



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 152 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, March 1, 2002

—
Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 1, 2002

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2001

The House proceeded to consideration of Bill C-49, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on December 10, 2001 as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

• (1000)

[*Translation*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: There are 29 motions in amendment on the notice paper in connection with the report stage of Bill C-49.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1, 10, 17, 18 and 20 will not be selected by the Chair as they could have been proposed in committee.

Motion No. 21 will not be selected by the Chair as it requires a royal recommendation.

Motions Nos. 3 to 9, 11 to 16, 19 and 23 to 28 will not be selected by the Chair as they are similar or identical to motions defeated in committee.

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

The motions will be grouped for debate as follows:

[*Translation*]

Group No. 1: Motion No. 2.

Group No. 2: Motion No. 22.

The voting patterns for the motions within each group are available at the Table. The Chair will remind the House of each pattern at the time of voting.

[*English*]

I shall now propose Motion No. 2 in Group No. 1 to the House.

• (1005)

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand your ruling is that Motions Nos. 10 and 17 are not to be heard because they could have been put at committee. Unfortunately I was not able to attend that committee because I was at the procedure and House affairs committee which is dealing with the matter related to the minister of defence.

As you well know, Mr. Speaker, the procedure and House affairs committee has been going virtually non-stop. I simply did not have an opportunity to introduce Motions Nos. 10 and 17 at the finance committee. Had I not been tied up in a motion that I think has precedence because of the extremely sensitive nature of that matter, I could have attended the finance committee and introduced these motions.

Therefore, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider your ruling in that respect and allow both Motions Nos. 10 and 17.

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I also rise on a point of order in this regard. I submitted three motions yesterday because I am not a regular member of that standing committee. As well, the official opposition had all its spots filled on that committee at the time so it would have been difficult for me to sidle up to the table. I was also busy at the time that committee was meeting. I am a regular member of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs and, as a result, had other committee responsibilities simultaneously.

What also needs to be taken into consideration is that the committee jammed the bill through so quickly that even the witnesses who were supposed to be called had only a day's notice or less. As a result, many people refused to appear because it was simply unreasonable to ask senior executives of airlines and whatnot to appear with less than a day's notice. The government whip in this case was also very heavy-handed in terms of forcing the bill through.

I think all these things need to be taken into account, as well as the fact that the witnesses, including Mr. Clifford Mackay with the Air Transport Association of Canada, basically said that the tax was too complex and needed a grace period.

Government Orders

On top of that, when the vice-president of WestJet, Mark Hill, made his presentation before the finance committee he said that he was shocked that the committee had not done an analysis of the impact it would have on the airline industry. He said that it would not have been difficult to do the analysis but that it was all a question of time.

Perhaps the question is not on the timing but unfortunately in this place we have been led to believe that government business does not have precedence over opposition business in terms of the drafting of some of these types of amendments and motions. Nonetheless, that does not appear to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to take all those things into consideration because frankly these are central and key amendments to the consideration of the bill.

• (1010)

The Speaker: Perhaps the member for Calgary West could enlighten the Chair by indicating which amendments he is speaking about. He did not give me the numbers.

Mr. Rob Anders: Mr. Speaker, the first motion I am referring to is Motion No. 18 which I believe deals with a 90 day grace period.

The next one is Motion No. 20 which has to do with a postponement of the legislation specifically because no impact studies were conducted with regard to the industry and consultation was not adequately rendered.

The third motion is Motion No. 1 which I believe has to do with the consultation issue.

The Speaker: To clarify for the Chair, the two points of order that have been raised concern Motions Nos. 1, 10, 17, 18 and 20. Is that correct?

Mr. Rob Anders: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief intervention on Motions Nos. 10 and 17.

I was present at the finance committee during its ostensible consideration of these motions. I would like to report to the Chair that while I understand that committee proceedings are the business of committee, I think it is important when the Chair considers this that he review the blues of the committee as well as published reports of the meeting where permanent members of the committee on the part of the government who had participated in witness testimony were removed from the committee by the whip's office and were not there to vote on these amendments and therefore were unable to exercise proper discretion.

Furthermore, the chair herself attempted to actually retroactively undo—

• (1015)

The Speaker: I know the hon. member for Calgary Southeast is trying to be very helpful to the Chair. I have read some of the published reports of the goings on in the finance committee. Of course I have no opinion whatsoever on anything that transpired there. It is not the concern of the Chair directly. I know in raising this the hon. member was not trying to draw the Chair into this kind of disagreement, not at all I am sure.

I am also aware, and the hon. member has just reminded me, how he could have moved these amendments in the committee had he received them from his colleagues. Of course the whole purpose of committee proceedings is to allow for these things to be put in the committee and dealt with there. I stressed that in my earlier ruling on this subject with which I know the hon. member for Calgary Southeast is very familiar. I understand he reads it on a regular basis.

Having said that, I am also satisfied that in this case I note that the bill was referred to the committee on February 18, it got second reading that day, and was reported on February 27, so obviously the committee moved with some alacrity on the matter. I know that during that time members have been involved in other committees and, in the circumstances, I am prepared in this case to exercise some leniency and allow these five motions in because this bill was reported on Wednesday and has only come up today. Had there been a little more time, maybe I would have been a little less generous.

However, in the circumstances I will put the five motions that we have heard about in, Motions Nos. 1, 10, 17, 18 and 20. They will be lumped into Group No. 1.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you will find that after consultation among all parties there is unanimous consent to allow all remaining motions standing in the name of the member for St. Albert to stand in the name of the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. They are Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28.

The Speaker: Is it agreed that the motions will all stand in the name of the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: However, none of the motion numbers I have heard have been selected for debate.

I will now put to the House the motions in Group No. 1.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Canadian Alliance) moved:
Motion No. 1

That Bill C-49, in Clause 2, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 5 the following:

“(6) The Authority must, before December 31 of each year following the Authority's first full year of operations, submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year to the Minister, and the Minister must cause a copy of the report to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister receives it.

(7) The report referred to in subsection (6) must include:

(a) national, provincial and regional data on the effect of the air travellers security surcharge on passenger travel and economic development; and

(b) a review of the impact of all the other surcharges levied on air travel.”

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-49, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing subsection 10(2) with the following:

“(2) Two of the directors must be nominees submitted by the representatives of the airline industry designated under section 11 whom the Minister considers suitable for appointment as directors, and two must be nominees submitted by the representatives of aerodrome operators designated under that section whom the Minister considers suitable for appointment as directors.”

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Government Orders

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-49, in Clause 5, be amended by replacing line 27 on page 16 with the following:

“schedule and a prescribed airport except if it is

(a) an aerodrome north of the 55th parallel of north latitude that is not served at least five times per week by non-stop round-trip jet service to an airport south of the 55th parallel of north latitude, or

(b) an aerodrome where the population of the adjoining city is less than 3,000 persons.”

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-49, in Clause 5, be amended by adding after line 13 on page 23 the following:

“(6) Despite any other provision of this Act, no charge shall be collected with respect to departure from a terminal at a listed airport unless screening was operational at that terminal as of September 10, 2001.”

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-49, in Clause 5, be amended by adding after line 18 on page 24 the following:

“15.1 No person who collects an amount as or on account of a charge within 90 days after the day on which this Part comes into force, shall be liable for any deficiency in the amount collected if the deficiency is the result of a reasonable error due to unfamiliarity with any aspect of the collection process.”

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-49, in Clause 11, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 22 on page 76 with the following:

“11. This Part comes into force on July 1, 2002.

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this bill which is particularly important for the airline industry. I know there has been some controversy and I want to speak to Motions Nos. 1 and 2 since debate has been permitted on Motion No. 1 moved by the member for Calgary West. First I would like to make some preliminary remarks.

This is a budgetary measure because of the charge that has been imposed to provide for the financing of all the various improvements under the air security authority. The Minister of Finance and his officials, the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance have all had carriage of the bill in the House. I thank them for their hard work. In particular, the Minister of Finance and the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions have come in for some rather unwarranted and unjust criticism in the House during question period in defending the charge.

Perhaps I can give a little of the background. The events of September 11 were such that we had to act quickly. The Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister agreed there should be a security based budget. As a result a lot of work was done under incredible time pressure.

Transport officials and I as minister talked to the Minister of Finance in November. Traffic flows were still uncertain. We had good reason to believe that Canadians would go back to travelling in large numbers and that is indeed happening. However at the time of the preparation of the budget we were not in possession of firm figures to denote that. As a result, the Minister of Finance had no other alternative but to be prudent and judicious with the taxpayers' money. We are talking about a \$2.2 billion expenditure over five

years. It was crucial that he have the revenue to cover the expenditures.

I believe the criticism he has come under is unwarranted and unjust. Perhaps there is some unevenness in the application as has been described by some of the aviation groups and the airlines, but the Minister of Finance has been categorical that he will review the charge in September.

He has also been categorical that this will not be a revenue grab by the government. These moneys will not be applied for other uses. This is not a revenue generating mechanism. That is why we are not calling it a tax, because it is not a tax. It is a user charge like other user charges, specifically to cover the expenditures related to the airlines.

I do hope members understand that whatever unevenness and few bumps we may have in the next six months, it is my hope that with traffic coming back, the Minister of Finance will be in a position in September after a review of the charge to make adjustments. He has given that undertaking. He is a man of his word and all hon. members should accept that.

With respect to two motions at hand, the hon. member for Calgary West put forward a motion, and I understand why, that clause 2 be amended by adding a couple of clauses but one in particular, that an annual report be tabled and that the annual report must include national, provincial and regional data on the effect of the air travellers security surcharge on passenger travel and economic development and a review of the impact of all other surcharges levied on air travel.

The Minister of Finance will be addressing those issues when he makes the determination as to whether or not the charge in its present form should continue. That will be in the month of September.

However, on the issue of the annual report, as a crown corporation the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority is subject to the Financial Administration Act and part I of schedule III of the FAA is amended accordingly by Bill C-49.

Section 150 of the FAA already provides that each crown corporation submits an annual report to the appropriate minister and the President of Treasury Board as soon as possible and in any case within three months after the termination of each financial year. The minister then tables the report before the House on any of the first 15 sitting days.

● (1020)

Section 150 of the FAA also species the information that must be included in the annual report: the financial statements; the auditor's annual report; a statement on the extent to which the corporation has met its objectives for the financial year; quantitative information respecting the performance of the corporation; and such other information as is required by the FAA or any other act of parliament, or by the appropriate minister, the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance.

I would respectfully say to the hon. member for Calgary West that the FAA already has provisions which achieve the objectives of his motion which therefore make his motion redundant.

Government Orders

On Motion No. 2, which is to amend clause 2 of Bill C-49, we are providing for the appointment by the governor in council of the board of directors of the authority. The board is to be composed of 11 directors, including the chair.

The board's composition was amended by the Standing Committee on Finance to include two directors nominated by the bargaining agent that represents the greatest number of screening officers employed at aerodromes in Canada. At first glance this seems like a reasonable approach, but only if it fairly reflects the composition of the workforce. In fact, this is not the case for the air transport security industry.

There are 13 different companies providing passenger screening at airports. About half, approximately 2,500 screening officers, are represented by as many as six different unions. These include the United Steelworkers of America, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, the Hotel, Restaurant and Bartenders' Union and the Labourers International Union of North America.

We debated this at length. We debated it at the department. We debated it at cabinet and in committee clause by clause. We understood that there would be pressure from labour for dedicated labour representatives among the representatives on the board.

However, there are other parties who are affected by the operations of the security authority and it is really not possible to put a seat on the board of directors to represent each stakeholder group. We think it is important to balance the benefits of representation on the board of directors with the need to establish a manageable sized board to facilitate effective decision making. Clause 10 as previously drafted at second reading does just that.

There is nothing in the legislation which would preclude the governor in council from appointing a labour representative or representative from any other stakeholder group to the board of directors, provided that those individuals met the requirements set out in the legislation. The board of directors would be composed of 11 directors of which only four seats would be designated for the two stakeholders most affected by operations, that is, the airlines and the aerodrome operators. This means there would remain seven seats on the board which would be available to represent an appropriate cross-section of the Canadian public.

If we were not to revert to the original wording in the bill, as proposed by the motion, in effect the largest union now offering the services, the United Steelworkers of America, would have permanent representation on the board and the union dynamic may change after the authority gets up and running. We cannot encumber an authority with the fact that it can only deal with security companies with one bargaining agent, i.e., the United Steelworkers of America.

I have met on two occasions with United Steelworkers of America officials. My officials have met with them a number of times. I have to say they have been extremely helpful in designing the bill. I think the rapport has been good. I do not blame them for having a last kick at the can in the House and in committee to try to get their point across. However, it has to be seen from their own particular interest as one union rather than from the perspective of labour as a whole.

Mr. Svend Robinson: The committee supported it.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom: It was the committee.

Hon. David Collette: The hon. member from Saskatchewan has been in the House a long time and should know he should give courtesy to hon. members trying to explain a very germane point.

I will give an undertaking to the House that there will be among the seven government representatives a person or persons who will be sensitive to organized labour's goals and ideals. In the same way, we will do it for the tourist industry and other affected stakeholder groups.

Mr. Svend Robinson: How about the amendment? It is contempt for the committee.

Hon. David Collette: Mr. Speaker, I know that this has come from the NDP. I have been in the House a long, long time. The NDP's basic ethos in life is to promote the interests of organized labour. The Liberal Party is not opposed in any way to organized labour. In fact, most union members voted for the Liberals in recent elections. The fact is that we speak for all labour and not just one trade union.

● (1025)

Mr. Svend Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. minister will surely know that it is out of order to impute motives. It is very clear that the amendment the government is overturning was supported by the committee. The government is showing total contempt for the work of the committee itself.

● (1030)

Hon. David Collette: Mr. Speaker, I am not imputing motives. I am just trying to understand the logic of the NDP and let other members who are unaware of the way the NDP thinks in these matters know why we are reverting back to the original language.

Therefore, notwithstanding the good points made in the committee, I would hope that the House understands the government's position and understands its commitment with respect to labour representation and the labour point of view and will support this motion to revert back to the original language as introduced.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I find it very instructive that the Minister of Transport has finally risen on the bill when he has refused to answer a single question in question period with respect to this new policy—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transport on a point of order.

Hon. David Collette: Mr. Speaker, this is unwarranted imputation here. The fact is that this is a financial matter. The Minister of Finance is the lead because it is part of a budget bill. I would love to answer all these questions and I have shown that I have done it today.

The Speaker: I think the statement shows that we are really in a debate here, not on a point of order. The hon. member for Calgary Southeast has the floor.

Mr. Jason Kenney: I am afraid the transport minister has disappointed us, Mr. Speaker, in not answering our questions.

Government Orders

I find it very peculiar that a policy which will very seriously impact the airline industry, the ostensible purview of the hon. Minister of Transport, should have been invented, implemented and defended by the Minister of Finance with virtually no reference to the transport department, which is responsible for this. We even sought to have the Minister of Transport appear before the committee, but the new whip-appointed chair of that committee, who has turned what was a normally thoughtful and businesslike committee into a partisan gong show, refused to allow us to call the Minister of Transport to ask him some very serious questions.

However, I did have an opportunity at committee to ask one of the minister's senior officials whether the Ministry of Transport had conducted any impact studies on the consequences of this \$24 round trip air security tax. Lo and behold, the transport department, apparently responsible for airline policy, has not even, according to that witness, done a single study on the potential impact on the airline industry in Canada. This is unbelievable and doubly unbelievable because Department of Finance officials admitted at committee that it had not engaged in any economic studies about the impact of this enormous \$24 tax.

I also found it instructive that the Minister of Transport began by essentially saying that the finance minister had no choice at budget time but to introduce this \$24 tax, that he had no alternative but to be prudent with tax dollars. I do not know how it is prudent with tax dollars to collect an additional 2.2 billion of them. If the finance minister wanted to be prudent he could have and would have reduced spending in low and falling priority areas and in wasteful government spending, areas that have been identified by this opposition, by the auditor general and by many external critics, and he could have reallocated those resources to finance new security measures, including new airport security measures.

Instead, the finance minister could not and did not identify a single red cent of reallocated public spending in his budget, so I find the transport minister's argument of budgetary prudence just a little hard to take. I am glad he has admitted that the bill is pretty seriously flawed, because for a minister to say that there may be some unevenness with the application of this new tax is so serious that he is basically saying they will try to change this in six months. He is basically saying "trust me, I am going to lobby the finance minister in the next six months not to completely crater the Canadian airline industry, just wait, be patient". Anybody with objections, including the hon. member for Hillsborough in P.E.I. who was prepared to vote for one of our motions to cut the transport tax in half, is pulled out of committee and read the riot act by the finance minister and the whip. The non-commitment he was given was that in six months the government will take a look at it. In six months it may be too late. It may not be a review; it may be a post-mortem.

That I draw from the testimony of every industry witness who appeared before committee even though a number of witnesses were not permitted to appear as the whip's representative in the chair attempted to jam the bill through with absurd and undue haste.

The Canadian Airports Council said that the "current fee structure will create disproportionate price increases on short haul and regional flights—unfairly penalizing smaller carriers who provide these services", e.g. WestJet. The council also said:

—the proposed \$24 charge is a significant disincentive to air travel at a time when the price of an air ticket is already significantly inflated by an array of fees and charges for air navigation, fuel taxes, federal and provincial sales tax, and self-financed airport improvements.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce as well was not given an opportunity to appear before us with live witnesses for questioning because of the way in which the whip ran these hearings, but it stated in a written submission that:

The one-way cost of the Air Travellers Security Charge of \$12, represents almost six per cent of the average price of a one-way domestic ticket sold in Canada in 1999.

● (1035)

It went on to state that "If a one per cent increase in ticket prices represents a one per cent decrease in passenger travel", an estimate which it attributes to the Air Transport Association of Canada, "then the average air traveller security charge of six per cent will have a significant effect in terms of the number of air passengers".

Captain Kent Hardisty from the Air Line Pilots Association stated:

The proposed legislation does little but create an expensive bureaucracy that will be unresponsive to the insights and interests of the people on the front lines of aviation security.

He also stated that the \$24 surcharge:

—will be particularly crippling to short-haul domestic carriers such as Air Canada Regional and WestJet. We find it ironic, to say the least, that legislation intending to improve security of air travel in Canada could assist its very demise...We therefore recommend that the entire security charge scheme should be abandoned in its entirety.

Randall Williams of the Tourism Industry Association of Canada stated:

This tax will hurt an industry still recovering from the September 11 terrorist activities and the economic slowdown...The traveling public does not support this tax. Combine this with the major administrative and logistical difficulties this tax will create for the air industry, travel agents...it is clear that a user-pay system to offset costs for security and policing is inefficient and a terrible precedent.

Finally, under questioning I put it to Clifford Mackay of the Air Transport Association of Canada that the government says it will not try to run a surplus with the new \$2.2 billion tax. The government claims that it will reduce the fee at some indefinite point in the future if it finds that expenditures have not expanded to consume the combined revenues. However, Mr. Mackay, a former senior official in this government, knew as well as I did that this was complete nonsense. He stated:

The problem with the model we have is...it's unlikely—and I spent 20 years as a senior government official—that you will get the response, "No, reduce our revenues because we don't need any more money". I'm not saying this to be derogatory to federal public servants. Frankly, they try to do their job well, but it's not a normal occurrence around this town...The implementation of this new tax or charge...is frankly extremely complex. We've spent hundreds of hours trying to figure out how to do this. It's not going to be easy.

Government Orders

There were two hours of testimony and many more witnesses before the committee, including those from WestJet. WestJet, being the only profitable airline in Canada and which is the only hope for competition in this monopolistic environment, told the committee that its business will be severely jeopardized. Why? Because of, as the minister puts it, the uneven application of this tax.

A passenger who has a \$100 fare ticket from Kelowna to Vancouver or Edmonton to Calgary with WestJet, on a discount, low cost, short haul flight, will end up paying the \$24 round trip tax, but someone who is flying on a business expense account on Air Canada, a full service carrier, from Halifax to Vancouver, on a \$4,500 J class fare will pay a \$24 round trip tax. In other words, this tax, I believe, has been surreptitiously designed to benefit the monopoly airline in the country and drive out of business the successful element of competition which is the only hope for a competitive airline industry in this country.

We know that the government is planning to bring in more revenues from its tax this year than it plans to expend in security fees, so why is it going to take a six month review? The transport minister already has admitted that this approach is flawed. Members of his government were willing to vote against it at committee, were willing to cut the fee in half in one of our amendments and were seriously willing to consider other opposition amendments until removed from the room. We had one case on that committee where the member for Hillsborough announced his intention to support and therefore pass our amendment to cut the security charge in half. When the question on that motion was called and on the floor, about to pass, the whip's representative in the chair gavelled the meeting to a close and we had a missing person's case on our hands which turned out to be a mugging, because he came back and had been given his marching orders.

●(1040)

These are modest amendments which would undo the damage of the bill and they ought to be passed. Government members should vote freely on this as its members were unwilling to in committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this morning to speak to Bill C-49, with which the Minister of Finance, in his last budget, applies an additional tax.

When we want people to stop smoking, all we can do is impose a tax. The higher the tax, the more cigarettes will cost, and the more likely the consumer is to decide to stop smoking.

Someone who can afford to fly to Florida can probably afford the \$24 air security tax, but where the problem lies is that the tax the Minister of Finance announced in his last budget, which will be applicable starting March 31, 2002, applies to domestic flights in the regions. Through the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Finance, the federal government has just hammered the last nail in the coffin of the regional airports.

This is nothing new. Since the Liberals came to office in 1994, they have busied themselves with collecting money and then no longer distributing it to the regions.

Yesterday the NDP moved a motion that listed 12 good reasons to stay in Canada and conduct reforms. This morning, if we were to

draw up a list, those of us from Quebec could provide 100 good reasons to withdraw from Canada. One of these good reasons is that the federal government has withdrawn from regional development and its own infrastructure in the regions. This started right away in 1994.

Will closing control towers in airports and eliminating air traffic controllers reassure passengers? In an airport such as the one in Baie-Comeau, there are control towers, and there used to be air traffic controllers. They were not there for fun, they were there to ensure safety. There have been accidents; an Air Satellite plane had an accident. It was not the airport security service that found the plane that had crashed, nor was it the RCMP, it was the volunteer firefighters from the town of Baie-Comeau.

Fire prevention services have also been eliminated in regional airports. This is important in the unfortunate event of an accident at an airport. The federal government had decided, through equipment and personnel, to provide an adequate fire fighting service, if there was a plane crash at an airport. This was eliminated. It no longer exists at regional airports.

The federal government will assign a category to an airport, based on use. Airports will now be classified as either important, intermediate or, just because of a lack of use, as airports that the federal government no longer considers in its air transportation action plans because of a drop in activity. I will explain later why this leads to a drop in airport use.

In the last ten years, the federal government has not invested a cent in regional airports. These are white elephants with deteriorating equipment. Besides, the federal government has a policy of airport divestiture. Today, it plans to sell to local corporations those white elephants with obsolete equipment and infrastructure that is inadequate, and unsafe in some regards.

Following the extensive consultations on airports carried out by the Standing Committee on Finance, of which I am a member, together with the transport critic and member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, I have come to the conclusion that it would be preferable for the federal government to remain the owner of its airports and to let local authorities administer them. It would be better for the federal government to remain responsible for its infrastructure, in order to be able to set its own standards. If airports were transferred to local corporations, there is a risk that the federal government could change its legislation, regulations and standards, which would result in a reduction in the profitability of airports.

●(1045)

On the other hand, if airports end up closing, the federal government will wash its hands of it, saying "We are not to blame for the Baie-Comeau closing, as for the one of Saint-Irénée, in Charlevoix".

Government Orders

I believe that the Competition Bureau has not done what it should have to increase the level of movement and improve customer service in the regions. The bureau, which is under federal jurisdiction, has not done its job. Let me explain.

In Baie-Comeau, Air Canada had a subsidiary company called Air Alliance or Air Nova, which competed fiercely to get to service the North Shore region. I have always seen Air Canada as a predator. Today, this company has a monopoly and no longer provides services to its customers. Now that it has forced InterCanadien into bankruptcy, it fixes schedules as it pleases. InterCanadien was a subsidiary of Canadian Airlines.

Profits were being made and there was a competitive environment. Two aircraft would arrive at 15 minute intervals. Air Canada's white and red aircraft would arrive at 7.30 a.m., while Canadian Airlines' white and blue aircraft would land 15 minutes later. Travellers had a choice of schedules and airfares. That allowed people from Charlevoix and north shore to come to major urban centres such as Quebec City and Montreal. All this has disappeared because of Air Canada's tactics.

Air Alma is no longer in the picture. In western Canada, I am convinced that Air Canada will succeed in eliminating WestJet. The situation there will be the same as in Baie-Comeau, with only Air Canada, mediocre services, airfares going up and inadequate schedules. Again, there will be fewer flights, with the result that one day airports will be closed.

Prices are on the rise and we know that the government just imposed a new tax that will come into effect on March 31. That tax is \$12 for a one way trip and \$24 for a return trip. A passenger who makes a return trip between Baie-Comeau and Quebec City already has to pay \$460 for his airfare and will now have to shell out an additional \$24, which means that his return trip, often completed on the same day, will cost close to \$500.

One can fly from Montreal to Florida or Mexico for the same cost. In the regions, we have no choice but to fly, for reasons such as our schedules, availability, the weather and various other factors.

There is a lack of services in the regions. We only have one carrier. If it decides to stop flying between Baie-Comeau, Quebec City and Montreal, and instead flies only between Baie-Comeau and Montreal, what are we going to do if we have a meeting in Quebec City at 9 a.m.? We will have to leave the day before and fly from Baie-Comeau to Montreal, then from Montreal to Quebec City, and stay overnight in Quebec City to attend the 9 a.m. meeting the next morning. If that meeting ends at 5 p.m., we will have to fly back to Montreal, stay overnight and, the next morning, make the trip between Montreal and Baie-Comeau.

What will happen? Business people, who cannot afford to take three days just to attend a meeting in Quebec City, will decide to drive the 450 kilometres to get there and the 450 kilometres to get back. Again, the number of passengers will go down, which means that profits will also go down and that, some day, there will no longer be any airline serving the regions. They will say that it is no longer profitable, that it does not work, that there is no longer any business. And then the airport will close.

This is unacceptable, in a region such as the north shore—whether it is Sept-Îles, Baie-Comeau or Saint-Irénée, in the riding of Charlevoix—for the federal government to levy a \$12 tax on a one way ticket and \$24 on a return ticket.

The Liberal government is really hindering regional development. We have to get professional services. We have to import professional services into the regions, and there are professionals in the regions who have to go to other institutions.

This is the case in health services. A person living in Baie-Comeau and having to consult a specialist in Quebec City or Montreal has to travel by plane. Unfortunately, flight schedules do not always allow this and the costs are very high.

• (1050)

For example, a student going to a university in Quebec City or Montreal cannot afford to travel by air. He or she must travel by bus. This too leads to a drop in the number of passengers.

In concluding, I must say that the Liberal government will once again wash its hands and say, "I am not the one who closed the airports; it is the local authorities who did".

The federal Liberal government rakes in billions of dollars to the detriment of the regions. This is an excellent reason for demanding our sovereignty. I say to Quebecers, particularly those in the regions, let us wake up and, at the next referendum, let us vote yes for Quebec's sovereignty.

[*English*]

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about Motion No. 2 that was moved by the minister. I submit that the minister showed real contempt for the democratic committee process of the House of Commons.

In committee last Tuesday members accepted an amendment that I proposed that there be two representatives of the labour movement on the board of directors of the authority. The authority would have 11 directors, two coming from the airline industry, two coming from the aerodromes and the others to be chosen by the minister or by order in council.

I moved a motion to have two representatives of the labour unions who represent workers at security points throughout the country. That motion passed in the House of Commons finance committee. What we have today is a motion by the minister totally reversing the expression of the House of Commons finance committee. What is the purpose of committees if a minister is able to overrule what a committee recommends?

To make it even worse, over the last couple of days we were told by a member of the government that someone from the Prime Minister's Office, or the powers that be, had indicated that the government did not want two labour representatives but was willing to accept one representative on the new board of directors.

S. O. 31

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance is an honourable man and acts in good faith. He was with me yesterday at a meeting with Dennis Deveau, a representative of the united steelworkers. He assured Mr. Deveau that there would be one labour representative on the board of directors. He said that the Prime Minister's Office did not want two representatives and would move an amendment to reduce this to one.

The parliamentary secretary was acting in good faith. I received a call at about 6 o'clock last night stating that the Minister of Finance had pulled the rug out from under us and the expression of the finance committee of the House of Commons. That is absolutely shameful. He owes an explanation to the trade movement and to the individuals who are screening people at airports right across the country. What utter contempt for the democratic process of this House of Commons.

Why do we even have parliamentary committees? This committee accepted to amend the legislation and the Minister of Transport pulled the rug out from the democratic process here in the House of Commons.

I know it is getting worse as the years go on with regard to the government running the entire show. The show is being dictated by the minister's office or the Prime Minister's Office. In this case the Prime Minister's Office sent a clear signal that it would accept one labour representative on the board of directors and the Minister of Finance vetoed that.

• (1055)

Hon. David Collette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is a longstanding member in the House. He should know that ministers, in this case the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Transport, determine what the government's policy will be with respect to a bill, not a nameless official in the Prime Minister's Office.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, sometimes in the House we operate in good faith. As the minister said, we take people at their word. We took people at their word. The United Steelworkers were told that. There is such a thing as good faith and trusting what people say. This can put the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance in a bad position.

The minister over there says he determines what goes into legislation. It is the Parliament of Canada that decides the laws of the country, not the Minister of Transport. We have parliamentary committees to examine the bills that go before the House of Commons. If the finance committee amends bills surely the Government of Canada and the minister across the way can show respect for its decisions.

Why do we even have parliamentary committees? We have Liberal government members operating in good faith. An amendment was passed. They gave us assurances that they did not want two labour representatives but would accept one. All of a sudden the minister came to the House today and said no, they did not want any at all.

Why is that? It is because there is more than one union representing workers at security checkpoints across the country. My God, there is more than one airline yet the airlines would get two

seats on the board of directors. Who would occupy the seats? Would it be someone from Air Canada? Who would occupy the other one? What would happen if the other one went bankrupt? Where is the logic in the minister's argument?

The airport authority or the aerodromes would get two representatives on the board of directors. Who would they be? Would they be from Pearson airport in Toronto? Would they be from a small airport? Would they be from a small airport that might go under because of the new airport tax? We do not know.

What does the minister have against the trade union movement? The United Steelworkers of America gave a reasonable presentation that the committee respected. The union is co-operating with the government with respect to the bill. It is co-operating with the Minister of Finance, the parliamentary security, Liberal members and all committee members.

The union made the argument that workers should have representation. It did not even say two. It would prefer two but it only asked for some representation. The committee said two because there would be two from the airlines and two from the airports. This was overruled by the Minister of Finance, a little tin pot dictator sitting across the way who does not listen to the expression of a parliamentary committee where members of his own party are in the majority.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle will have five minutes remaining in the time allotted for his remarks when debate on the motion is resumed, which I expect will be a little later today according to what we are now seeing.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, March 8 is International Women's Day. It is a day when women around the world, despite divisions of ethnic, linguistic, cultural, economic and political issues, come together and celebrate. They celebrate women as makers of history and their achievements for women's equality worldwide.

Women who are single mothers, women who have chosen non-traditional careers, and women who inspire young girls to break gender stereotypes are being honoured. Theatre productions, art shows and musical presentations will showcase female Canadian talent from coast to coast to coast.

Many Canadians will celebrate International Women's Week at these and other unique and exciting venues. They will be showing how proud we are of women's achievements both present and past.

I strongly encourage my fellow hon. members to seek out and participate in these activities. We should take pride in the diversity of accomplishments big and small, national and international, that Canadian women have attained.

HEALTH

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there are more than two million diabetics in Canada. Ten per cent are insulin dependent.

Since the introduction of synthetic insulin in Canada animal based products have been rapidly phased out, but not everyone tolerates the new synthetic insulin. I have heard from two very concerned endocrinologists and recently met with three parents carrying photos of their deceased children.

Katherine Ferguson of Vancouver described the untimely death of her son Christopher who died at age 17, three years after switching to synthetic insulin. He suffered from distress signals such as blackouts, comas, seizures and no warning signs for rapid onset low blood sugar.

Health Canada has over 460 reports of adverse reactions to synthetic insulin. There used to be more than 27 insulin based products to match with difficult patients. Now there are only four. Health Canada needs to do more to alert doctors and patients to adverse reactions and to ensure that animal based insulin alternatives are readily available to those who need them.

* * *

• (1100)

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is currently hosting a very important visit of senior officials from the Hong Kong Correctional Services Department including the commissioner of corrections, his assistant commissioner, the principal of the staff training institute and the chief officer of the Correctional Services Department of Hong Kong.

The visit is part of a joint collaboration to enhance our respective correctional services through the sharing of best practices, values and experiences. It is but one component of the work being achieved under the memorandum of understanding signed in March last year between our two jurisdictions.

The visit also supports Canada's international agenda to build strong and safe communities by creating and sharing opportunities globally. It is another indication of how the Government of Canada is committed to working with its international partners to promote international peace and security and to strengthen democracy, justice and social stability worldwide.

Canada is indeed strengthening its place in the world, and we look forward to future visits and collaborative efforts of this kind.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, March 8 is International Women's Day. This year's theme, "Working in Solidarity: Women, Human Rights and Peace", recognizes the crucial role played by women in seeking social justice on the local, regional, national and international scenes.

S. O. 31

It reinforces the need to work in solidarity to address the abuse of women's human rights and to replace the global culture of violence with a culture of peace.

The situation of Afghan women now in the news since the tragic events of September 11 is unfortunately just one example of the sad reality of the millions of women and girls around the world who live daily with the threat of war, terrorism or violation of their human rights.

On this International Women's Day, I urge Canadians and the other peoples of the world to take the time to reflect on the difficulties encountered by many women and to look for ways of improving their quality of life.

Together, we can build a world of peace.

* * *

PARALYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Ottawa—Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to the paralympic team representing Canada at the Paralympic Winter Games, which begin on March 7 in Salt Lake City.

All Canadians can be proud of our paralympic team, made up of 29 exceptional men and women who have put years of intense effort into attaining the ultimate goal in sport, the Paralympics.

I also wish to congratulate and thank the thirty or so trainers, specialists and volunteers who provide our athletes with top notch assistance. Their devotion and expertise mean that our athletes can train in the best possible conditions and aim for the highest peaks.

I pay tribute to event co-ordinators, training personnel, volunteers and parents, who have supported our team for many years, and especially in preparation for the Salt Lake City Paralympics.

We are proud of all our athletes, and I urge all my distinguished colleagues to join with me in congratulating the 2002 Canadian paralympic team and wishing them good luck.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's report by the auditor general on the Canadian Wheat Board, Ms. Fraser stated that she could not look into the mandate of the wheat board or its monopolistic single desk selling system.

These glaring omissions in this audit are the things that farmers want to know about. The Canadian Wheat Board is a monopoly with no transparent operations, so in light of this an audit needs to be done to find out whether the board is maximizing the return to farmers.

S. O. 31

The questions the auditor general should have answered are: Do farmers get a good deal in comparison to producers in competing countries? Are taxpayers being well served by the board's handling of its own operations? Would farmers benefit more if they could bypass the board and add value to their product by processing grain and marketing it independently? Would organic producers of quality wheat and barley benefit if they could market their own product?

Finally, farmers want to know how they benefit in a monopolistic situation when they are forced to buy expensive television advertising during the winter olympics through the Canadian Wheat Board. All of these subjects must be looked at immediately.

* * *

● (1105)

MULTICULTURALISM

Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago Vincent Massey became the first Canadian appointed as Governor General of Canada. Massey visited every part of Canada to promote Canadian unity and identity. His speeches often praised Canada's cultural diversity, and what a diverse and multi-ethnic nation we have become in these 50 years.

Since Massey's time over eight million immigrants have come to make their homes in Canada, changing the face of our country. These immigrants, now citizens of Canada, work in all trades and professions and serve their communities in every part of Canada.

I commend one such immigrant, our present Governor General, the Right Hon. Adrienne Clarkson, an immigrant from China. Her Excellency follows in the footsteps of Vincent Massey in educating people about our diverse cultural heritage as she travels to all parts of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]**INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S WEEK**

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, March 3 to March 9 will be International Women's Week. This year's theme, "Working in Solidarity: Women, Human Rights and Peace" focuses more than ever on the importance of recognizing and making a significant contribution to universal social justice for all women.

To accomplish this, we need solidarity. Let us no longer tolerate suffering and war; let us speak out on every possible occasion against injustice and the abuse of rights, of which women far too often still fall victim.

Celebrating the significant progress we have made over the years must not cause us to lose sight of the fact that a great deal remains to be done if women's fundamental rights are to be fully recognized.

If women decided today to finally assume the space to which they are entitled in society, perhaps we would be witnesses all over this planet to the blossoming of flowers of peace and solidarity.

My best wishes to women here and elsewhere. Have a good week.

LANDMINES

Ms. Yolande Thibeault (Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are celebrating the 5th anniversary of the Ottawa convention banning landmines.

Mines Action Canada is organizing a number of activities across the country to mark Canadian Landmine Awareness Week. These activities are aimed at informing the public on the importance of this issue. The week also celebrates the central role played by Canada in eliminating these terrible weapons from the surface of our planet.

Landmines continue to wreak havoc long after conflicts are ended. Towns and villages become the battleground when the war is over. They kill or maim innocent people going about their day to day activities, including children.

The Ottawa Treaty is evidence that individuals joining together toward a shared goal can make a difference. I invite my colleagues to take part in these celebrations.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Elk Island.

* * *

[*English*]**STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am very sad today. For a number of years I have served, I would add with considerable enthusiasm, on the finance committee. It has been very interesting and very challenging, and I like to think that the work of our committee had considerable influence on the fiscal policies of the government, and I think that we were doing some good work. However in the last few weeks that has really evaporated and I am very discouraged.

Can members imagine? We heard witnesses. The witnesses give us unanimous testimony that the new air security tax was going to kill their industry, and yet the finance committee when it came time to vote on the clause by clause moved all of the members out who heard the testimony and replaced them with sign-ins who would simply vote the way they were told to do.

We might as well tell the members of the committee that they can go home, that they serve no function there. We might as well tell the witnesses "Stay home, it does not matter".

* * *

[*Translation*]**POLICE SERVICES**

Mr. Serge Marcil (Beauharnois—Salaberry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are jobs that require courage because they are performed under dangerous conditions. Female and male police officers must sometimes work under enormous pressure. Unfortunately, some of them pay the ultimate price in ensuring that justice is respected. Every day, female and male police officers show their dedication to society.

In recent days, police officers have lost their lives in Canada. Others have been injured. This happens all too often. I want to condemn this situation. These demonstrations of violence have disastrous consequences.

My colleagues join me in extending our sincere condolences to the families, friends and colleagues of those police officers who were killed in the line of duty.

* * *

•(1110)
[English]

RAILWAYS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the behaviour of Canada's railways continues to concern both railroaders and the general public. Longer trains block roads for longer periods of time. Many of these same larger trains are not inspected by rail workers performing pull-by inspections any more, and the electronic sensors being replied upon do not pick up a myriad of other safety hazards. Improper documentation of trains is also a growing problem.

On top of this CN in particular has become a Canadian railway in name only, increasingly run by American managers only here for a short career move. Jobs are being funnelled into the United States. The next casualty may well be Symington Yards in Winnipeg with CN proposing to move a portion of its marshalling to Wisconsin.

When will government act to stop this tragic gutting of a once proud Canadian institution, a gutting I might add that it started with its ridiculous, treacherous and traitorous privatization of the CNR?

* * *

[Translation]

GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, no less than 20% of retired people who are eligible to the guaranteed income supplement are not getting it, simply because Ottawa is not making efforts to contact them and inform them. This is not a myth, it is a fact.

This is a real scandal, particularly considering that this government has known since 1993 that its guaranteed income supplement program does not cover all those who are eligible for it and who are often poor elderly people for whom this supplement is a necessity.

In its editorial, yesterday, Trois-Rivières' daily *Le Nouvelliste* supports the Bloc Québécois spokesperson on this issue, the hon. member for Champlain, and says that Ottawa's attitude is truly out of line, because the federal government is changing the rules at the expense of the elderly, who are often the poorest people in our society.

Instead of merely looking into this issue, the Bloc Québécois will soon organize an awareness and information session to reach all seniors in the Frontenac—Mégantic region.

* * *

[English]

DOUGLAS MILLER AWARD

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate provincial court Judge Nancy Orr for being this year's recipient of the Canadian Bar Association's prestigious Douglas

S. O. 31

Miller Award. The award is given to members who have demonstrated outstanding dedication and team spirit in their ongoing involvement with the Canadian Bar Association.

Judge Orr has demonstrated that dedication in a number of ways. She has served on the CBA's national council for more than 20 years and was co-founder of the Canadian Judges Forum. She has been a longstanding and active member of the P.E.I. branch executive, serving as president in 1987-88, and received the branch's Distinguished Service Award.

Judge Orr has also been active at the community level, particularly in the promotion of junior hockey, and remains actively involved throughout the maritimes with the Canadian Hockey Association and the Junior A Hockey League.

All Islanders are proud of the work and the contribution that Nancy has made to our community and to the cause of justice in Canada. Congratulations.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago the department of Indian affairs determined that Amherst, Nova Scotia was the very best location for the regional office for the Atlantic Canadian region, not by coincidence but because its location was exactly in the centre of the Atlantic region.

The office employs 140 well-trained and qualified people who serve the native community with dedication and commitment, yet a few months ago the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development hired a consultant to determine the best location for this regional office. The minister explained this in the media by saying that there were complaints from the staff because they were on the road a lot.

The staff are more than happy to stay exactly where they are, and several native organizations reminded me that just a few years ago the chiefs in the Atlantic region voted in favour of keeping the office in the Amherst area. The regional office of Indian affairs was located in Amherst because it was the very best location. Nothing has changed. It is still the very best location.

I call on the minister to call off this study and listen to the voices of the 140 people who live and work in Amherst. I call on him to respect the vote of the native chiefs and not to listen to a couple of—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Nunavut.

* * *

THE LADIES OF NUNAVUT

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with International Women's Day being celebrated on March 8, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the Cambridge Bay women's group called The Ladies of Nunavut, which is working hard in preparation for the grand opening of the Kitikmeot Heritage Centre scheduled for May.

The members of The Ladies of Nunavut are sewing the caribou clothing for the mannequin displays for the heritage centre as well as using traditional skins for mitts, parkas, dolls and wall hangings.

Oral Questions

The members of The Ladies of Nunavut are women of all ages and share their experience and skills. They not only sew but are famous throughout Nunavut for catering their traditional food and dishes.

Women's groups like this are the cornerstones of communities throughout Nunavut and are good examples of the difference we can make in the lives of others.

I wish The Ladies of Nunavut continued success in all of its endeavours.

* * *

• (1115)

CUSTOMS OFFICERS

Mr. Richard Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the call for arming our border guards has fallen on deaf ears with this Liberal government. Once again customs officers are in the line of fire. They were called to detain a suspect at the Rainbow Bridge who tried to get into Canada using a fake passport. When the suspect became violent, Niagara police had to be called to physically remove this person from this country to be placed in custody with the American authorities.

The Americans arm their customs officers. One has to ask: how can our customs officers feel safe when the Liberal government refuses to acknowledge the security of our border and ports and the safety concerns of our customs officials? It is no wonder the Americans are putting troops on border checkpoints with Canada when the Liberal government refuses to give our custom officers the tools to do the job.

Will it take a customs officer being injured or killed in the line of duty before the government will take action to secure their safety? What will it take?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, if Canada ratifies the Kyoto protocol, it will raise the cost of fossil fuels and electricity produced by Canada by those means. Yet cost and production of these fuels will be cheaper in countries such as India, China and the United States that are outside of the protocol.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. If we raise the cost of fossil fuels or the electricity produced by them in the name of environmental protection, yet the Americans, Indians and Chinese do not, where does he think Canadian jobs will end up?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, climate change is one of the most difficult and complex environmental and economic challenges of our time, not just for Canada but for the entire world.

To deal with this issue sensibly and responsibly, the Government of Canada is consulting with all stakeholders, including provincial governments and the private sector, to develop a good, solid, sound plan that will ensure that we meet our environmental obligations and do so in a way that also meets all of the economic imperatives that we would want to see for Canada.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, then they should start being upfront with Canadians on the costs of those type of things.

[Translation]

The government can continue to play the part of an ostrich, to bury its head in the sand, but its own statistics demonstrate that the costs of the Kyoto protocol will be astronomical for the country.

One government study predicts that if our NAFTA partners do not ratify the treaty, our GDP will drop by 2% to 3% permanently.

Instead of deliberately misleading the public, as it often does, why does this government not tell the truth about the costs involved with Kyoto?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, going back to a first ministers meeting in December 1997 shortly after the original Kyoto protocol was initialled in Kyoto, a process was started involving the Government of Canada, the provinces, the private sector and a whole variety of non-governmental organizations to find the answers to the question to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

At the moment, a very elaborate federal-provincial-territorial working group is working very hard to determine what those cost issues are and how they can properly be addressed.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government started that process over five years ago and we still have seen nothing when it comes to the cost. The numbers it is putting out are completely across the board and it is obvious that the Kyoto protocol is flawed. It excludes developing countries and will likely exclude the U.S. It could cost Canadians billions, hurt our national competitiveness and do nothing to reduce emissions.

Given all these things and the fact that the United States signed a climate pact with Australia yesterday, will the Deputy Prime Minister consider Canada's participation in a similar agreement with the U.S. in lieu of the Kyoto accord?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all factors are being taken into account in the federal-provincial-territorial consultations and in our consultations with stakeholders. We want to be sure that when it comes to making a ratification decision with respect to Kyoto that all Canadians, most especially government authorities and the stakeholders in the private sector, are fully informed about all the ramifications. We intend to make a responsible decision.

• (1120)

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the problem is that we have been getting the same answer from the government for five years with respect to Kyoto. Now the environment minister tells us he wants to ratify this agreement in June and the government still does not have a specific answer to a specific question.

Provinces are against this, including the Liberal government of Newfoundland. The government's own studies now show a potential cost of 2% to 3% of our gross domestic product.

How can the environment minister propose ratifying an accord when even the House leader admits the government does not know where it is headed on this?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would point out that we have had a national implementation strategy and a business plan with respect to the principles of Kyoto for the last two years. The government has invested a total of \$1.5 billion in an active search for climate change solutions.

We are now engaged in further consultations with the provinces and territories and the private sector as they have requested. We want to have all of that knowledge and information before us so that when we make a decision with respect to ratification, it is fully informed, intelligent and in the best interests of all Canadians.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister could understand if we are just a little bit skeptical about consultation given the last time the provinces were consulted prior to Kyoto, their consultation was completely ignored and the government went ahead and signed an agreement that the provinces had not signed onto.

How can the government continue down this road of spending money on studies which show a potential cost to our economy of 2% to 3% of GDP? How can it do that without telling Canadians how many jobs we will lose, how much lower our standard of living will be and how this will or will not improve the environment? How can it continue to do that?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the consultation process that we are now engaged in is to ensure that all Canadians, not just members of any particular government, can fully understand the details of what is involved here.

This is the single most complex environmental and economic problem of our time. It is global in scope. It needs an intelligent response. The government is determined to provide that intelligent response based upon meaningful consultations with other governments and the private sector and non-governmental organizations.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Human Resources Development trivialized the whole issue of women in Quebec who take preventive withdrawal under Quebec's legislation, by denying them many weeks of employment insurance benefits.

Instead of playing down the number of women, the minister needs to realize that behind what she considers to be statistics, there are women and men, young families in Quebec, who need this money.

Will the minister show that she can be open, sensitive and flexible and finally realize that her employment insurance program unfairly penalizes women in Quebec?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, this is a very important issue for us. Ensuring that all mothers have full access to the benefits through the employment insurance system is a priority for the government. As I said yesterday, officials in the department are working diligently to find the quickest way of resolving this issue.

[Translation]

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for months the minister has been singing the same tune.

If the minister is serious about wanting to solve the problem, she first needs to understand that parental leave should not come under an employment insurance program, but should be part of a real family policy, like the one proposed by Quebec.

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the track record of the Government of Canada in supporting Canadian mothers and their children is strong. For 30 years we have been providing maternity benefits to Canadian moms, and 10 years ago we introduced parental benefits. Last year we doubled those benefits.

We have a problem here that is affecting a small number of mothers in the province of Quebec, but it is important that they have full access to the benefits. That is why officials are working diligently to fix the problem.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development always answers with statistics, like a true technocrat.

She trivializes issues by saying that only a “small minority” is affected: a minority of pregnant female workers, a minority of parents who do not qualify for parental leave, a minority of self-employed workers.

Could the minister set her technocratic approach aside and realize that these “small minorities”, as she calls them, are people, human beings who expect her to transfer the necessary moneys that will allow Quebec to take charge—

• (1125)

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

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what Canadian mothers want and what these mothers in the province of Quebec want is full access to the benefits, and that is what we will ensure.

I remind the House again that it is this government that doubled parental benefits. It is this government that reduced the number of hours required to receive those benefits. It is this government that ensures that for those in low income circumstances, particularly single parent families led by women, 80% of benefits are provided.

Our track record is clear and we will continue to support Canadian parents.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I remind the minister that what we expect from her is to transfer the necessary moneys, so that Quebec can take control of its whole family policy, including the parental leave.

Does the minister realize that, through her attitude and in spite of the nice rhetoric, the only message that she is sending to these workers is that she is totally indifferent to their plight?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): I see now, Mr. Speaker, that this really is not about mothers, it is something political. On this side of the House we are not interested in playing politics. We want to ensure that these mothers have full access to benefits and that is what we will do.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Last month at a conference in Ottawa, Canadian Lieutenant General George Macdonald stated that if Greenland would not co-operate with the United States in its proposed national missile defence system, that Canada would consider offering the U.S. use of Canadian bases in the north to support the NMD.

Will the minister now tell Canadians precisely what discussions have taken place to date with the United States on the possible use of Canadian territory as part of the U.S. national missile defence system?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, none with respect to the use of Canadian territory. We have not been asked in that regard. Nothing is really new from the last time the member and other members asked the question.

The United States has indicated determination to put such a system in place. The architecture of the system is yet to be determined. What role Canada would play, if it wanted to play any, has yet to be determined. We have not been asked. We have not made any decision with respect to the matter.

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs who knows that Canadians do not want our country to participate in this U.S. star wars scheme that will lead to a dangerous escalation of the nuclear arms race.

Will our government finally get off the fence, stop saying that missile defence is hypothetical, even though the ABM treaty has been torn up, and tell Americans that not one inch of Canadian territory will be made available to them for this dangerous new NMD system? If Greenland can say no, why can Canada not say no?

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in this as in other matters, the government will ensure that the security of Canadians comes first in our consideration. We will ensure that we discuss with our American allies ways in which we guarantee our security and our interests. We will not enter into an arrangement that is for them. We will enter into arrangements that are good for us.

As the minister of defence has said, we have not been asked, but when we are, we will study it from our perspective, our requirements, our needs and our interests.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in response to a question by the member for Fraser Valley, the immigration minister stated that the fraudulent use of immigration forms was under investigation by the RCMP.

Legitimate immigrants who respect the process deserve to know if the government is taking this issue seriously.

We know the police are investigating the illegal use of stolen blank immigration forms but are they also investigating the fraudulent use of recycled or previously used IMM 1000 forms?

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for this pertinent question.

First of all, when theft was involved, we assumed our responsibilities. An investigation is under way.

As for recycled forms, we implemented a pilot project which has now become permanent and which makes it possible to cancel these forms so that they cannot be used again.

Increased vigilance is also important. Accordingly, we have beefed up the Integrated Border Enforcement Team, which means that each time people pass through customs, we are able to do the necessary checks.

• (1130)

[English]

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many illegal immigrants are in the country having used those forms that should have been cancelled long ago.

In the aftermath of September 11, it is increasingly important that we reassure the Americans that our immigration system is not being abused. We have heard conflicting reports as to which police are investigating the illegal use of these immigration forms.

Could the solicitor general assure Canadians that the RCMP remains in control of this file and that the investigation has not been handed off to police in Cornwall?

[Translation]

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we may not comment when RCMP investigations are under way.

That having been said, we have also put in place other means of assuming our responsibilities. The immigration control officers we have hired since 1995 have arrested more than 33,000 smugglers.

Following negotiations with the Americans—over 60% of people coming to Canada as refugees come through the United States—we concluded a 30 point agreement, signed by our colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister, and Tom Ridge. We are in negotiations and we are working together.

* * *

[English]

PAROLE BOARD

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, a 29 year old police officer was tragically shot and killed in Montreal yesterday adding to a growing string of violent attacks on police officers, including two recent attacks in my home province of Manitoba. In some of these attacks the suspects were wanted for parole violation.

Why does our solicitor general continue to put our police at risk by accelerating the process of early parole that will see even more dangerous offenders released from his club fed style prisons?

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is very

sorry for the families involved in any of these tragedies because it is very sad for them and for all Canadians who feel very strongly about the great work that our police do and how we have to stand behind them in a very meaningful way.

What I do know is that our police, wherever they are in Canada, do a tremendous job on a daily basis. We should always be grateful that we as a government have the tools in place to ensure that they have the kind of capabilities that are necessary.

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, every member in the House is sorry but we are in a position to do something about it and Canadians expect us to do something about it.

Since the Liberal government has been in power all it has been doing is handcuffing our police forces in terms of resources. Now police must contend with a parole quota system that puts hardened criminals back on the street early and present a danger to our police officers.

Why will the solicitor general not commit to ending early parole instead of giving us those kinds of platitudes?

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are two things wrong with that question. The first is that there are absolutely no quotas in the country. To keep repeating that is doing a great disservice not only to Correctional Service Canada but to Canadians wherever they are.

The second is that we do as a government provide the resources and tools necessary. I do not think anything is served by the fearmongering of the people opposite. I believe what we should do is get down to the task at hand, which is to ensure that there is security in this country, which is precisely what the government does.

* * *

[Translation]

AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, stubborn as ever, stated yesterday in this House that it is normal for users to pay his air transport tax.

What the minister seems not to realize is that, in the long run, it is entire regions that are going to pay the devastating consequences of this rash decision.

Is the Minister of Finance so blind as not to realize that, in the long run, it is not just the users who will be paying for the disastrous consequences his policies will have on the regions, but everyone?

Oral Questions

● (1135)

Hon. John McCallum (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have explained several times in the House, users pay perhaps \$2.2 billion, but the total cost of the security program is \$7.5 billion. We therefore feel it is reasonable for users to pay a portion of these costs, but not all of them.

In addition, as we have also said on several occasions, in the fall we will be reviewing the program. We can change the situation and there can be a reduction, if conditions allow.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if the secretary of state is that convinced, let him visit the regions. Let him tell that to all the regions of Quebec, and he will see that the reality is something else.

The Minister of Finance plans to carry out a thorough review this fall. Does the Minister of Transport not find it paradoxical for his colleague to implement a measure that relates to air travel and then to carry out an impact analysis of that measure six months after its adoption?

Hon. John McCallum (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is reasonable for there to be a set fee, when the cost of security is not a function of the distance flown.

As we have said, we are flexible and, in the fall, we will hear representations from those concerned. It is possible that the charge will be reduced, perhaps even the structure could be changed. We shall see.

* * *

[English]

TERRORISM

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Samir Mohamed is a terrorist. Six months ago the United States sought his extradition from Canada so he could face trial there.

I have been at the Canadian court proceedings, which have been stalled several times already, but the latest insult to the United States came recently when it was decided to put the extradition hearing off until next September.

Why is it that so many obstacles are put in place to prevent a terrorist from being extradited from Canada to the United States?

[Translation]

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you know, because of the Privacy Act, I am not able to comment on personal or specific cases.

That having been said, with respect to Bill C-11 and the new regulations, additional powers allow us to fight terrorism even more effectively.

I would like to reassure my colleague that the safety and well-being of Canadians are a priority for this government.

[English]

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to have laws in the country but it is another thing to carry them out.

Prior to coming to Canada, Samir Mohamed tried to gain refugee status in England and was deported. He then tried Germany and was turned away. Mohamed then tried Canada in 1997 but application was denied and he was ordered deported. However he stayed in Canada, raised money for terrorist activities and has again applied for refugee status under appeal.

Why is it when Germany and England say no they mean it but when Canada says no it seems to mean that the person can stay, carry on terrorist activities and reapply again?

[Translation]

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is easy and very dangerous to constantly associate all immigration related activity in Canada with terrorism. Therefore, I think we must be very careful when talking about this.

That being said, the Immigration Act contains provisions for the extradition of permanent residents who are found guilty of serious crimes, and we can conduct the related investigations.

However, I agree with him that it is not enough to simply pass a law; its provisions must be enforced, and I believe that this is what the government does best.

* * *

STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the Supplementary Estimates tabled yesterday, no amount appeared for the Strategic Infrastructure Fund. But we know that the government will be announcing surpluses in the billions. Until March 31, this money remains available. After that deadline, the money will be used to pay down the debt.

Since there are only 31 days left till the end of the fiscal year, does the Deputy Prime Minister intend to ask for part of the surplus in order to implement the Strategic Infrastructure Fund immediately, since the money is now on the table?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the money for the Strategic Infrastructure Program is not tied to this year's surplus. This is a program which is proposed and which is in the budget implementation bill, a bill I hope the Bloc Québécois will support.

● (1140)

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, by not releasing all the money promised by his colleagues during the last election campaign for Quebec's highways, some \$3.4 billion, the Deputy Prime Minister is showing that he too thinks nothing of promises made to the public.

The money is available until March 31. Will he finally release the money promised for highways 175, 185, 30, 20 and 50? The memoranda of agreement are there. Will he sign them? For promises and hopes will not build a road; that takes money.

*Oral Questions***NATIONAL DEFENCE**

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if I understood the member correctly, she is proposing that between today, March 1, and March 31, we build all the roads in the Province of Quebec.

That is a bit difficult, and it must also be recognized that highways come under the jurisdiction of the Province of Quebec. They are a provincial responsibility. I know that a provincial election is looming, but today is not the day to try to build all the roads for the Quebec government before March 31.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in 1998 the justice committee recommended that victims of crime be permitted to give oral impact statements at parole hearings. The solicitor general has dragged his feet and finally implemented this policy only recently.

Now an internal audit has found that only about one-third of court delivered victim impact statements actually make it into the inmate files. Those who do the audit found that most are ignored. Is this what the solicitor general calls giving victims a role in the system?

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government takes the statements of victims very seriously because we believe in the rights of victims to do the kinds of things that are necessary.

We as a government and all who are involved in this very important area want to ensure that victims are heard because that is fundamental to the very justice system which we instill and we want to maintain.

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general has led victims of crime to believe that their experiences and their input is relevant but this report suggests otherwise. To him a victim's impact statement appears to be nothing more than just another piece of paper, not even important enough to ensure its inclusion in a file.

I know what it is to pour one's heart and soul into a victim's impact statement. The fact that it will likely be ignored by corrections staff disgusts me.

What specific measures will the solicitor general put into place to make sure this does not happen again?

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since July 2001 we have allowed victim impact statements to be permitted at parole hearings. We continue to ensure that those victims are heard. The Canadian system wants to maintain the integrity of victims and what those statements say.

I believe that the Canadian people want to have this in place. They know it is important and we on the government side want to ensure that it is in place for the benefit of all Canadians.

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

In January the government agreed to deploy 750 members of the 3rd PPCLI to Kandahar in Afghanistan. Is it the intention of the government to deploy any more troops to Afghanistan?

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am announcing today a further contribution to the coalition campaign against terrorism by the sending of another infantry company to augment the battle group led by the Princess Patricia's.

This is part of the original 1,000 persons that were placed on notice to deploy in November. The additional company is 130 strong. It will come from the Winnipeg based second battalion, bringing the strength of the battle group up to 880, all ranks. They will depart by the middle of this month.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, during parental leave, employment insurance benefits cease immediately following the death of the baby. In Canada, one thousand mothers a year experience this tragedy, and on top of that, they lose their benefits as well. This is inhumane and unacceptable.

The report on Bill C-49 contains a proposed amendment to continue benefits for two additional weeks following the death of a child.

Will the Minister of Human Resources Development show her human side and support this amendment?

• (1145)

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that there are parental benefits and there are also sickness benefits. These special benefits are there to assist Canadians when they need them.

The challenge is to make sure that as one moves from one sort of benefit to another, it is done in an appropriate fashion recognizing the circumstances faced by the beneficiary.

Ms. Judy Wasylcia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is one week from International Women's Day and all we get from the government is empty rhetoric and an added burden heaped upon women and mothers across the country.

Kelly Lesiuk is the Winnipeg mother who took her case that EI rules discriminate against women as part time workers to the courts and she won. What did the government decide to do? To appeal that decision and actually prevent women from accessing their fair share of maternity benefits.

Today of all days will the government at least agree to stop this appeal and start acting for women instead of against women?

Oral Questions

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to remind the hon. member of the actions that have been taken by the government in support of Canadian women.

I must remind the House again of the doubling of parental benefits. We have reduced the number of hours required to receive these special benefits. As I mentioned earlier, we ensure that in low income families 80% benefits are provided. This primarily supports single parent families, most often women.

We constantly are looking for ways to improve our programs to ensure that Canadians have the support they need to raise their families and participate fully in Canadian society.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Gerald Kedy (South Shore, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, March 21 is the final determination date for the U.S. department of commerce to establish countervail and anti-dumping charges against Canadian softwood lumber.

The charges are weak, yet the Prime Minister has begun a flurry of negotiations with the U.S.

The United States wants Canada to use cross-border reference criteria to establish Canadian subsidies, increase raw log exports and adopt U.S. style timber auctions.

What has happened to Canada's case before the WTO? Is the Minister for International Trade considering capitulating to American timber interests?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been working very closely with the Canadian industry and with all the provinces.

We are today going through a very important day of discussions with the United States. Canada will remain Canada. We are very proud of our public lands and the way we function in this country which is different than in the United States, but we like it that way and we will maintain that.

We want to bring in some elements of transparency. We want to bring our price fixing elements closer to market practices. It is on that policy based solution that we want to get a market access guarantee from the United States. This is the objective of the government.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, last week the U.S. lumber coalition upped the ante in the softwood lumber debate when it filed an application to increase the preliminary countervail charge from 19.3% to 50.8%.

Is the minister aware of this increase to 50.8%? Does he consider this the counteroffer he was asking for?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course I am not negotiating with the U.S. lumber coalition. I already have expressed time and again what I think of that protectionist coalition. I am negotiating with the Bush administration. I have found an administration that is now at the table, fully re-engaged with the Government of Canada and in close

consultation with our provinces. The Prime Minister has raised it with President Bush in the last few days.

On this side of the House we are trying to do constructive work with the administration of the United States and are not interested in every little blip from the lobbyists in the United States.

* * *

THE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is reported that the Prime Minister will be flying to Australia in a leased Bombardier plane at an extra cost to the taxpayer of a quarter of a million dollars. One of the excuses given is that the Airbus A310 cannot land in Coolool but we have learned that the airport in Coolool can land the Airbus A310.

Why is the government wasting hard earned taxpayers' dollars on this trip?

● (1150)

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, an Airbus does not fly for free and it is a little big for nine people. Quite apart from that, the Global Express is actually a piece of Canadian technology that we ought to be very proud of. Quite frankly I am surprised the hon. member is not asking why the Prime Minister does not make all of his international trips in that piece of Canadian technology.

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, what the minister is saying is that once again the taxpayers are on the hook for the Prime Minister. The government already has a national defence Airbus A310 to fly the Prime Minister on foreign trips. If this is just an idea to promote Bombardier or to help the Prime Minister's friends, why are the taxpayers paying for it?

I have to believe that the government has not seen a tax dollar it did not like to spend. Once again, why is the government doing this to the taxpayers?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I understand the question. If the member is suggesting the Prime Minister should fly on his own tab, I do not think too many Canadians agree with that.

Those members are the same people whose leader turned over the keys to his limousine only to decide they had to take the car back. They promised to turn Stornoway into a bingo parlour. Now they are attacking the question of the Prime Minister flying at public expense. What kind of a country do they think we have here, that the Prime Minister buys a ticket to fly on Qantas?

* * *

[Translation]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with softwood lumber negotiations going full swing in Washington, the Minister for International Trade and the Prime Minister have confused all the stakeholders.

Oral Questions

The Prime Minister maintains that the situation will be resolved before March 21, while his minister is more pessimistic and is floating all sorts of scenarios.

Is the Minister for International Trade, who should be showing more leadership in this matter, aware that this confusion is undermining Canada's position?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that the confusion is mainly in the mind of the Bloc Quebecois member.

Our government speaks with one voice. It is engaged, as we speak, in negotiations which are proceeding very well and which have made considerable progress.

I do not know when the agreement will be signed. What I can say is that our government is determined to find, with the governments of Quebec and British Columbia and the other stakeholders and in very close and constant consultation with the industry, a long term solution based on the policies on this issue. This is a complex and extremely important exercise for Canadians.

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the Minister for International Trade is floating all sorts of possibilities, will he at least confirm that Canada will maintain the complaints it filed with the WTO and the NAFTA panels?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that the goal would be to find a long term solution to the softwood lumber dispute.

Every four or five years for the past 25 years now, we have had a major trade dispute with the United States.

Our goal is to find a long term solution. Naturally, if that is not possible, we will take the WTO and NAFTA route.

* * *

[English]

BIOTERRORISM

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, as the U.S. led war on terrorism continues, the government's inaction on bioterrorism is nothing short of scandalous.

Months ago, the health minister promised that there would be smallpox vaccine and now the current minister is thinking of going back on that promise. It is almost half a year since September 11 and the minister's department has only begun to train the 1,500 emergency workers needed to counter bioterrorist threats.

How much longer will it be before Canada is ready for a bioterrorist attack?

[Translation]

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a very important question for all Canadians. I am pleased to inform my colleague of our position.

It is already well known that we are prepared at this time to deal with the possibility of an attack using smallpox, should this ever occur. As I have already said here in the House, this threat affects perhaps the entire planet. It requires co-operation, by the various

governments involved throughout the world, and by the various agencies on the provincial level.

As for preparations for a potential attack, the minister has reported on what is being done at the present time—

• (1155)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Yellowhead.

[English]

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last November the minister announced the creation of a national advisory committee on bioterrorism. The chair was named and a mandate was given. However, over four months later and six months after September 11, we have learned that the committee has not yet even met. My office confirmed this with the office of a committee member just hours ago.

If the government takes bioterrorism seriously, then why has the committee not even met for the first time?

[Translation]

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we take any possible threat of bioterrorist attacks very seriously. What I was going to say was that in the past week, training courses have been started on the response to bioterrorist attack.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay: If people will listen, I will answer.

It must be realized, however, that training people requires a structure to be in place. This is not the place for band-aid solutions. We have to know where we are headed. That is what we are doing. We are putting it in place at present and will continue throughout the year.

* * *

[English]

STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma—Manitoulin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister for International Trade is very aware of how important the steel industry is to Canada and in particular to the city of Sault Ste. Marie and to my own neighbouring riding of Algoma—Manitoulin.

On March 6 U.S. President Bush is expected to respond to the recommendations by the U.S. International Trade Commission on restrictions to steel imports. Does the minister have any information on what his decision will be and how it may affect the Canadian steel industry?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are hopeful that President Bush will decide not to apply restrictions on imports from Canada.

It is our position that steel imports from Canada are not contributing to any injury to the United States industry. Further, as a NAFTA partner we should be exempt from any U.S. trade action. In the last month I have raised it with United States Trade Representative Zoellick and Secretary of Commerce Evans. These are our arguments.

Oral Questions

Steel is a global problem. Canada is fully engaged in multilateral efforts to find a global solution to the worldwide overcapacity problem.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, our reserves need separate budgets. Our reserves need separate budgets. Our reserves need separate budgets. I say this three times because our defence minister admits he needs three briefings.

Twenty per cent of our peacekeepers come from the reserves. They play a vital role in our armed forces. However, because of the government, our regular forces must steal resources from the reserves just to survive. In many cases our reserves are being trained with equipment left over from the Korean war.

Will the minister set up a separate fund for the reserves or will he let the regular forces—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of National Defence.

Hon. Art Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I got it the first time. Perhaps if he had not repeated himself so often, he would have got his question out.

I assume the member wants to know that we are paying attention to the reserves. We are indeed.

In fact, the head of the minister's monitoring committee, who is himself a reservist, says that the land force reserve restructure is on increasingly solid ground and is potentially a significant success story. In fact, we put a major general in charge of it. We have a project office.

The time for the reserves to improve is now and it is getting better every day.

* * *

[Translation]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is a growing international momentum to convince Canada to put pressure on Zimbabwe immediately, without waiting for the March 9 and 10 election.

Could the Minister of Foreign Affairs confirm that the Prime Minister will arrive at the Commonwealth conference, which begins today in Australia, with a position similar to the one adopted by Great Britain, to defend democracy in Zimbabwe?

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said before in the House, Canada has already taken a number of measures against the Government of Zimbabwe to indicate that it disapproves of its actions.

The Prime Minister is going to the Commonwealth meeting with his own conviction, namely that the Commonwealth must act and that the international community must clearly tell Mr. Mugabe "Let a fair and proper election take place in Zimbabwe, and let Zimbabweans speak for themselves during that election".

● (1200)

[English]

TRADE

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has asserted himself into the softwood lumber dispute in order to bail out the Minister for International Trade. Will the minister tell the House what progress he is making on the removal of the tariff on Canadian shrimp into the European market, or should we bring the Prime Minister in on this one also?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know it is surprising for many members of the opposition to see the Prime Minister and a minister working hand in hand in the interest of Canada. I am extremely grateful for the Prime Minister's total support to the softwood lumber industry of the country.

Unlike when that opposition party was in office, the then prime minister refused to raise the softwood lumber issue. This Prime Minister has stood by his industry and his Minister for International Trade, and I thank him for that.

As for the shrimp negotiations, this is something we have raised every time. We will raise it again at the next Canada-EU.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, farmers in Canada face many challenges, such as unfair subsidies and drought. There are too many to list. The latest Statistics Canada survey shows rapidly declining farm employment numbers, the largest drop in 35 years, and increasing numbers of farmers leaving the land. The industry needs youth and profitability.

What will the minister and his department do to encourage young farmers and attract new youth into the industry?

Mr. Larry McCormick (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member indicated there are indeed many challenges facing farmers and the future of farming depends on our youth.

I am pleased to inform the House that the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food announced yesterday in Halifax that the Government of Canada would be providing \$250,000 under the Canadian adaptation and rural development fund to help the Canadian young farmers forum create a national network.

These young farmers have taken on the responsibility and challenge of learning not only the day to day business of farming but also the factors affecting farmers today and into the future. This determination to contribute today to discuss and find solutions will go a long way toward securing the future of the Canadian agriculture industry.

PRIVILEGE

MINISTER OF TRANSPORT

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege to charge the Minister of Transport with contempt for his failure to comply with a legislative requirement compelling him to table a report on the monitoring of the grain transportation handling system in the House.

In June 2000 the government passed Bill C-34 that amended the grain provisions of the Canada Transportation Act. Subsection 50(3.2) of the new act reads:

The Minister must prepare, within six months after the end of each crop year, a report on the monitoring of the grain transportation and handling system and cause the report to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister prepares it, if the Minister

- (a) makes a regulation under paragraph (1)(e.1); and
- (b) uses or communicates the information provided under the regulation for the purpose of monitoring the grain transportation and handling system.

The government hired Quorum Corporation to monitor the grain handling and transportation system and has fulfilled parts (a) and (b) of subsection 50(3.2) of the Canada Transportation Act.

The crop year ends July 31. Therefore, the six month period mentioned in subsection 50(3.2) ends on January 31. According to my count 15 sitting days after January 31 is February 28, yesterday.

On November 21, 2001, the Speaker delivered a ruling in regard to a complaint by the member for Surrey Central who cited 16 examples of where the government failed to comply with legislative requirements concerning the tabling of certain information in parliament. In all 16 cases raised on November 21 a reporting deadline was absent from the legislation and as a result the Speaker could not find a prima facie question of privilege.

However, the Speaker said in his ruling at page 7381 of *Hansard*:

Were there to be a deadline for tabling included in the legislation, I would not hesitate to find that a prima facie case of contempt does exist and I would invite the hon. member to move the usual motion.

I have established that the legislative requirement provided for in subsection 50(3.2) of the Canada Transportation Act includes a deadline for the tabling of a report on the monitoring of the grain transportation handling system. I have also established that the legislative deadline has not been met. Therefore, a prima facie question of privilege does exist. Accordingly, I am prepared to move the appropriate motion.

•(1205)

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a member of parliament from western Canada who has taken a great deal of interest in issues related to grain transportation I take the provisions of the Canada Transportation Act in relation to grain very seriously. Therefore, I do want to treat the point made by the hon. member with the seriousness that it deserves.

If the section of the statute that has been referred to is examined carefully, namely subsection 50(3.2), there is a requirement with

Routine Proceedings

respect to the filing of a report within a certain time period but it is all conditional upon certain other events having taken place. There is an issue here of whether the creation of a new regulation triggers the time period involved or whether action is in fact taken under pre-existing regulations.

It is a complex matter in terms of exactly what the trigger is that starts the time clock ticking. It might be useful for the House to reflect on this matter to determine whether we are within that six month period yet or not. It might be appropriate if we could return to this item after the constituency week that is soon to be upon us. I will consider the matter in more detail at that time.

It is my view at the moment that the triggers referred to in the legislation that would require the filing of a report within a certain time period have not yet been pulled and therefore the government is not in any way in violation of the legislation.

I would like further time to reflect on the point. It is quite technical. I do want to say that this is an important matter. It is one that we take seriously and we will provide the hon. member with a substantive response.

The Speaker: The Chair of course takes the matter seriously as well. Could the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam provide a copy of the regulation under subsection 50(1)(e.1) which would, in the view of the Chair and as the minister has said, trigger the requirement for the tabling of this report?

I am prepared to leave the matter until we have had a chance to research this more thoroughly. I know the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam will want to have a look at the matter again and check into the regulation, as I am sure the minister will do. The Chair looks forward to hearing from both hon. members on this point when we resume. I thank the minister and the hon. member for their interventions on this matter.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. John O'Reilly (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments made recently by the government.

*Routine Proceedings***GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

Mr. John O'Reilly (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to nine petitions.

* * *

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 47th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, regarding the membership of the Special Committee on Non-Medical Use of Drugs.

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 47th report later this day.

• (1210)

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Hon. Andy Scott (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the twelfth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

[English]

Pursuant to its order of reference of Tuesday, October 16, 2001, the committee has considered Bill C-217, the blood samples act, and pursuant to Standing Order 97.1 recommends the House of Commons do not proceed further with the bill, that the order be discharged and that the bill be withdrawn from the order paper.

[Translation]

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the thirteenth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

[English]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) the committee recommends that the issues addressed in Bill C-217, the blood samples act, be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the federal-provincial-territorial meetings of ministers of justice, attorneys general and solicitors general, as well as the agenda of the uniform law conference.

In addition, the committee recommends that Health Canada increase its efforts to gather statistics on the number of emergency workers who are exposed to blood borne pathogens in the course of their duties. The committee also recommends that government allocate the resources necessary to achieve this objective.

* * *

TRIBUTES

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister Responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocuter for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties and I believe you would find unanimous consent for the following order. I move:

That at 3 p.m., on Wednesday, March 13, 2002, the Right Hon. Herb Gray shall appear at the Bar of the House of Commons to hear remarks by one representative of each party in the House and to respond thereto; and

That the time taken by these proceedings be added to the time for government orders that day.

The Speaker: Does the hon. government House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

[Translation]

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 47th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented earlier this day be concurred in.

The Speaker: Does the deputy government whip have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present three petitions this afternoon. The first petition is signed by hundreds of residents of my constituency of Burnaby—Douglas on the issue of energy prices. The petitioners note that energy is a Canadian natural resource, but that we have little control over this important resource. They note that the big oil companies that dominate refining and gasoline sales are free to set whatever price they want at the wholesale level and at the pumps and that these prices do not have to be justified in any way to the federal government. They note as well that Canadian households and businesses rely on energy and therefore have no alternative but to pay the higher prices.

The petitioners therefore call upon parliament to urge the government to set up an energy price commission that would hold the big oil companies accountable for the energy prices that they charge Canadians.

Routine Proceedings

•(1215)

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition which is signed by residents of British Columbia and Alberta on the issue of Conscience Canada. It notes that the Constitution Act of 1982 guarantees freedom of conscience and religion in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It points out that the rights of conscientious objection have long existed in Canada and urges parliament to establish peace tax legislation by passing into law my private member's bill, the conscientious objection act, which would recognize the right of conscientious objectors to not pay for the military and within which the government would declare its commitment to apply that portion of their taxes to be used for military purposes toward peaceful purposes such as peace education, war relief, humanitarian and environmental aid and housing.

FREE TRADE AREA OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, lastly I have the honour of presenting a petition on the subject of the free trade area of the Americas. As the Speaker will see, this is a petition signed by literally thousands of Canadians, including many from my constituency of Burnaby—Douglas, and as well I note a number of signatures from the magnificent city of Kingston, Ontario.

These petitioners note that the Liberal government has conducted secret negotiations on the proposed free trade area of the Americas while refusing to make public the text that is the basis for these negotiations, although I will say it finally did do that. They note that the proposed FTAA would effectively extend NAFTA to the hemisphere, vastly broadening the reach of its investment provisions and would give corporations unprecedented rights to sue, intimidate and override democratically elected governments. They go on to talk about the impact of the FTAA on universal public education, health care and the environment.

Therefore the petitioners request that all texts that are the basis of the negotiations be made public and that any trade deals, including the proposed FTAA, which would preserve NAFTA style provisions that put the rights of corporations and investors ahead of the rights of citizens and government, be rejected.

Finally, they call for the adoption of a new approach to globalization that places social, economic and ecological justice above the profits of multinational corporations and establishes an alternative rules based system that promotes and protects the rights of workers and the environment, respects cultural diversity and ensures the ability of governments to act in the public interest.

The Speaker: I am sure the House appreciates that brief summary of the petition given by the hon. member for Burnaby—Douglas.

PESTICIDE USE

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief. It is certainly a pleasure to present this petition to parliament on behalf of the citizens of the South Shore, who are calling upon parliament to enact an immediate moratorium on the cosmetic use of chemical pesticides until such time as their use has been scientifically proven to be safe and the long term consequences of their application known.

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the House agrees, I would like to propose again the following motion: That the 47th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented to the House earlier this day be concurred in.

The Speaker: Does the member have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

[English]

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. John O'Reilly (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 100 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No.100—**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis :**

With regard to xenotransplantation experimentation in Canada, can the government identify: (a) all research projects in progress or completed since 1995 within Canada that are known to the government or funded in whole or in part by the government; (b) the objectives, starting dates, sites, lead researchers, and sponsoring organizations for each project; and (c) the source (both commercial and geographical origin) of live animal materials used in these projects?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): With respect to human research, xenotransplants, the live cells, tissues and organs from animal sources, are considered therapeutic products, drugs or medical devices, and are subject to the requirements of the Food and Drugs Act and the Food and Drug Regulations or the Medical Devices Regulations.

Pursuant to these regulations, sponsors of human clinical trials involving xenotransplants would be required to submit an application to Health Canada for approval before a clinical trial may proceed. The clinical trial review and approval process conducted by Health Canada applies to all clinical trials involving xenografts, cellular, tissue or whole organ, in Canada, regardless of who the research is conducted by, for example, hospital, university or pharmaceutical company.

Government Orders

On March 29, 1999, Health Canada issued a notice to hospitals on the clinical use of viable animal cells, tissues or organs to treat patients, notifying hospitals that any studies involving xenotransplants could only be conducted under the auspices of an authorized clinical trial.

To date, no requests for clinical trials involving xenotransplantation have been received or approved by Health Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. John O'Reilly: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-49, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on December 10, 2001, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will continue by making some comments on Motion No. 2 which was moved by the Minister of Transport. I do wish he were in the House. He is not here right now. I think what happened in terms of Motion No. 2 is absolutely outrageous in terms of the procedure of the House of Commons.

To summarize again, the finance committee accepted a motion that I proposed to add two representatives of labour to the new board of directors for the new crown corporation that looks after security at the airports. This airport authority would have a board of directors of 11. The airports or the aerodromes would have two members on the board and the airlines would have two members on the board.

We had a representation made by Lawrence McBrearty, the national director of the steelworkers union of Canada asking for trade union representation on the board because there are a number of unions that represent the security workers. There are about 3,000 security workers in this country. The steelworkers union is the largest union representing those workers and represents most of the airports in the province of Quebec, in the city of Ottawa and in many other places around the country. There are also other unions that represent other workers and it only makes sense that the working people who are out there doing the screening have a voice on the board of directors.

The committee in its wisdom passed the motion, which would have two members of the trade unions representing the workers on the board of directors. This is what the committee did on Tuesday. On Tuesday it accepted the idea. Of course the trade union movement was pleased with this openness. It provided some fairness, justice and equity with two members on the board of directors from the airlines, two from the airports, two from the trade union movement and another five, including the chair, chosen by the governor in council, the cabinet.

It makes sense that the workers would be represented at the board of directors table. They are the frontline people. They do the screening. If we want to have a smooth process let us have both workers and management on the board of directors. It is not exactly a revolutionary idea. There are many companies in the country and around the world, public companies, privately owned companies and crown corporations, that do have labour representation on the board of directors.

Now here is what happened, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure it will interest you. We got a message from a member of the government saying that the Prime Minister's Office had a problem with two labour representatives but assuring us that there would be one labour representative on the board of directors and that the government would move an amendment at report stage to reduce the two to one.

I did not like that idea because I thought there should be two. There are several unions involved and this would have offered an opportunity not to divide the workers among the various unions but to provide a bit better representation for the people who work at the airports. However, I can understand the Prime Minister's Office being a little nervous. It really does not want to have too many trade union representatives on boards of directors of crown corporations.

That assurance was made to us. As a matter of fact, I think it was around 12 noon yesterday that the assurance was passed on by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance to the United Steelworkers public affairs director here in Ottawa at a meeting in the office of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance. I was in attendance at that meeting where the parliamentary secretary said that there would be one member from the trade union movement on the board of directors, that the government or the powers that be were nervous about having two. The parliamentary secretary was acting in good faith. He is an honourable man. He had been told this.

He had been told this but then, later on yesterday, about 6.30 or 7 o'clock, I got a call from someone in the government informing me that the Minister of Transport would be moving a motion to reduce the two directors to no directors and no labour representation whatsoever. The minister obviously hung the parliamentary secretary out to dry and hung members of his own caucus out to dry and he shows utter contempt for the work of the finance committee of the House of Commons.

Why do we even have parliamentary committees? Why do we spend millions of dollars a year in terms of parliamentary committees and committee travel when a committee moves an amendment, accepts an amendment, proposes it to the House and the minister just says "no way, that's not good enough, we're not going to listen to the finance committee, we're not going to take it seriously"?

My friend from the Alliance Party—

• (1220)

Mr. Svend Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would seek unanimous consent of the House to immediately dispose of this amendment and reject it.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: It seems to me that I have been caught flatfooted. I have just arrived. I just heard the end of the intervention of the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle. I was conversing with the hon. Speaker making sure a transition was going to be made as smoothly as possible.

To catch up, we have a request for unanimous consent from the hon. member for Burnaby—Douglas.

An hon. member: To do what?

The Deputy Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Burnaby—Douglas would like to repeat it.

Mr. Svend Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to repeat it. I am seeking unanimous consent of the House to immediately dispose of the amendment which would reverse the decision of the committee and which shows such contempt for the work of the committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: I would ask the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle to briefly wrap up.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I wonder about the whole process of parliament. This committee was dominated by government members who supported an amendment to the bill. Members of all five parties supported the amendment to the bill. It comes to this place as an amendment to the bill from the finance committee of the House of Commons and the minister says no, it is not any good and he will wipe it out entirely.

Now one of the members of parliament has moved a motion to dispose of this amendment by the Minister of Transport and a bunch of Liberals rush in from eating their dinners with food crumbs on their suits not even knowing what they are voting on and voting against what the finance committee recommended in a democratically constructed House of Commons.

What shame. What contempt for the parliamentary process.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you as a former referee in the national hockey league must be feeling exactly the same way as I am feeling about the way this place operates and the lack of respect—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have tried to be generous with the hon. member in extending his time for a few seconds, but we will resume debate.

• (1225)

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I think the public has unanimously heard the loud cry for democracy from the opposition. What we and the public have heard is a violation not only of the rights of the members of the House but the rights of the public at large.

The public should be aware that the members in the House work hard to put forth fair and reasonable legislation. However, the process, which has been adhered to by the members of the House to put forth amendments to Bill C-49, has been violated and disabused by the minister and the Prime Minister's Office. There seems to be an

unholy kobold going on between senior bureaucrats and the Prime Minister's Office and between unelected, invisible, unaccountable members on both sides that squeeze members of the government and force them to do things that they would not otherwise do. This violates the basic rights of members of the House and, by doing so, violates the basic democratic rights of members of the public.

I will deal with three major parts of Bill C-49: first, accountability and parliamentary authority; second, the Canada fund for Africa; and third, the Canada fund for infrastructure.

On the issue of the motions presented today by my colleagues in the Canadian Alliance, we have some serious problems with the domestic surcharge. It will gut and severely compromise the ability of people to fly and thereby the economies, not only of large and medium cities but also small towns. It will also compromise the ability of airline workers, who often do not live in the cities in which they work, to get from their home to their workplace. It will cost them \$24 for each round trip they take.

It will cost flight attendants, people who do not make a lot of money, \$25 every time they go to work. This is ridiculous. This will force many of these people to quit work. This is a hidden consequence that I am sure the minister has not taken into consideration but one of great concern to the people who work in the airline industry. If we were to add up this amount of money over the course of a year it could have a huge impact on these people who do not make a great deal of money?

The security fee would also be applied unevenly between cities and even between carriers. If one were to fly Air Canada from Victoria to Vancouver, a surcharge would have to be paid. If one were to fly Harbour Air there would be no extra charge. We are not suggesting for a moment that this fee be charged to Harbour Air. We are only demonstrating the unevenness and unfairness of the tax.

No one should pay taxes for services not received. Many people from small towns who will be paying this tax will not have the privilege of having access to the security arrangements the fee will be applied to.

I will speak now about parliamentary accountability and authority. Day after day we hear tales of woe about what is taking place in committees. Committees are supposed to be a place where the public can make intelligent interventions that will be listened to by the government. Committees have the ability to put forth good documents with good ideas and good solutions to address big problems that affect Canadians but the opposite is taking place.

What we have is a situation where the Prime Minister's Office, through the minister, is tightly controlling the committees' activities. Committee members do not have the flexibility nor the power to do their jobs. Therefore the efforts of all those well-meaning Canadians who come in front of committees to put forth meaningful interventions, I am sad to say, are wasted.

• (1230)

I cannot think of a democratic country in the world where committee structures are so hamstrung and so neutered that members simply cannot do their jobs.

Government Orders

It was not like that when many of us were elected in 1993. The government made good promises to reform the committee structure because it made sense. It made sense to liberate members of parliament from all sides so they could do their work, use their skills, put forth constructive solutions and have those solutions listened to. However that has not been taking place. We have an utter violation of the meaning and the spirit of the committees. We have seen egregious attempts at hijacking those committees, such as the one mentioned by my colleague from Elk Island, the finance committee which is one of the most important committees in the House of Commons.

I will now talk about the Canada fund for infrastructure, which is part six in Bill C-49. We know infrastructure can be a good thing. In fact my party supports infrastructure where it is used for the betterment of the people. However the current situation is anything but that. When the former auditor general audited infrastructure grants, he found that infrastructure did not do what it was supposed to do. I will give some facts.

The auditor general's 1999 report found that the treasury board claimed that in 98% of cases, short term job creation occurred. The actual number was 3%. The treasury board also claimed that 34% of the infrastructure programs funded would result in increased economic competitiveness. The auditor general found that the actual number was 5%. Treasury board claimed that economic stability would improve by 40% but the actual number turned out to be 12%.

Infrastructure programs have often been used to fund bowling alleys, hockey players and their rinks, and to upgrade bocce ball courts. Taxpayer money should not be used for those things. Taxpayer money should be used for infrastructure development that will improve competitiveness, create jobs and improve the economic situation within communities. It cannot be used as a political pork barrel.

The last thing I will talk about is the Canada fund for Africa, a half billion dollar fund proposed by the Prime Minister. We are all for funding programs that work but we want transparency and accountability in the program. We want full access to all aspects of the fund, including access to information and privacy.

If the government wants this fund, it should consider it in this fashion. A civilian in Africa should be at the centre of the program. Around the wheel there needs to be five components: the environment, good governance, primary health, primary education and a good economic environment that includes good monitoring of fiscal policy, the protection of foreign and domestic investors, and anti-corruption laws.

There also has to be a quid pro quo. The moneys that are spent have to be spent at the sharp edge of aid. They cannot be spent domestically. The public would be very interested to find that when we analyze where a lot of aid money goes, more than half of it is actually spent on health here in Canada. It does not go to the sharp edge where people are in need.

It is important that the government look at all five of those components. If any of those components are missing, the structure will actually fall apart. Primary health, primary education, good governance, anti-corruption laws, good monitoring of fiscal policy

and a commitment by the receiving country that it will actually engage and be a full partner in this is essential. If we do not have the commitment of the receiving countries then this fund will go down as a waste of money. We will only be able to spend this money profitably in the long term if the moneys that are spent have long term effects, and we will only have that if the recipient country is prepared to have the measures I mentioned: good governance, good monitoring of fiscal policy, investment in primary health and education, and strong anti-corruption laws.

I would like the government and the public to listen very closely to what my colleagues and my party have said about the bill. The bill has been railroaded by the government. The government has violated the democratic rights of the members of the House and the public by actually throwing out our good ideas for its own political gain.

• (1235)

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Oak Ridges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hear a lot about democracy in the House, unfortunately when the opposition members vote together they consider that democratic but when we vote together, apparently it is whipped, which unfortunately is a misrepresentation.

I cannot believe some of the comments I have heard from the other side. It is very disappointing to hear some of the comments given that some of these members, when things are explained to them, turn around and say things which they know are incorrect. Nevertheless, some of the members seem to have a really good grasp of the finance committee, even though they have never attended it.

I would like to comment particularly on Motion No. 10 which deals with the issue of aerodromes north of the 55th parallel and how they would be served.

In the committee, we responded by saying that the listed airports, those airports that are planned by Transport Canada to benefit directly from security enhancements under the new authority, would be in place. All these airports currently have pre-board screening practices that would be continued and enhanced under this authority. Therefore, for travel in Canada, the charge would apply to flights between the listed airports. Direct flights to or from small and remote airports that are not listed airports will of course not be subject to the charge. Further, this would reduce considerably the incidents of the charge in remote areas in the country.

The list of airports will be reviewed, as has been said many times in the House, on an ongoing basis and, if necessary, revised to reflect any changes in the provision of security in those airports.

Further, on Motion No. 17, the charge will fund enhanced air travel security, which I believe is the goal of all members of the House. This would be based on national standards developed by Transport Canada and applied to the new air transport authority. This is extremely important.

Transport Canada has recently established security responsibilities and determined where and how the security will be enhanced.

Government Orders

The charge will not apply at airports where the government will not be providing enhanced security. Not applying the charge in respect of flights to and from portions of the listed airports that may not have screening services would raise, obviously, two difficulties.

First, it would be administratively complex and perhaps unworkable to identify each separate circumstance in which the charge would not apply at a particular time for a particular listed airport.

Second, it would create a cost advantage to operate flights from unsecured portions of listed airports that would be inconsistent with the key goal of enhancing air travel security. I am sure my friends on the other side do not want to see that as they are always talking about their concern for the dollar. They are all concerned about the issue of security and yet they, by their actions, would in fact put the public at peril by not supporting the notion of the type of security measures that are being implemented.

Further, the legislation already provides the authority to the Minister of Revenue to waive all or part of any interest on penalties otherwise payable on late or deficient payments. This was an issue that was raised at the committee. If the minister considers it reasonable to do so, then the minister will take the appropriate action.

This ministerial authority is consistent with the authority provided under the tax statute, such as the goods and services tax legislation, and the income tax legislation.

The authority would be expected to be exercised by Canada Customs and Revenue Agency in its administration of the charge in the same fair and reasonable manner as exercised in relation to other statutes.

Finally, the budget sets out a fiscal track for funding the enhanced security expenditures by way of the air travellers security charge, which entails a total budgetary commitment of \$2.2 billion over a five year period. The integrity of that fiscal framework is dependent on the charge going into effect April 1, 2002.

● (1240)

The air travel industry which consists of air carriers and travel agents across the country and abroad needs certainty as to when it would need to begin collecting the charge. It is gearing up to collect it as of April 1, 2002.

Projected revenues from the charge in the first two years are lower than projected expenditures. It is only in 2004-05 that annual revenue is projected to exceed annual costs. The air travel industry must buy the appropriate equipment and put it in place, so expenditures would go higher than revenues initially. Only by 2004-05 would it make up for the earlier shortfalls.

The government is committed to an open and transparent process. It was said time and again at the committee that the charge must be reviewed annually. The Minister of Finance is on record on repeated occasions in the House as saying he would review the charge to ensure revenue over the five year period did not exceed the costs of the enhanced air traffic travel security system.

However members on the other side of the House only seem to hear what they find convenient, and they are not prepared to hear the

views of the committee. A number of times they were not even at the committee. They did not seem to feel they received a positive response to the issues they raised so they took their marbles and went home.

Unfortunately, at the end of the day we are responsible for the security of Canadians. We want to make sure air travellers are secure. We want to make sure the costs are partly borne by the consumer. That approach has been taken. I would hope the majority of members of the House support that approach.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ) Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in today's debate on Bill C-49, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in parliament on December 10, 2001.

First, I would like to concentrate on one of the aspects of this bill that is the most important to us, and I do not necessarily mean that in a good way. It has to do with all of the provisions of the bill that create a new passenger safety tax for air travellers. I have the impression that, when the government, with the help of its officials, developed this type of clause for the bill to create a new tax, they did so in a vacuum. I do not believe that the government consulted with the regions on the impact that such a tax would have.

This morning, my colleague, the member for Charlevoix, gave a somewhat caricatured example, but one that is quite easily understood: when a tax on tobacco is set, or raised, what is the basic objective, in terms of public health? The objective is to discourage the consumer from using a substance that is harmful to health. Obviously, it allows the government to raise money. However, it also discourages the consumer.

In studying Bill C-49, it appears as though the government is not aware of its own policies, which it applies in other areas. What impact will adding a new tax and additional fees have on consumers when it comes to air transportation? It will discourage people from using regional airlines. It will wind up creating a parallel travel network for Canadian citizens. It will mean that people, if they are required to pay more taxes, will end up using their cars. A tax such as this one will therefore reduce air travel among citizens. We can imagine the other consequences that it will have.

When a bill such as this one is drawn up, it cannot simply be considered in a context of specific funding and objectives. I refute the arguments made by the member opposite, who said, some twenty, ten, or five minutes ago, that opposition members were not concerned about air transportation safety. According to him, the opposition is not concerned about providing an airline industry that is dependable and safe. That is not the issue. Instead, he should say "We realize that September 11 significantly changed the way things operate".

Government Orders

However, could the government not have used the surpluses it has been accumulating for years to pay for air travel security? Is it not the responsibility of Canadians as a whole to have a reliable and safe airline industry? Is it only travellers flying between Montreal and Alma who have to pay this cost? I do not believe so. National airline security must be the responsibility of every taxpayer.

Therefore, we must pay for airline security with the budget surpluses accumulated by the government. What will the impact of this tax be? As I said, it will most likely be a drop in the number of air travellers, which in turn will have repercussions on regional development, our regions' economic structure and also young people.

• (1245)

If we want to stop the exodus of young people toward urban areas, we must give the regions the necessary tools for their development.

At some point in time, business people will be told they have to drive from Alma to Montreal because the Montreal-Alma flight has been discontinued; recently, Air Alma made just such an announcement. If we want our regional economies to flourish, we must give the necessary tools to our business people.

Moreover, this tax is completely irresponsible when Canada is trying to improve its record on the environment and sustainable development. The government is preparing the demise of several airlines in Canada, making sure that Canadians will no longer fly but drive their CO₂ producing cars.

Unwittingly, the government is pushing citizens to no longer use a means of transportation which I would call "mass transit", namely the airplane—which is what we can call it—in favour of another means of transportation, the car. In environmental terms, the federal strategy is totally irresponsible.

The citizens, the taxpayers, the air travellers will have to assume the cost of this tax. For travel within Canada, the total cost of the charge will be \$12 for a one way ticket and \$24 for a round trip. The charge on a ticket to the continental U.S. will be \$12. It will be \$24 for a ticket to travel outside Canada and the continental U.S.

The charge will apply to flights connecting the 90 airports where the Canadian air transport security authority is planning security enhancements. However, it will not apply to direct flights to and from small airports or regional airports not included in the list of 90 airports.

It is obvious that Quebec will be hard hit by this tax. This will affect the regional airports. In Quebec, 20 airports out of 90 will be affected by this bill. This represents 25% of the airports in Quebec. There are 20 in Quebec and 15 in Ontario.

This is not only the fight of the Bloc Quebecois members but also the fight of all the members of this House whose constituents an adequate airline and adequate service. I understand that some government members, including the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, were very critical of this bill. Why is that? Because the regions will suffer, particularly the regional economies.

• (1250)

[*English*]

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House to speak to motions put forth on Bill C-49. Motion No. 1 states:

The Authority must, before December 31 of each year following the Authority's first full year of operations, submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year to the Minister, and the Minister must cause a copy of the report to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the Minister receives it.

The report must include:

- (a) national, provincial and regional data on the effect of the air travellers security surcharge on passenger travel and economic development; and
- (b) a review of the impact of all the other surcharges levied on air travel.

I will comment on all the motions being debated today during my 10 minutes and then I will speak about them all in one block.

The second motion has been proposed by the Minister of Transport. It states:

Two of the directors must be nominees submitted by the representatives of the airline industry designated under section 11 whom the Minister considers suitable for appointment as directors, and two must be nominees submitted by the representatives of aerodrome operators designated under that section whom the Minister considers suitable for appointment as directors.

Obviously the amendment was put in to cut out the amendment that would have allowed two representatives from the unions to sit on the board.

Motion No. 10 states:

- (a) an aerodrome north of the 55th parallel of north latitude that is not served at least five times per week by non-stop round-trip jet service to an airport south of the 55th parallel of north latitude, or
- (b) an aerodrome where the population of the adjoining city is less than 3,000 persons.

This is an attempt to waive the fee.

The Speaker ruled those three motions admissible. Of those three motions, we would support two. However the third motion on behalf of the minister is an attempt to override the democratic process of the committee. The committee already established a bona fide case and allowed an amendment to be put forth that would allow for fair and equitable representation on the committee, but the minister decided to overrule it. This is very typical of not only this legislation but of a lot of other legislation that the government has passed. It just does not seem to understand the responsibility that we all have as members of parliament to ensure that we put forward legislation that is meaningful, representative of all Canadian society and has some built-in process that allows for accountability.

Bill C-49 needs several amendments. If the amendments are not brought in, then the measures that were announced in the December budget will be.

Government Orders

The specific amendments which deal with the Canadian air transport security authority are most important and should be looked at first. Probably there are two tests that should be applied to all those parts of Bill C-49 that set up this authority.

Given the amount of money it would spend, with the lion's share of the revenue being raised by the \$12 ticket tax, is the governance structure adequate to protect the taxpayer money? I argue quite vehemently on behalf of taxpayers that there are not enough sections in the in bill to protect their money.

• (1255)

The second rule that should be applied is if there will be sufficient mechanisms for Canadians to judge whether the authority has significantly improved air traffic security or whether it has just become another expensive and bureaucratic boondoggle. Surely there should be a sufficient mechanism built into the authority that would allow us to establish a scale. Is the system working? How will we know whether the system is working or not? We do not see anything built into this.

A number of areas are troublesome. The tabling of information to parliament is extremely troublesome. The directives from the minister are quite heavy-handed. The process for review for the bill and the access to information and privacy are all areas that were not taken seriously enough when the bill was introduced. All these areas need improvement.

Tabling of information to parliament is the very life and breath of the House. Under clause 32 of Bill C-49, the minister would be allowed to block the tabling of information in parliament under section 10 of the Financial Administration Act if he or she felt it would be detrimental to public security. This would affect three specific types of information: directives from cabinet to the entity, which are under section 89.1(4) of the Financial Administration Act; significant problems that may be found during an annual audit that the auditors feel should be drawn to parliament's attention and to inclusion in that entity's annual report which is under section 132(v) of the FAA; and significant problems that are found during a special examination. The examiner possibly, in this case the auditor general, feels these should be included in the entity's annual report.

A special examination must be conducted every five years. Its purpose is to give the board an independent opinion on whether the corporation's financial and management control, information system and management practices are proper. There are absolutely no safeguards built into the legislation to ensure that the minister does not use transportation security as an excuse to simply prevent publication of embarrassing information. It should be further questioned whether any directive would ever, under the legislation, be allowed to be tabled before parliament. It is very questionable how much information parliament will get under the legislation.

At the very least, the bill should have included a motion that would have forced the minister and the board to table information that could present a security threat and have some type of accommodating legislation to prevent such information that was not a security threat, but would simply prove embarrassing to the minister, from being tabled.

Under the directives from the minister, the minister may issue written directions to the authority on his or her own matters of air transport security without going to cabinet. Maybe the minister should not have to run back to cabinet every time he or she wants to deal with any particular issue in Canadian legislation. However we have seen an increase in this type of behaviour on behalf of the government. It is just sheer arrogance that would allow any minister not to refer back to cabinet and never refer back to parliament. He or she need not consult the board. There is no requirement that any directives be tabled in parliament.

Further, Bill C-49 specifically declares that there are no statutory instruments. There is no mechanism for review. For that matter, there is no mechanism for even informing parliament.

• (1300)

There is much more to be said on this legislation, particularly under access to information and under the Privacy Act. There are major areas of concern, typical of a lot of legislation that the government has put forth which has been poorly crafted, not thought out and absolutely not accountable to the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this important matter. There are a number of points I wish to make. I listened to the speech by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance. I found it curious that he took a shot at the official opposition on the question of free votes, in that when we vote in unison somehow that is free votes, but when the government does not do it that is not somehow imposing party discipline.

Coming from the authority he has as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, I find it absurd for him to stand in the House and lecture anybody on the issue of free votes and represent democracy. Consider the debacle that happened in the second election of the chair of the finance committee and how much of an embarrassment that was, not only to the Liberal government, but to the entire House and to democracy.

What is more, consider the lack of democracy at the finance committee when the Liberal member of parliament for Hillsborough, Prince Edward Island, dared to say that he might vote in favour of lowering a tax. Then the committee was gavelled and shut down. We came to the House to vote 15 minutes before any of the other committee meetings broke to come to the House for the vote. Moreover, the chair of the committee would not entertain a vote prior to us coming here even though there was nobody left on the speaking roster.

Government Orders

Clearly, the whip appointed chair of the finance committee did not like what was going on. When we came back to the committee after the vote, the member for Hillsborough was nowhere to be seen for close to half an hour. Then when the Liberal member for Hillsborough came into the committee, he said that he had been made aware that the government would be reviewing this tax sometime in the fall. Therefore, he was not going to vote for my amendment to cut the tax in half.

It was curious given that he said he learned that information in the previous half hour while we were voting. The government said that back in December. Somehow it was a revelation to him even though the information had been made public almost two and a half months prior.

I want to speak to Motion No. 10 which is to remove northern airports from this list. In the House of Commons the finance minister said and I quote:

—the charge will not be applied to direct flights to and from the smaller and remote airports that make up the vast majority of the airports in the north.

I challenged the finance minister and the Liberal government to live up to that recommendation at committee. I tabled a bunch of small and rural communities and airports at committee for them to vote on, to put some muscle behind their rhetoric.

I put the Inuit village of Rankin Inlet which has a population of 2,500 people on the list. It is exempt from the tax. I also put the smaller community of Kuujjuaq, with a population of 1,470, on the list to have exempted. In Liberal math 1,470 is bigger than 2,500. For some reason the people of Kuujjuaq with a population of 1,470 will have to pay the \$24 round trip air tax, but the people of Rankin Inlet with a population of 2,500 will not.

Frankly, the government did not fulfill the spirit of what was said by the finance minister in the House. What was very interesting was I said that Miramichi, New Brunswick, another small community, should taken off the list, the argument being that there was no air service to its airport. Somehow the government said that it needed 90 airports, a round number, so Miramichi, New Brunswick was left on the list. There is no air service to Miramichi, New Brunswick, none whatsoever.

Liberals at the committee and all the genius that was mustered said that they would agree with my amendment to take Miramichi, New Brunswick off the list.

After that we voted on taking Dawson Creek off the list, another small city in British Columbia. The Liberals said no, that we could not do that. They also voted to keep Churchill Falls on the list. Churchill Falls has a population of 717 people. It is a small, rural, northern community which is trying to pull the community up, expand it and grow it. However the government is going to tax that community \$24 round trip on air service. Then there is Miramichi, New Brunswick. Its airport is dead. Therefore because there is no revenue for the government, it is not going to charge it the tax. Only when an airport is dead will the government say it should be taken off the list. I will bet that if Miramichi airport at some point in the next year or so, if one Dash 8 flies out of that airport, the government will come in and nail that community for the \$24 tax again.

● (1305)

There are many reasons the \$24 tax is bad public policy. First, it is not revenue neutral. The government's own numbers in Bill C-49 contrast with the budget it announced in December. In year one there would be a \$90 million surplus. That is not revenue neutral.

Second, I sat for hours at the transport committee and we unanimously came up with a list of recommendations for airport and airline security. Not one of the recommendations found its way into the law that is supposed to improve airline and airport security.

At the finance committee the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance seemed to be an expert on airport and airline security. However he was not on the transport committee so he knows not of what he speaks when he talks about the recommendations.

Recommendation 14 was unanimously supported by the Liberals including the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport. It states:

All stakeholders—including airports, air carriers, airline passengers and/or residents of Canada—contribute to the cost of improved aviation security.

The transport committee's recommendations were totally ignored and brushed aside. The finance minister said he wanted tax revenues to go to the general revenue. The government has ignored the recommendation of the transport committee and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport. The Liberal arrogance on display in the House is quite typical. The Liberals see a tax grab and they like it. They throw corporate welfare to the people in their constituencies. It is a huge a tax grab.

The government did not do one impact study on the tax. Government members should know WestJet's profit margin is four passengers per flight. We have heard from industry people that WestJet may eliminate its Calgary-Edmonton run. Today WestJet flies 14 or 16 daily round trip flights from Calgary to Edmonton. It may completely eliminate the run from its schedule because of the air tax. The government did not ask one air carrier or industry official what the impact of the tax would be on their business. WestJet's profit margin is four passengers per flight.

WestJet may kill its Toronto-Calgary run altogether. That is the route on which it built its business. It may lose the run because of Liberal policy. The government did no impact study or assessment whatsoever.

Government Orders

The tax would be collected on April 1. All the money from it would go straight into the general revenue of the government. Air carriers and travel agents would cut cheques to the receiver general which would go straight into the general revenue. The money would then go to the new airport authority the government is supposed to be creating. The airport authority would not be created until November or December of this year. In other words, from April 1 until November or December of this year Canadians would essentially have taxation without representation through the authority they are supposed to be financing.

What are Canadians to expect during that time? The \$24 fee is supposed to finance \$2.2 billion in air security improvements. More than \$1 billion of the \$2.2 billion would be for new technology such as bomb detection equipment, metal detectors and so on. There would be a one year backlog in getting the equipment because of the attacks in the United States. However the government would pay cash upfront in 2002 for equipment it would not receive for a year. It would pay 100% of the cost upfront.

If the government had any common business sense it would do what people in small business do all the time: amortize the cost of the equipment over the life of the equipment. It could do that. It would cut the tax in half. However the government would rather put the money into the general revenue. After the government paid upfront for equipment it would not get for a year, the same amount would keep pouring into the general revenue. The Liberals could keep throwing it at corporate welfare and their friends. They could keep spending the way Liberals love to spend.

I encourage all members of the House to support the transport committee's amendments and bring sanity back to the House. We studied the issue for hours and spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars. The member opposite may not care because he is a Liberal, but taxpayers care about their money being wasted.

• (1310)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in this debate on Bill C-49.

I would like to focus mainly on Motion No. 2 which reads, and I quote:

That Bill C-49, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing subsection 10(2) with the following:

“(2) Two of the directors must be nominees submitted by the representatives of the airline industry designated under section 11 whom the Minister considers suitable for appointment as directors, and two must be nominees submitted by the representatives of aerodrome operators designated under that section whom the Minister considers suitable for appointment as directors.

An amendment put forward by my colleague from Regina—Qu'Appelle said, and I quote:

That Bill C-49, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 10, page 6, with the following:

“for appointment as directors, and two must be nominees submitted by representatives of aerodrome operators designated under that section whom the Minister considers suitable for appointment as directors; and two must be nominees submitted by the bargaining agents representing the largest number of screening officers working at Canadian aerodromes.”

Today, the minister is putting forward in the House an amendment excluding workers' representatives.

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Frankly, what is shameful is that the federal government is ignoring workers.

Honestly, I do not blame the Liberals for thinking that way since as they said this morning they have their votes anyway. They are saying “We can crucify them every day, we can hit them in the face, we can do whatever we want to workers, they will vote for us anyway.”

I hope workers are listening to what I am saying. The transport minister believes it is not enough. In his opinion, there is no need to have workers' representatives on the committee. It is not necessary, they already have their votes.

I will remind the House of something. In my riding, my predecessor used to say the same thing, “Between elections people in Acadie—Bathurst are mad at the Liberals, but when the election comes, they vote for us anyway.” In 1997, he saw that they did not. Maybe the Liberals will stop being so arrogant and show some respect for workers.

I hope that workers in Toronto are hearing what I am saying. At the Toronto airport, they are represented by a union. The Minister of Transport has just said that it is not necessary to have representatives of the workers, but that airport authorities can be represented. Airlines can be represented. Are they going to be represented by Air Canada? By WestJet? Is it these two, the only two airlines in Canada, that will decide? Is it the minister who will decide?

Workers are being told, “You, the workers, do not have anyone competent enough to represent you”. This is what the minister should have said in the House this morning, “You cannot have representatives, have someone to represent workers”.

Again, this is a disgrace, and the government talks about democracy. Earlier, the Liberals rose and said, “According to them, democracy only works when it comes from the opposition. When it does not come from the proper side, it is not democracy”. I can guarantee that democracy exists everywhere, as long as it is based on respect for everyone.

I am convinced that, in this particular case, unions could make a useful contribution to the committee. They would bring nothing but good things to the committee.

• (1315)

But it is not good enough for the Minister of Transport. No, because it is not his gang.

When the Minister of Transport appeared before the committee, he said that, even though there is a collective agreement, the act could not even go against the agreement as regards official languages. Well no, because the idea was to represent workers. It is always the same thing in these cases. You never stand up for the workers.

Government Orders

[English]

At no time have I seen the Liberals get up from their chairs and fight for the working people but they brag that they are getting their votes. I hope the working men and women of Canada recognize this once and for all.

We got the Minister of Transport to come to the House this morning to remove the amendment that was put to the House. To have only two persons on the committee on airport security who represent working people is a shame. It is because the minister does not trust them.

The Liberals trust the working people on voting day. They even brag about it. As my predecessor said, between elections the working class is always pissed off at the Liberals but when election day comes it votes for them anyway.

The Liberals go across the country and make promises about roads. They say that with the Liberals in office working people have hope. They have had hope for 10 years but it is an empty hope because the roads are not being built. This is the type of hope we get from the Liberals: empty hope with no results.

This morning the Minister of Human Resources Development was bragging about all the good things the government has done to Employment Insurance. It made all the cuts in 1996 and she has the guts to brag about it. The hon. member for Toronto—Danforth, who is a Liberal, said he would tell employees who tried to hang him out to dry on the national stage that they were working for the wrong company. On the national news he said employees who did not have good witnesses for their ministers would lose their jobs.

The Liberals talk about democracy. I hope they have a bit of conscience left and change their minds. I hope they appoint labour representatives to the board so the working men and women of Canada are represented rather than just the big corporations. That is what needs to be done.

• (1320)

[Translation]

The Liberals should be ashamed to have the nerve and the guts to come before the House and say, "We will boot the two union representatives out, because workers on the work sites will vote for us anyway". I hope that Canadians will be able to see through the Liberals opposite.

[English]

Hon. Lorne Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point order. I wonder if there is unanimous consent in the House to allow the hon. member to continue his speech.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague from Acadie—Bathurst spoke from the heart and I would like to do the same. We all know that he is a very compassionate man.

Unfortunately, the flu I have been fighting for the last two weeks will prevent me from bringing as much passion as he did to this debate, which I tend to do at times.

I just want to remind the hon. member that he can name his predecessor, the former member for Acadie—Bathurst, his predecessor, the one who was elected with the Liberal government in 1993, when referring to him in the House. His name is Doug Young. As transport minister at the time, he was my counterpart for a few years until the current member for Acadie—Bathurst was kind enough to send him packing.

Some hon. members: Oh, Oh.

Mr. Guimond: Doug Young is now a lobbyist very close to—

Mr. Speaker, could you ask the chihuahua from Beauharnois—Salaberry—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. We are having a very important debate.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

An hon. member: You're a bunch of liars.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I realize that we are having a lively debate, but to set things straight, I will ask the member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans to withdraw the word chihuahua.

Then, I will ask the member for Beauharnois—Salaberry to withdraw the word liar.

The hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans.

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, I remind you that this issue was already discussed in the House, because I once called the member for Bourassa a chihuahua. I am referring to what was said at the time.

The Deputy Speaker: Still, at this point, as the one in the Chair, I deem that expression to be unparliamentary. Therefore, I am asking the member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans to withdraw his words.

• (1325)

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my words.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his co-operation. I will ask the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry to withdraw the term liar.

Mr. Serge Marcil: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that term.

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans.

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleague from Acadie—Bathurst, his predecessor, Doug Young, was a typical example of a chihuahua's behaviour. Doug Young was a typical chihuahua.

Private Members' Business

A chihuahua is a little dog that barks a lot but does not bite. That was the case with Doug Young. He barked about everything, but his bark was worse than his bite, as they say, like the chihuahua.

Since I must get back to the crux of the matter, and the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry knows what I think of him, I would like to say that Bill C-49, particularly in connection with air travel, will penalize the regions.

The present Minister of Transport, an MP for the Toronto area, has the good fortune to work in Ottawa, which is served by RapidAir. There are Ottawa-Toronto and Toronto-Ottawa flights hourly. In peak periods, there is one every half hour. Can the Minister of Transport not understand how the regions, and the human beings living in the regions, can be penalized by his acceptance of this surtax, when he works in an area where airlines are not in a position to meet the demand?

Can the job done by the Minister of Transport, as far as air travel is concerned, be considered to have been effective? We need only think of the bankruptcies of InterCanadian, Royal Aviation, Region Air and Air Alma.

An hon. member: RootsAir.

Mr. Michel Guimond: My colleague from Calgary is suggesting RootsAir. This is the record of the Minister of Transport.

Does the Minister of Transport find that things are going well for regional air travel? It is a monumental failure. The result of this tax will be to impose once again a surcharge on the regions.

People who live in the regions have no choice but to go to the major centres. For instance, in Quebec the people in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, in Abitibi, in the Gaspé or on the north shore need to go to Montreal or Quebec City for specialized services. Our population is aging. I am thinking about my mother-in-law, who is 94 and lives in the Gaspé. There is no way she is going to take a bus or train to go to Quebec City for medical tests. This is utterly ridiculous and the government should think about it.

The Deputy Speaker: I would like to let the member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans know that he will have approximately five minutes remaining when we resume debate on this bill.

• (1330)

[English]

NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it has not been possible to reach an agreement under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the report stage and the third reading stage of Bill C-49, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in parliament on December 10, 2001.

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

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Am I to understand it is the convention of the House for the government House leader, under the standing order in question, to be able to give notice of time allocation after two hours of debate at report stage? Is this the convention of this place, sir? Because if it is, it is outrageous.

The Deputy Speaker: I regret that this is not a point of order. What the government has chosen to do at this time is well within the rules of the House and so we will now proceed with other business.

[Translation]

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]

PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance) moved:

That the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights fully examine the effectiveness of property rights protection for Canadian citizens as provided in the Canadian Bill of Rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and report back to the House whether or not the federal laws protecting property rights need to be amended in order to comply with the international agreements Canada has entered into, including Article 17 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights that states: "1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. 2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time since 1997 that I have brought forth legislative proposals in an attempt to strengthen property rights in Canadian law.

On each of the four occasions my private member's bill and now my private member's motion have been declared non-votable. This is a regrettable situation. It is a serious infringement of our democratic rights and a violation of my rights as a member of parliament.

On three previous occasions I introduced well-researched, expertly drafted private member's bills to strengthen property rights in federal law. It is somewhat understandable for the government to be reluctant about passing legislation. Today's motion is simply asking the justice committee to fully examine the issue. Where is the risk in that?

I refer members to my motion again. It states:

That the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights fully examine the effectiveness of property rights protection for Canadian citizens as provided in the Canadian Bill of Rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and report back to the House whether or not the federal laws protecting property rights need to be amended in order to comply with the international agreements Canada has entered into, including Article 17 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights that states: "1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. 2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property."

I am asking that we refer this to the committee to see whether this needs further strengthening in Canadian law.

Private Members' Business

I start today's debate by reading a Southam editorial by Murdock Davis that was published in many papers on January 10, 2001. I believe this puts the whole discussion into perspective. It states:

The right to acquire, use, enjoy and transfer property—land, buildings, vehicles, intellectual property and more—is fundamental to liberty. And Canadians are naive to rely on governments to respect ownership rights without a constitutional guarantee, considering the patchy record of those governments.

Aboriginal Canadians on reserves live with the corruption and economic desperation that accompanies insecure rights to property. Citizens of Japanese descent saw their property confiscated and sold during the Second World War. Prairie farmers have been jailed for exporting grain grown on their own land, rather than using the Canadian Wheat Board.

Proposed federal endangered species legislation could mean vast tracts of land are made off-limits to ranchers, farmers, other landowners and resource users, with compensation at the discretion of politicians. It could allow the federal government to intrude into property rights, generally a provincial jurisdiction.

Legislation passed to combat international terrorism authorizes police to seize certain property without normal judicial review.

The Firearms Act compels law-abiding owners to surrender certain firearms, without compensation. (Those who support this because they disapprove of guns should consider: If you favour government authority over property that you don't like, it is harder to fend government off when it comes after yours.)

Private property rights serve two purposes. They have economic utility, and they help guarantee political liberty.

Private property keeps power diffuse. It strengthens individual autonomy from government. Property rights and the protection of contracts form the legal foundation of the free-enterprise system. They create incentives by rewarding owners for wise stewardship and maximizing the productive use of resources.

Nations with the strongest protections for private property have the highest levels of prosperity. Canada is considered to have strong property protections, but it will take vigilance to maintain them.

The Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution reads in part: "(No persons shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of the law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.)"

● (1335)

Canada's Bill of Rights says Canadians have the right to "enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law". But parliament can override that bill at will, just as it can subvert through statute centuries of common law on property rights. Neither is part of the Constitution.

Entrenching similar language in the Charter would place the right at a higher level. It would give Canadians recourse, through the judiciary. It would place an onus on any government seeking to impinge on such rights to prove it meets the constitutional test of reasonableness.

The provinces were vocal opponents of a property-rights provision when the Charter was drafted: Saskatchewan, to protect its expropriated mineral resources and Crown corporations; P.E.I., to preserve laws limiting non-resident land ownership; Quebec, to safeguard its unique income-security programs. As co-conspirators with the federal government, provincial premiers are hardly reliable guardians of your property.

These limits and some of the examples cited previously might well qualify under the "reasonable limits" provision of our Charter. They are not reasons to oppose Charter protection.

James Madison, a drafter of the U.S. Constitution, recognized that a charter could not totally protect citizens from legislative intrusions. In Canada this would be even truer, because of the "reasonable limits" clause.

But Madison's argument for enshrining such rights was "to establish public opinion in their favour, and arouse the attention of the whole community".

The attention of Canadians most certainly needs arousing.

To enhance our democracy, Canadian governments should establish a constitutional remedy to the expropriation or undue restriction of property.

Today we are not debating that property rights be entrenched in the charter. I want to make that clear. We are only debating whether there is enough evidence to show that the issue needs to be fully examined by the justice committee.

I have researched this issue for years and I have followed recent court cases over the years. I have a pretty good idea what the conclusion of such a study might be.

The committee would likely conclude that the only property rights protection Canadian citizens have in federal law is the totally ineffective protection provided by the Canadian Bill of Rights, as Saskatchewan farmer David Bryan found out in 1999. Here is his sad story.

David Bryan grew a crop of wheat on his own land. He got into trouble when he tried to sell his wheat for a better price than what the Canadian Wheat Board would pay him. The federal government charged Mr. Bryan with exporting his own grain to the United States without getting an export licence from the monopolistic, dictatorial wheat board.

For violating this Soviet style decree Mr. Bryan spent a week in jail, was fined \$9,000 and received a two year suspended sentence.

Mr. Bryan—

● (1340)

Mr. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Canadian Wheat Board is not dictatorial; it is elected by producers. It has nothing to do—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. O'Reilly): I do not consider that a point of order.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, I hope you will extend my time because that was simply an abuse of privilege.

Mr. Bryan, with the help of the National Citizens' Coalition, appealed his conviction on the grounds that it violated his property rights as guaranteed in the Canadian Bill of Rights passed by this parliament in 1960. On February 4, 1999, the Manitoba Court of Appeal ruled against David Bryan's right to sell his own grain that he grew on his land.

The Manitoba Court of Appeal stated on page 14 of its ruling and this is a key part of my argument to refer this to committee:

Section 1(a) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, which protects property rights through a "due process" clause, was not replicated in the Charter, and the right to "enjoyment of property" is not a constitutionally protected, fundamental part of Canadian society.

Can anyone who is listening to this debate or who reads the record of this debate believe these words came out of a Canadian court of law? I repeat "the right to 'enjoyment of property' is not a constitutionally protected, fundamental part of Canadian society." It is about time we listened to what this judge had to say. He is not the only one to state it.

Private Members' Business

This ruling was confirmed by constitutional expert Peter Hogg in 1992 in his book *Constitutional Law of Canada*, Third Edition. Citation 44.9 on page 1030 states:

The omission of property rights from section 7 [of the Charter] greatly reduces its scope. It means that section 7 affords no guarantee of compensation or even a fair procedure for the taking of property by the government. It means that section 7 affords no guarantee of fair treatment by courts, tribunals or officials with power over purely economic interests of individuals or corporations.

Professor Hogg also wrote:

The product is a section 7 in which liberty must be interpreted as not including property, as not including freedom of contract, and, in short, as not including economic liberty.

Therefore, without protection of property rights and freedom of contract in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and with the court's recent ruling that the Canadian Bill of Rights does not provide any protection whatsoever from the federal government's arbitrary taking of property or infringing on our fundamental economic liberties, I decided it was time for parliament to do something about it.

Amending the charter is a hugely complicated task because it requires a resolution to be passed in the House of Commons and in seven provincial legislatures comprising more than 50% of the population. In past debates the government has argued rather poorly that there is no need to strengthen property rights in federal law, that the Canadian Bill of Rights provides adequate protection of property rights. The Bryan case proves that to be totally wrong on this count.

The bill of rights provides absolutely no protection of property rights and even if the government ignores the David Bryan judgment these rights can be overridden by just saying so in any piece of legislation passed by the House. Canada's foremost constitutional expert and the Manitoba Court of Appeal both agree there is no protection of property rights in federal law.

What is parliament to do? Does it just ignore it as we have been doing for the past decade? I do not think so. That is not an option and that is why I have introduced Motion No. 426.

In December, 1948 member states of the United Nations general assembly, including Canada, adopted and proclaimed the universal declaration of human rights. As stated in my motion, among the rights proclaimed in the UN declaration and ratified by Canada was the "right to own property alone as well as in association with others" and not to be arbitrarily deprived thereof.

In 1992 Gudmunder Alfredsson had this to say about Article 17 in his book *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights: A Commentary*:

It applies to both the individual and collective forms of property ownership. The absence of the limitations proposed in the legislative debate [leading up to the final draft] is noteworthy; there are no references in the article to conformity with State laws, personal property or decent living. The right is not an absolute one, however, it is foreseen that persons can be deprived of their property under circumstances...The term "arbitrarily" would seem to prohibit unreasonable interferences by States and taking of property without compensation.

● (1345)

The evidence is clear. This is an issue that needs to be fully examined by the committee. I would like at this point, for those who have listened carefully to my arguments, to request that the House consent unanimously to make my motion votable.

I have clearly indicated why this is a violation of my rights. I have had four opportunities to bring this to the House. I think it is about time we had an opportunity to fully debate this issue and vote on the it. I am asking simply to refer it to committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give its unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

The Minister of Justice feels strongly about the important role of property rights in our society. Property rights represent one of the fundamental pillars of the legal system and our democratic society. Indeed our legal system is replete with protection for property rights.

However, the Minister of Justice cannot support the motion because it raises some important concerns.

The motion is merely the latest in a series of efforts aimed at amending the Canadian bill of rights and the Constitution Act, 1867 to increase property rights protections. Most recently the issue was raised in this Chamber in 1999 by the same member in the form of Bill C-237 and was afforded considerable debate at that time.

It is very important that before the House assigns additional tasks to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, the full schedule and heavy workload currently facing the committee ought to be considered.

As the idea of increasing protection for property rights has been debated on numerous occasions in the past and has repeatedly been rejected, there is no need to use the precious time, energy and resources of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights to revisit the issue.

During the discussions and debates preceding the introduction of the charter, a significant amount of time and consideration was given to the idea of including protection for property rights. The idea again surfaced during the lead up to the Charlottetown accord. However, in both cases the notion of entrenching property rights in the charter was strenuously resisted by the provinces as an intrusion into provincial jurisdiction and as a restriction on their ability to legislate in areas involving property.

In this regard it should be remembered that section 92(13) of the Constitution Act assigns much of the responsibility for regulating property to the provinces. This is not to say that the federal government cannot legislate in ways that affect property, but its jurisdiction is limited in these respects.

Private Members' Business

At the federal level for example, we have environmental laws, land use laws, laws providing for the establishment and operation of corporations and the ownership and disposition of shares, laws on banking, laws on bankruptcy and copyright laws. Each of these laws touches in some way on the ownership and use of property. Each of these laws serves an important public purpose. Each of these laws also contains provisions to ensure that people are treated fairly.

Property rights are a fundamental part of our legal system and the law provides in many ways for their recognition. Canadian law contains innumerable protections for property rights, whether in the common law or by statute.

More specifically, the protection afforded to property rights contained in paragraph 1(a) of the Canadian bill of rights is one such expression. The section recognizes the right of an individual to the enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law.

Further, numerous federal statutes contain provisions to ensure fair dealing when property rights are affected, by providing for fair procedures and for fair compensation, that is in shareholder laws, banking laws, criminal laws.

Our common law tradition as well offers significant protection for property rights by virtue of the common law presumption of compensation when someone is deprived of property. This notion forms a fundamental part of our legal system.

On the whole, people in Canada enjoy a very high degree of protection for their property rights under the statutes and common law applicable at the federal level, including the provisions of the Canadian bill of rights. Property rights are ingrained in our laws, whether legislated or judge made.

The ample protection afforded to property rights reflects the value that Canadians place on property rights. The right to own and dispose of property is a basic component to our way of life.

• (1350)

As important as property rights are, as Canadians, we have also recognized that these are not unlimited rights. We have many laws that regulate the ownership and use of property in Canadian society. Municipal laws, environmental laws, laws regulating incorporation and the operation of limited companies, laws regulating the division of family property, succession and estate planning laws and personal property security laws are just some of the myriad of laws that place socially necessary limits on either the ownership or the use of property.

It is difficult to think of laws that do not affect or touch on property in one way or another. When we realize this it becomes incumbent upon us to ensure that protection for property rights is kept in balance with the other values of our society that are reflected in our laws and socially important legislation.

Increasing property rights protections under the bill of rights or the charter would have serious implications for the federal government's ability to legislate and regulate in a wide variety of areas and would have untold implications for federal laws. For example, it could affect everything from federal laws dealing with pollution to

shareholder rights to divorce laws making provision for the division of property.

One only has to look at the American experience with constitutional property rights to understand the implications of extending property rights. In the United States property rights have been extended in ways that no one could have anticipated. This has led to huge amounts of litigation and has complicated and burdened the process of law making.

Early on in the history of the United States, important social reforms were struck down by the courts in the name of property rights. I am not saying that this kind of unfortunate judicial intervention would necessarily happen here, but we should be conscious of that possibility.

The protection of property rights is of course an important principle in Canadian society. No one in this Chamber would dispute that. While agreeing with the principle of protecting property rights, we must be cognizant of the impact that an increase in property rights protection would have.

In any event, as I have already indicated, it is very important to remember that our legal system presently and appropriately acknowledges property rights. The concept of property rights is fundamental to our legal system. It is the basis of the operation of our economy. This is reflected in the legal framework that governs our economy. Every day property rights guide our actions in the way we do business.

Contract law, real property law, personal property law and so on are built on the concept of property rights. Indeed our legal system could not function without it. As such, our legal system provides, as a matter of common law that has been built over hundreds of years through court decisions, basic protections for property owners. Hundreds of years of jurisprudence must not be lightly disregarded.

The common law provides basic protections for individuals regarding state action that affects their property. Statute law is also filled with protections for property rights. Whether we are looking at shareholder laws, banking laws, criminal laws or otherwise, these laws contain a wide variety of provisions that are designed to ensure fair dealings with property.

The hon. member's motion would have the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights examine whether our current federal laws are in compliance with our international human rights obligations and in particular, whether they comply with article 17 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states:

1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.
2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

In this regard, it is important to note that the protection for property rights already provided by section 1(a) of the Canadian bill of rights guarantees "the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of person and the enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law".

Private Members' Business

• (1355)

We will continue to support property rights to promote respect for these and all rights of Canadians. However, we cannot support a motion that could result in reopening the question of increased property rights protections that would disrupt the current democratic balance of property rights and other rights, thereby putting into jeopardy social and economic laws and policies that are important to the people of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Motion M-426, moved by my colleague, the member for Yorkton—Melville. The motion reads as follows:

That the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights fully examine the effectiveness of property rights protection for Canadian citizens as provided in the Canadian Bill of Rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and report back to the House whether or not the federal laws protecting property rights need to be amended in order to comply with the international agreements Canada has entered into, including Article 17 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights that states: "1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. 2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property."

At first glance, this topic may seem rather agreeable. In fact, measuring the very liberal principle of property rights against the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and international conventions Canada has ratified seems harmless and genuine.

If the bill were to measure certain Canadian laws against international conventions on human rights, those set out in the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, or on refugees, or even on protecting the environment by respecting the Kyoto protocol, there is no need to say that we would be enthusiastic in our support for such objectives. However, the motion deals with the threat to property rights. This, by the way, is not the first time our colleague has drawn the attention of the House of Commons to his concerns on this matter. He mentioned this fact himself at the very beginning of his speech. He most certainly is consistent in his ideas, and I would like to congratulate him for that.

Obviously, the purpose of Motion M-426 is to give property rights better protection than to all other rights mentioned in the Canadian charter of rights. We think that private property rights, as enshrined in the Canadian Bill of Rights, enjoy adequate protection. Why then should a committee be asked to examine this issue? If everyone agrees that the freedom to enjoy one's property is a democratic freedom, then one question can come to mind: is this freedom unconditional? For most of us, property refers mainly to our home, but it also includes a lot of other things: car, bicycle, land, firearms, camera, just to name a few. I am excluding women from that list, Mr. Speaker.

Even though I am not a constitutional expert, I know that the provinces have authority with regard to property and civil rights. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the provinces to legislate in any areas involving private property. The member should be defending provincial prerogatives instead. However, his motion is rather aimed at recognizing property rights in federal legislation under the Canadian Bill of Rights, since the latter applies strictly to federal laws and institutions.

The right to enjoy property is already included in section 1(a) of the Canadian Bill of Rights. One is entitled to wonder about the meaning of the motion before us. What scope does the member want to give to the motion?

I think the member wants to open the door to a general debate on the right to private property based on the premise that it is a natural right that exists above and beyond the law. It is a sacred right. Yet, every day, we see many situations showing that collective rights often require that individual rights be restricted, including the right to private property.

• (1400)

We must recognize that, in reality, rights sometimes clash. This is true when it comes to protecting the environment and the health of the public, which requires us to pass laws which sometimes limit the right to private property, by imposing stringent regulations on companies, for instance.

Another example, familiar to everyone and certainly to all parliamentarians here, is the speed limit on highways. These rules limit the extraordinary pleasure I derive from my car's performance. But reckless behaviour could deprive me of its use. Imagine the disaster. Furthermore, I am delighted to tell you that I have just earned back one point.

Another example is the Firearms Registration Act. Far be it from me to impute motives to the member for Yorkton—Melville. From what he said, it seems clear to him that the amended Canadian Bill of Rights could make private property—such as a revolver—inalienable. Firearms regulations would therefore be impossible to enforce. It is already quite difficult to enforce them; the costs would be prohibitive because anyone could demand a court hearing and argue that the provisions limiting use of a firearm go against the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, because it gives the right to property precedence over other rights.

Perhaps the hon. member has been taking his inspiration from author Thomas Hobbes, who viewed private property as being part of natural laws. Hobbes defended the pre-eminence of lords over serfs, but that was in the 16th century. We have now entered the third millennium.

In the 19th century, the era of diehard economic liberalism, certain rulings denied the various parliaments of Canada the right to interfere with private property, either to confiscate it or to destroy it without compensation. Times have changed, and for the better.

Now, finally, we come to the 21st century. Parliament has the power to make laws and the public has the right to judge their legitimacy or morality. This can be easily illustrated. If we think about the surplus in the EI fund, the current government made it legal to use it for purposes other than those originally provided for. It will ultimately be up to the public to judge the legitimacy and morality of such a misappropriation of funds.

Private Members' Business

The rights and freedoms recognized by the charter are not limitless when it comes to protecting certain fundamental values and rights. For example, the freedom of expression is limited by laws prohibiting hate propaganda or pornography. It is prohibited to own pornographic material depicting children. No one has any doubt that we are entitled to the peaceful enjoyment and free use of our property, within the confines of the law.

Section 1 of the charter provides that the other rights set out in it may be subject to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society. If Article 17 of the Declaration of Human Rights states that "No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property", everyone will recognize that the term "arbitrarily" has a political weight that implies an analysis before passing judgment.

States exist to give themselves laws and to implement them. In the case of the right to private property, ultraliberalism seeks to exclude it from the sovereignty of the states, from the governments' authority to legislate this matter, thus opening the way for businesses.

We do not intend to support this motion, because we believe that one person's freedom stops where other people's freedom begins. This is the price to pay to live in a harmonious and responsible society.

The Canadian and Quebec societies will never opt for the law of the jungle.

• (1405)

[*English*]

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC/DR): Mr. Speaker, certainly I listened with some interest to the member who presented the motion, the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville. I think it is worth reading to the House the intent of the proposed legislation:

That the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights fully examine the effectiveness of property rights protection for Canadian citizens as provided in the Canadian Bill of Rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and report back to the House whether or not the federal laws protecting property rights need to be amended in order to comply with international agreements Canada has entered into, including Article 17 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights that states: "1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. 2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property".

As well, I listened to the other members who spoke to the motion, which is non-votable, and particularly to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice. To give credit to the member for Yorkton—Melville, he has raised other issues in the House on and about gun control and has admitted that this motion distinctly was brought in to deal with gun control. I noted that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice never once mentioned the words firearms or gun control in his reply. I thought it was quite an interesting discussion. I do not know quite how he managed to avoid it.

Certainly I would agree with the member for Yorkton—Melville that this is worthy of taking to the committee, worthy of looking at, worthy of debate, and worthy of a vote in the House. Whether or not that vote would be passed, whether or not given more information the majority of members in the House would support it is yet to be seen. Certainly a couple of things came to mind as I was listening to the debate.

The first thing that leaped out at me in the discussion of firearms registration was that the member stated he had presented bills to the House before that had been well researched and well drafted and he thought this was another good motion to bring to the House. I am not as certain, after listening to the debate, that this is as well researched and as well drafted as some of the other motions and private members' bills.

Certainly I listened with some concern when I heard reference to the American constitution and the fifth amendment. We can debate, and probably should, and that would be the point of taking this to committee, the provision of the fifth amendment and the American constitution, but the first thing that comes to my mind is the Enron scandal in the United States. The perpetrators of that crime, and it is a crime, are appearing at the inquiry, which is dealing with \$100 billion of private investors' money in the United States, and they have all claimed the fifth amendment. It certainly looks as if they will walk, scot-free. It is absolutely scandalous that we would allow such a provision in the charter of rights in Canada, a provision that would allow perpetrators of a crime to claim something similar to the fifth amendment and walk away scot-free.

Also mentioned were the social limits on the ownership and use of property. The member from the Bloc raised a very good point about the fact that many people would claim that child pornography is property and therefore they should be allowed to own it, distribute it and use it as they see fit. I would disagree with that. The Bloc member has made a very good point.

• (1410)

On the issue I take this to be about, the issue of firearms control and some misguided, poorly used and poorly implemented legislation brought in by the Liberal government, certainly I would agree that we need to find an avenue to change it. The only avenue I see before the people of Canada to change that particularly spurious piece of legislation, Bill C-68, at this stage in the process would be to change the government and bring in legislation that effectively gets rid of long gun registration. Until that happens, I do not expect any other changes to be made. We can continue to raise the issue. We can continue to explain to Canadians why it continues to be an important issue, but at the end of the day there is only one thing that will change Bill C-68 unless suddenly there is a great amount of calcium found in the spines of the Liberal backbench members which would actually force the government to bring in some meaningful legislation to deal with firearms registration.

Private Members' Business

I will just take a few minutes for this because we are talking about property and in this case I am talking about firearms and not about other types of property. With regard to Bill C-68, which was implemented and passed in 1995, I think it never hurts to just spell out one more time the cost of this poorly crafted piece of legislation. The government promised, as we all remember, that it would cost \$85 million, and \$50 million to \$60 million per year to run the registry. That operating budget has soared from a projection of \$60 million to \$100 million a year. As of November 21, 2001, the cost of the program was confirmed as of that date at \$689 million.

I suspect that the legislation may have been brought in with some good intentions. Unfortunately those good intentions have never done what they were supposed to do. The only thing that has occurred from the onset of that legislation is that the government has refused to give out information, has refused to give out statistics and has refused to engage in realistic debate in the House of Commons on the issue, and it has steadfastly refused to amend it. As a matter of fact, the few times it has been amended have probably made it worse.

There are new provisions in the safety act, Bill C-42, which raise real questions about whether or not black powder advocates in Canada, people who either enjoy black powder hunting or belong to re-enactment groups like the King's Orange Rangers, will be able to have access to black powder to use in their muskets. Black powder is an explosive. In Bill C-42, under the section dealing with natural resources and the Explosives Act, there would be some question of whether or not these people would qualify to actually purchase that explosive.

It just goes on and on. We all know about the constitutional challenge to the gun registry. We all know that it was denied at the supreme court. I think we have to go back to the basics. We have to try to understand why the government would bring in such a poorly crafted piece of legislation and why millions of Canadians have still refused to register. The registration date has been changed, first from 1998, then to 2001 and now it is in 2003 that we will have the last opportunity to register on the last minute of the last day. Again the government has come out with a bunch of magical numbers, saying that of 2.2 million firearms owners 90% of them have complied, so that is 1.8 million or something like that. These are ridiculous numbers.

• (1415)

We know there are 7 million to 8 million firearms in the country, mostly long guns, used by people like myself for hunting, or trapping or for varmint control. It is time that we absolutely stopped setting penalties against legitimate firearm owners. We have to do something about it and reverse the legislation.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in the debate about property rights which has been initiated by the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

This is not the first time I have had the opportunity to hear a debate in the House about property rights. My mind harkens back to the debate about whether or not property rights should be included in the charter of rights and freedoms at the time when the House was seized with the question of the charter of rights and freedoms.

It is ironic that the debate originates with an Alliance member, although I understand it is a private member's bill and he is entitled to his own views on this. The Alliance Party has always demonstrated a great respect for provincial jurisdiction and for the views of the provinces.

I simply remind the hon. member, as I have in another forum, that when property rights was suggested as something to be included in the charter of rights and freedoms in the debate in this place and across the country between 1980 and 1981, when the patriation package was finalized, it was the provinces that objected very strongly to including property rights in the charter of rights and freedoms because they saw that as a matter of provincial jurisdiction.

One can hold that view and still not be in disagreement with article 17 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which says:

Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property...

I suppose even the United Nations declarations need to be updated. Probably this should read his or her property. We will forgo the gender based analysis of United Nations declarations at the moment and say that really the debate here is about in some respects whether or not this should be included in the charter of rights and freedoms.

I might also say that at the time the NDP was opposed to the inclusion of property rights in the charter of rights and freedoms. We did not see it as an appropriate right to be included in the charter at that time, regardless of questions of jurisdiction.

Since then, it seems to me that the rights of property have hardly suffered. Since 1981 the rights of property, in spite of the fact that they are not included in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, have done nothing but advance in ways that, frankly, I find regrettable and questionable.

I am thinking of the way intellectual property rights have advanced to such a degree that Canada had to abandon its generic drug laws on the basis of agreements entered into between Canada and the United States and ultimately at the global level with respect to the intellectual property rights of brand name drug creators and producers.

This is an occasion where property rights trump all kinds of human needs. They trump the needs of the health care system, and we all know it is that property right and the consequences of having it enshrined in the way that it was that is one of the cost drivers of our health care system. It is one of the reasons we are having the debate about the future of medicare today. It is because of the private property rights that were enshrined in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, sometimes called TRIPS.

Private Members' Business

I would think it would have been more appropriate for members of parliament not to be concerned about the alleged erosion of property rights by virtue of the absence of property rights in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms but to be more concerned, indeed alarmed, about the way property rights are being enshrined everywhere. They may not be enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms but they are certainly enshrined at the World Trade Organization and in the NAFTA where the property rights of corporations trump the environment, labour standards and almost anything we can think of. Are property rights under attack? They are hardly under attack.

Thinking about the advancement of property rights, we now face the possibility of our very genetic material being regarded as corporate property. I remember one of the first debates in the House I was ever in. The hon. member opposite was probably involved in the National Farmers Union at the time and talking like a New Democrat. When plant breeders' rights were an issue in the late seventies and had not yet been instituted by the House of Commons I took part in a debate in the fall of 1979 in which the NDP expressed concern about the institution of plant breeders' rights and the consequences it would have for our agricultural system and for various forms of vertical integration and corporate control.

We lost that debate and have lost a few others since then. Most of them had to do with property and the role property rights have had in determining the kind of agricultural policies we would have, the kind of health care policies we would have and a myriad of other policy sectors that have been affected not by the erosion of property rights but by the ever accelerating entrenchment and expansion of property rights.

As I mentioned before I got off on the plant breeders' rights tangent, I am now concerned that the human genome or our very DNA and genetic material will become the object of the same property rights fixation so that we will be buying and selling gene therapies in the marketplace and our health care system will be affected once again.

None other than Premier Mike Harris, who is not exactly known for his left wing views, has expressed concern about the cost this might pose for the health care system and the fact that these things are being patented and held in abeyance by various corporations. The Canadian health care system will be put in the position, if it has not already in certain circumstances, of having to pay enormous sums of money to have these gene therapies available.

I frankly think this is wrong. If we want to talk about an axis of evil this is where we find real evidence of wrong, in the way corporations want to own the very structures of our biological existence and piece them out to us on a cost-plus, profit basis.

If the hon. member from the Alliance is worried about property rights he should be able to sleep soundly tonight. I can tell hon. members that property rights are not exactly under threat anywhere. Quite the contrary, it is the human race and the global environment that are under attack by a far too strong entrenchment of property rights in the various ways that I have had this brief opportunity to describe.

● (1420)

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that this motion is so important and is driving such great interest, I would move that the time of the House be extended by 20 minutes during which time the Speaker may accept no motions other than the motion to adjourn.

● (1425)

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give its consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that on a topic which is so fundamental and so important to our society that we cannot even speak an extra few minutes. We cannot vote on it. We cannot refer it to committee. We cannot even talk about it at length here. That is really unfortunate.

I would like to thank all those members who spoke in support of my motion. I would like to quickly counter some of the arguments that the government put forward as to why we should not refer this to committee.

First, it argued that it is a waste of time of the committee. It argued that it was a waste of time of the House. Many people in the country are very concerned that Bill C-5, a bill that is presently before the House, could clearly be a violation of their rights. We need to discuss these things.

We have provinces in Canada that of course have property rights protection. However we need protection in federal legislation against the violation of the rights of private citizens by the federal government. It is not engrained in our laws, as the federal government has tried to intimate. Nor are they in our charter. Some speakers have said that it is in our charter. If they were to read the charter, it is not in there. Even judges have said in their rulings that we do not have property rights protection in our charter. Provincial and environmental laws could clearly violate this and in fact would have serious implications.

Also, I really want to pick up on something else the government said. It said that it would disrupt the current democratic rights. The only thing it would disrupt is the power of the Prime Minister's Office to legislate at will, violating our fundamental rights. We have built these up over 800 years and they are being seriously violated.

The UN declaration of human rights says "No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property". The voters in this country have to know that the federal government, by its own legislation, the legislation government members have supported, condones the arbitrary taking of property in direct contravention of article 17 of the UN declaration of rights. It is hard for Canadians to go to other countries in the world claiming to be defenders of fundamental human rights, when our own country does not defend one of these most fundamental human rights and does not have any constitutional legislative protection for property rights in federal law.

In 1903, Pope Pius X wrote to his bishops. He said:

The right of property, the fruit of labour or industry, or of concession or donation by others, is an incontrovertible natural right; and everybody can dispose reasonably of such property as he thinks fit.

Today we have all heard the proof that our fundamental property rights are under attack and we should not ignore that. Just because a bill is passed in parliament does not make the use and abuse of government force to violate the fundamental property rights and freedom of contract of its citizens a good thing.

I would like to quote one more item here. This is from a book by Ayn Rand entitled *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*. It states:

The concept of a right pertains only to action—specifically to freedom of action. It means freedom from physical compulsion, coercion or interference by others. The right to life is the source of all rights—and the right to property is their only implementation. Without property rights, no other rights are possible. Since man has to sustain his life by his own effort, the man who has not right to the product of his effort has no means to sustain his life. The man who produces while others dispose of his product, is a slave.

Czech President Vaclav Havel also hit the nail on the head when he said “Human rights rank above state rights because people are the creation of God”.

My colleagues, property rights are our most important human right because they allow each of us to provide the necessities of life for our families and ourselves.

Private Members' Business

Therefore, I respectfully request, with the unanimous consent of the House, to refer my motion to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights for further consideration. That is the whole intent of this. We need to discuss this further. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the committee examining this. I am sure everyone here would agree. Therefore, I would like to seek that consent.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give its consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of private members' business is now expired. As the motion has not been designated as a votable item, the order is dropped from the order paper.

[*Translation*]

It being 2.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, March 11, 2002, pursuant to Standing Orders 28 and 24.

(The House adjourned at 2.30 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. PIERRE BRIEN

HON. RALPH GOODALE

MR. GARRY BREITKREUZ

MR. RANDY WHITE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland and Labrador.....	PC/DR
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec).....	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la- Chaudière	Quebec	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CA
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf.....	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island....	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Art, Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	CA
Epp, Ken.....	Elk Island.....	Alberta	CA
Eyking, Mark.....	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia.....	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de- la-Madeleine—Pabok	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Fitzpatrick, Brian.....	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CA
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre.....	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul.....	New Westminster— Coquitlam—Burnaby	British Columbia	CA
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy.....	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane.....	Québec.....	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing— Pembroke.....	Ontario	CA
Galloway, Roger.....	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne.....	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick.....	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton Centre-East	Alberta	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim.....	Kootenay—Boundary— Okanagan	British Columbia	CA
Graham, Hon. Bill, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant.....	Surrey Central.....	British Columbia	CA
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	PC/DR
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina.....	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (25)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	CA
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CA
Benoit, Leon	Lakeland	CA
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	CA
Chatters, David	Athabasca	CA
Clark, Right Hon. Joe	Calgary Centre	PC/DR
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	CA
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton Centre-East	CA
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	PC/DR
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	CA
Hill, Grant	Macleod	CA
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	CA
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	CA
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	CA
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Health	Edmonton West	Lib.
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	CA
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	CA
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	CA
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	CA
Rajotte, James	Edmonton Southwest	CA
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	CA
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	CA
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	CA
Williams, John	St. Albert	CA
BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay—Columbia	CA
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	Lib.
Burton, Andy	Skeena	CA
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	CA
Cummins, John	Delta—South Richmond	CA
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Day, Stockwell	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CA
Dhaliwal, Hon. Herb, Minister of Natural Resources	Vancouver South—Burnaby	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	CA
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	CA
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby	CA
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan	CA
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	CA
Harris, Richard	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	CA
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	PC/DR

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hinton, Betty	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	CA
Leung, Sophia, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	CA
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CA
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	CA
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	CA
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	PC/DR
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	PC/DR
Moore, James	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	CA
Owen, Hon. Stephen, Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Peschisolido, Joe	Richmond	Lib.
Reynolds, John, Leader of the Opposition	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	CA
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	CA
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	CA
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	PC/DR
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	CA
MANITOBA (13)		
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC/DR
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	CA
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	PC/DR
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Hon. Rey, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	CA
Toews, Vic	Provencher	CA
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour and Secretary of State (Multi-culturalism) (Status of Women)	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
Castonguay, Jeannot, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Madawaska—Restigouche	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC/DR
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
LeBlanc, Dominic	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	Lib.
Savoy, Andy	Tobique—Mactaquac	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	PC/DR
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC/DR

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (6)		
Baker, Hon. George	Gander—Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC/DR
Hearn, Loyola.....	St. John's West	PC/DR
Matthews, Bill, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.....	Burin—St. George's.....	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence.....	Labrador	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC/DR
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC/DR
Cuzner, Rodger	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton.....	Lib.
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald.....	South Shore	PC/DR
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC/DR
McDonough, Alexa.....	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West.....	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley— Eastern Shore.....	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	West Nova	Lib.
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut.....	Lib.
ONTARIO (102)		
Adams, Peter.....	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis.....	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke—Lakeshore.....	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga.....	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald, The Acting Speaker.....	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène.....	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's.....	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Vaughan—King—Aurora.....	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond.....	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey.....	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.....	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie.....	Oakville.....	Lib.
Bryden, John.....	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough— Aldershot	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
QUEBEC (74)		
Allard, Carole-Marie	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC/DR
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	BQ
Marcil, Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Lib.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny— L'Islet	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister for International Trade	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Anderson, David	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CA
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CA
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Wascana	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Lib.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	PC/DR
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CA
Skelton, Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	CA

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

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of March 1, 2002 — 1st Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

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

Associate Members

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

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Charles Hubbard

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

(16)

Associate Members

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

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairs: Jim Abbott
Dennis Mills

Paul Bonwick	Christiane Gagnon	John Harvard	Grant McNally	(16)
Sarmite Bulte	Cheryl Gallant	Betty Hinton	Caroline St-Hilaire	
Rodger Cuzner	Roger Gallaway	Wendy Lill	Tony Tirabassi	
Claude Duplain				

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	Robert Lanctôt	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Antoine Dubé	Gary Lunn	John Reynolds
David Anderson	John Duncan	James Lunney	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Reed Elley	Peter MacKay	Benoît Sauvageau
Roy Bailey	Ken Epp	Preston Manning	Hélène Scherrer
Leon Benoit	Brian Fitzpatrick	Richard Marceau	Werner Schmidt
Bernard Bigras	Paul Forseth	Serge Marcil	Carol Skelton
Bill Blaikie	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Jim Gouk	Keith Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Diane Bourgeois	Gurmant Grewal	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitzkreuz	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Darrel Stinson
Scott Brison	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Myron Thompson
Serge Cardin	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	Grant Hill	Brian Pallister	Suzanne Tremblay
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Jim Pankiw	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Howard Hilstrom	Pierre Paquette	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Rahim Jaffer	Charlie Penson	Randy White
Joe Comartin	Dale Johnston	Joe Peschisolido	Ted White
John Cummins	Gerald Keddy	Dick Proctor	John Williams
Libby Davies	Jason Kenney	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Stockwell Day	Stan Keyes		

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SPORT

Chair: Dennis Mills

Vice-Chair:

Rodger Cuzner	John Harvard	Robert Lanctôt	Dick Proctor	(9)
Cheryl Gallant	Loyola Hearn	Serge Marcil	Hélène Scherrer	

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs:

Paul Forseth
Steve Mahoney

Mark Assad
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
John Godfrey

Art Hanger
Inky Mark
Anita Neville

Jerry Pickard
David Price
Stéphan Tremblay

Tony Valeri
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Charles Caccia	Vice-Chairs:	Karen Kraft Sloan Bob Mills
Roy Bailey Bernard Bigras Joe Comartin Paul Forseth	Marcel Gagnon John Herron Gar Knutson	Rick Laliberte Karen Redman Julian Reed	Andy Savoy Hélène Scherrer Alan Tonks

(16)

Associate Members

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

FINANCE**Chair:**

Sue Barnes

Vice-Chairs:Nick Discepola
Ken EppCarolyn Bennett
Scott Brison
Roy Cullen
Albina GuarnieriRahim Jaffer
Jason Kenney
Sophia Leung
Yvan LoubierMaria Minna
Shawn Murphy
Lorne Nystrom
Pauline PicardGary Pillitteri
Monte Solberg
Bryon Wilfert

(18)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
John DuncanReed Elley
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. PerronJoe Peschisolido
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Stéphan Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair:

Wayne Easter

Vice-Chairs:

John Cummins

Paul Steckle

Sarkis Assadourian
 Andy Burton
 Rodger Cuzner
 Georges Farrah

Loyola Hearn
 Dominic LeBlanc
 James Lunney

Bill Matthews
 Lawrence O'Brien
 Jean-Yves Roy

Peter Stoffer
 Suzanne Tremblay
 Tom Wappel

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Diane Ablonczy
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Gérard Asselin
 André Bachand
 Roy Bailey
 Leon Benoit
 Rick Borotsik
 Garry Breitzkreuz
 Scott Brison
 Chuck Cadman
 Bill Casey
 Rick Casson
 David Chatters
 Joe Clark
 Stockwell Day
 Norman Doyle
 John Duncan
 Reed Elley

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

Gerald Keddy
 Jason Kenney
 Gary Lunn
 Peter MacKay
 Preston Manning
 Inky Mark
 Keith Martin
 Philip Mayfield
 Grant McNally
 Val Meredith
 Rob Merrifield
 Bob Mills
 James Moore
 Deepak Obhrai
 Brian Pallister
 Jim Pankiw
 Charlie Penson
 Joe Peschisolido
 James Rajotte
 Scott Reid

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

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:	Jean Augustine	Vice-Chairs:	Brian Pallister Bernard Patry	
George Baker	John Duncan	Francine Lalonde	Pat O'Brien	(17)
Aileen Carroll	John Harvard	Diane Marleau	Pierre Paquette	
Bill Casey	Marlene Jennings	Keith Martin	Svend Robinson	
Rick Casson	Stan Keyes			

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Stan Dromisky	Gary Lunn	John Reynolds
Rob Anders	Antoine Dubé	James Lunney	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Peter MacKay	Yves Rocheleau
Sarkis Assadourian	Ken Epp	John Maloney	Benoît Sauvageau
André Bachand	Mark Eyking	Preston Manning	Werner Schmidt
Claude Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Richard Marceau	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Inky Mark	Monte Solberg
Colleen Beaumier	Cheryl Gallant	Pat Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Bob Speller
Stéphane Bergeron	Jim Gouk	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Bernard Bigras	Gurmant Grewal	Val Meredith	Darrel Stinson
Bill Blaikie	Deborah Grey	Rob Merrifield	Chuck Strahl
Rick Borotsik	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Greg Thompson
Garry Breitkreuz	Mac Harb	James Moore	Myron Thompson
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Anita Neville	Vic Toews
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	Lorne Nystrom	Stéphane Tremblay
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Tony Valeri
Serge Cardin	Grant Hill	Jim Pankiw	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Jay Hill	Charlie Penson	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Howard Hilstrom	Joe Peschisolido	Randy White
Irwin Cotler	Betty Hinton	Beth Phinney	Ted White
Paul Crête	Rahim Jaffer	David Price	John Williams
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Stockwell Day	Gerald Keddy		

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

HEALTH**Chair:** Bonnie Brown**Vice-Chairs:**Reg Alcock
Rob MerrifieldDiane Ablonczy
André Bachand
Colleen Beaumier
Diane BourgeoisJeannot Castonguay
Brenda Chamberlain
Stan DromiskyJames Lunney
Réal Ménard
Hélène ScherrerJudy Sgro
Yolande Thibeault
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(16)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Madeleine Dalfond-Guiral
Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John DuncanReed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
Pauline PicardJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Judi Longfield	Vice-Chairs:	Carol Skelton Diane St-Jacques	
Eugène Bellemare	Monique Guay	Serge Marcil	Larry Spencer	(18)
Paul Crête	Tony Ianno	Joe McGuire	Greg Thompson	
Libby Davies	Dale Johnston	Anita Neville	Alan Tonks	
Raymonde Folco	Gurbax Malhi	Werner Schmidt		

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Carolyn Bennett	Vice-Chair:		
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Anita Neville	Greg Thompson	(9)
Raymonde Folco	Wendy Lill	Larry Spencer	Tony Tirabassi	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

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

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:	Walt Lastewka	Vice-Chairs:	Dan McTeague Charlie Penson	
Larry Bagnell	Preston Manning	Andy Savoy	Paddy Torsney	(16)
Stéphane Bergeron	Serge Marcil	Brent St. Denis	Joseph Volpe	
Bev Desjarlais	James Rajotte	Chuck Strahl	Susan Whelan	
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold				

Associate Members

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

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS**Chair:** Andy Scott**Vice-Chairs:** Chuck Cadman
Denis Paradis

Carole-Marie Allard	Paul DeVillers	Paul Harold Macklin	Kevin Sorenson	(18)
Michel Bellehumeur	Brian Fitzpatrick	John Maloney	Vic Toews	
Bill Blaikie	Ivan Grose	John McKay	Pierrette Venne	
Irwin Cotler	Peter MacKay	Lynn Myers		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Derek Lee	Geoff Regan
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	James Lunney	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Paul Forseth	Preston Manning	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Richard Marceau	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Werner Schmidt
Leon Benoit	Jim Gouk	Keith Martin	Carol Skelton
Bernard Bigras	Gurmant Grewal	Philip Mayfield	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Diane Bourgeois	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitkreuz	Richard Harris	Val Meredith	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	Loyola Hearn	Rob Merrifield	Greg Thompson
Andy Burton	John Herron	Bob Mills	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Grant Hill	James Moore	Suzanne Tremblay
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Anita Neville	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Howard Hilstrom	Deepak Obhrai	Tom Wappel
Joe Clark	Betty Hinton	Brian Pallister	Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Joe Comartin	Rahim Jaffer	Jim Pankiw	Elsie Wayne
John Cummins	Marlene Jennings	Pierre Paquette	Randy White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Dale Johnston	Charlie Penson	Ted White
Stockwell Day	Gerald Keddy	Joe Peschisolido	Bryon Wilfert
Bev Desjarlais	Jason Kenney	David Pratt	John Williams
Norman Doyle	Dominic LeBlanc	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich

SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY**Chair:** Derek Lee**Vice-Chair:**

Bill Blaikie	Lynn Myers	Kevin Sorenson	Pierrette Venne	(11)
Marlene Jennings	David Pratt	Vic Toews	Bryon Wilfert	
Peter MacKay	Geoff Regan			

LIAISON

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	Walt Lastewka	
Peter Adams	Raymond Bonin	Gurmant Grewal	Judi Longfield	(19)
Jean Augustine	Bonnie Brown	Charles Hubbard	David Pratt	
Sue Barnes	Charles Caccia	Ovid Jackson	Andy Scott	
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Clifford Lincoln	John Williams	
Carolyn Bennett				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Reed Elley	Walt Lastewka	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Ken Epp	James Lunney	Scott Reid
Reg Alcock	Brian Fitzpatrick	Peter MacKay	John Reynolds
Rob Anders	Paul Forseth	Steve Mahoney	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Cheryl Gallant	Preston Manning	Jacques Saada
Jean Augustine	Yvon Godin	Keith Martin	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Jim Gouk	Rob Merrifield	Monte Solberg
Bill Blaikie	Michel Guimond	Bob Mills	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitkreuz	Art Hanger	Dennis Mills	Larry Spencer
Pierre Brien	Mac Harb	James Moore	Diane St-Jacques
Andy Burton	Richard Harris	Lorne Nystrom	Paul Steckle
Chuck Cadman	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Darrel Stinson
Murray Calder	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Yolande Thibeault
Rick Casson	Howard Hilstrom	Jim Pankiw	Myron Thompson
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	Denis Paradis	Vic Toews
John Cummins	Rahim Jaffer	Charlie Penson	Maurice Vellacott
Libby Davies	Dale Johnston	Joe Peschisolido	Tom Wappel
Stockwell Day	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Beth Phinney	Randy White
Nick Discepola	Jason Kenney	David Price	Ted White
John Duncan	Karen Kraft Sloan	Marcel Proulx	Lynne Yelich

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	Walt Lastewka	
Mauril Bélanger	Charles Hubbard			(4)

COMMITTEE BUDGETS SUB-COMMITTEE

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	Walt Lastewka	
Mauril Bélanger	Clifford Lincoln	Judi Longfield	John Williams	(7)
Bonnie Brown				

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:	David Pratt	Vice-Chairs:	Leon Benoit David Price	
Rob Anders Claude Bachand Colleen Beaumier Stan Dromisky	Cheryl Gallant John O'Reilly Janko Peric	Louis Plamondon Carmen Provenzano Peter Stoffer	Elsie Wayne Bryon Wilfert Bob Wood	(16)

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:	Colleen Beaumier	Vice-Chair:		
Roy Bailey Stan Dromisky	Dan McTeague Louis Plamondon	Carmen Provenzano Peter Stoffer	Elsie Wayne Bob Wood	(9)

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Peter Adams	Vice-Chairs:	Garry Breitkreuz Jacques Saada	
Pierre Brien	Michel Guimond	Paul Harold Macklin	John Richardson	(16)
Marlene Catterall	Jay Hill	Carolyn Parrish	Tony Tirabassi	
Cheryl Gallant	Joe Jordan	Geoff Regan	Randy White	
Yvon Godin				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Gary Lunn	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	James Lunney	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Peter MacKay	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Ken Epp	John Maloney	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Preston Manning	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Sue Barnes	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Monte Solberg
Michel Bellehumeur	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Stéphane Bergeron	Deborah Grey	Réal Ménard	Caroline St-Hilaire
Bill Blaikie	Art Hanger	Val Meredith	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	John Harvard	Bob Mills	Paul Szabo
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	Dennis Mills	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	James Moore	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Grant Hill	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Howard Hilstrom	Deepak Obhrai	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	Brian Pallister	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Rahim Jaffer	Jim Pankiw	Ted White
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Charlie Penson	Bryon Wilfert
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Gerald Keddy	Joe Peschisolido	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Jason Kenney	Marcel Proulx	Lynne Yelich

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Marcel Proulx	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Blaikie	Jay Hill	Gerry Ritz	Tony Tirabassi	(6)
Michel Guimond				

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY CALENDAR

Chair:	Marlene Catterall	Vice-Chair:		
Garry Breitkreuz	Pierre Brien	Yvon Godin	Jay Hill	(5)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chair:	John Williams	Vice-Chairs:	Mac Harb Beth Phinney	
Robert Bertrand John Bryden Gerry Byrne Odina Desrochers	John Finlay Rahim Jaffer Sophia Leung Pat Martin	Philip Mayfield Shawn Murphy Gilles-A. Perron	Alex Shepherd Greg Thompson Myron Thompson	(17)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson André Bachand Roy Bailey Leon Benoit Rick Borotsik Garry Breitreuz Scott Brison Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Serge Cardin Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters Joe Clark John Cummins Stockwell Day Bev Desjarlais	Norman Doyle John Duncan Reed Elley Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Paul Forseth Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Richard Harris Loyola Hearn John Herron Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton Dale Johnston	Gerald Keddy Jason Kenney Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Preston Manning Inky Mark Keith Martin Grant McNally Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Jim Pankiw Denis Paradis Charlie Penson Joe Peschisolido	James Rajotte Scott Reid John Reynolds Gerry Ritz Benoît Sauvageau Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Darrel Stinson Peter Stoffer Chuck Strahl Vic Toews Maurice Vellacott Elsie Wayne Randy White Ted White Lynne Yelich
--	--	---	---

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMBATING CORRUPTION

Chair:	John Williams	Vice-Chair:		
Robert Bertrand John Bryden Odina Desrochers	Pat Martin Philip Mayfield	Shawn Murphy Beth Phinney	Alex Shepherd Greg Thompson	(10)

TRANSPORT AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair:	Ovid Jackson	Vice-Chairs:	James Moore Marcel Proulx	
Reg Alcock	Bev Desjarlais	Mario Laframboise	Alex Shepherd	(16)
Gerry Byrne	Peter Goldring	Ghislain Lebel	Darrel Stinson	
John Cannis	André Harvey	Val Meredith	Paul Szabo	
Joe Comuzzi				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Rahim Jaffer	Joe Peschisolido
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	Dick Proctor
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid
G�rard Asselin	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dominic LeBlanc	John Reynolds
Andr� Bachand	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	Gerry Ritz
Roy Bailey	Ghislain Fournier	James Lunney	Werner Schmidt
Leon Benoit	Christiane Gagnon	Peter MacKay	Carol Skelton
Bernard Bigras	Cheryl Gallant	Preston Manning	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Richard Marceau	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Jim Gouk	Serge Marcil	Larry Spencer
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Inky Mark	Peter Stoffer
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Keith Martin	Chuck Strahl
Chuck Cadman	Monique Guay	Philip Mayfield	Greg Thompson
Serge Cardin	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	R�al M�nard	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	John Herron	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Paul Cr�te	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Ted White
John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	Jim Pankiw	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton	Bernard Patry	Lynne Yelich
Odina Desrochers	Charles Hubbard	Charlie Penson	

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

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

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Carolyn Bennett
John Bryden

Joint Vice-Chair: Betty Hinton

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Jane Marie Cordy

Donald Oliver
Vivienne Poy

Mauril Bélanger
Robert Bertrand
Marlene Catterall
Marcel Gagnon
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Jim Karygiannis

Raymond Lavigne
Wendy Lill
Jerry Pickard
Louis Plamondon
Jacques Saada
Darrel Stinson
Andrew Telegdi

(21)

Associate Members

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

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Howard Hilstrom
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
James Rajotte

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

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Mauril Bélanger
Shirley Maheu

Joint Vice-Chairs: Scott Reid
Yolande Thibeault

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Jean-Robert Gauthier
Laurier LaPierre

Viola Léger
Jean-Claude Rivest
Raymond Setlakwe

Eugène Bellemare
Gérard Binet
Sarmite Bulte
Claude Drouin
Christiane Gagnon
John Godfrey
Yvon Godin

Peter Goldring
Richard Harris
John Herron
Raymond Lavigne
Dan McTeague
Benoît Sauvageau

(23)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Stockwell Day

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney

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

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

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Gurmant Grewal
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair: Tom Wappel

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

John Bryden
Christopher Henderson
Mobina Jaffer

Noël Kinsella
Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin

Sue Barnes
Paul Bonwick
Pierre Brien
Jean-Guy Carignan
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Jim Gouk
Michel Guimond

Gar Knutson
Derek Lee
Paul Harold Macklin
Lynn Myers
Lorne Nystrom
Jim Pankiw
Ted White

(24)

Associate Members

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

Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney

Robert Lanctôt
Ghislain Lebel
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Pierrette Venne
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panels of Chairman of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

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

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Joe Jordan	to the Prime Minister
Mr. André Harvey	to the Minister of Transport
Mrs. Karen Redman	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Benoît Serré	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of Industry
Ms. Sarmite Bulte	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Bryon Wilfert	to the Minister of Finance
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Paul Harold Macklin	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Lynn Myers	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Paul Szabo	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Mr. Alex Shepherd	to the President of the Treasury Board
Ms. Sophia Leung	to the Minister of National Revenue
Ms. Raymonde Folco	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Bill Matthews	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Pat O'Brien	to the Minister for International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Larry McCormick	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Carmen Provenzano	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. John Finlay	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Minister for International Cooperation
Mr. Mark Assad	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration

CONTENTS

Friday, March 1, 2002

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2001

Bill C-49. Report stage..... 9399

Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker..... 9399

Mr. Toews..... 9399

Mr. Anders..... 9399

Mr. Kenney..... 9400

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)..... 9400

Motions in amendment

Mr. Anders..... 9400

Motion No. 1..... 9400

Mr. Collenette..... 9400

Motion No. 2..... 9400

Mr. Toews..... 9400

Motions Nos. 10 and 17..... 9401

Motions Nos. 18 and 20..... 9401

Mr. Collenette..... 9401

Mr. Kenney..... 9402

Mr. Asselin..... 9404

Mr. Nystrom..... 9405

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

International Women's Day

Ms. Phinney..... 9406

Health

Mr. Lunney..... 9407

International Co-operation

Mr. Myers..... 9407

International Women's Day

Mrs. Jennings..... 9407

Paralympic Winter Games

Mr. Bellemare..... 9407

Canadian Wheat Board

Mr. Breitzkreuz..... 9407

Multiculturalism

Mr. Malhi..... 9408

International Women's Week

Ms. Dalphond-Guiral..... 9408

Landmines

Ms. Thibeault..... 9408

Standing Committee on Finance

Mr. Epp..... 9408

Police Services

Mr. Marcil..... 9408

Railways

Mr. Blaikie..... 9409

Guaranteed Income Supplement

Mr. Bigras..... 9409

Douglas Miller Award

Mr. Easter..... 9409

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Casey..... 9409

The Ladies of Nunavut

Ms. Karetak-Lindell..... 9409

Customs Officers

Mr. Harris..... 9410

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Kyoto Protocol

Mr. Jaffer..... 9410

Mr. Goodale..... 9410

Mr. Jaffer..... 9410

Mr. Goodale..... 9410

Mr. Jaffer..... 9410

Mr. Goodale..... 9411

Mr. Kenney..... 9411

Mr. Goodale..... 9411

Mr. Kenney..... 9411

Mr. Goodale..... 9411

Employment Insurance

Ms. St-Hilaire..... 9411

Mrs. Stewart..... 9411

Ms. St-Hilaire..... 9411

Mrs. Stewart..... 9411

Mr. Guimond..... 9412

Mrs. Stewart..... 9412

Mr. Guimond..... 9412

Mrs. Stewart..... 9412

National Defence

Mr. Robinson..... 9412

Mr. Eggleton..... 9412

Mr. Robinson..... 9412

Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale)..... 9412

Immigration

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)..... 9412

Mr. Coderre..... 9413

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)..... 9413

Mr. Coderre..... 9413

Parole Board

Mr. Toews..... 9413

Mr. Myers..... 9413

Mr. Toews..... 9413

Mr. Myers..... 9413

Air Transport

Mr. Bigras..... 9413

Mr. Godin	9429
Mr. Guimond	9430
Notice of Time Allocation	
Mr. Goodale	9431

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Property Rights

Mr. Breitreuz	9431
---------------------	------

Motion	9431
Mr. Macklin	9433
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	9435
Mr. Keddy	9436
Mr. Blaikie	9437
Mr. Breitreuz	9438

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :

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

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Communication Canada - Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9**