers of two police officers who recently retired after more than 20 years of service in 51 division in my riding of Toronto Centre—Rosedale.

Constables Gerrard Jones and Danny Forsyth were pioneers of community policing, making it their priority to know members of our community and work closely with them to address concerns. No issue was too small to merit their attention. At night and on weekends they were there to work with us and to celebrate with us.

The complex social environment of our urban areas requires many innovative approaches to the issues of drugs, crime and troubled youth. In that context, community policing has an important role to play in creating a safe and harmonious environment for us all.

Constables Jones and Forsyth are examples of integrity and selfless service in the bringing of community policing to our neighbourhoods. They have given much to make the neighbourhoods in my riding safer and healthier places in which to live, and for that the community is deeply grateful.

It is an honour and a privilege to acknowledge their service and I wish them every happiness for years to come.

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC): Mr. Speaker, while most Canadians think that diabetes is not a serious disease, diabetes and its complications cost Canada more than \$9 billion per year in health care and lost productivity. Therefore, diabetes is a major public health issue.

To raise awareness and educate people about diabetes, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation organizes each year a Shoppers Walk for the Cure fundraiser in cities across Canada.

The purpose of this event is to raise much needed funds to continue essential research programs. So far the Juvenile Diabetes foundation has given more than \$49 million to diabetes research in Canada since its beginnings seven years ago.

I encourage all members of parliament to take part in this year’s Walk for the Cure.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE SECOND BATTLE OF YPRES

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we recall our achievements at the battle of Vimy Ridge, we must not forget that April 22 and 24 mark the 85th anniversary of the battle of Ypres. In 1915, 6,035 Canadian soldiers—one soldier in three—died in this battle.

These young Canadian soldiers were among the first victims of a new deadly weapon—poison gas.

The most disastrous and horrible battle took place at Saint-Julien. On April 24, as they were trying to end an impasse, the Canadians were hit with a great cloud of mustard gas.

● (1115)

Our courageous Canadian soldiers continued to fight fiercely and to hold their position for two weeks, although their lungs were burning and they could hardly breathe because of the terrible effects of the gas. It was not long after this battle that John McCrae wrote his famous poem “In Flanders Fields”.

Canadians must never forget the sacrifice made by the victims—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton East.

* * *

[*English*]

VOLUNTEER WEEK 2000

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Edmonton North District Area Council Two. They are celebrating 25 years of volunteer commitment to our communities on Volunteer Week 2000.

Oral Questions

I wish to recognize all who have given unselfishly to volunteer and contribute to many worthwhile projects. Contributors permit the soil of aspirations to be cultivated, help breathe life into dreams, nurture mere ideas to fruition and bring the riches of goals to harvest.

Volunteers give freely of their daily lives. Their efforts add to our quality of being and are vital contributors to success, as dreams take wing and rise to lofty heights. All volunteers have my deepest appreciation for outstanding service to their communities. I wish everyone continued success and welcome their community leadership. I extend a sincere thanks to everyone for their good efforts.

Why will the minister not set up an independent inquiry so we can fully find out where the billions have gone?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true that the opposition did unite in its efforts to have an independent public inquiry.

However, by that suggestion it knows full well that the auditor general has HRDC grants and contributions on his list for audit this very year. By that suggestion are the opposition parties also suggesting that the auditor general is not an independent official?

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister has done almost nothing but stonewall for months now. She rejects an inquiry. She rejects revealing all the facts. She even rejects access to information requests.

Yesterday I asked her why taxpayers funded the purchase of a motorhome. She has had a day to think about it. I would like to know what the explanation is today.

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite seems unaware of the fact that mobile vehicles have purposes other than that which she cited yesterday, a luxury motorhome.

This mobile vehicle was purchased to provide access to technology, information, seminars and workshops in rural areas around Strathroy. Access to computers was available as well as information on business start-up, employment training and education. It served the community from May to October 1999.

The next thing we will find out is that the member is opposed to bookmobiles.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, for two and a half months the HRDC minister has stood in the House defending her programs as being beneficial to Canadians. Now we see how Canadians are benefiting. A select few who control the funds are receiving five figure honorariums. They are playing the stock market with Canadian taxpayer dollars, and they are buying motorhomes.

• (1120)

Are these the types of activities that the minister has in mind when she tells Canadians that they are benefiting from her department's funds?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems that this party can never get itself out of the gutter trying to pick up those projects with which there have been problems.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, revelations to the HRDC committee have raised even more startling questions than the infamous audit.

The minister who claimed to know that she knew where every penny went was completely unable to give specifics. The information commissioner blasted the government for a deliberate policy of holding back important documents requested under access to information.

Four opposition parties want to get to the bottom of this for all Canadians. Why will the Liberals not join the move to have an independent inquiry to get complete answers?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is an independent inquiry under way which is being performed by an officer of this parliament, the auditor general. Not only did he approve of the six point action program of the minister to deal with the problems in the department, he said that he would carry on his own inquiry, the results of which he will make public in October.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, would this be the same auditor general whose reports have been ignored by the government for years?

Yesterday all opposition parties joined in calling for a public inquiry into the HRDC scandal in which billions of dollars in grants and contributions were handed out with a cavalier disregard for the interests of the taxpayer.

The minister's answer that she knows where every penny went is patently incorrect, as the 19 police investigations clearly show.

Oral Questions

Canadians have benefited. In one program alone, under grants and contributions, 28,000 new jobs have been created which employ Canadians. The main thing is that with our investment of about \$300 million we have leveraged \$2.7 billion to partner with us, for a net gain of \$3 billion of economic activity in regions of high unemployment. The people who live in those regions know that these programs are valuable to them.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, this is incredible. In 10 weeks the minister's standard response has gone from "There are a few problems, but I have everything under control" to "There are a lot of problems, but Canadians are benefiting from the expenditure of funds" to "I can't answer that because of the police investigation".

Since the parliamentary secretary cannot give us more of the specifics, can she provide us with an update? How many police investigations are there into the grants and contributions from HRDC and how much Canadian taxpayer money is involved in those investigations?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is and what is not a matter of police investigation is the business of the police. To comment could impede the investigations, and I am sure the member opposite would not want that to happen.

* * *

[Translation]

MIDDLE EAST

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's trip continues to make waves.

The Lebanese Prime Minister even joked that he hoped the Prime Minister of Canada would not make a gaffe in Lebanon.

Considering that a government leader went so far as to allude to several faux pas made by his guest, will the Deputy Prime Minister continue to say that the Prime Minister's inappropriate statements are of no consequence?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, it is very interesting to see a separatist party support the foreign policy of a united country. What a flip flop.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the preparations for the arrival of the Prime Minister of Canada in Syria are basically completed.

However, the Prime Minister had to ask his ambassador in Damascus to confirm that Syria's president would meet with him, in spite of his unfortunate statements.

Would the Deputy Prime Minister not feel more comfortable if Canadian diplomats put all their energy into making sure that Canada has its proper place in the peace negotiations in that region of the world, instead of being busy making up for the Prime Minister's gaffes and mistakes?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is only normal for our ambassador in Syria to be in contact with her Syrian counterparts. This is nothing new.

Again, on the issue of gaffes, it is interesting to see those of the Bloc Québécois, which changed its policy of opposing our foreign policy as a united country to one of full support. What will Mr. Bouchard have to say about that?

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I urge the member to reread *Hansard*.

Despite the Deputy Prime Minister's assurance on Wednesday that middle eastern newspapers were not reporting on the Prime Minister's gaffes, today it seems that not only have his remarks had repercussions in the Middle East but that they have been picked up by major international news agencies.

Is the government not afraid that all its diplomatic efforts in this region will be compromised by the negative fallout from the Prime Minister's statements?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the heads of state with whom the Prime Minister has held talks have not been critical of the Prime Minister's remarks.

• (1125)

I am told that Prime Minister Barak of Israel publicly thanked Canada for its peacekeeping efforts in the region and that President Arafat also publicly thanked the Prime Minister for visiting the region and for Canada's support for the Palestinian people.

So, if we are talking about really important figures, leaders of countries in the region, they thanked the Prime Minister.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, some people must be very busy.

The Prime Minister's goal was to use Canadian diplomacy to create just, lasting and general peace in the Middle East. That was his goal.

Will the government agree that this goal is threatened by the Prime Minister's apparent insensitivity to the complex issues in the region, which require all international players to show careful judgment?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we are talking about agreements, our Prime Minister has signed some very important agreements with Israel and Egypt and we are also pursuing our efforts to help the cause of peace in the region.

Oral Questions

Once again, I thank the new federalist party, the Bloc Québécois, for supporting our efforts as a united country.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Yesterday, the Minister of Health indicated that his department was studying the NAFTA implications of Bill 11 in Alberta. We welcome this. We think it should have happened a long time ago. But time is now of the essence. By the time we come back from the Easter recess Bill 11 could have passed and the wall that protects Canada's medicare system could well have been breached by then.

What contingency plans does the minister have to stop Bill 11 and to stop Premier Klein from committing this act which has irreversible and national consequences?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, there are differing points of view on that question. The hon. member has expressed one, there are others.

The job of this government and its lawyers is to examine those various interpretations to determine which is the most sensible, and then develop policy on that basis. That is what we are doing.

The NAFTA is only one of the concerns we have about Bill 11. We think it is bad policy. We have also written to the Alberta government saying that enhanced services should not be sold for profit at a private for profit hospital.

The bill has not yet passed. Amendments will be coming before the Alberta legislature. We hope the bill, as it emerges—if it emerges—will not contain that feature.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister that he cannot afford to be wrong in his interpretation of the NAFTA. Time is of the essence. We cannot afford to allow the bill to pass if there is any uncertainty.

Recently we passed Bill C-20 in the House, which said that Quebec could not unilaterally separate from Canada, that the interests and rights of all Canadians must be taken into account.

Where does Premier Klein get the right to unilaterally sabotage a national social program which all Canadians value? What will the national Minister of Health do about this?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the national Minister of Health, from the beginning of this debate in November, has made it very clear that the Government of Canada will safeguard the principles of our national health care system.

We have done precisely that in the positions we have taken and on the issues we have identified for the Klein government, including NAFTA.

I tell the hon. member that not only NAFTA, but the combination of enhanced services being sold at a private for profit hospital, elements of conflict of interest and overnight stays enlarging the role of private for profit hospitals at an accelerated rate are all issues that have been taken up with the Alberta government, and we will continue to do so.

* * *

FUNDRAISING

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions.

Bank lobbyist Barry Campbell, a long time Liberal, organized a huge fundraiser for the minister last fall, raising over \$70,000.

Did the minister consider the clear violation of the conflict of interest code that a fundraising event organized by a bank lobbyist for him would create?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, prior to the fundraiser I called the ethics counsellor about this issue. He said that as long as the solicitation was broadly based there would be no problem if financial institutions attended or were invited.

• (1130)

In spite of this, we went out of our way not to solicit institutions within my area of responsibility, and if cheques were received they were sent back and refunds were issued.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, there is no solicitor like an old solicitor. If there was no conflict of interest, why is federal ethics counsellor actually investigating?

Barry Campbell, a friend of the minister, was a lobbyist for the Bank of Nova Scotia from May 1998 to mid-March 1999, a period when the bank mergers were under discussion and review by the government.

Why did the minister compromise the merger review with his close affiliation with the bank lobbyist representing the Bank of Nova Scotia who later rewarded this loyalty with \$70,000 of fundraising?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Campbell is a former colleague and a long time friend.

When Willowdale's regular finance chair could not be available for the event, I asked Mr. Campbell to replace him. He did. At no

Oral Questions

point while he was the chair of our fundraising dinner did I have any dealings with Mr. Campbell in any area of my responsibility.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we believe that the grants and contributions mess at HRDC should be looked into by an independent public inquiry. Such an inquiry would be most effective if public servants at HRDC would be free to speak about abuses of which they have knowledge.

Why does the minister not agree that legislation protecting whistle-blowers within her department is crucial to employees divulging crucial information without loss of their jobs?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, employees within HRDC are free to come forward at any time and state what they have to tell us without fear of reprisal.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the human resources minister rejected the public's request for a public inquiry into the boondoggle at HRDC. The Oxford dictionary defines the words public inquiry as a search into a matter done by the people for the people.

I would simply ask the minister and the government why they do not want the Canadian public to get the information regarding the boondoggle at HRDC.

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister did not reject the need for a public inquiry. We are having one. It will be done by the auditor general and it will be done during this calendar year.

The public has not asked for this. It is the only thing that the four opposition parties could agree on in trying to put forward a dissenting report to the committee's majority report.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development has again totally contradicted the owner of Placeteco, who received a grant of \$1.2 million and who said on the CBC that he had 78 people in his firm and not the 170 the minister keeps reporting.

If the minister continues to totally contradict her department and its figures and the figures of the head of Placeteco on the number of jobs, is it not because she is incapable of justifying the use of \$1.2 million by the creation of jobs at Placeteco as the grant went elsewhere?

[*English*]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have

been clear that there were different numbers of people working at different times as the business cycle rose and fell. To the best of our knowledge the combined workforce at Techni-Paint and Placeteco is now 170.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister herself is confusing Placeteco and Techni-Paint and preventing the details of this matter from coming to light.

Why is she so afraid to table the invoices she must have in hand to justify the grant, unless no jobs were created?

[*English*]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that party always wants to point out things that might be wrong with every project that we help to bring to the workers of Quebec.

I emphasize the good news about this company, which is that it just signed a five year contract worth \$8 million with a major aeronautical company, Bell Helicopter, and there are 78 people working at that firm.

* * *

• (1135)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Canada could have played a dominant role in the peace process in the Middle East. Instead, the Prime Minister damaged it.

As a Syrian minister said, our Prime Minister comprised the neutrality of Canadian peacekeepers monitoring the ceasefire between Israel and Palestine. The Prime Minister's Gaza gaffes are putting the lives of Canadian peacekeepers in jeopardy and destroying our reputation and neutrality.

How could the Deputy Prime Minister continue to blindly defend the Prime Minister, even after he has put the lives of Canadian peacekeepers at risk?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if there is any blindness here, it is in the eyes and mind of the hon. member.

He does not recognize that Canada continues to be the chair of the multilateral group on refugees as part of the Oslo peace process. He does not recognize that Canada remains one of the members of the overall steering group of the peace process. He does not recognize how successful the talks have been that our Prime Minister has had with the leaders he has met so far. I am sure this will continue to be the case.

Oral Questions

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Patrick Seale, a journalist and Middle East analyst with access to President Assad with regard to the Prime Minister's remarks said that they:

—suggest someone who has not fully grasped the subtleties of the different positions. . . In this crucial moment on the peace process, the Middle East needs someone that tries to contribute to the solution, rather than someone that makes the solution more difficult.

Why does the Prime Minister not quit while he is behind and come back home?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of behind, the hon. member and his party have been behind for a long time, and that will continue to be the case.

The Prime Minister's mission is going very well. He is having very successful talks with leaders of the Middle East. The hon. member has quoted one person. I quoted another, the well informed president of the Hebrew University, who has been praising the Prime Minister for his efforts. That also has weight.

* * *

[Translation]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there are limits to the nonsense that can be passed off in the House. We have proof, and we even wanted to table it in the House, that the grant was used to pay back a National Bank loan, and the owner of Placeteco himself admitted it. The government cannot keep sticking its head in the sand on this one.

The Minister of Human Resources Development can no longer hide behind the pat answers prepared by her staff. What is she waiting for to table the invoices that would back up what she is saying?

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable to me the opposition claims that grants and contributions are a serious subject. It has co-operated with us in investigating them in the committee for months now and those people across the way can only ask about one file out of tens of thousands.

I think it is time to grow up and to realize that when there are 10,000 projects there are probably 100,000 partners and among those 100,000 partners there will be a few people for whom—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, such arrogance. There is no word in the French language

that would be acceptable in the House to describe the behaviour of the government in this affair. No jobs were created. Gauthier himself admitted it. The Groupe Vidéotron was forced to pay back its grant.

What is the minister waiting for to call back the \$1.2 million grant that was used for purposes other than creating jobs?

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have made it clear in the past and it continues to be true. If a review of a file indicates that there has been an overpayment, we will ask for the money back. We have done that in some cases and the money has come back.

If one cannot establish an overpayment, one cannot ask for the money to be returned, and that is the case with this particular file.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there has been no conversion on the road to Damascus for the Prime Minister. He just keeps on doing what he always does when he puts his foot in his mouth; he keeps on stumbling. He has aggravated our allies and he has threatened a delicate diplomatic balance. If this mission is going well, I would hate to see bad.

Let us see if the Deputy Prime Minister could perhaps answer this question without saying "I reject the member's premise" or quoting some friendly academic. Why will the government not bring the Prime Minister home before he hurts us any more?

• (1140)

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, now I know why the CCRAP is behind in public opinion. When we have questions like that I do not see why one should take them seriously.

The Prime Minister's talks are going well. The leaders of the countries he has met with have spoken well of his efforts. I am sure he deserves the support of all Canadians, even the CCRAP.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, if it is going well, I would hate to see bad. Today is day five of the Prime Minister's Middle East travel. After four major gaffs in four days, saying what he is not supposed to say, now he says "listen, I do not have to discuss the situation between those two countries".

We might ask what two countries. For the Prime Minister, it could be any two countries in the region. Why will not the Prime Minister just come home?

Oral Questions

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not say that, when the former leader of the opposition badmouthed Canada abroad. That is the guy who should have been brought home.

Speaking of the Prime Minister's four steps, yes, there have been four major successful accords signed involving Israel and Egypt. There will be other concrete, positive achievements for Canada and the cause of peace because of the Prime Minister's efforts.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the employment insurance plan as we know it is disintegrating.

Self-employed workers, who account for 18% of the work force, are excluded; women and young people are victims of flagrant discrimination, which will be dealt with by the courts; soon, as well, most unemployed workers will receive benefits that will not exceed 50% of what they were earning.

Can the minister make a commitment to totally review the present program so as to bring it in line with the labour market realities of the year 2000?

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the employment insurance system was completely reviewed and revamped in 1996, only four short years ago. We have monitoring and assessment reports which monitor the progress and the adjustment of Canadians to this new system.

As far as discrimination against women under the new system, it seems rather strange to me because women's unemployment rate right now is at the lowest point in 15 years at 5.6%. Sixty-one per cent of all claims involving small weeks projects were made by women. Two-thirds of our new family supplement recipients were women. Women have done well by our reform.

* * *

COMPETITION ACT

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. In today's global economy the effects of anti-competitive conduct are not limited by borders. The government needs to be able to enter into mutual co-operation agreements with other enforcement agencies to be able to effectively deal with anti-competitive conduct which crosses borders.

That is exactly what Bill C-471 will do. Would the minister tell Canadians what his and this government's position is regarding Bill C-471?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the very positive suggestion that the member has made in the context of Bill C-471. There have been a number of very useful recommendations with respect to the Competition Act that have been proposed by private members, including by the member for Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge and the member for Kitchener Centre.

I have asked the commissioner of competition, in light of the number of bills that deal with the Competition Act, to take those bills and use them as a basis for public and stakeholder consultation over the months to follow and if acceptable—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Macleod.

* * *

CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, both the finance minister and the Prime Minister promised that they would release the minutes of the CDC when the finance minister was on the board.

Yesterday we got the documents. We got 100 pages of newspaper clippings, 100 pages of annual reports and 2 pages of whited out minutes. Why should not the victims of hepatitis C think that whited out minute documents are nothing but a whitewash?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is criticizing the report of the ethics counsellor. If he has questions about the report he might want to address them to the ethics counsellor.

● (1145)

The ethics counsellor looked into the matter thoroughly. He not only reviewed and released documents, he also carried on discussions and interviews with persons who played key management roles at the relevant time. They confirmed that the CDC board never discussed the question of tainted blood during the relevant period in which the person who is now the finance minister was on the board.

In general, the ethics counsellor found that the Minister of Finance had not—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo—Alberni.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister may be in a conflict of interest by being on the board of the Canada Development Corporation because of discussions about the tainted blood issue at the cabinet table.

We know that the Deputy Prime Minister has said that the ethics counsellor has the board minutes of the CDC and Connaught Labs.

Oral Questions

There is one way to clear this issue up and that is to release all of the minutes of those boards. Why does the government refuse to issue those board minutes?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that certain documents belong to private corporations. They are not under the control of the government. The decision of whether or not to release them belongs to the companies in question.

As to whether more efforts can be made in that regard, I suggest my hon. friend address his question to the ethics counsellor who, I repeat, found that the present Minister of Finance is not in a conflict of interest nor was he because of his service on the board of Canada Development Corporation.

* * *

PLUTONIUM SHIPMENTS

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in January the government quietly granted approval to allow weapons grade plutonium into Canada. Now we hear about plans to import an even larger amount from Russia, something which may well be illegal. The Americans who are part of this deal are being up front about it, but our government is less forthcoming.

Can the minister tell us how much plutonium is coming from Russia? When is it coming? How will it be transported to Chalk River? Will the public be consulted if the shipment is larger than that approved last year?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the details of what AECL is proposing was laid out through the public consultation process last fall. That methodology as described by AECL at that time was approved. If it is to change in any material way, AECL would have to reapply for a different undertaking.

* * *

TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Minister of Transport announced funding for VIA Rail service across the country.

The NDP believes that public passenger rail strengthens the federation and brings Canadians closer together. However, I wonder if the minister knows that the province of Newfoundland is no longer served by passenger rail. I wonder if he knows that Newfoundlanders have been waiting for 12 years for needed upgrades to the Trans-Canada Highway and for improvements to existing ferry service.

Will the minister commit today to timetables with targets to deliver on four laning and improved service to the mainland which Newfoundlanders have been expecting for years?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as one of the conditions for the elimination of the rail service some 10 or 12 years ago, the former government entered into a long term financial arrangement with the government of Newfoundland to upgrade the highways. That province has been particularly well served by that agreement. I am surprised the hon. member was unaware of this.

On the larger point, this has been a great week for passenger rail in this country. We have turned the corner and we are saying that in the new millennium there is a role for passenger rail.

Other countries in the world are supporting their passenger rail systems. It will become an even more important fabric of Canadian life.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians who are repaying their Canada student loans have been able to claim a 17% tax credit on the interest paid on their loans.

Thousands of students each year have to scramble to get a student loan privately because the federal government turns them down. Yet the government does not allow them to claim that tax credit on their student loan.

Why not allow all students to claim the student loan interest tax credit? Why is there a double standard?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these issues are ones which we have addressed very fulsomely in past budgets. The plight of students and the need to have a highly educated Canadian populace, the best educated and the best trained in the world, has been part of our strategy from day one, even when we were in deficit. This is why we have had all sorts of tax incentives made available to students. We have enhanced them fulsomely. This is why we brought in the millennium scholarships.

● (1150)

If the member has further representations he wants to make as to how to help make post-secondary education more affordable, we would be happy to listen to him.

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC): Mr. Speaker, was that an answer?

The average debt for a Canadian student has tripled to \$25,000. To help in repaying that debt some students can now claim the interest paid on their income tax but tens of thousands of students cannot. Only those who qualify for government loans are eligible for the tax credit.

Oral Questions

When is the government going to treat all students equally and allow all students to qualify for the student loan tax credit?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I bring to the hon. member's attention not only the millennium scholarships that we have brought in but also in past budgets we have enhanced the tax incentives for those who want to go back to school, for those who have dependent children and for the fees students have to pay in addition to their tuition. All of these have been enhanced in a way to make it possible.

The student loans program has been enhanced so the repayment provisions relate to the capacity of the individual student to repay. We do not believe—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Essex.

* * *

HEALTH

Ms. Susan Whelan (Essex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Cancer Society issued its 12th annual report entitled "Canadian Cancer Statistics 2000". The report contains some positive news for the decline in the incidence of some types of cancer but reveals that areas such as breast cancer and tobacco related cancers need more attention.

Can the Minister of Health tell the House today what the government is doing to reduce the incidence of cancer?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the report released yesterday contains both good news and bad.

On the positive side, the incidence of some cancers is down. Recovery rates are higher because of new treatments and early detection. But there are also troubling signs. We know that the death rates particularly in lung cancer and especially among women are way up. We are told that in 15 years the incidence of new cases is going to increase by 70%.

The signals are clear. First of all, lifestyle and other changes to prevent cancer, early detection, but also new treatments and renewing medicare so that we can afford to properly treat the—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Battlefords—Lloydminster.

* * *

CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the government's ethics counsellor is accountable to no one but his boss the Prime Minister. He has no independence and no incentive to come clean about his findings. In fact, there is a big disincentive if his report embar-

rases members of cabinet. Only two pages of minutes from six years of meetings, that would be an embarrassment.

If the finance minister has nothing to hide, why will the Prime Minister not instruct his ethics counsellor to release all the minutes we know he has?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Prime Minister has said that the report of the ethics counsellor be made public. It was made public.

In addition to documents, the ethics counsellor's office conducted interviews with people who are involved with the board meetings in question. I am told that some documents are not under the direct control of the government or the ethics counsellor. If I am wrong in this, I will be happy to correct my statement. My hon. friend should go to the office of the ethics counsellor and see what further things he has to say about this.

The important point is that the finding was that the Minister of Finance was not and is not in any conflict of interest. That is the important point.

* * *

[Translation]

IMPORTATION OF PLUTONIUM

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's *La Presse*, Canada is preparing to import from Russia five times the planned amount of plutonium: 600 grams. This plutonium will, moreover, be brought in by plane, a practice that is banned in the United States.

How can the Minister of Natural Resources endanger the safety of his fellow citizens by allowing plutonium to be carried over Canada by air?

[English]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what has been approved in the regulatory procedure last year is a shipment volume from Russia that could rise up to something just below 400 grams. If AECL proposes to change the volume, that would require reapplication through the regulatory process.

With respect to the transportation mode, the American system is not approved in Canada and the Canadian system is not approved in the United States. If I have a choice between the two, I will follow Canadian law.

* * *

● (1155)

GIANT MINES

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the history of Giant Mines in Yellowknife is one of tragedy, violence,

Oral Questions

corporate greed and now environmental degradation, because yesterday it was fined \$1.4 million for dumping cyanide into the water system. Ironically, that is about the same amount of money that workers were cheated out of in terms of severance pay and cuts to their pension plan. The federal government played a role in negotiating away the rights and benefits of those workers in terms of those two figures.

Will the government intervene again, this time on the workers' behalf and apply this \$1.4 million to the pension plan and the severance packages which Peggy Witte cheated these workers out of?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the issue of the shortfall in the workers' pension plan is one that the government takes very seriously.

We have been investigating and looking into it on behalf of the pensioners. We have brought a claim against the receiver. We are contemplating other possible action because when this type of thing happens to pensioners or people who will eventually be pensioners, we take it very, very seriously.

Along with the other members of parliament involved, including the member for Western Arctic, we are committed to pursue all possible avenues to making those pensioners whole.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to include fishermen and processors in negotiations with first nations in Atlantic Canada. The minister skirted the answer because he has not listened to processors or the fishermen. Yet in order for this interim agreement to work, he absolutely needs their support and, I might say, their input.

Will the minister re-open dialogue with the east coast fishermen and processors immediately?

Mr. Lawrence D. O'Brien (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that so far we have concluded eight agreements with the aboriginal parties, i.e., first nations. We have eight more agreements in principle in negotiations right now. We are making great progress in concluding agreements.

I can tell the hon. member also that last Tuesday the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans met with the standing committee. He released information on licences at dollar value by species. We will continue to release information as it becomes available. But most important, we will conserve our stocks—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

HOUSING

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services.

Would she mind informing the House what has the government done to help the Canadian housing industry participate on the international scene?

Ms. Carolyn Parrish (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would not mind at all.

Canada's national housing agency, CMHC, works closely with industry and its team Canada partners to promote the participation of the Canadian housing system in foreign markets. CMHC brings down housing barriers, gathers market intelligence and supports the housing industry's export promotion, new trade shows and other missions.

In fact, I was able to join the team Canada mission to Poland last year which saw a lot of contracts signed. Joint ventures were entered into that enriched both economies.

Opening new markets and increasing the number of Canadian firms involved in exports is at the heart of Canada's international business.

* * *

CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the finance minister's involvement in the tainted blood situation, I would like to follow up on what the Deputy Prime Minister said.

He said that all the documents were under the control of the government. He also said that board members were interviewed. The fact is that the same board members could face liability issues on this too. It is no wonder that they said there was no conflict.

The truth of the matter is that the ethics counsellor and the government have the board minutes and they are stonewalling and refusing to release them. What is it that they are hiding in these documents?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I did not say all the documents are under the control of the government. I said just the opposite.

Also, the hon. member is making an assertion which is not accurate, and that is that the Minister of Finance is involved in the tainted blood scandal. This is not true and this is backed up by all the inquiries made into this matter.

Points of Order

● (1200)

The hon. member ought to take another look at the premise of his question. His colleague does not like me talking about the premise of a question but if the premise is wrong, it is wrong. I will not be muzzled and I will not be censored when I want to bring that fact to the attention of the House.

* * *

[Translation]

GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as regards the GMO issue, the Minister of Agriculture is either burying his head in the sand or he is not properly informed.

Europe has the technology to detect GMOs and is threatening to ban Canadian agricultural products. Here in Canada, the Laboratoire d'environnement SM, in Quebec, and Genserve Laboratories, in Saskatchewan, can detect GMOs.

Since the technology to detect GMOs exists in Europe and in Canada, what is the minister waiting for to order the mandatory labelling of GMOs, for the benefit of consumers and farmers?

Hon. Gilbert Normand (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we already said that a committee of experts was set up to see if it is advisable to label GMOs.

This week, I met with Australia's chief scientist. Last year, Australia passed a law on the labelling of GMOs. He told us that the law cannot be enforced, because they do not have the scientific means and it costs too much money. We are currently looking at the issue and we will protect the public's health.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN GRAIN COMMISSION

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, problems continue to mount inside the Canadian Grain Commission. The government has had to address a \$20 million cost overrun recently.

There is an ongoing inquiry as to why 70 grain inspectors were off the job recently in Thunder Bay. One inspector is under a gag order for criticizing mismanagement at the place. Now unidentified grain inspectors are sending mail to members of parliament saying they feel stepped on, suppressed, silenced and, frankly, scared of management at the grain commission and the government. How has it deteriorated so much—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Natural Resources.

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has taken some very positive steps, most recently in the latest budget, to deal with the pressures that apply to the Canadian Grain Commission.

Substantial new dollars have been made available which will ensure that the grain commission can continue to provide top quality service protecting the interests of farmers and, at the same time, there will be no fee increases for a period of at least four years.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my point of order arises out of Standing Order 31. You may have noticed that there was a member who did a bit of fundraising for a particular cause during his statement.

Although I have a great deal of sympathy for the cause, which is multiple sclerosis, and I have a great deal of admiration for the person who was named in the statement, I think it would be a mistake if we were to get into the habit or even allow it to pass without comment when members rise in their place and give telephone numbers and addresses as to where people could donate to certain causes.

I think this is something that the Chair might perhaps want to comment on. If there is no rule against it, it seems to me there should be. I just wanted to register my own concern about that particular event.

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to rise on this point but now that the hon. member has raised it, there could be a precedence here that should be looked at either by the Chair, and if not, then perhaps House leaders could arrive at a consensus to make a recommendation, if there is none available, to the Chair immediately.

It seems that using Standing Order 31 for the purpose of fundraising for charitable causes, and in this case a very excellent one, is perhaps a precedent that we should be very careful of setting.

● (1205)

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there is no disputing the value and legitimacy of the question raised by the member. If the House leader of the government has a problem with it, we would be glad to get together with all House leaders to talk about it.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that this issue has come up.

Routine Proceedings

We in the House should also understand and respect the right of each member to submit to the House issues that are important to them. If the information in that S. O. 31 was important to the member then it should also be respected and kept in mind if any decisions are made.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have done a lot of research on non-profit organizations and charities. The reality is that although there are very many worthy charities, sometimes it is impossible to tell when a charity is not worthy. I think it would be a great mistake to set a precedence whereby members would be promoting one charity or another charity when there is always some danger that the charities may, indeed, not be worthy.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair is ready to at least say something on this subject. It is a matter of some concern to the chair, not just because of the point raised today but because there have been other occasions when the Chair occupant has been in the House and has heard statements listing other members' number so people can call and complain or giving various sorts of advertising for different causes. They are sometimes of interest and sometimes of great amusement but they are not always ones that are necessarily widely appreciated on every side.

Being conscious of that and being conscious of the freedom of speech that the Chair seeks to ensure for all hon. members in the House, I respect the submissions that have been made by all hon. members who have said something on this subject.

For the benefit of all hon. members, I will read from page 364 of Marleau-Montpetit. It states:

The Speaker has also cautioned Members not to use this period to make defamatory comments about non-Members, nor to use the verbatim remarks of a private citizen as a statement, nor to make statements of a commercial nature.

Whether we have stepped beyond a charity, to commercial in this case, I am not prepared to rule. I would caution members to exercise discretion in their use of the time they have. It is a one minute statement. There are guidelines. If hon. members feel uncertain about the guidelines I urge them to read chapter 10 of Marleau-Montpetit and conduct themselves accordingly.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker,

pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 30 petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. Rick Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the third report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration with regard to Bill C-16, an act respecting Canadian citizenship.

FINANCE

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Finance regarding its order of reference of Thursday, April 6, 2000 in relation to Bill C-22, an act to facilitate combatting the laundering of the proceeds of crime, to establish a financial transactions or reports analysis centre of Canada and to amend and repeal certain acts in consequence.

The Committee has considered Bill C-22 and reports the bill with amendment.

I want to quickly take the opportunity to thank the clerk, the researchers, the members of the committee, the witnesses and departmental officials for their excellent work.

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 27th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership and associate membership of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, and I should like to move concurrence at this time.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

● (1210)

PETITIONS

PESTICIDES

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present a petition by 25 people in my riding and other areas of Quebec who call on parliament to enact an immediate moratorium on the cosmetic use of chemical pesticides.

[Translation]

That moratorium would be in effect until the safety of these products had been demonstrated and their long term effects known.

[English]

BILL C-23

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present to the House today.

The first petition, although it is late and third reading has already been given, prays that parliament withdraw Bill C-23 and affirm the opposite sex definition of marriage in legislation and ensure that marriage is recognized as a unique institution.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, calls on parliament to prioritize funding for the national highway system, a project very dear to me, in the 2000 budget to reduce fatalities and injuries on the roadways, alleviate congestion, lower vehicle operating costs and reduce emissions, improve Canada's competitiveness, economic development and overall economic prosperity. This is a wonderful petition.

MAMMOGRAPHY

Mr. John Harvard (Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a petition signed by dozens of Canadians who are concerned about the high rate of breast cancer in Canada.

The petitioners point out that Canada has the second highest rate of breast cancer in the world, second only to the United States. They also point out that the U.S. has had a mandatory mammography quality assurance standard since 1994 and that Canada has no legislation for mandatory mammography quality assurance standards.

Therefore, the petitioners call upon parliament to enact legislation to establish an independent governing body to develop, implement and enforce uniform and mandatory mammography quality assurance and quality control standards in Canada.

CHILD POVERTY

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by virtually hundreds of Canadians, most of them from the Victoria and Nanaimo, B.C. area.

The petitioners draw the attention of the House to the fact that one in five Canadian children live in poverty; that on November 24, 1989 the House of Commons unanimously resolved to end child poverty in Canada by the year 2000; and that since 1989 the number of poor children in Canada has increased 60%.

They therefore call upon parliament to use the federal budget 2000 to introduce a multi-year plan to improve the well-being of Canada's children. The budget is already over but the sentiments of these Canadians continues on to other budgets and beyond.

Routine Proceedings

BILL C-23

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a petition calling on the government to withdraw Bill C-23 and affirm the opposite sex definition of marriage in legislation and ensure that marriage is recognized as a unique institution.

You will realize, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Commons did indeed pass Bill C-23. Bill C-23 does include legislation that defines marriage as a union of opposite sex persons and that it has ensured that marriage is recognized as a unique institution.

RURAL ROUTE MAIL COURIERS

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have also another petition from rural route mail couriers who would like to see the government support private member's legislation that would ensure that contract mail couriers could form collective bargaining units. That private member's bill was defeated in the House, but I do urge the government on behalf of the petitioners to look very carefully at the plight of contract rural route mail couriers.

CHILD POVERTY

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the last petition I have concerns the problem of child poverty and asks the government to seriously consider taking measures to improve the situation of children by means of a multi-year plan that will help Canada's children.

• (1215)

I believe this is, generally speaking, very much at the heart of the government's budget that just passed. I urge the government to bear in mind that Canada's children are indeed a concern to all of us.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour on behalf of my constituents to present two petitions today. The first petition concerns immigration and calls for the government to enact much tougher immigration laws than those proposed in Bill C-16. The petitioners ask that people smuggling cease and that Canada no longer be a target.

TAXATION

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is very timely as it has to do with high taxes. Hundreds of people across my riding have signed the petition calling for real tax relief, not the tinkering we see in Bill C-32.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present. The first petition comes from a large number of people in my constituency.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners are concerned that under the Criminal Code of Canada it is currently not a criminal offence for an adult to engage in sexual activity with a young person aged 14 years or older if the young person consents to sexual activity, as long as the adult is not in a position of trust or authority over the young person. The petitioners therefore ask that parliament amend the Criminal Code of Canada to raise the age of consent for sexual activity for a young person from 14 to 18 years of age.

MARRIAGE

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the petitioners who have signed the second petition are concerned about Bill C-23. I am, as well. They suggest that it is an inappropriate intrusion and discriminatory for the federal government to extend benefits based on a person's private sexual activity while excluding other types of dependency relationships.

The petitioners ask that parliament withdraw Bill C-23, affirm the opposite sex definition of marriage in the legislation and ensure that marriage is recognized as a unique institution.

Given the government's record on that issue, a fat lot of good a petition would do.

The last petition I wish to present is related, as well, to Bill C-23. It states that the government has invoked time allocation to cut off debate on Bill C-23 and that the Prime Minister has indicated that a free vote would not be allowed. I see that it was.

The petitioners ask parliament to withdraw Bill C-23, affirming the opposite sex definition of marriage in legislation and ensuring that marriage is recognized as a unique institution.

Given the government's record, once again, a fat lot of good a petition would do.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present today. The first asks parliament to withdraw Bill C-23 and to ensure that marriage is recognized as a unique institution.

DIVORCE

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the second petition pertains to divorce and calls upon parliament to pass legislation incorporating the rights of children and the principles of equality among parents.

CHILD POVERTY

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the last petition which I wish to present today concerns child poverty. The petitioners urge parliament to fulfil the

promise of the 1989 House of Commons resolution to end child poverty by the year 2000.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 57 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 57—**Mrs. Michelle Dockrill:**

For the period covering the last three years, what grants, loans, or interest-free loans have been provided to Scotia Rainbow, Serge Lafrenière, or the Rainbow Group by: (a) Human Resources Development Canada; (b) Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency; (c) Industry Canada; (d) Economic Cape Breton Corporation; (e) Canada-Nova Scotia Infrastructure Program; and (f) Canada-Nova Scotia Cooperation Economic Diversification?

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): I am informed as follows:

(a) In so far as Human Resources Development Canada, HRDC, is concerned only one agreement was contracted with one of the companies mentioned above. HRDC has contracted with Scotia Rainbow, under the transitional jobs fund program. HRDC contributed \$2 million for the fiscal year covering the period of April 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999.

(b) In July 1998, Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, ACOA, made an offer of a \$1 million repayable contribution for the establishment of Scotia Rainbow. In February 1999, ACOA offered a \$150,000 loan to Liscot Enterprises of Pictou County to assist in the construction of an additional building and the purchase of equipment. Subsequent to the offer being accepted, Liscot Enterprises was purchased by Scotia Rainbow Incorporated and the letter of offer was amended to include both companies.

(c) No.

(d) In September 1999, Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, ECBC, offered an \$800,000 conditional interest subsidy to Scotia Rainbow for a period of five years for an expansion project and ACOA offered a \$500,000 repayable contribution for the same project.

(e) No.

(f) No.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if

question No. 25 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 25—**Mr. Charles Caccia:**

How much money in the form of direct grants, loans, tax concessions and other payments have been made available to Spar Aerospace by the Government of Canada since the company's inception?

Return tabled.

[English]

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

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, an act respecting genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes and to implement the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, and to make consequential amendments to other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-19 is, of course, a very important bill that has international and national ramifications here at home. It highlights a very serious situation at a time when our Prime Minister is in the Middle East making numerous comments which have made Canada the focus of the world stage. He has made some very reckless comments, which have been referred to in the House. It is no joking matter. Sadly, some of the commentary that has been highlighted is quite pathetic in nature, and the ramifications are most serious for Canada as our international reputation is very much at stake.

• (1220)

Turning back to the bill at hand, it is very clear that the parlance in this legislation is basically aimed at the defence of disobedience to superiors' orders and peace officers who use a certain type of defence. The bill is aimed, in essence, at scrutinizing very closely

Government Orders

the defence that individuals were simply taking orders when partaking in some of the most heinous crimes imaginable. Instances in which this type of defence is raised and circumstances where the accused has no moral choice as to whether he or she could follow the order are addressed in the bill.

When we refer to moral choice we mean that other particular circumstances might exist where there was such an air of compulsion or threat to the accused that he or she had no alternative but to obey orders. Obviously this argument was maintained throughout the trial of R. v Finta and, for those reasons, on March 24, 1997 the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that Mr. Finta could not be found guilty of the crimes against him. It is a very troubling situation, one that takes a great deal of moral intrusion and comprehension as to the human dynamics that exist when a person in authority is faced with this type of order.

I can assure hon. members, as a former crown prosecutor, that the provisions included in Bill C-19 are very necessary and welcome. It is a shame, however, that rather than amend Canadian law to do away with some of these grey areas when it comes to prosecuting individuals for war crimes or crimes against humanity, or when these specific defences are invoked, the federal government opted instead for a course of action whereby war criminals could be deported to their native country as a temporary solution to the problem at hand.

However, with that said, this is a very complicated process because in most cases the events in question took place as far back as the second world war and sometimes before. Many of those events that date back 50 years are increasingly difficult to deal with, simply because the individuals who may be involved or who may be able to give evidence are no longer available or, in some cases, are no longer living or no longer compos mentis.

The individuals who perpetrated war crimes and crimes against humanity under the Nazi regime fall very much into the latter category.

Furthermore, the same problems surface when justice department officials attempt to find witnesses to those events to justify the extradition or the prosecution. Evidence sometimes goes missing and key witnesses, as referred to, may no longer be available.

[Translation]

As I mentioned earlier, the offences of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity committed outside Canada are covered under clause 6 of Bill C-19. Contrary to the three offences defined in clause 4, those in clause 6 are based on the provisions of international law existing at the time they are committed.

[English]

Henceforth, perpetrators of genocide, crimes against humanity or war crimes could be brought to justice regardless of where the

Government Orders

crime was committed. Furthermore, pursuant to subclause 6(4), the crimes in question could be dealt with if they were committed prior to July 17, 1998, the date on which the Rome Statute was adopted by the United Nations. As such, the bill applies retroactively.

I congratulate again all members of the committee and the minister for bringing this bill to fruition. In that precaution, if this had not taken place, this bill would have been, some would argue, irrelevant.

Another particularity of the bill is that in the case of war crimes or crimes against humanity or genocide committed outside Canada or within Canada, clauses 5 and 7 of the bill make it an offence for a military commander or other superior to fail to take reasonable steps or exercise proper control over one or more military or civilian person under their command. As a result, very serious offences may sometimes be committed.

• (1225)

In the case of offences committed outside Canada, subclause 7(5) provides for criminal prosecution before the coming into force of Bill C-19, to the extent that at the time and place of the act of omission the latter constitutes a contravention of customary or conventional international law.

This means that the offender may be prosecuted if the criminal act according to the general principles of law is recognized by the community of nations, whether or not it constituted a contravention of law in force at the time and in the place of its commission.

Bill C-19 is fairly complete, as it gives jurisdiction to Canadian courts in the case of offences committed outside Canada through clause 8. This clause also recognizes that Canadian courts have the authority to prosecute any person charged with having committed specific acts, providing one of the conditions is listed exists.

For instance, if a person was a Canadian citizen or was employed by Canada at the time, perhaps in a civilian or military capacity, or if the victim was a Canadian citizen, there may be some attachment to Canadian law.

The Conservative Party supports this idea. Canadian courts also have jurisdiction to prosecute if, at the time the offence was committed, Canada could, in conformity with international law, exercise jurisdiction over the person with respect to the offence on the basis of that person's presence in Canada before or after said criminal offence.

As I mentioned, the defence of superior orders, which is perhaps one of the most compelling and interesting aspects of this bill, and the defences which stem from it, can be used, barring a few exceptions. The defence of superior orders should be in compliance with the provisions set out in the Rome Statute.

Therefore, an accused cannot base his defence solely on the belief that it was an order if it was unlawful and if the belief was based on information about a civilian population or an identified group of people who encouraged the commission of inhumane acts or omissions against the population or group. There is potential for prosecution.

Bill C-19 puts aside the Finta decision, to all intents and purposes, and is a good step toward the pursuit of justice. Bill C-19, because of its complexity and because of the objective it pursues, also makes it an offence to possess or launder property obtained as a result of the commission of the proposed new offences. This is a good provision.

Canada and the Progressive Conservative Party fully support the principle that no one should profit from war crimes. Obviously there is potential for further legislation. If the government wanted to make sure that all war criminals would and could be convicted, other laws might have to be modified. I am referring to the Citizenship Act and the Extradition Act which, through their new provisions, would make it easier to prosecute.

[Translation]

Clause 33 of Bill C-19 would amend the Citizenship Act so that while a person is under investigation by the Minister of Justice, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or the Canadian Security Intelligence Service for one of the offences in Bill C-9, that person shall not be granted citizenship or take the oath of citizenship.

[English]

With respect to Bill C-19, Canada now has an obligation to surrender people caught by the ICC for genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes.

Pursuant to section 48 of the Extradition Act, a person who is the subject on a request for surrender cannot claim immunity from arrest or extradition under common law or by statute under the Extradition Act.

In conclusion, by stating that victims of war crimes have suffered terrible ordeals is to understate the obvious. Through Bill C-19 Canada takes the position that no war criminal is safe or welcome within our borders.

This is a positive undertaking on behalf of the government which is supported, I believe, by all opposition parties. The Progressive Conservative Party also affirms this principle. Canada cannot tolerate our wonderful country being used as a safe haven to escape responsibility for acts so heinous and so atrocious against humanity.

There will be ample opportunity to review further provisions within this bill. As it moves to committee, there will be opportunity to modify and perhaps improve upon this legislation at that time.

• (1230)

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to have participated in this very important debate.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, when we look at this legislation, it appears on the face of it to be a good thing. We all have concerns about human rights and war crimes. We would have to say that the devil is in the details or in some cases lack of details in respect to some of these things. There are some very vague definitions and in other cases, no definitions at all.

Our party supports war crime tribunals in practice and the apprehension, trial, conviction and punishment by due process of genuine war criminals. However, we have some serious reservations about the international criminal court. We have these reservations because the statutes that were agreed to in Rome in 1998 regarding the international criminal court were negotiated without adequate public consultation and input from parliament. They were negotiated with the aid of NGOs that did not represent the values and principles of most Canadians. The international criminal court is flawed in several ways. From the larger perspective of international treaties in general, we see that there needs to be a democratic reform of the whole treaty-making process in Canada.

An esteemed member of the Bloc yesterday put forward a private member's bill in regard to this whole problem. We agree to these international treaties without ever having scrutinized them within this House and without having had any discussion or forum across the country. We see the same problem in what is before us today.

Our party supports foreign policy guided by the values and the principles of Canadians, that is political democracy, economic freedom and human rights. Therefore, we support in principle the idea of war crimes tribunals. However, as I said, the international criminal court threatens to become an unaccountable institution with power to investigate, prosecute, indict and try citizens of Canada, thus undermining Canadian sovereignty and Canadian justice. As a new and permanent international institution, the international criminal court creates a new power hungry United Nations type of bureaucracy.

Canada and its like-minded allies failed to win the support of the United States and some other critical countries around the world. Without that support, the input and the co-operation of those major countries in the world, how can the international criminal court ever be effective or ensure true justice?

The international criminal court threatens to become an international stick in the hands of rogue states and special interest groups in particular to beat the United States and its allies, including Canada. That would be the primary intent of certain of those who are involved. The international criminal court could undermine the ability of UN members to act in the interests of international

Government Orders

security and peace, for example, stopping Saddam Hussein or sending a message to terrorists. Charter and common law rights such as the right to a fair trial by jury would not be guaranteed under the international criminal court.

The federal government paid for special interest groups to attend five weeks of meetings in and to advise the Canadian delegation. I do not have time to speak today about some of the shenanigans and games that were played. There were secret meetings off to the side. Certain other Canadian people were shut out because it was known that they would oppose certain elements and aspects of the international criminal court.

The failure to consult with Canadians about what is wanted at the international criminal court is a major problem. Canadians were again left out of the process as they were at Kyoto and with the MAI, the multilateral agreement on investment. This situation is no different.

We believe that the people, through parliament, should have an oversight of treaty making and international agreements well before it gets to the stage where we have our leaders signing.

The international criminal court will have power to investigate. I think we are pretty much agreed in terms of the war crimes area, but there are other vague terms such as crimes of aggression that are used where it is left wide open to judges from around the world who will constitute the tribunal to interpret. It is another reason why we have some serious reservations about this.

• (1235)

We support human rights objectives in co-operation with international organizations. Such activities must be the result of free and sovereign Canadian initiatives acted at the will of parliament through international instruments of our choice and not the other way around. The emphasis should be on working with them as that suggests a voluntary nature of working alongside them instead of an element of coercion as is the case here. This is another reason why we have for many decades now supported ad hoc tribunals, agencies with a sunset provision rather than permanent bureaucracies and the concept of an unaccountable international court.

Some supporters are calling for empowering this court to prosecute not only war crimes and things of that sort, but to prosecute drug trafficking, something we should be going after, as well as such other vague offences as serious threats to the environment and committing outrages on personal dignity, whatever that possibly could mean. This is the direction many individuals are pushing this to go. Obviously we do have concerns about some of that.

As an alliance, we are certainly prepared to work with international organizations, but we feel it should be our Canadian parliament first and foremost that makes decisions. We should not give up our sovereignty.

Government Orders

I want to read for the record part of a letter from a rather outstanding individual, Judge Eli Nathan, head of the delegation of Israel to the UN diplomatic conference where this was being discussed. I read this into the record because Israel was one of the countries that over the years because of the Holocaust and so on has had a real strong interest in a court, generally speaking, of this nature. Israel initiated this.

Israel was the original country to come up with this idea and has been promoting it because of the terrible injustices and genocide committed against its people. I think it rather significant and very noteworthy that Israel itself had to back away and could not vote in favour of the statutes agreed upon by other countries. Israel, as one of the prime movers of this, had to back away and could not give its approval. I will cite at least one of its major concerns but it has other concerns as well.

The letter from Judge Eli Nathan states:

Mr. President, it causes me considerable pain, both personally as a victim of the Nazi persecution of the Jewish people, and on behalf of the Israeli delegation which I proudly head, to have to explain the negative vote which Israel has been unwillingly obliged to cast today with regard to the Statute of the International Criminal Court.

It is no secret that out of the embers of the Holocaust against the Jewish people—the greatest and most heinous crime to have been committed in the history of mankind, came the calls of Jews throughout the world, and leading Israeli lawyers and statesmen, as far back as the early 1950s, for the establishment of an International Criminal Court, as a vital means of ensuring that criminals who commit such heinous and terrible crimes will be duly brought to justice. This was, Mr. President. . .our idea!

He said “With this aim in mind, Mr. President,” and having regard to the world renowned judiciary established in Israel, we have enthusiastically and quite responsibly been involved at the earlier stages here.

The letter goes on to point out and make the particular point:

We therefore fail to comprehend why it has been considered necessary to insert into the list of the most heinous and grievous war crimes, the action of transferring population into occupied territory, as it appears in Article 8, Paragraph 2(b), subpara.viii.

Without entering here into the question of the substantive status of any particular alleged violation of the Geneva Convention. . .can it really be held that such an action as that listed in Article 8 above really ranks among the most heinous and serious war crimes—

That refers to the resettling of people as they have done in the Middle East. We can question that but there are many in the world who do not accept that on the rank of a heinous war crime or the nature of the others listed. He asks whether:

—this has been inserted as a means of utilising and abusing the Statute of the International Criminal Court and the International Criminal Court itself as one more political tool in the Middle East conflict?

That gets to the nub of it.

• (1240)

This international criminal court already has become very politicized and will be more than ever because of the special interest groups that are involved, the radical feminist groups and the anti-family groups and so on. It will be a very politicized tool in the hands of elite and special interest groups.

One of the delegates, this esteemed judge from Israel, goes on to say:

Despite all our entreaties, during the discussions of the Prep-Com as well as here in Rome and directly to capitols, this paragraph still remains as a symbol of politicization, sullyng the entire Statute.

He went on to say:

Mr. President, neither the Delegation of Israel nor other delegations have been given the opportunity to vote against inclusion in the Statute of Article 8, Paragraph 2(b), sub-para.viii.

He further talks about his frustration at this politicization of the statute and the court. Then he goes on to say:

Mr. President, Israel has other problems with the Statute, which we will address at the appropriate time.

It is very insightful and eye-opening to understand that a country, which of all should most be concerned and wanting something like this, has grave concerns with the direction this has taken.

I mentioned before the matter of overriding our national sovereignty. This permanent international body, if that is what it becomes, could be very unaccountable and might override the sovereignty of our nation’s legal and government systems.

Some people defend it and say that it has been structured so that the sovereignty of nations will remain primordial, and it does so by requiring the enactment of domestic legislation as before us in each ratifying state, which gives that sovereign state both the judicial equipment and the right to prosecute suspected cases of the said crimes domestically.

We would rebut that by saying that requiring an enactment of legislation does not allay our fears. The legislation may simply enact the signing away of Canada’s sovereignty.

Actually, while the legislation gives Canada the right to prosecute suspected cases of said crimes, there is a whole list of them and there are some vagaries in there as well, we do have the right to prosecute domestically. It also imposes not only a right but an obligation to do so with the penalty being that the international criminal court will step in and take over if in its judgment Canada does not fulfil its obligations.

Our courts over the course of time, including the supreme court, are dangerously close to conceding Canada’s sovereignty. For example, a recent decision in the Supreme Court of Canada states

that international covenants have no direct application within Canadian law, however, it goes on to say:

Nevertheless, the values reflected in international human rights laws may help inform the contextual approach to statutory interpretation and judicial review. . . The legislature is presumed to respect the value and principles enshrined—

In whatever international law happens to be out there.

In so far as possible, therefore, interpretations that reflect these values and principles are preferred.

Referring to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Chief Justice Antonio Lamer gave impetus to that when he said:

—the Charter can be understood to give effect to Canada's international legal obligations, and should therefore be interpreted in a way that conforms to those obligations.

What we are saying here is that we have in effect been invoking international arguments about which Canadians and their legitimate lawmakers were never properly consulted, and that is the problem, getting back to the ceding of our sovereignty to other countries.

What we also find somewhat disconcerting is the fact that Bill C-19 writes a blank cheque. What I find rather disturbing is the fact that the rules of procedure and evidence are currently being negotiated through a series of meetings of prep-coms which include delegations from signatory states and other interested states.

The details of precise meetings, of terms found in the statute, evidence and court procedures and administrative structure are to be concluded in consensus agreements adjacent to, not part of, after the fact, it seems. It is kind of like buying a pig in a poke or signing a blank cheque for these things to be worked out over the course of time, but we already agreed to be part of the deal.

The negotiations address some of the critical and fundamental issues, the things that as we said before are not discussed here in parliament. Issues such as the definition of aggression and other terms, the conditions of imprisonment, judicial protocol are controversial issues. All of these decisions taken at these negotiations should be subject to the input and ratification of parliament, otherwise the values of Canadians might not be adequately enshrined in the law, the structure and procedure of the criminal court.

• (1245)

I also draw attention to something which may be of interest to some. Some words make up new terms and expressions in a surreptitious manner. I draw attention to some of the concerns from the pro-family, pro-life perspective.

There were certain things with respect to the protection of family and so on which some of the Mideast and Arab nations wanted to be put in yet they were turned aside. They have grave concerns

Government Orders

about the intrusion into family and imposing our culture, a western mindset if you will, on some of the other cultures. Some of the Arab states are concerned about removing protection for families.

Another one is in terms of respect for life or a pro-life point of view. They realized they could not get abortion into the statutes, so instead they talked about enforced pregnancy. That was a new one to me. What is enforced pregnancy? We find out as we begin to read the material and get at a definition of what they have in mind. An enforced pregnancy is where a woman has become pregnant, a wife or a girlfriend, and she has to carry the child for nine months. I think this is a beautiful and wonderful thing. An enforced pregnancy is when there is no access to abortion so in effect the pregnancy has to run its course.

Countries that do not have abortion facilities nor provide that option to women would be subject to the International Criminal Court. An enforced pregnancy has to go its nine months because the abortion clinic or facility is not available. It would be a punishable crime if a country did not provide abortion clinics.

For example, in 1992 in the state of Utah, the American Civil Liberties Association came up with this new, strange and perverse wording. It argued that the law caused enforced pregnancy because there was no possibility of an abortion, that a woman had to carry and give birth to a child, that it was an intolerable and dehumanizing form of servitude. It said that it was an awful, atrocious thing and tantamount to a war crime, a crime against humanity.

A lot of special interest groups have got in at the very beginning and are pushing their point of view in a pretty persistent way. In fact these groups can have individuals helping out in the International Criminal Court, funded by wealthy individuals, the billionaires of this world, and of course are beholden somewhat to those individuals.

Instead of the International Criminal Court, we should support the continuation of the concept of ad hoc international tribunals. Such tribunals would not be permanent. They would always remain ad hoc and subject to "sunset provisions" as are the tribunals that operate at present. An ad hoc body has the advantage of being able to be set up and dismantled again by sovereign governments.

The bureaucrats of ad hoc bodies in turn can be removed at the will of elected parliamentarians by dismantling these bodies. That is why officials and bureaucrats are keen supporters of a permanent body that is not subject to the will of the electorate or the public in any one country.

Primarily, because of the imposition of international law, and we have a good law system here in Canada, there is an overriding of our sovereignty. The vagueness of some of the definitions leaves room to shoehorn in some rather strange terms that impose other

Government Orders

cultures upon certain countries around the world, to which we have major objections.

In effect we are signing a blank cheque. The rules of procedure and evidence, which are well established and have stood the test of time in our country and within the British Commonwealth, are still being made up on the fly. We would be signing on to something over which we would not have proper control with respect to that.

For those and other reasons, notably that there are certain major countries around the world that have grave concerns, it is not a good thing for our country. Countries like Israel no less have not been able to sign on because of the politicization of the International Criminal Court.

It may suit the Liberal government and its agenda of soft power, but frankly we think for a whole host of reasons, it is not a good thing to do. As a Canadian Alliance government coming into power, we would have to revoke and pull back on this.

• (1250)

Hon. David Kilgour (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the hon. member for Wanuskewin.

Does he not think that Bill C-19 deals with some very important issues of implementing a process by which people cannot commit crimes against humanity? Genocide and war crimes are defined in the bill. Is he suggesting to the House that this bill is not trying to deal with an extremely important question in the world today?

I do not know if the member was here when President Václav Havel from the Czech Republic was here. He talked about the fact that in the new century the nation-state concept was giving ground to wider responsibilities. From everything I have read and know of him, I suggest that Václav Havel would be supportive of this.

What is in the bill that any citizen of goodwill in Canada or another country would not support? With Kosovo, Rwanda and with all of the catastrophes we have seen around the world, this bill is something all of us should support, not just members on this side of the House.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciate the question asked by the hon. member. There is no doubt in my mind that he has probably looked at the greater document, the United Nations Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the establishment of an International Criminal Court, the five weeks of meetings in Rome and some of the other things. I referred to the Israeli concern in terms of the politicization of the whole thing.

No, I am of the view that we need to prosecute and pursue these people to the full extent of the law. We need to go after them. We have to reach into these different countries and so on. I think we

can do that by the ad hoc tribunals of the past. I am not sure what this is going to do that we have not already been able to do. If we cannot get access to those people by way of ad hoc tribunals, how will we be able to do it by way of this?

I am also very much aware, and no doubt the hon. member is somewhat aware, that over the years we have had the aspect of victors' justice. I have never seen a situation historically. These bodies when they came together for prosecution, it was always from the perspective of the conquerors and not the vanquished. We look at some of this stuff within the International Criminal Court. If we were to go back to some of the actions that were taken on the part of the victors, they sometimes deserve due consideration but in the real world that probably will not happen. I have concerns for that reason as well.

There are different cultural backgrounds. Frankly, to load all that into a situation would on many occasions be an imposition of a western mindset or world view in respect to other countries.

I believe that we could address these things, as we have in the past, by ad hoc tribunals. I am not convinced that this is any improvement. In fact, I see all kinds of flaws and problems in terms of usurping our country's sovereignty.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, like the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa, I am mystified at how anybody can find fault with what is being put forward today. I cannot understand how people can fail to see it and mix in as part of the argument such narrow and parochial views such as abortion or whatever special interest group the hon. member happens to represent.

It strikes me that the hon. member for Wanuskewin has failed to recognize that the international institutions to deal with these things are inadequate. They were not adequate during Kosovo. We bumbled our way through the Balkans. The whole world, as are hon. members and guests who have visited this House recently, is calling out to leaders around the world to come together. If we are going to have the globalization of capital, we must also have the globalization of human rights, labour standards, environmental standards and the rule of law in order to enforce those newly agreed upon standards.

• (1255)

I do not want the hon. member to restate the arguments he has already put forward which I thought were very weak. Does the hon. member have any way to defend his position other than dredging up his family values, special interests, abortion and so on? I ask the hon. member to leave that stuff to the side and honestly try to address how to defend or criticize a concept of an international institution that is capable of dealing with the very complex issues of globalization and globalization standards.

Government Orders

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Madam Speaker, I certainly will. As I move to do that I do not apologize for my pro-family concerns. I do not apologize for acting on behalf of Arab families and these were the states that brought these concerns forward.

I will say when we have brought into the International Criminal Court some of the statements and others pushing for other things with respect to environmental issues and those being tantamount or ranking equally with crimes against humanity, war crimes and so on, I have considerable concerns about that. We would begin to shoehorn all other kinds of things. We talk in terms of aggressions that are undefined. What exactly do we mean by that?

Yes, I am concerned that this would become captive to special interest groups that would drive the agenda. We already have enough issues in terms of judicial activism within our own country, never mind some unaccountable group of the United Nations which would be entrenched forever. We have no way of recalling those people. We have dollars to no end that are wasted in my view on some of the United Nations activities.

This just adds another big monster with respect to trying to do things that can be done effectively in other ways. Sunset clause tribunals that are ad hoc over a shorter period of time can get to the same result.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak today to Bill C-19, on the issue of the International Criminal Court, its purpose and relationship to Canadian law and rules.

I will do an overview on the purpose of the International Criminal Court. It is designed to be a permanent institution that would prosecute serious crimes of international concern. It is designed to be complementary to national criminal jurisdictions.

I note that our Minister of Foreign Affairs is vigorously supportive of this court. On September 25, 1998 when the minister appeared before the UN General Assembly he said, "A strong reinvigorated United Nations is still the best foundation for the future. The contours of that future are emerging. A new system based on humanitarian standards and new practices based on humanitarian needs and human security is emerging. Also enhancing human security requires establishing new legal instruments. The agreement in Rome which establishes the ICC, the International Criminal Court, is a major step toward that goal". Our minister has stated publicly and internationally that he supports this initiative.

In trying to review issues like this one I believe in doing an equilibrium or balance. I will try to do that today to lay out some of the positives behind the bill, this institution, this court and then highlight some of the potential concerns which I think could well be addressed and should be addressed.

On the positive side, the crimes are defined pretty specifically as crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. A reasonable thinking Canadian citizen would say that any of those things should be prosecuted, should be taken care of and should see sanctions.

• (1300)

A second positive aspect would be that war criminals would have difficulty hiding. In this modern day of rapid communication it would be very difficult for a war criminal from another country to hide. With international scrutiny and the scrutiny of the public, I think that would surely be a positive. This process would leave the right to prosecute still with the nation's judicial system. In other words, if Canada had a war criminal living here, we could prosecute that individual here under Canadian law. To my mind that would be appropriate.

Another thing I find positive is that the bill is a forward looking bill which could not look backward at crimes committed before the bill was enacted. We have a bill which is trying to look at things that most reasonable thinking individuals would say are horrific. They should not be condoned. They should not be allowed. They should be prosecuted. To that end those are the positives.

What concerns are there related to going down this road? One of the concerns is about national sovereignty. When there are extra country bodies there is a concern about national sovereignty.

I listened to my colleague from the NDP, which is regularly against globalization when it relates to financial issues, praising globalization of court issues. That is one thing I would like to engage in, in terms of an information gathering source. If globalization is bad with these big international companies coming in and taking over, and I think that is a legitimate concern in some cases, how is it that suddenly globalization of a court system would cause no anxiety whatsoever? There seems to be a bit of an imbalance in that debate.

National sovereignty is a concern. Would the prosecutor have powers that would override national laws? I am not certain that I have the answer to that. I pose that more as a question than as a statement of fact.

The second big issue for me is accountability. That is a buzzword phrase these days in politics. By that I mean that if there is an expansion of rules relating to specified crimes, if there is a problem with the bureaucracy growing and becoming very expensive, are those mechanisms of accountability present? In my reading of this issue that is another question mark. The regulations which go with these processes often do not follow the line or the trend intended. Accountability is a second concern.

Government Orders

There is the issue of cost. It would be a very foolish politician who said "Here is a blank cheque. Let's have an international court that is not subject to cost". I listened to those who said that war crimes tribunals would be more expensive than an international criminal court. I have yet to see an international organization save money, especially one run by politicians and bureaucrats.

The politicization of some of these issues, these war crimes, is another concern I have. I will use the specific example of expansion. I said before that one of the big crimes was crimes against humanity. That is a very broad categorization. During war crimes rape is one of the horrific crimes. No one would argue with that.

• (1305)

Another crime under crimes against humanity is enslavement. If someone were to ask me if a soldier enslaving a group of individuals would be a war crime, my answer would be categorically yes. To bring people under bondage is a crime against humanity.

What if the definitions went a little further? In a relatively more narrow form the family position in many Arab countries is that the woman stays home, covered and does not have much interchange with the masculine component of society. What if that were to become enslavement?

I have heard from members of Arab nations that they have concerns in that regard. How would I prevent those definitions expanding? The means to do that so there are no court challenges would be to have very specific definitions of enslavement. I will not go deeper into that, but the specific way in which those crimes are defined is very important in something of this nature.

I mentioned briefly the issue of globalization. There are many who think that globalization is absolutely ideal when it comes to economic issues. There are many who think that globalization is absolutely ideal when it comes to a large police force in the world to do peacekeeping. There are many who think that globalization is ideal with regard to a court system for these crimes.

I raise my own personal concerns because I have not seen good accountability, good cost control and a lack of politicization at that level. The idea of going after criminals worldwide for heinous crimes is one that any sound thinking Canadian would support vigorously. The bill may end up being supportable. Bill C-19 may end up having enough definition and specificity brought to it. I certainly hope that would be the case.

I will pause in my commentary on the international criminal court and sum up by saying that I believe this could move toward a point where it is supportable. At this point in time, in terms of the positive and the negative, maybe we need to tip the scales of balance a bit to bring in more of the positive before I could personally support the way the bill is laid out.

Hon. David Kilgour (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member who just spoke indicates it is one hand or the other for him, but does he not think that there is much that is positive in the bill?

Anybody who has been, for example, to Rwanda has seen the bodies of people as I have in the schools that are still there. Does he not think that we need something like this that will help us to bring to justice people who commit these crimes outside Canada?

I know the member admires Václav Havel too. Was this not the kind of thing that President Havel was talking about when he spoke to the House not so long ago? What would it take to tip the balance for the hon. member so that he could support the bill?

Mr. Grant Hill: Madam Speaker, I value the opinion of the member opposite. I have always found him to be a very fair and balanced individual. The positives that I mentioned of course were not allowing war criminals to escape by hiding in a jurisdiction, the definitions of the crimes and having an oversight.

The concerns I have relate to expanding definitions of some of these crimes and having an impact on cultures which do not operate like those in Canada. I do not think it would be impossible to make the bill very supportable. The definitions of the war crimes would need to be pretty specific. They would have to exclude some things that activists might go after. I do not mean to spend a lot of time on that, but issues of costs and accountability would be very well and properly laid out.

• (1310)

One thing I did not mention was the comparison between the ad hoc tribunals that we have had and a permanent operation. My long term hope is that this sort of thing would not be necessary, that we would be able to co-operate in an international way, and that brotherhood and wonderful values would prevail. Perhaps the eternal optimist in me is showing.

I do not think my concerns are insurmountable. I would hope that we could review these things in a good and open spirited dialogue.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, my question is with respect to some of the other material in the Statutes of Rome. I am referring to a rather intriguing section in chapter 6 under genocide.

How would the member define the things included under article 6(b)? It talks about causing mental harm to members of the group. In another place I read in article 8(c)(ii) that it talks about committing outrageous acts upon personal dignity. Would the

Government Orders

member have a way of defining or telling me exactly what that means?

Mr. Grant Hill: Madam Speaker, I believe those definitions are not specific enough for me. I think my colleague is moving in the same direction as I am. If we are to define crimes against humanity, let us be specific. Most of us understand that these are major crimes such as genocide. Wiping out a population for political purposes is absolutely against everything I believe in. Since time immemorial we have had people who have purposes that I do not understand.

Let us not go down the road of politicization. Let us not go down the road of saying that if there were a war and a host of people were being held in an area against their will would somehow be the definition of crimes against humanity.

I talk about murder. I talk about rape. I talk about torture. I talk about the awful things that happen. Let us make sure that we stay on real true crimes against humanity rather than going to some idea that is hard to define such as mental cruelty. I have real trouble with that in my own family. I sometimes think my teenagers practise mental cruelty on me. I hope I would not be confined for that.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, the debate today on Bill C-19 concerns setting up an International Criminal Court that would deal with serious issues like genocide and various other crimes between nations and internally.

The idea for this court came up after the serious issues of the second world war involving the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials. It also came from the current United Nations special war crimes tribunals which arose out of Yugoslavia and Rwanda.

On July 18, 1988, under the auspices of the United Nations General Assembly, Canada along with 119 other countries signed a treaty that would bring into force the International Criminal Court. This court is intended to be a permanent court with a permanent bureaucracy. The treaty was specifically referred to as the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

This court would have the power to investigate, prosecute, indict and try persons for the most serious crimes of international concern. These include genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression which are open to wide interpretation by judges from around the world who would be sitting on this tribunal.

• (1315)

In short, the purpose of the ICC is to prosecute war crimes, including internal acts of repression. This is where we begin to question the interpretation that the various judges would use and

bring into effect judge graded law, I guess, on an international scale. It is my understanding that the regulations and other issues setting up this court are not in place at this time. To a certain extent, we are buying a pig in a poke on this treaty with not knowing those very things.

We in the Canadian Alliance certainly support foreign policy that is guided by values and the principles of Canadians. In trying to set up one court that would encompass the beliefs and traditions of the whole world, it is hard to see that being done in a very effective and efficient manner or even in a manner that would deal fairly and justly with individual countries around the world.

That is one of the arguments why ad hoc courts have been set up to deal with specific incidents that arise as opposed to trying to say, before the crime is even committed, that we will be imposing this set of values on those people in that country when it may be culturally insensitive and not in keeping with the traditions in that area of the world.

A specific country or individuals in a specific country who are committing crimes against humanity certainly cannot be tolerated, but I question whether or not this permanent court is the best way to address those crimes.

The ICC threatens to become a powerful, unaccountable institution with power to investigate, prosecute, indict and try citizens of even Canada. Here we would run into the interpretation of the courts as to what constitutes this crime when that may be something we would consider a crime in Canada but a crime that should be dealt with internally as opposed to a crime that this court and the United Nations would feel should be dealt with on the international scene. That is a serious consideration.

I do not believe it has been demonstrated that the United Nations has the capacity to run an international criminal court without making it as ineffective as some of its programs and the bureaucracy set up to handle issues of starvation and so on around the world. It always seems that individual countries end up having to come to the aid of other countries that are experiencing problems that the UN seems incapable of doing anything about because of the gigantic bureaucracy it has put in place. It is a bureaucracy that has been put in place not by an elected government necessarily. The bureaucracy is made up of people who were appointed, often patronage appointments, from the member countries of the UN that puts these people in place.

What we could see with a permanent court is virtually permanent employees of the bureaucracy and permanent appointments to that court that would not be in the best interests of many people and many countries. As Canadians, we have to very seriously consider national interests and national values as to what we believe is a criminal justice system. Even between ourselves and Europe there is a difference in how criminal justice systems work. I do not

Government Orders

believe the negotiations that were entered into to bring this treaty forward really considered all the various aspects.

● (1320)

From our government's point of view, prior to the signing, besides the non-government organizations that were funded by the federal government, we should have obtained more input from the general population of Canada and from the opposition members in the House of Commons.

I believe that the ICC could undermine the ability of the United Nations to act in the interests of international security and peace. One example would be stopping Saddam Hussein or sending a message to international terrorists. I do not see how, at this point in time, we can get away from the co-ordinated efforts, such as we have under NATO, to take care of these serious international issues. The United Nations just does not have that capacity. Giving the United Nations a permanent criminal court would not seem to be the way to go at this point in history.

I do not think the world is ready yet for a world government. There is a lot of resistance out in the ridings when people consider that there is this bogeyman set up as the world government. When we talk about permanent institutions like a criminal court, that is what is happening. I appreciate that it is not designed for every small offence inside a country, but it does smack of having one world government, which is certainly not in the best interests of individualism, freedom or democracy as we know it in Canada.

I support the concept and the continuation of the ad hoc international tribunals that have been dealing with war crimes and international situations. These tribunals should never be made permanent. Instead, I argue that they should always remain ad hoc, subject to sunset provisions as the tribunals are presently operating.

My main reason for saying that is that a permanent international body would essentially be unaccountable and would, as experience with other international organizations have shown, become a rogue type entity to the sovereignty of elected parliaments and legislatures. Not every country that appoints people to this court would be democratic. Many countries in this world are still run by dictatorships.

The ad hoc bodies have the advantage that they can be set up and dismantled by sovereign governments and by governments that have a direct concern and interest in the area and might have the military strength. In the case of Canada, which has little or no military strength, it could make a strong, morally persuasive effort for which we have a good reputation on the international scene. The world would be much better served by having that type of ad hoc court which would be more sensitive to the very incident that has given rise to the complaint of war crimes.

In conclusion, war crimes are something that every one of us has lived with in our lifetimes. We can certainly go back into recent history and see the war crimes that were committed. It is of very serious concern to all of us.

However, rather than just submitting a good idea forward to our foreign affairs minister and certain other people around the world, maybe the majority of people will not be in agreement with that. Countries with a long history of democracy, such as the United States or Israel, have very serious concerns about this treaty.

● (1325)

I think we would be remiss as a government in Canada and as Canadian people to approve a treaty that is deficient in any way. When the majority of the world, including a major power like the United States, have their questions answered, along with the serious questions we have raised here today as part of the Canadian Alliance, that is the time we could consider having a permanent court.

Hon. David Kilgour (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.): Madam Speaker, does the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake, who stressed what he regards as the financial unaccountability of the international court, accept the fact that there is an assembly of states parties that will elect the prosecutor and judges for the court on the basis of established qualifications, that the assembly will be able to remove judges for improper conduct, will have management oversight of budgets and will audit the operations of the court?

Does this international court not have a good deal of accountability? I would contend that it has a lot more accountability than the present ad hoc tribunals do, at least the one in Arusha. Perhaps the member is aware that there have been all kinds of administrative and other problems with the ad hoc tribunal operating in Arusha.

Is it not more cost effective to have a standing court rather than continually reinventing the wheel, such as we have had to do in the case of the ad hoc tribunals?

The member said that we were buying a pig in a poke. That is a good metaphor but where is the pig and where is the poke? It seems to me that this court is something that has been shrieked for by what has been happening around the world, which the member knows very well. I would urge him to reconsider what he said about the lack of accountability in the bill.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Madam Speaker, the pig in a poke comment referred to the fact that it would be nice to have all the regulations and everything set out beforehand so that we could know fully how the court will actually operate and how it will be put into place.

When it comes to war crimes, I do not believe that cost is a big concern when trying to deal with the actual issue, but I am concerned with costs that are imposed by a bureaucracy that has been put in place.

I do not think the hon. member opposite can deny that the bureaucracy of the United Nations has been really unaccountable. We saw several countries, including the United States, withhold payments in order to get the United Nations to become more accountable and more efficient. I think its agriculture department was one of those that was identified.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member is aware that article 44 in the documents from Rome provides that the international criminal court may employ, free of charge, expertise of personnel provided by state members and individual NGOs. To me that will mean that well-funded radical groups will be stacking this court with their selected radicals. Article 105 also provides that the \$80 million annual cost to the ICC could be defrayed by voluntary donations.

I wonder if he has a concern that groups like the Rockefeller and Ford foundations will be contributing to the court with many strings attached.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Madam Speaker, certainly non-elected organizations, which are non-government organizations, should have input into government policy in their home countries. However, to be so directly involved on the international scene affecting the sovereignty of countries like our own is unacceptable to me.

• (1330)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

PETITIONS

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Private Members' Business

I. That Standing Order 36(8) be amended to read as follows:

Except in the case of a petition referred to the Chief Electoral Officer pursuant to section (1) of Standing Order 36.1, every petition presented pursuant to this Standing Order shall forthwith be transmitted to the Ministry, which shall, within forty-five days, respond to every petition referred to it; provided that the said response may be tabled pursuant to Standing Order 32(1). In the case of a petition referred to the Chief Electoral Officer pursuant to section (1) of Standing Order 36.1, it shall be transmitted to the Ministry for response pursuant to this section only if the Chief Electoral Officer reports that it does not comply with Standing Order 36.1(1), or, if it complies, the motion pursuant to Standing Order 36.1(2) is defeated by the House.

II. That the Standing Orders be amended by adding new Standing Orders 36.1, 36.2 and 36.3:

36.1(1) At the request of the Member presenting a petition, or if no request is made at the time of the presentation of the petition, by any other Member giving notice in writing to the Clerk, a petition which has been presented in accordance with Standing Order 36 and which purports to be signed by two per cent of the persons entitled to vote in the last general election to the House of Commons may be referred to the Chief Electoral Officer, who shall determine within forty-two days whether the petition complies with this requirement by counting the signatures and verifying such proportion of them as is in his or her opinion reasonable. The Chief Electoral Officer shall make a report of his or her findings to the Speaker within the time specified, and such report shall forthwith be submitted by the Speaker to the House of Commons.

(2) If the report of the Chief Electoral Officer is that the petition complies with the requirement set out in section (1) of this Standing Order, immediately after the said report is submitted by the Speaker to the House of Commons, the Clerk of the House shall cause to be placed on the Notice Paper, a notice of motion for referral of the petitioners' prayer to a standing committee, which shall stand in the name of the Member presenting the petition or such other Member who requested that it be referred to the Chief Electoral Officer pursuant to section (1) of this Standing Order, as the case might be.

(3) When a notice given pursuant to section (2) of this Standing Order is transferred to the Order Paper, it shall be set down for consideration, and the House shall meet at 11:00 a.m. on the next Wednesday when the House is sitting, at which time the order of business shall be the consideration of the said notice. In the event that a notice or notices of motion for concurrence has been set down pursuant to Standing Order 124 for such day, or if other business pursuant to this Standing Order or Standing Order 36.2 has been previously set down for such day, it shall be set down for consideration, and the House shall meet at 11:00 a.m. on the following Wednesday when the House is sitting.

(4) When the House meets at 11:00 a.m. on any Wednesday pursuant to section (3) of this Standing Order, the House shall not consider any other item but that provided pursuant to that section, provided that:

(a) if such proceedings are concluded prior to 1:45 p.m. on any such day, the Speaker shall suspend the sitting until 2:00 p.m.; and

(b) all such proceedings shall be concluded except as provided pursuant to section (5)(b) of this Standing Order at 1:45 p.m. on the same day.

(5) A notice given pursuant to section (3) of this Standing Order shall be taken up and considered for a period not exceeding two and one-half hours, provided that:

(a) during the consideration of any such motion, no Member shall speak more than once or for more than ten minutes; and

Private Members' Business

(b) unless the motion be previously disposed of, not later than the end of the said two and one-half hours of consideration, the Speaker shall interrupt any proceedings then before the House and put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment, every question necessary to dispose of the said motion or motions, provided that any division or divisions demanded in relation thereto shall stand deferred until no later than the ordinary hour of daily adjournment in that sitting, when the bells to call in the Members shall be sounded for not more than fifteen minutes. Any remaining questions necessary to dispose of proceedings in relation to such motion or motions, on which a decision has been deferred until after the taking of such a division, shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

(6) The provisions of Standing Order 45(5) shall be suspended in the case of any division demanded pursuant to paragraph (b) of section (5) of this Standing Order.

36.2(1) When a petition is referred to a committee pursuant to Standing Order 36.1, the committee shall, within sixty sitting days of the referral, report back to the House, provided that if no report is presented by the end of the sixty sitting days, the Member who presented the petition, or such other Member who requested that it be referred to the Chief Electoral Officer in accordance with Standing Order 36.1(1), as the case might be, shall be entitled to present a bill or motion to give effect to the petitioners' prayer within fifteen sitting days, and such bill or motion shall for all purposes be deemed to be the committee's report referred to in section (2) of this Standing Order.

(2) The committee's report shall be in the form of either

(a) a bill for an Act which, if adopted by the Parliament, or

(b) a motion which, if adopted by the House,

would give effect to the petitioners' prayer, and the committee's report to the House shall be deemed to constitute notice of motion or notice for leave to present the bill, as the case might be.

(3) The Member who presented the petition, or such other Member who requested that it be referred to the Chief Electoral Officer in accordance with Standing Order 36.1(1), as the case might be, shall be deemed to be the sponsor of the bill or of the motion prepared pursuant to this Standing Order in the House, unless the Member is a Minister of the Crown in which case it shall be considered to be an item of Government Orders.

(4) After forty-eight hours' notice, the Member sponsoring the bill, or a Minister, as the case might be, may introduce the bill during the daily routine of business and the House shall give it first reading in accordance with these Standing Orders.

(5) Notwithstanding any other provision in these Standing Orders, a bill that has been introduced pursuant to section (4) of this Standing Order by a Member who is not a Minister of the Crown, or a motion sponsored by a Member who is not a Minister of the Crown after forty-eight hours' notice upon the Member giving notice in writing to the Clerk, shall be placed on the Order Paper and shall be set down for consideration, and the House shall meet at 11:00 a.m. on the next Wednesday when the House is sitting, at which time the order of business shall be the consideration of the said bill or motion. In the event that a notice or notices of motion for concurrence has been set down pursuant to Standing Order 124 for such day, or if other business pursuant to this Standing Order or Standing Order 36.1 has previously been set down for such day, it shall be set down for the consideration, and the House shall meet at 11:00 a.m. on the following Wednesday when the House is sitting.

(6) Subject to paragraph (b) of section (8) of this Standing Order, when the House meets at 11:00 a.m. on any Wednesday pursuant to section (5) of this Standing

Order, the House shall not consider any other item but that provided pursuant to that section, provided that:

(a) if such proceedings are concluded prior to 1:45 p.m. on any such day, the Speaker shall suspend the sitting until 2:00 p.m.; and

(b) all such proceedings shall be concluded except as provided pursuant to section (8)(c) of this Standing Order at 1:45 p.m. on the same day.

(7) Notwithstanding any other provisions in these Standing Orders, but subject to the time limits set out in this Standing Order, a bill under this Standing Order shall be debated at second reading, and, if passed, it shall immediately be considered in a Committee of the Whole, which shall report to the House forthwith upon completion of its consideration, and the House shall immediately take up the report and third reading stages of the bill; provided that, unless the Committee of the Whole has reported the bill earlier, then fifteen minutes prior to the end of the time scheduled for consideration of the bill, it shall be deemed to have been reported without amendment. Standing Order 71 shall be suspended with respect to any bill considered pursuant to this Standing Order.

(8) A bill or motion set down pursuant to section (4) of this Standing Order shall be taken up and considered for a period not exceeding two and one-half hours, provided that:

(a) during the consideration of the motions to adopt the bill at all stages or the motion, no Member shall speak more than once or for more than ten minutes;

(b) in the case of a bill, if the said bill has not been disposed of prior to the end of the first ninety minutes of consideration, during any time then remaining, any one Member may propose a motion to extend the time for the consideration of any remaining stages on a second Wednesday when the House is sitting for a period of two and one-half hours beginning at 11:00 a.m., provided that

(i) the motion shall be put forthwith without debate or amendment and shall be deemed withdrawn if fewer than twenty members rise in support thereof; and

(ii) a subsequent such motion shall not be put unless there has been an intervening proceeding;

in the event that a notice or notices of motion for concurrence has been set down pursuant to Standing Order 124 for such day, or if other business pursuant to this Standing Order or Standing Order 36.1 has previously been set down for such day, it shall be set down for the consideration, and the House shall meet at 11:00 a.m. on the following Wednesday when the House is sitting; and

(c) unless the bill or motion be previously disposed of, not later than the end of the said two and one-half hours of consideration, or not later than the end of two and one-half hours of consideration on the second Wednesday agreed to pursuant to paragraph (b) hereof, the Speaker shall interrupt any proceedings then before the House and put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment, every question necessary to dispose of the motion or motions, provided that any division or divisions demanded in relation thereto shall stand deferred until no later than the ordinary hour of daily adjournment in that sitting, when the bells to call in the Members shall be sounded for not more than fifteen minutes. Any remaining questions necessary to dispose of proceedings in relation to such motion or motions, on which a decision has been deferred until after the taking of such a division, shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

(9) The provisions of Standing Order 45(5) shall be suspended in the case of any division demanded pursuant to paragraph (c) of section (8) of this Standing Order. 36.3 No vote taken in the House pursuant to Standing Orders

36.1 or 36.2 shall be deemed to involve a question of the confidence of the House in the Ministry or a Minister, unless the Bill or Motion is considered to be an item of Government Business pursuant to section (3) of this Standing Order.

III. That the Clerk be authorized to make consequential amendments to the Standing Orders.

He said: Madam Speaker, in addressing the House today on petitions I want to start by saying several things about the democracy within which we live. There are many concerns in the country about the ability to take concerns to the House of Commons to be heard and to get action taken. Petitions is one of the few ways that citizens can sign a document, send it to the House of Commons, have it read in the House of Commons, and get some action taken.

The unfortunate thing about petitions is getting the action taken. I just submitted three petitions today. Two were on Bill C-23 which the government has already disposed of and really did not listen to it. The other one was about changing the age of consent from 14 to 16 years for consensual sex. That will fall on deaf ears. A letter will go back to the person who initiated the petition saying so sad, too bad, try again some time.

I will give a brief background about petitions and what they are used for. The petition process was first introduced into the Alberta legislature by Jim Gurnett, an NDP member for Spirit River. Those particular concepts upon which this motion is debated were eventually brought into the House of Commons by Ross Harvey, another NDP member for Edmonton East in 1992 under Motion No. 89.

Let us not make the wild assumption that I am following the dialogue and prospectus of any bill in which the NDP would be interested, but where it comes down to the input as a democracy I think those two gentlemen had the right idea.

In the United Kingdom the right of petitioning the crown and parliament for redress of grievances dates back to the reign of King Edward I in the 13th century. Citation 666 of Beauchesne's fifth edition at page 209 says the following about petitions:

The right of petitioning the Crown and Parliament for redress of grievances is acknowledged as a fundamental principle of the constitution and has been exercised without interruption since 1867.

The difficulty with petitions in this land is that they fall on deaf ears once they reach the House of Commons. Virtually everybody in the House has submitted petitions. Many of them have been very good and informative petitions that we want to go somewhere.

The current process is that they are presented by members of the House under Standing Order 36. Then the government tables a response in the House and sends the response to the first name on

Private Members' Business

the petition. Even if 40,000 people signed it, only one person would get a response. That is the end of the deal.

The only way a petition can be referred to a committee is with a show of unanimous consent, which is something that almost never happens in the House of Commons. Basically it does not even go to a committee for study, which is sad indeed.

• (1335)

When we debated whether or not the particular motion should be votable, it is unfortunate that even the subcommittee on Private Members' Business decided not to support it as a votable motion. I believe the issue has a great deal of support in the House of Commons. It is sad that it will never get to any further action than what is said here today.

What was I proposing in the motion? Let us see how harmful it is, if it is at all. If hon. members had 3% of eligible voters on a petition, which is approximately 550,000 people, it would ultimately get to be a votable resolution in the House. It is as simple as that.

I could go through a lot of the other details, but the primary point is that people in our country see it important enough to physically take a petition around their areas, their cities, their communities and their provinces. They see it important enough to take it door to door. Those who see the issue as important enough to sign a petition should have some way of seeing it followed through by their representatives in the House of Commons.

This is not happening today. If someone signs a petition it basically goes nowhere. It comes into the House. We say we have a petition and have about 15 seconds to read the darned thing, and there it dies.

The government might say that it looks at the petition and considers it in legislation, but let us face it: since I have been in the House I have not seen a petition that has really affected a piece of legislation. Major bills have come forward such as the Young Offenders Act; Bill C-68, the gun control bill; and Bill C-23, the recent modernization of benefits. All of them had substantial petitions from across the country with hundreds of thousands of names. They have come into the House and nothing has happened with them.

As politicians we hear from people who say that they feel strongly about an issue. They want to get a petition together and ask for help in wording it. They want to take it door to door and make a change in Canada. I do not even have the heart to tell them that the other half of the process is that I will take it to the House and read it for 15 seconds. Then I will sit down and it will die. It is not a good process whatsoever.

Private Members' Business

The motion is not votable. I stand here today on a non-votable issue only to get my point across. What we need is all parties in the House to say that the process is not working. We need to be able to effect change by the will of a majority of people who care about it. In effect that is called citizens initiative. We talk about citizens initiative. That is what a petition really is. It is a citizens initiative to invoke change.

Mr. John Duncan: When it reaches a certain threshold.

Mr. Randy White: Yes, I agree with my colleague. This certain threshold is 3% of eligible voters. When it is signed and 3% or more of eligible voters want the change, it does not mean that it has to come into the House and is done right away. It means discussion takes place. It means committees get involved and look at it. In effect, rather than have legislation that comes into the House top down, we are getting legislation that is encouraged bottom up. It makes sense to most people.

I hope this does not fall on deaf ears after today. I hope when we get into committees like procedure and House affairs, the main management committee of the House of Commons, we could table this as a necessary change to the standing orders.

• (1340)

We could have a serious discussion and have a subcommittee and the House of Commons look at some way of putting some strength into the courage and convictions of those who walk around the country and sign documents to get change to take place.

The point is being made here that we lack a certain amount of democracy in what we call a democracy. If we continue with majority governments in this land that basically make the bills in cabinet and whip their members into a vote on a Tuesday night—

Hon. David M. Collette: You're cynical.

Mr. Randy White: The minister says I am cynical. At least there is one minister here listening to how we should invoke democracy into the country by getting petitions in place.

If the government and the democracy keeps working from a majority government and a cabinet to its members to vote in a certain way, notwithstanding the desires of people through petitions across the land, then we tend to alienate ourselves from the very people who have put us in this place.

My comment is this. If we truly want democracy, then let us put it in place. Let us take a simple process like petitions with some threshold of numbers of our population who sign them and turn their question or desire into a motion. Let us get it into a

committee, study it and possibly turn it into legislation or include it in a piece of legislation that we want.

That is it. I would be interested in other comments in the House, but more than comments, I am interested in some action. The next time this comes up, it should be in the House of Commons with some kind of legislation with teeth in it and not some kind of rhetorical comments that, sure, they want our comments but, too bad, so sad, they are going to do nothing about it.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Madam Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to speak to Motion M-128. Institutional reform is something for which I believe there is a broad based level of support, not just within this parliament but from Canadians, and that we do need a significant level of institutional reform to make parliament and our democratic institutions more functional. There are a number of things that need to be done.

There has been a secular decline in the role of the member of parliament over the last 30 years. It started in the late 1960s when the practice of debating the estimates in the House of Commons ceased and instead committees took over some of that. The notion of committees taking over some of these responsibilities previously held by the committee of the whole in the House of Commons is not in and of itself necessarily a bad thing. The difficulty with it is when the committee structure becomes so partisanly controlled and, of course, comprised of a majority of the government.

Often we get the idea in the House as members of parliament that the committees are operated as branch plants of the ministers' offices and in fact committee chairs are often at the beck and call of ministers it seems. Sometimes the legislative agenda of committees seems to be more dominated by the legislative agenda of the executive than it probably should be. I think there would be a rather significant level of agreement with that from both members on the opposition benches and members of the government side.

This proposal brought forward by the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford would change the standing orders to provide direct access to the agenda of the House of Commons for petitioners representing 2% of the eligible electorate. It does this by requiring qualified petitions to be the basis for legislation or an order of the House to meet the demands of petitioners. A mandatory process of time allocation or closure of debate governs the considerations of all qualified petitions.

• (1345)

It is ironic in some ways that the hon. member, who regularly objects to the government's use of time allocation, is prepared to have it further enshrined in the rules to cover this proposal. Time allocation, some arbitrary allocation of time to any legislation whether imposed by the government or some institutionalized

Private Members' Business

parliamentary procedure, is equally egregious. This proposal would give something to petitioners that members of the House do not enjoy and that is the guaranteed consideration of any proposal meeting the 2% threshold. I have some concerns about that.

At the heart of the discussion is the age old question of what is the role of the member of parliament. Are members of parliament here to represent their own best judgment and to represent the best interests of their constituents by using that judgment? In a representative democracy this is a very important issue.

A representative democracy is based on the premise that when a member is elected to the House, that for the period of a member's term he or she makes decisions. The member's goal is not only to represent the views of his or her own constituents but also the interests of all Canadians in this House. Every four years there is an opportunity for the electorate to make a decision to re-elect that member or to elect somebody else.

If in fact the hon. member actually believes we should be moving away from the principles of a representative democracy to a direct democracy, I have some significant concerns as would many Canadians when they really thought about it. What is the magic of a 2% threshold? It is an arbitrary figure. Certainly it is a large number of people, but 2% of the electorate certainly does not represent a majority. It is 2%. Why should special powers be given to 2% of the electorate that is denied to other petitioners? Are the ideas or grievances of persons lacking resources to garner the 2% threshold automatically less worthy than the beliefs or concerns of the people who may account for 1.5%?

At present the House requires 25 signatures on a petition. This was put in place in reaction to abuses that took place in the past when petitions were used to delay or oppose government bills. Those days are gone and the House should back Canadians who petition the House of Commons on legitimate issues.

All members take very seriously the petitions presented in the House. I listen intently to petitions when they are presented. I consider the views of individuals who have through the petition process an opportunity to have their views heard here in the House of Commons. Through the private members' process, which should be bolstered and improved, individual members of parliament have the opportunity to represent views presented in petitions from their constituencies, not just on Wellington Street but on the main streets of their ridings. We should be using the private members' process, as should the government. All parliamentarians should advance the notion that there should be a greater level of engagement for private members to bring forward through the private members' process constructive motions and legislation that can benefit Canadians.

My concern is with who would use this provision. It is a ready opportunity for many of the moneyed interest groups and so-called

ordinary citizens are quite likely to initiate petitions. If we look at the U.S. with the well financed and powerful lobby organizations, the difficulties and problems are far greater with the degree to which these lobby organizations are financed.

This would invite the same type of what the hon. member may view as direct democracy. I consider this as being an opportunity for some of the major lobby organizations and individuals with money to use the process to garner support and actually gain direct access to the House of Commons. In some way they could push aside the elected members who are here as part of a representative democracy to not only recognize the concerns of focused special interest groups, but also to make decisions on behalf of all Canadians.

• (1350)

I have a number of concerns. The hon. member has spoken a number of times about the importance of his constituents. If the majority of his constituents want something, then it is absolutely the right thing for us to do. I remind the hon. member that there have been times in the past when decisions have been made, which in retrospect have been the right decisions, that a majority of Canadians did not agree with.

One was the free trade agreement. The majority of Canadians voted against a free trade agreement in the 1988 election, but a visionary and courageous government was willing to seize the day. It had a vision for the future. Instead of focusing on polls, it took a significant risk. It actually implemented the types of public policy Canadians needed for the long term, not the types of public policy that would benefit the party in the short term.

Populism is the natural enemy of representative democracy. The poll based populism which is so pervasive in the hon. member's party, seems so palatable to people when they first hear of it. When Canadians have thought about it more clearly however, and they have, they have rejected the hon. member's party. Canadians have done this because they realize they are better served by thinking members of parliament who have a vision for the future and who will take risks sometimes and offer Canadians real solutions and courageous visionary policy on issues of importance to Canadians instead of focusing on short term polls.

The party the hon. member represents has at various times fought against the charter of rights. It has criticized the charter of rights and has referred to it as judicial activism. It has ignored the fact that in our system of government the judiciary has a role. Ultimately I am glad that we have a charter of rights to protect Canadians against members of parliament who would go with the tyranny of the majority and where majority rules in areas where it should not, such as minority rights.

I could go on an on about this motion. It clearly will not work.

Private Members' Business

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to address the issues raised in Motion No. 128 introduced by the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford. He proposes that we amend the standing orders to alter the way we deal with petitions.

My hon. colleague is well known for his background, experience and knowledge in the area of parliamentary procedure. I will take the time to review the proposal carefully and I hope he and the House will view it as constructive.

If I understand my hon. colleague's motion correctly, the purpose of his motion would be to alter the process for dealing with petitions so that a public petition could automatically become the basis for law or a resolution of the House. Not only does the member propose that any petition with sufficient signatures could become law, he also proposes that these laws could come into effect with no apparent policy analysis or prior consultations with affected groups and with relatively minimal parliamentary scrutiny. In fact it appears that the House and its committees would be forced to consider these petition bills on a relatively short deadline.

Before I discuss the merits of the motion, I will address the historic background of petitions. The procedure for petitioning parliament is a longstanding practice which goes back many years.

• (1355)

In medieval England, the records show that individuals petitioned parliament to seek resolution to an issue in cases where the courts had been unable to reach a decision. The British House of Commons, therefore, served in a quasi-judicial capacity.

Procedures for handling petitions evolved from this early form partly because of their extreme popularity in Great Britain in the early part of the 19th century. In the year 1843 alone there were over 33,000 petitions filed in the House of Commons. However, as my hon. colleague might imagine, dealing with this inordinate number of petitions did not leave very much time to deal with the other pressing matters of national business.

Because of the impact of these petitions on the time of the House, changes were made to limit the rules of debate so that matters of interest and importance to all individuals would not be hijacked by political strategies that might not be in the broader interest of the nation.

Canada, of course, has adopted these British parliamentary traditions and petitions are now only presented to the House, generally without provision for debate. In the 1985 report of the Special Committee on Reform of the House of Commons, the chair, Mr. James McGrath, noted:

—the right to petition Parliament is a fundamental right of the citizen and that petitions are an integral part of the process whereby the people of Canada speak to their elected representatives.

This is still true today.

As a means of ensuring that petitions are treated in a relevant fashion, the standing orders require that the government respond to petitions within 45 days to ensure that the government would take note of the content of the petitions.

It appears that the sponsor of this motion is suggesting that petitions are not given due recognition by the government and it would seem that through Motion No. 128 he is attempting to alter the nature and significance of petitioning a parliament.

To begin with, the government does take seriously its responsibility to respond to petitions presented by Canadians and within the 45 day limit. In this session we had about 600 to 700 petitions presented by members from both sides of the House.

First, the presentation of petitions allows parliament and the government to tap the public mood and to hear what issues concern individuals, not only from across the country but also from specific regions.

Second, the standing orders require the responsible department to respond to petitions. Petitions give these policy makers or policy advisors valuable information that can be fed into the ongoing and dynamic process of policy development. This can and often does stimulate legislation, regulatory or policy change.

Finally, members of the House have numerous instruments here at their disposal for debating issues of national and regional importance, including those raised in petitions.

As a representative of his constituents and with his experience, if my hon. colleague saw an issue that required attention he could introduce a private member's bill or motion to allow an issue to be considered, just as he has done in this case.

On any day the House is sitting, a member can ask a question of member of the government during question period or can submit a written question. Of course, opposition parties can make their own determination of what issues are important to Canadians. They actually select the subject of debate on any opposition day in the House.

Furthermore, the standing orders of the House now provide that standing committees have a mandate to study any issue that falls within the mandate of a minister's department.

The process that my colleague is proposing through Motion No. 128 raises a number of questions. For example, how would parliament deal with several petitions on the same subject but with

opposing perspectives? How would a standing committee cope with petitions that affected many other committees or that required broader consultation and integration with the work of other committees of the House? From a purely constitutional and procedural perspective, bills which involve the spending of public funds can only be introduced by the government with what we call the royal recommendation.

I suggest that my hon. colleague's motion, while it is a creative initiative, it has a number of practical difficulties. I want to emphasize that the government supports the ability of Canadians to petition their parliament. With reference to the member's initiative, members of the House may wish to consider whether they want to alter the way we deal with petitions. We might wish to consider other ways of dealing with them and place these procedures in the standing orders. I therefore suggest that if the hon. member wishes to pursue this matter further—and he may well might as well might other members of the House—he could seek to have this issue, among others, brought on to the agenda of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs which might study it further. One never knows what might be recommended back to the House.

• (1400)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Madam Speaker, Motion M-128, introduced by our colleague from Langley—Abbotsford, moves us to reflect upon the political system within which we operate.

The British parliamentary system is, as we know, one of representative democracy. It is absolutely beyond the realm of possibility for 30 million Canadians and 7 million Quebecers to all get together at one time in one place to pass rules to govern the society in which we live.

As a result, the population delegates the power to legislate to a certain number of representatives, their members of parliament, who meet together in parliament to pass legislation in lieu of their constituents, their fellow citizens, whom they represent to the best of their ability, during a mandate. At the end of their mandate, if the elected representatives have not fulfilled the expectations of those who elected them and have not carried out their mandate, it is the responsibility of the population to decide to change representatives and to place its trust in another party, another individual.

The debate around Motion M-128 leads us to reflect upon this system of representative democracy within which we operate at the present time, and to look at what possibilities are available to us in order to achieve better participation and a participative and more direct democracy. This would result in our fellow citizens, those whom we represent, becoming more involved.

Private Members' Business

When the British parliamentary system as we know it was first established, centuries ago, in the United Kingdom, Great Britain at the time, communications systems were obviously not like those we enjoy today.

It is, therefore, understandable that our fellow citizens experience a degree of frustration and cynicism as far as politicians are concerned, because nowadays they are in a position to follow politics closely. They can get their expectations and concerns through to their MPs quickly, and they are also able to see very quickly the impact of the decisions made by their elected representatives.

If we are to counter this sort of wave of public cynicism toward politics and parliament, perhaps we should consider involving the public more in the democratic process and politics outside the traditional election periods when they choose their members of parliament.

That said, let us get back to the heart of the debate, the matter of petitions. We know that petitions have been an integral part of the British parliamentary system since its inception. It became clear very quickly that, outside election periods, the public needed a way to make its expectations known to parliamentarians and to direct the work done and decisions made by its representatives. So petitions made this possible.

• (1405)

The public could sign a petition from time to time, express, in doing so, its support for a given cause, its support for a given government legislative measure. In fact, the petition served to draw the attention of parliament and the government to a variety of public concerns.

It is obvious that over the years, even though petitions remain a privileged means of expression for the people, they have lost a great deal of their meaning, not because it is no longer important for Canadians to share their expectations with their elected representatives, but because we can see that the government is paying less attention to those petitions.

How many times have we tabled petitions in the House and received just a very short response from the government? And then nothing further is done.

At least the motion brought forward by the member for Langley—Abbotsford would make sure there would be a proper follow-up on every petition. Having said that, I have some questions regarding the appropriateness of the particular measure proposed by the member for Langley—Abbotsford.

Obviously, and members certainly noticed that in my introduction, the Bloc Québécois is completely open to the development of

Private Members' Business

mechanisms for participatory democracy. As a matter of fact, we embarked on a thinking exercise on democracy to see which avenues could be explored to bring the people to take a greater interest and participate more actively in the political process.

This first thinking exercise led to a second one because we felt there was still a lot of work to be done, there were still many elements to develop with regard to this idea of better involving the people in the political process.

However, I must tell my colleague from Langley—Abbotsford that, in this respect, the legislation introduced by one of his colleagues, namely Bill C-229, seemed to me more appropriate, even though I had some concerns regarding it as well.

In his motion, my colleague from Langley—Abbotsford proposes that when a motion is supported by at least 2% of registered voters it eventually become a resolution of the House or a bill.

Bill C-229 is better in that a petition was not supposed to minimize, so to speak, the work of parliamentarians because it provided for one extra step. A petition was needed to hold a referendum. And its was only after the referendum was held that parliament could consider passing a bill.

In this case, I wonder about the mechanisms, as they seem somewhat absent from Motion M-128, if I may say so; mechanisms should be put in place in order to ensure that ultimately it is the elected representatives of the people who make the decision to pass legislation so as not to jeopardize or make a travesty of representative democracy by introducing an element of direct democracy.

If the goal is to allow people to bring about changes to the existing political framework, influence public policy and government action, questions arise since even an election fails to alter the course of events in parliament.

• (1410)

One has only to think of the 1993 election, which at the time completely destroyed the political balance within this parliament and reflected a deep desire for change among then people. What did this deep desire for change translate into? Nothing. The federal government has done absolutely nothing.

I wonder how this could be done. How will this measure manage to take into consideration other measures passed by the House? I am thinking in particular of the distinct society motion passed in this House.

Points 3 and 4 stipulated that:

(3) the House undertake to be guided by this reality;

(4) the House encourage all components of the legislative and executive branches of government to take note of this recognition and be guided in their conduct accordingly.

Even the House is paying no attention to this motion. How could the House pass Bill-20? How can the House be preparing to pass Bill C-3, without taking into account the distinct character of Quebec, which should have precluded it?

In conclusion, I would say that, because even this House fails to respect a number of earlier decisions, how can members of the public be expected to stay on top of all those decisions previously taken by the House, which would eventually affect its subsequent actions?

We are open to discussion. I believe that Motion M-128 opens the debate on participatory democracy. Unfortunately, I think that Motion M-128 as drafted fails to meet the short term goals.

[English]

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Well, Madam Speaker, never let it be said that private members' hour in the House does not produce some interesting debates and some excellent speeches.

I had never intended to speak on this debate. I just happened to be in the House doing my duty, but I received I think some very eloquent points of view on an issue which I think is of importance.

The question of petitions and what petitions mean when people submit them to members of parliament is a very important question.

I have to say, Madam Speaker, that I remember when I came up here as a parliamentarian for the first time in 1993, there was an orientation period in which experienced members of parliament instructed us in this very chamber on what to expect as fledgling members of parliament. I remember, for the member for Langley—Abbotsford's benefit, that one of those MPs who advised the new MPs on what to expect here was the member for Edmonton North who brought up the question of petitions.

What she said basically, was that the members of parliament can take advantage of the opportunity to present petitions from their constituents. I remember classically the words. She said "They do not really mean anything when you put them before the House. They do not actually do anything or have any effect, but they are a great instrument for encouraging personal attention in your own riding".

So the member for Langley—Abbotsford I think touches a real nerve. I remember that statement vividly. In fact, Madam Speaker, as a result of that statement I have tended to discourage petitioning in my riding, and yet I hear the parliamentary secretary observe that in fact, yes, there is a place for petitions in the House, that it is

an opportunity for people to actually get a forum through their MPs. So there is merit both ways, although I am very sensitive to the criticism that is being raised by the member for Langley—Abbotsford, that is where do petitions really go?

One of the difficulties, however, with petitions, and trying to expand the opportunity for petitions to have an effect, as suggested by Motion No. 128, is in fact petitions like opinion polling or referendum, that kind of thing, can in fact represent a minority trying to grab the agenda by putting direct pressure on the parliamentarian.

Earlier today, I presented three petitions in the House. Each one of those petitions represents a minority in society who has a particular thing they want to see happen. They are trying to put pressure on me as a member of parliament by means of a petition. It does not matter whether there are 25 names or there are 200 or it is 2% of the entire population. It is still a minority. It is still a special interest group. Whether the special interest group represents people who are against Bill C-23, as was the case in one of the petitions I presented, or whether the subject is a contract for the postal workers who were petitioning me to support a private member's bill allowing the unionization of rural mail couriers, it is still a special interest group pressuring a member of parliament to take a particular action.

• (1415)

In the final analysis there is nothing wrong with this. I have to answer not only as best I can to everyone in my riding, but I also have to be sensitive to the petitions of minorities, the petitions of special interest groups, the petitions of groups of people with whom I may personally disagree. They still have to have a voice in this place.

I agree with the member for Langley—Abbotsford that the present situation and the present method is inadequate. People, no matter what their viewpoint in a democracy, particularly an open democracy like Canada, have to have an opportunity to speak.

I think that parliament is in the process of being reformed. One way it is being reformed is by opening up Private Members' Business. Just as we are having a very fine debate this afternoon in private member's hour, so too are we trying on all sides of this House to open up the opportunities for backbench MPs to advance meaningful legislation. We have had a number of very good private members' bills advanced, and on this side of the House, at any rate, voting on private members' legislation is always a free vote.

I would say to the member for Langley—Abbotsford that rather than try to adjust the rules in a huge way in which basically we would be advancing the power of minority special interest groups, which we do not want to do, I would take the point of the member for Kings—Hants. We are elected to represent and to make decisions on behalf of everyone, as best we can. That is the

Private Members' Business

parliamentary system. That is what we inherited from the British system. On the other hand, we can give everyone an opportunity to be heard and to have their issue debated.

What I would suggest is that we go forward and try to find a new method of dealing with petitions. One thing we could consider, and this would go to the procedure and House affairs committee, would be to open up Friday, which is a day which is not very good for government business because many MPs are away and often cabinet ministers have other duties. Perhaps we could devote Friday entirely to Private Members' Business, to debate and advance private members' legislation.

Why not use part of that time to debate petitions, no matter what the petition is about? If I have received a petition, whether it is on Bill C-23 or the rural mail couriers, that petition is independent of everything else. It is independent of legislation and it deserves to be heard and debated.

I would propose that perhaps the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs could consider setting up a regime whereby the petitions would come before a subcommittee to determine whether they should be debated in the same way as private members' bills come before a subcommittee to determine whether they should be made votable. That way the petitions which Canadians gather, again whether there be 25, 100 or 1,000 names, might have more of a life in this House than they do at present. I congratulate the member for Langley—Abbotsford for raising a very important issue.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I often get some of my knowledge and points from the great and learned Yuroslav, who is an individual of impeccable knowledge. The great Yuroslav has often told me about the need to involve people in politics.

I want to make a couple of comments about the comments that were made. By and large, we all agree that we should do something with petitions, that they should not just come into the House and die here, that we should have a way of at least discussing the darn things.

• (1420)

One of my colleagues, the chairman of the procedure and House affairs committee, mentioned that we should discuss this issue at committee. I did table that idea about three years ago, so one has to ask where it is going to go.

The only disappointing comments I heard today were from the Progressive Conservative members, who said "If the majority of Canadians want it, that is not necessarily the right thing to do". Is it any wonder people do not vote Progressive Conservative today.

Private Members' Business

That is exactly the opposite of what I think most people are saying today in Canada. If the majority of people want it, that is necessarily the right thing to do, even though politicians in their rhetorical positioning in the House may not agree. That should be quite irrelevant. It is what the majority of Canadians think that matters.

The bottom line is that petitions are indicators in our society that people want change. People organize petitions and go through the exercise of getting a certain number of Canadians interested in an issue for the purpose of sending it to the House. No matter what the issue is, and it may not be palatable to the House, we should have the right to discuss it, to look at it, to provoke thought and to send something forward to move the government in some direction.

I would not ask for unanimous consent, but I would suggest to the chairman of the procedure and House affairs committee that the committee look at this issue. I would ask that it look at the issue

and not exactly what I have put forward in my motion. Let us not get tangled up in whether there are opposing positions on certain petitions. Let us not get tangled up in whether it is 2% or 3%. Let us take this issue to the procedure and House affairs committee to see if there is anything that can be done with petitions to make the people of Canada feel that all the work they went through was worth it.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. As the motion has not been designated a votable item, the order is dropped from the order paper.

[*Translation*]

It being 2.22 p.m. the House stands adjourned until Monday, May 1, 2000 at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.22 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

MR. STÉPHANE BERGERON

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. JAY HILL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MacKAY

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session — Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	British Columbia	CA
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Alberta	CA
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alarie, H��l��ne	Louis-H��bert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	CA
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, G��rard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Andr��	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	CA
Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
B��lair, R��ginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
B��langer, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eug��ne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	CA
Bergeron, St��phane	Verch��res — Les-Patriotes	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gasp�� — ��les- de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	PC
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	CA
Brien, Pierre	T��miscamingue	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	Nova Scotia	PC
Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	British Columbia	CA
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Quebec	BQ
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	PC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	CA
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	Lib.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	CA
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac — Mégantic	Quebec	BQ
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Quebec	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup — Témiscouata — Les Basques	Quebec	BQ
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond	British Columbia	CA
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South — Burnaby	British Columbia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or — Cape Breton	Nova Scotia	NDP
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland	PC
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	Quebec	BQ
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	New Brunswick	PC
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CA
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	NDP
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	CA
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	CA
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	British Columbia	CA
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	British Columbia	CA
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan	British Columbia	CA
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	CA
Grey, Deborah, Leader of the Opposition	Edmonton North	Alberta	CA
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Gruending, Dennis	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	Saskatchewan	NDP
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Côte-de-Beaupré — Île-d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CA
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
Harris, Richard M.	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	CA

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	British Columbia	CA
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	Quebec	PC
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	CA
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	CA
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	Manitoba	CA
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Manitoba	Ind.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	CA
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CA
Jones, Jim	Markham	Ontario	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CA
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CA
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Ontario	Lib.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CA
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	NDP
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	Ind.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Whitby — Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Alberta	CA
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	CA
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	Nova Scotia	NDP
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CA
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	Quebec	BQ
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	CA
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	CA
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	CA
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	CA
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	British Columbia	CA
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	British Columbia	CA
Mifflin, Hon. Fred	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	CA
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches — East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CA
Muise, Mark	West Nova	Nova Scotia	PC
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Ind.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	CA
Pagtakhan, Rey D.	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	CA
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	CA
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Rivière—des—Mille—Îles	Quebec	BQ
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade	Papineau — Saint—Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham — Kent Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Bas—Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancour	Quebec	BQ
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	PC
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proud, George	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ind. - CA
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	CA
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	British Columbia	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CA
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount — Ville—Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	CA
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	CA
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CA

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik	Quebec	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	CA
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	CA
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	CA
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	PC
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	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
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	British Columbia	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CA
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	CA
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
VACANCY	St. John's West	Newfoundland	

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	CA
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CA
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	CA
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	CA
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	CA
Chatters, David	Athabasca	CA
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	CA
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	CA
Grey, Deborah, Leader of the Opposition	Edmonton North	CA
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	CA
Hill, Grant	Macleod	CA
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	CA
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	CA
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	CA
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	CA
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	CA
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	CA
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	CA
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	CA
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	CA
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ind. - CA
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	CA
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	CA
Williams, John	St. Albert	CA
BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	CA
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	CA
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond	CA
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South — Burnaby	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	CA
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	CA
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	CA
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	CA
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan	CA
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	CA
Harris, Richard M.	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	CA
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	CA

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	CA
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	CA
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	CA
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	CA
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	CA
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	CA
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	CA
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	NDP
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	CA
Scott, Mike	Skeena	CA
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	CA
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	CA
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	CA

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	CA
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Ind.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Provencher	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	CA
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D.	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	PC
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe	Lib.
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	PC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	PC
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Gander — Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Lib.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Labrador	Lib.
VACANCY	St. John's West	
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	PC
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or — Cape Breton	NDP
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	NDP
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	PC
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	NDP
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Muise, Mark	West Nova	PC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore	NDP
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak—Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
ONTARIO (103)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Lib.
Bélaïr, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Carleton — Gloucester	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Oakville	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Lib.
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Trinity — Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	Lib.
Jones, Jim	Markham	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	Lib.
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	Lib.
Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Whitby — Ajax	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches — East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ind.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham — Kent Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Lib.
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Kitchener — Waterloo	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	Lib.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George	Hillsborough	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
QUEBEC (75)		
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères — Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac — Mégantic	BQ
Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup — Témiscouata — Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel	BQ
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Côte-de-Beaupré — Île-d'Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	PC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Ind.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade	Papineau — Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	PC
Proulx, Marcel	Hull — Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount — Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphane	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	BQ

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Gruending, Dennis	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	NDP
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	CA
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	CA
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	NDP
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	CA
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	CA
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	CA
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	CA

YUKON (1)

Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP
---------------	-------	-----

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of April 14, 2000 — 2nd Session, 36th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Sue Barnes	Vice-Chairs:	John Finlay Derrek Konrad	
Claude Bachand Ray Bonin Paul DeVillers Ghislain Fournier	Jim Gouk Ivan Grose Louise Hardy	David Iftody Nancy Karetak-Lindell Gerald Keddy	John O'Reilly Mike Scott Guy St-Julien	(16)

Associate Members

Carolyn Bennett Cliff Breitkreuz René Canuel Serge Cardin	Bill Casey Pierre de Savoye Gordon Earle Reed Elley	Maurice Godin Richard Harris Rick Laliberte	Gilles-A. Perron Daniel Turp Maurice Vellacott
--	--	---	--

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:	John Harvard	Vice-Chairs:	Murray Calder Howard Hilstrom	
Hélène Alarie Mark Assad Rick Borotsik Garry Breitkreuz	Odina Desrochers Gar Knutson Larry McCormick	Joe McGuire Ian Murray Dick Proctor	Gerry Ritz Paul Steckle Rose-Marie Ur	(16)

Associate Members

Peter Adams Roy Bailey Leon Benoit Paul Bonwick Rick Casson	Michelle Dockrill Jocelyne Girard-Bujold John Maloney Lee Morrison	Lynn Myers Lorne Nystrom John Solomon Guy St-Julien	Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp
---	---	--	--

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair:	Clifford Lincoln	Vice-Chairs:	Inky Mark Dennis Mills	
Mauril Bélanger Paul Bonwick Cliff Breitkreuz Sarmite Bulte	Irwin Cotler Pierre de Savoye Wendy Lill	Rick Limoges Eric Lowther Mark Muise	Alex Shepherd Caroline St-Hilaire Bryon Wilfert	(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott André Bachand Claude Bachand Carolyn Bennett Rick Borotsik	Pierre Brien Serge Cardin Antoine Dubé Maurice Dumas Gordon Earle	Paul Forseth Christiane Gagnon Rick Laliberte Peter MacKay Louis Plamondon	Benoît Sauvageau Guy St-Julien Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Elsie Wayne
---	---	--	---

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF SPORT IN CANADA

Chair:	Dennis Mills	Vice-Chairs:	Steve Mahoney Inky Mark	
Marlene Jennings Raymond Lavigne	Peter MacKay Pat O'Brien	Beth Phinney George Proud	John Solomon Caroline St-Hilaire	(11)

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs: Leon Benoit
Steve Mahoney

Rob Anders
Jean Augustine
Bernard Bigras
Paul Bonwick

John Bryden
Sophia Leung
Rick Limoges

Pat Martin
John McKay
Grant McNally

Pauline Picard
David Price
Andrew Telegdi

(16)

Associate Members

Claude Bachand
Serge Cardin
Libby Davies

Gordon Earle
Louise Hardy
Francine Lalonde

Réal Ménard
Deepak Obhrai
Diane St-Jacques

Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairs: Rahim Jaffer
Karen Kraft Sloan

Marlene Catterall
David Chatters
Jean-Guy Chrétien
Nick Discepola

Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Gurmant Grewal
Dennis Gruending

John Herron
Joe Jordan
Walt Lastewka

David Pratt
Julian Reed
Paddy Torsney

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Peter Adams
Hélène Alarie
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Pierre Brien

Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Aileen Carroll
John Duncan
Louise Hardy

Rick Laliberte
Clifford Lincoln
Peter Mancini
David Price
Nelson Riis

Judy Sgro
Guy St-Julien
Peter Stoffer
Stéphan Tremblay
Daniel Turp

FINANCE

Chair: Maurizio Bevilacqua

Vice-Chairs: Nick Discepola
Richard Harris

Scott Brison
Roy Cullen
Ken Epp
Roger Gallaway

Albina Guarnieri
Sophia Leung
Yvan Loubier

Richard Marceau
Lorne Nystrom
Gary Pillitteri

Karen Redman
Monte Solberg
Paul Szabo

(16)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
Carolyn Bennett
Rick Borotsik
Pierre Brien
Serge Cardin
Joe Comuzzi
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé

Joe Fontana
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Monique Guay
John Herron
Dale Johnston
Jim Jones
Jason Kenney

Rick Limoges
Gary Lunn
Peter MacKay
Alexa McDonough
Bob Mills
Lynn Myers
Gilles-A. Perron
Pauline Picard
Charlie Power

Nelson Riis
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Alex Shepherd
John Solomon
Guy St-Julien
Stéphan Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Tony Valeri

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Wayne Easter

Vice-Chairs: John Duncan
Carmen Provenzano

Sarkis Assadourian
G rard Asselin
Yvan Bernier
John Cummins

Bill Gilmour
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy

Bill Matthews
Lawrence O'Brien
Marcel Proulx

Lou Sekora
Paul Steckle
Peter Stoffer

(16)

Associate Members

Gilles Bernier
Ren  Canuel
Paul Forseth

Ghislain Fournier
Yvon Godin
Philip Mayfield

Svend Robinson
Yves Rocheleau

Mike Scott
Suzanne Tremblay

SUB-COMMITTEE ON AQUACULTURE AND OCEANS ACT

Chair: Carmen Provenzano

Vice-Chair:

Yvan Bernier

Bill Gilmour

Peter Stoffer

(4)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair: Bill Graham

Vice-Chairs: Colleen Beaumier
Deepak Obhrai

Sarkis Assadourian
Jean Augustine
Andr  Bachand
Maud Debien

Gurmant Grewal
Francine Lalonde
Diane Marleau
Ted McWhinney

Fred Mifflin
Denis Paradis
Bernard Patry
Svend Robinson

Yves Rocheleau
Bob Speller
Darrel Stinson

(18)

Associate Members

Claude Bachand
Eleni Bakopanos
Eug ne Bellemare
Carolyn Bennett
Bill Blaikie
Sarmite Bulte
Murray Calder
Serge Cardin
Aileen Carroll
Rick Casson

Irwin Cotler
Paul Cr te
Maurice Dumas
Raymonde Folco
Dennis Gruending
Jim Hart
Jason Kenney
Ren  Laurin
Sophia Leung

Gurbax Malhi
Richard Marceau
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Paul Mercier
Bob Mills
Lee Morrison
Lorne Nystrom
Pauline Picard

Marcel Proulx
Nelson Riis
Alex Shepherd
John Solomon
Diane St-Jacques
Chuck Strahl
St phan Tremblay
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Colleen Beaumier

Vice-Chair:

Jean Augustine
Eleni Bakopanos

Eug ne Bellemare
Aileen Carroll

Maud Debien
Keith Martin

Svend Robinson
Diane St-Jacques

(9)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair: Sarmite Bulte

Vice-Chair:

Sarkis Assadourian
Andr  Bachand

Bill Blaikie
Murray Calder

Richard Marceau
Deepak Obhrai

Alex Shepherd
Bob Speller

(9)

HEALTH**Chair:** Lynn Myers**Vice-Chairs:** Reed Elley
Ovid JacksonYvon Charbonneau
Christiane Gagnon
Bill Matthews
Ted McWhinneyRéal Ménard
Bob Mills
Marcel ProulxKaren Redman
Paul Szabo
Greg ThompsonRose-Marie Ur
Maurice Vellacott
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis

(16)

Associate MembersCarolyn Bennett
Bernard Bigras
Serge Cardin
Jean-Guy ChrétienLibby Davies
Pierre de Savoye
Michelle Dockrill
Jocelyne Girard-BujoldJohn Herron
Grant Hill
Sophia Leung
John MaloneyPauline Picard
Guy St-Julien
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp**HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chair:** Peter Adams**Vice-Chairs:** Maurice Vellacott
Bryon WilfertDiane Ablonczy
Bonnie Brown
Paul Crête
Libby DaviesJean Dubé
Raymonde Folco
Christiane Gagnon
John GodfreyDale Johnston
Judi Longfield
Larry McCormick
Rey PagtakhanAndy Scott
Judy Sgro
Stéphan Tremblay

(18)

Associate MembersCarolyn Bennett
Yvan Bernier
Bernard Bigras
Serge Cardin
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Bev Desjarlais
Michelle Dockrill
Norman DoyleAntoine Dubé
Maurice Dumas
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Ovid JacksonJoe Jordan
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Wendy Lill
Eric Lowther
Diane Marleau
Pat Martin
Réal MénardMark Muise
Lorne Nystrom
Diane St-Jacques
Guy St-Julien
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Angela Vautour**SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK****Chair:** John Godfrey**Vice-Chair:**Carolyn Bennett
Libby DaviesRaymonde Folco
Christiane GagnonOvid Jackson
Eric LowtherDiane Marleau
Diane St-Jacques

(9)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**Chair:** Carolyn Bennett**Vice-Chair:**Joe Jordan
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Wendy LillJulie Mackenzie
Mark MuiseKaren Redman
Andy ScottSuzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott

(10)

INDUSTRY**Chair:** Susan Whelan**Vice-Chairs:** Walt Lastewka
Charlie PensonPierre Brien
Gerry Byrne
John Cannis
Antoine DubéJim Hart
Marlene Jennings
Jim JonesEric Lowther
Gurbax Malhi
Dan McTeagueIan Murray
Jerry Pickard
Nelson Riis

(16)

Associate MembersPeter Adams
Hélène Alarie
Gérard Asselin
Bernard Bigras
Chuck CadmanSerge Cardin
Pierre de Savoye
Odina Desrochers
Jean Dubé
Joe FontanaChristiane Gagnon
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Rahim Jaffer
Richard Marceau
Philip MayfieldAlex Shepherd
John Solomon
Guy St-Julien
Peter Stoffer
Daniel Turp**JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS****Chair:** Andy Scott**Vice-Chairs:** Chuck Cadman
Ivan GroseJim Abbott
Reg Alcock
Michel Bellehumeur
Carolyn BennettAileen Carroll
Paul DeVillers
Peter MacKayJohn Maloney
Peter Mancini
John McKayJohn Reynolds
Jacques Saada
Pierrette Venne

(16)

Associate MembersBernard Bigras
Irwin Cotler
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Pierre de Savoye
Jim Gouk
Dennis Gruending
Michel GuimondLouise Hardy
Richard Harris
Jay Hill
Richard Marceau
Keith Martin
Réal Ménard
Lee MorrisonMark Muise
Lynn Myers
Jack Ramsay
Svend Robinson
Judy Sgro
Caroline St-Hilaire
Diane St-JacquesDarrel Stinson
Myron Thompson
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Tom Wappel
Randy White**SUB-COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT****Chair:** Paul DeVillers**Vice-Chair:**Jim Gouk
Ivan GroseRick Laliberte
Peter MacKayLynn Myers
Jacques SaadaPierrette Venne
Tom Wappel

(9)

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS**Chair:** Pat O'Brien**Vice-Chairs:** Jim Hart
David PrattRobert Bertrand
Hec Clouthier
Gordon Earle
Peter GoldringArt Hanger
René Laurin
Judi LongfieldPaul Mercier
John O'Reilly
Janko PericGeorge Proud
Elsie Wayne
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate MembersRob Anders
Leon Benoit
Pierre BrienSerge Cardin
John Duncan
Monique GuayFrancine Lalonde
Ghislain Lebel
Peter ManciniPat Martin
Daniel Turp

NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair:	Joseph Volpe	Vice-Chairs:	David Chatters Julian Reed	
Réginald Bélair Gilles Bernier Serge Cardin John Duncan	Yvon Godin Tony Ianno Ghislain Lebel	Carolyn Parrish Carmen Provenzano Werner Schmidt	Guy St-Julien Brent St. Denis Tony Valeri	(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Hélène Alarie Rob Anders Pierre Brien René Canuel Jean-Guy Chrétien	Michelle Dockrill Ghislain Fournier Christiane Gagnon Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Jim Jones	Gerald Keddy Derrek Konrad Judi Longfield Pat Martin Gilles-A. Perron	Nelson Riis Benoît Sauvageau Caroline St-Hilaire Darrel Stinson Daniel Turp
---	--	---	---

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Derek Lee	Vice-Chairs:	Marlene Catterall Chuck Strahl	
Eleni Bakopanos Stéphane Bergeron Ray Bonin Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Yvon Godin André Harvey Jay Hill	Bob Kilger Gar Knutson Grant McNally	Carolyn Parrish Jerry Pickard John Richardson	(16)

Associate Members

Peter Adams Michel Bellehumeur Bill Blaikie David Chatters Michelle Dockrill	Norman Doyle Deborah Grey Joe Jordan René Laurin	Eric Lowther Larry McCormick Réal Ménard Lorne Nystrom	John Solomon Suzanne Tremblay Randy White Ted White
--	---	---	--

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Larry McCormick	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Blaikie David Chatters	Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	André Harvey	Joe Jordan	(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE TELEVISING OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

Chair:	Marlene Catterall	Vice-Chair:		
Peter Adams Stéphane Bergeron	Michelle Dockrill	Grant McNally	Angela Vautour	(6)

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Raymonde Folco
Rose-Marie Losier-Cool

Joint Vice-Chairs: Grant Hill
Benoît Serré

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Joan Fraser
Jean-Robert Gauthier
Michael Meighen

Lucie Pépin
Jean-Claude Rivest
Louis Robichaud

Mauril Bélanger
Eugène Bellemare
Brenda Chamberlain
Pierre de Savoye
Yvon Godin
Bob Kilger

Raymond Lavigne (23)
Inky Mark
Dan McTeague
Ted McWhinney
Val Meredith
Louis Plamondon

Associate Members

Jean-Guy Chrétien
Maurice Dumas
Paul Mercier

Lorne Nystrom
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Gurmant Grewal
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Ethel Cochrane
Sheila Finestone
George Furey
Normand Grimard

Wilfred Moore
Melvin Perry
Jean-Claude Rivest

Mark Assad
Paul Bonwick
John Bryden
Bill Casey
Joe Comuzzi
Paul DeVillers
Ken Epp
Ghislain Lebel

Ian Murray (25)
Lorne Nystrom
Jim Pankiw
Gary Pillitteri
Jacques Saada
Pierrette Venne
Tom Wappel
Ted White

Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur
Michelle Dockrill

Michel Guimond
Suzanne Tremblay

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panel of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Don Boudria	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
The Hon. George S. Baker	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Robert D. Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Maria Minna	Minister for International Cooperation
The Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
The Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Jim Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)
The Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
The Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
The Hon. Denis Coderre	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Gar Knutson	to Prime Minister
Denis Paradis	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Dromisky	to Minister of Transport
Paddy Torsney	to Minister of the Environment
Brent St. Denis	to Minister of Natural Resources
Mauril Bélanger	to Minister of Canadian Heritage
John Cannis	to Minister of Industry
Roy Cullen	to Minister of Finance
Robert Bertrand	to Minister of National Defence
John Maloney	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Yvon Charbonneau	to Minister of Health
Jacques Saada	to Solicitor General of Canada
Carolyn Parrish	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Tony Ianno	to President of the Treasury Board
Beth Phinney	to Minister of National Revenue
Bonnie Brown	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Reg Alcock	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Bob Speller	to Minister for International Trade
Derek Lee	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Joe McGuire	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Lawrence O'Brien	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Judi Longfield	to Minister of Labour
Bob Wood	to Minister of Veterans Affairs
David Iftody	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Eugène Bellemare	to Minister for International Cooperation
Andrew Telegdi	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration

CONTENTS

Friday, April 14, 2000

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Crimes Against Humanity Act

Bill C-19. Second reading	6133
Mrs. Lalonde	6133
Mr. MacKay	6137

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

National Day of Mourning

Mr. Limoges	6138
-------------------	------

Agriculture

Mr. Hilstrom	6138
--------------------	------

Joseph DeKort

Mr. Lee	6138
---------------	------

Charlton Heston

Mr. Harvard	6138
-------------------	------

VIA Rail

Mr. Pratt	6139
-----------------	------

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Grewal	6139
------------------	------

National Volunteer Week

Mr. Proulx	6139
------------------	------

Highway Infrastructures

Ms. Girard-Bujold	6139
-------------------------	------

The Environment

Mr. Finlay	6140
------------------	------

Multiple Sclerosis

Mr. Morrison	6140
--------------------	------

Peacekeeping

Mr. Maloney	6140
-------------------	------

“The True Names of Birds”

Ms. Lill	6140
----------------	------

Prime Minister of Canada

Mrs. Guay	6141
-----------------	------

Community Policing

Mr. Graham	6141
------------------	------

Diabetes

Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	6141
---------------------------------------	------

The Second Battle of Ypres

Mr. Bertrand	6141
--------------------	------

Volunteer Week 2000

Mr. Goldring	6141
--------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Human Resources Development

Mrs. Ablonczy	6142
Mr. Gray	6142
Mrs. Ablonczy	6142
Ms. Brown	6142
Mrs. Ablonczy	6142

Ms. Brown	6142
Ms. Meredith	6142
Ms. Brown	6142
Ms. Meredith	6143
Ms. Brown	6143

Middle East

Mrs. Tremblay	6143
Mr. Gray	6143
Mrs. Tremblay	6143
Mr. Gray	6143
Mrs. Lalonde	6143
Mr. Gray	6143
Mrs. Lalonde	6143
Mr. Gray	6143

Health

Mr. Blaikie	6144
Mr. Rock	6144
Mr. Blaikie	6144
Mr. Rock	6144

Fundraising

Mr. Brison	6144
Mr. Peterson	6144
Mr. Brison	6144
Mr. Peterson	6144

Human Resources Development

Mr. Vellacott	6145
Ms. Brown	6145
Mr. Hart	6145
Ms. Brown	6145
Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	6145
Ms. Brown	6145
Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	6145
Ms. Brown	6145

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Grewal	6145
Mr. Gray	6145
Mr. Jaffer	6146
Mr. Gray	6146

Human Resources Development

Mr. Bergeron	6146
Ms. Brown	6146
Mr. Bergeron	6146
Ms. Brown	6146

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Chatters	6146
Mr. Gray	6146
Mr. Duncan	6146
Mr. Gray	6147

Employment Insurance

Mr. Crête	6147
Ms. Brown	6147

Competition Act

Mrs. Jennings	6147
Mr. Manley	6147

Canada Development Corporation

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	6147
--------------------------	------

Mr. Gray	6147
Mr. Gilmour	6147
Mr. Gray	6148
Plutonium Shipments	
Mr. Gruending	6148
Mr. Goodale	6148
Transportation	
Mr. Earle	6148
Mr. Collenette	6148
Taxation	
Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	6148
Mr. Peterson	6148
Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	6148
Mr. Peterson	6149
Health	
Ms. Whelan	6149
Mr. Rock	6149
Canada Development Corporation	
Mr. Ritz	6149
Mr. Gray	6149
Importation of Plutonium	
Ms. Girard-Bujold	6149
Mr. Goodale	6149
Giant Mines	
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6149
Mr. Peterson	6150
Fisheries	
Mr. Keddy	6150
Mr. O'Brien (Labrador)	6150
Housing	
Mr. Harb	6150
Ms. Parrish	6150
Canada Development Corporation	
Mr. McNally	6150
Mr. Gray	6150
Genetically Modified Organisms	
Mrs. Guay	6151
Mr. Normand	6151
Canadian Grain Commission	
Mr. Proctor	6151
Mr. Goodale	6151
Points of Order	
Statements by Members	
Mr. Blaikie	6151
Mr. Boudria	6151
Mr. Chatters	6151
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	6151
Mr. Bryden	6152
The Deputy Speaker	6152

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lee	6152

Committees of the House	
Citizenship and Immigration	
Mr. Limoges	6152
Finance	
Mr. Bevilacqua	6152
Procedure and House Affairs	
Motion for concurrence	6152
Mr. Lee	6152
(Motion agreed to)	6152
Petitions	
Pesticides	
Mr. Lincoln	6152
Bill C-23	
Ms. Meredith	6153
National Highway System	
Ms. Meredith	6153
Mammography	
Mr. Harvard	6153
Child Poverty	
Mr. Blaikie	6153
Bill C-23	
Mr. Bryden	6153
Rural Route Mail Couriers	
Mr. Bryden	6153
Child Poverty	
Mr. Bryden	6153
Immigration	
Mr. Ritz	6153
Taxation	
Mr. Ritz	6153
Criminal Code	
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	6153
Marriage	
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	6154
Mr. Jaffer	6154
Divorce	
Mr. Jaffer	6154
Child Poverty	
Mr. Jaffer	6154
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lee	6154
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Lee	6154

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Crimes Against Humanity Act	
Bill C-19. Second reading	6155
Mr. MacKay	6155
Mr. Vellacott	6157
Mr. Kilgour	6160
Mr. Vellacott	6160
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	6160
Mr. Vellacott	6161
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	6161
Mr. Kilgour	6162
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	6162
Mr. Vellacott	6162
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	6163
Mr. Hilstrom	6163
Mr. Kilgour	6164
Mr. Hilstrom	6164
Mr. Vellacott	6165

Mr. Hilstrom 6165

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Petitions

Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) 6165

Motion 6165

Mr. Duncan 6168

Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) 6168

Mr. Collette 6168

Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) 6168

Mr. Brison 6168

Mr. Lee 6170

Mr. Bergeron 6171

Mr. Bryden 6172

Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) 6173

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,
45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9