

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 238 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT (HANSARD)

Friday, June 4, 1999

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 4, 1999

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

(1000)

[English]

PRECLEARANCE ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-22, an act authorizing the United States to preclear travellers and goods in Canada for entry into the United States for the purposes of customs, immigration, public health, food inspection and plant and animal health, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (for the Minister of Foreign Affairs) moved that the bill be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

● (1005)

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (for the Minister of Foreign Affairs) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the preclearance act is a key element in Canada's efforts to modernize our border with the United States, while at the same time maintaining Canada's sovereignty and protecting the rights and freedoms of travellers in Canada.

The world we live in is increasingly interdependent, a world in which capital, goods and people move ever more freely. To remain competitive we must look outward and think globally. New technologies and modes of transportation increasingly allow us to transcend national boundaries. In this era of just-in-time produc-

tion we must find new and innovative ways of moving people and goods while ensuring the safety and security of our border.

Today over \$1.35 billion in trade crosses the Canada-U.S. border each day. There are over 200 million border crossings each year. The success of our bilateral relationship with the United States hinges on our ability to move people and goods efficiently. I would like to elaborate on how this act will help to modernize the management of our border.

Preclearance is not a new concept. It was introduced in Toronto in 1952 and is currently operating at the Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal airports. It allows U.S. border control officers working in Canadian airports to determine whether people and goods can enter the United States. In 1974 Canada and the U.S. formalized this arrangement under the air transport preclearance agreement.

Bill S-22 will provide structure for the existing preclearance regime and direct its enforcement. The bill represents roughly two years of negotiations with the United States government. The preclearance scheme is a hybrid which maintains the supremacy of Canadian law but also allows the U.S. to administer certain civil and administrative matters in designated areas that pertain to the entry of persons and goods to the United States.

One of our primary objectives has been to safeguard Canadian sovereignty. This has been accomplished by ensuring reciprocity, by making clear that the charter of rights and freedoms and all Canadian laws will apply and by ensuring that only Canada enforces criminal matters in the preclearance area.

Since the signing of the open skies agreement in 1995 there has been a 39% increase in air traffic between Canada and the United States. Many destinations do not have customs and immigration inspection.

When this legislation comes into force, intransit preclearance operations will be extended in Vancouver and will be implemented in Toronto and in Montreal's Dorval airport. Other Canadian airports with current U.S. preclearance programs will subsequently become eligible for intransit preclearance.

Intransit preclearance will improve service to international transiting passengers, encourage the use of Canadian air carriers and airports for travel from Asia and Europe to the United States via Canadian airports and foster economic development in airport communities.

The preclearance act is intended to be the basis for agreements between Canada and the United States for other modes of transport which may include air cargo, road, rail, marine and ferry. This will further revolutionize the way we manage the border by creating a virtual border, a border that allows travellers and commerce to be processed at their point of departure rather than at the physical border. It will significantly reduce costs and increase convenience.

● (1010)

Canada and the United States have a long history of co-operation along the world's longest undefended border. Beyond facilitating travel and trade, the preclearance act is a symbol of how we can manage the border as a joint asset in the next century.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to seek unanimous consent to divide my allotted 40 minutes with the hon. member for South Surrey—White Rock—Langley.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, given that this is my first opportunity to do so, I would like to begin, on behalf of the official opposition, by congratulating the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario and the leadership of Premier Mike Harris for the stunning re-election last night against overwhelming odds.

We are thrilled to see that a tax cutting, fiscally responsible government has been re-elected in Ontario. It will certainly help to increase transit and free trade. That is why this bill will be much more used under a Mike Harris government in Ontario. There will be more economic growth in this province, which will mean more trade with our partners to the south and elsewhere.

People who are watching today on electronic *Hansard* will see that the code of this bill is S-22. Sometimes they will see bills that are C-34 or C-56 and so on. These different codes indicate where the bill has been introduced. When the bill is preceded by a *C*, it means that it has come in through the House of Commons, which is the conventional means of introducing a bill into parliament. When the bill is preceded by an *S*, it means that it has been introduced in the other place, the so-called upper Chamber. That would be the unaccountable, unelected, patronage haven a few metres down the hall from here. This just so happens to be such a bill, Bill S-22, Senate Bill 22.

We are joined by the esteemed and newly academically accredited government House leader, to whom we extend our commenda-

tion. I would like to point out that while he may have extraordinary academic credentials, he does not seem very capable of managing the legislative agenda of the government through the normal democratic conventions of parliament by introducing legislation first in the House of Commons. Instead, he has taken to the objectionable practice of introducing bills such as this in the other place. Why? Presumably because he thinks it is easier and because they have so little work to do over there. They are so unburdened by the business of the people that bills can be introduced there to expedite their passage through parliament.

We want to make it clear that the official opposition objects to government bills being brought before us in the elected and accountable Chamber which have first been introduced in the unelected and unaccountable Chamber. It may just seem to be a technical complaint by members of my party, but for us it represents a legitimization of an illegitimate upper Chamber which ought not to be exercising powers in a modern democratic society.

We look very closely at every bill that comes before us which is first introduced in the Senate. Our position is to oppose those bills simply as a symbol of our opposition to using the Senate as a place for the introduction of legislation. We have not done that in this case. While I have registered my serious objections to Senate legislation, we find that this bill is good in its intention and that it is a well drafted bill which seeks to expedite the intra-transit flow of passengers and goods between foreign jurisdictions and Canada en route, for instance, to our major trading partner, the United States.

• (1015)

In principle, the Reform Party of Canada endorses, embraces and supports free trade. We support reducing red tape. We support any measures that would make it more convenient for travellers, business people and trade in goods and services to pass into Canada and through Canada. That is the objective of the bill, and for that reason we can support it.

Never let it be said that simply because we are in the official opposition position we always oppose legislation unthinkingly and in a knee-jerk fashion. That simply is not true. Members of the government would sometimes have people believe that the opposition opposes for the sake of opposing. That is not so. As I understand it, the official opposition has supported roughly half of the government bills introduced in this session of parliament. Those have mainly been technical bills that have achieved incremental advantages and which we have not objected to in principle. This is such a bill.

I wanted to make that point very clear because we try to be a constructive opposition. Where we see flaws in legislation, we speak up and object to it and do so sometimes very vociferously.

When we see bills that are supportable, that incorporate common sense and are reasonably well drafted, we are prepared to support them at all stages. We do exercise discretion in the way we analyze legislation and in what we choose to support and oppose. Never let it be said that this official opposition is simply an obstructionist opposition.

Yes, when it comes to the tax increase, soft on crime, top-down, Ottawa knows best agenda of the government, we do oppose it vigorously, as we do with various bills before parliament today, but not Bill S-22, an act authorizing the United States to preclear travellers and goods in Canada for entry into the United States for the purposes of customs, immigration, public health, food inspection and plant and animal health.

Essentially, as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs indicated, the bill deals with Canada allowing the United States to operate preclearance centres in Canada. That already is the practice for Canadian travellers travelling directly to destinations in the United States. A case in point would be someone travelling through Lester Pearson airport in Toronto, which is the airport that had its privatization contract screwed up by this government and which cost the taxpayers billions of dollars.

However, if we were travelling through that Liberal white elephant en route to the United States, we would present ourselves at a U.S. customs desk and would have to pass through U.S. immigration. If we were travelling to the United States so that we could pay less taxes, we would end up not having to stop to clear customs in the United States. This is advantageous to our trading partners, the Americans, because it allows them to screen potentially problematic travellers, commercial or personal travellers, before they get onto American soil. It is to their advantage in terms of interdicting contraband and interdicting illegal immigrants and illegal aliens.

It is also good for Canadians because it expedites our passage. It is very quick. We get checked in at the airline counter and within a few minutes we pass through American customs and immigration and are essentially in a legal no man's land until we arrive in the United States. However, we are able to walk off the plane there and away we go.

For tens of thousands of air travellers, this preclearance, which happens at most of our international airports, is certainly a convenient expedition of travel. It saves time and therefore saves money.

The bill would essentially expand that. It would allow in-transit preclearance services. Suppose we were to arrive from Asia at the Vancouver International Airport on Canadian Airlines, our preferred airline, we would find, if the bill is passed and the elements of it are adopted and implemented, that we could pass through this kind of preclearance allowing Canadian transportation hubs like Vancouver to increase. It would also assist Canadian air carriers. This is of particular importance to Vancouver, which is becoming a

major hub for international travel. We want to do everything we can to expedite that.

• (1020)

If the traveller's final destination is Europe or South America on a non-stop flight from Vancouver, the passenger can wait in the transit lounge until his next flight and not go through customs and immigration until his final destination. That is the kind of thing this would allow.

I just want to make clear once again that we are distressed to see this bill coming from the other place. We really do object to this gratuitous legitimization of an illegitimate, unelected Chamber by this constant introduction of government legislation. It was a very irregular practice until this House leader and this government began to regularize it.

We are of course going to continue our fight to legitimize that upper chamber. Next week, we will be participating in a rally outside the other place, co-sponsored, believe it or not, by members of the NDP and the Liberal Party. The hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle and the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton will be co-sponsoring the event with Reformers and concerned Canadians who are distressed with the lack of democracy in parliament and in the other place in particular. We will be there and one of the things we will be objecting to is this House leader's and this government's legitimization of that upper chamber by introducing bills there.

In closing, I want to say that we will support Bill S-22 here at its final stage and hope for its expeditious passage into law so that we can increase, and make more convenient, travel for Canadians and other passengers through this country.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to any of my colleagues that I would be speaking on the preclearance bill. The movement of goods and persons across the Canada-U.S. border is a pet project of mine. I have been working with the Cascadia trade corridor project for almost two years now and have appreciated the preclearance that has been a pilot project at the Vancouver airport.

Although I share the concerns of my hon. colleague, that the bill should have and could have been introduced through the House of Commons rather than the Senate, which is an unelected, unaccountable body, I do feel that the legislation is very dearly and badly needed to advance the free trade that has been developed between Canada and the United States, as well as making it easier for our trading partners from countries other than the United States and Canada.

This preclearance bill will make it much easier for the international community to use Canada as a gateway to its trade in the

U.S. or to use Canada as a gateway from the U.S. back home. It is essential that we make the movement of people, who have legitimate business to carry on, or a legitimate desire to visit Canada or the United States, as unencumbered as possible.

One of the concerns people express is that travellers would fall under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and this preclearance bill addresses that. It allows American customs and immigration officers to have a degree of law enforcement of the American act on Canadian soil, but with limitations. I think that would meet the concern that some Canadians have that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms would be somewhat undermined.

I think this preclearance bill does deal with the issue. For anyone who is concerned about the heavy arm of the U.S. authorities, that would be minimized. It is not to say that we will not see the odd incident that we have seen in the past happen, but I think the bill clarifies the role that U.S. officials would have in Canada and reciprocally what role Canadian officials would have in the United States.

• (1025)

I would like to share with Canadians, who might be watching or reading *Hansard* on the Internet, that we cannot underestimate the importance of our trade with the United States. There is over \$1.4 billion worth of trade between Canada and the United States every single day. The free trade agreement accounts for about a third of Canada's GDP, which means a lot of jobs. It means a lot of Canadians are working today because of the trade arrangement we have with the United States.

Canadians can also appreciate that part of that ease of trade is the ease of movement of persons and goods across the border. We in the House have a responsibility to make sure that everything humanly possible is done to make sure that the trade corridors have the right infrastructure and the right legislation to allow for the movement of trade, people and goods, that will allow this free trade agreement with the United States, and potentially our NAFTA agreement with Mexico, to reach the potential that is out there. It means jobs for Canadians. It means an increasing standard of living for Canadians. Hopefully, it means lower taxation and a greater awareness of what the North American continent has to offer to the international trade community.

The preclearance act is a start. My understanding is that this preclearance act is primarily for airports. Although I think it is very important that it be started with the air industry because it has already shown that it works very well, we, in particular on the west coast with Amtrak, would like to see this brought in very quickly in terms of looking at train services between Canada and the United States. We could then continue to promote the "two nation vacation" concept that is being promoted by Cascadia and, I would

imagine, other trade corridors are also looking at it. We could then promote the concept of international travellers being able to land in our country and getting preclearance in any mode of transportation. This would allow our customs and immigration agencies to highlight their time and pinpoint their efforts on the 20% of problem cases.

Preclearance allows far more information to be shared with our authorities before they transfer across the border. It allows customs and immigration officials at the border to concentrate on those individuals who may create the problems that we are all concerned about, whether it is illicit drugs, illicit goods or illegal immigration flowing across the border. This would allow both Canada and the United States to concentrate their efforts and resources on the problem cases.

Hopefully this preclearance will be brought through not only for air, but for rail and potentially trucks. It would be great to see trucks enter some kind of preclearance which could take place outside of the border corridor or the border infrastructure. What we see now is a congestion of trucks and trains having to stop at the borders. This has caused a problem for Canada in trying to meet its pollution requirements under its Kyoto obligations.

A lot of pollution is caused by the delay and congestion in the movement of people and goods by truck traffic. A lot of pollution we see every day is caused by trucks lining up and being put in park or neutral while they wait to proceed either on city streets or across the border at various check points. To have preclearance for people who are not a problem in an area that is not consuming time at a congestion point would be such a great thing for the advancement of our trade corridors.

• (1030)

The preclearance act is a good first step. I am disappointed that it came not through the House of Commons but through the Senate. Barring that, I look forward to legislation that will broaden the application of the preclearance. I would like to see that it is not too long a time before these kinds of applications are added to the preclearance.

Certainly this is a first step. I look forward to supporting it and to making sure that at the Vancouver airport, at the Amtrak station in Vancouver, at the border crossings this kind of preclearance is a very effective way of moving not only goods, but people so that we can have this two nation vacation. We can have open borders and free trade that benefits all Canadians.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start my remarks by pointing out as well that the number of this bill is S-22. People are not aware that most pieces of legislation we deal with are numbered C something, C and then a

number, meaning that bill originated in the House of Commons. S-22 means that it originated in the Senate, in the other place, the unelected and as other members have pointed out, unaccountable other place.

It makes me wonder and it is mind boggling that if the government wanted to garner the Canadian public's interest and support for this bill why it would originate the bill in a place that only has the support of 5% of the population. Recent polling shows that a full 45% of the population wants to see the Senate radically reformed, the triple E model, elected, effective, et cetera. Another full 40% of Canadians want to see the Senate abolished altogether. They want to see it done away with. There are very few Canadians left who really like it the way it is. Probably the immediate families of senators are the only people left who think it is a really good idea.

If the government were serious about having people rally around Bill S-22, it should have been a bill with a C number. It should have originated in the House of Commons from elected representatives.

Speaking to the bill, the preclearance act was introduced in the Senate by the deputy leader of the government side in the Senate. The bill would provide U.S. federal inspection services with the appropriate statutory authority at designated areas in Canada to determine what people and what goods would be allowed entry into the United States.

Canada has allowed the U.S. federal inspection services to operate air passenger preclearance in Canada since the 1950s. This is not really anything new. It seeks to broaden and expand the preclearance situation in the airports.

The NDP caucus has serious reservations about Bill S-22. We recognize, as do members of the other parties who have spoken, that it is in the interests of Canadian travellers to be processed more quickly and to move more freely through the airports if it is only a simple trip to the United States, to our main trading partner. However we should point out a number of problems with the bill as it stands. Our caucus hopes to have the opportunity to move amendments which I will speak to later.

Bill S-22 represents a substantial intrusion on Canadian sovereignty. It gives officers of a foreign government the power to enforce foreign preclearance laws on Canadian soil. We believe that preclearance and intransit facilities can be legislated in a manner that is less intrusive, particularly for Canadian citizens and permanent residents.

We also have concerns about the legal implications of the bill. While some of our arguments were already addressed by amendments that have been made earlier, we still have some concerns as

Government Orders

it is presently drafted. I would like to go through a few of those in the time I have.

The NDP remains of the view that it is possible to achieve our goals with a voluntary rather than a compulsory framework. Persons wishing to go to the U.S. could voluntarily submit themselves to examination and if necessary search. If they did not wish to undergo that kind of process, they could then withdraw their application to enter the U.S. and leave the preclearance area.

• (1035)

We do not believe it is necessary to create Canadian offences for resisting the enforcement of foreign laws on Canadian soil. As such we believe that clauses 33 and 34 should be removed and that clause 10 should be amended to clearly provide that right of withdrawal.

We also believe it is not necessary to grant preclearance officers the power to enforce U.S. laws on Canadian soil. In particular, we see no reason for granting the power to levy fines, seize property or to declare it forfeit as per U.S. law. Those in favour of the bill are arguing that the U.S. officers should have the same powers that they enjoy at land crossings where they are operating on American soil. In this case they would not be operating on American soil. We believe this is a major difference both legally and geographically.

If we grant these powers, they can result in enforcement of penalties or the forfeiture of goods in Canada for doing things which are not against the law under Canadian law. We are granting U.S. officers the right to enforce and penalize Canadians on our soil. We think this is a breach of Canadian sovereignty.

Under the use of force, we are very concerned about clause 12 which authorizes preclearance officers to use "as much force as is necessary" in order to effect their purposes. At the very least, this section should be modified to add the word "reasonably". It is common in statutes of this type to use the term "reasonable force" and not give carte blanche to use as much force as is necessary. I know it is a fine legal point but it does give a lot of latitude to the enforcement officers.

These foreign officers would have the right to hold people and stop people from leaving. That is a fairly sweeping power to grant a foreign officer on our soil. It means they could detain people. If the officers think people are guilty of breaking a law in another country, they could be held, essentially arrested. We are granting foreigners powers on our soil which we do not think is necessary. This needs to be reviewed.

Under that article, clauses 10 and 22 of the bill need to be revised because they have a very low threshold for who can be detained. The NDP is very serious about that particular issue.

We submit that the test contained in clause 24 is preferable. There it has to be belief on reasonable grounds. Again it is a term that would stand up in court if it was tested and challenged. This is not present in clauses 10 and 22. At the very least, we want the same test that is given in clause 24, to be treated the same way in clauses 22 and 10.

On passenger information, there is a whole series of questions that people are asked when entering the country. A lot of it is very private information. What is done with that information? How long is it kept?

We have to keep in mind that we are giving this information to a foreign country, not to a Canadian official. We may not wish to have this private information spread around, personal information such as health records. We are told that this information will be quickly destroyed but we do not know when. We are not told how long this information is kept. Can this information be sold or are they bound to keep it private? We do not have any control over that. Privacy is becoming more and more of an issue.

The NDP remains firmly opposed to the creation of Canadian offences for resisting or misleading a foreign preclearance officer. We do not think it should be a Canadian offence to mislead a foreign officer about an issue entering a foreign country. I suppose they have every right once a person is in their country to charge them with offences, but why should it be a crime in Canada to knowingly mislead a foreign officer on our soil? These are things we have serious problems with. We want clauses 33 and 34 modified to point to those concerns.

It is not just the NDP caucus that has problems with this. The Canadian Bar Association made a presentation to the committee and coincidentally it pointed to many of the same clauses we want changed. The association wants clause 10, clause 12, clause 24, clause 28, clause 32(h) and clauses 33 and 34 amended, most of which I mentioned in my original concerns. This is the Canadian Bar Association, people who actually know something about this.

● (1040)

In the interests of trying to make travel more convenient for frequent travellers, like us and business people who travel a lot, we are ready to trample on Canadian sovereignty. Why? Where is the payback in this? The two things are of completely different weight.

We are willing to give foreign officers the right to penalize Canadians under Canadian law for telling them stories that are not true. Frankly, it opens up such a can of worms that it should be sent back to the other place for them to try again and take into consideration such basic things as national pride.

The other group which spoke out very strongly against the bill is the Canadian Civil Liberties Association. It wrote: In our view, the bill should not empower the officials of any foreign state to detain Canadians against their will, in this country, simply for a suspected violation of foreign law.

As I understand it, I could be arrested by a foreigner in my country because he thinks maybe I did something wrong in misleading by giving false information. If he thinks I might have some illegal substance on me he is allowed to strip search me, do all those things and hold me there against my will. In any event, that is one of their problems. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association went on to say:

Thus, even if there are reasonable grounds to suspect that any Canadians seeking admission to the United States have lied about possessing goods that they may not lawfully take into the United States—Such Canadians should have a presumptive right to leave the preclearance area without travelling to the United States.

In other words, rather than be arrested because the officer thinks perhaps I have some contraband, I should at least be allowed to leave, to change my mind, "Okay, maybe I will not go to the U.S. If you are going to be so difficult about this, I will just leave". That would not be allowed. They could hold me there against my will, detained, arrested by a foreign cop on our soil. That is what the Canadian Civil Liberties Association has a real problem with.

Another person who has a problem with Bill S-22 is our own Privacy Commissioner of Canada. He wrote a very strong letter. Mr. Bruce Phillips, Privacy Commissioner of Canada, wrote to the chair of the foreign affairs and international trade committee:

I am writing to express my concern regarding potential privacy issues relating to Bill S-22. ...one must not forget the fact that customs officers in the course of exercising their duties often collect vast amounts of personal information about travellers, sometimes of a highly sensitive nature. As such, I feel it is my duty to impress on the Committee the need to ensure that the privacy rights of the travelling public are adequately honoured and protected under this Bill.

He has serious reservations that they are being adequately honoured under this bill. Again, as I have pointed out, there is no real detail about how long that information can be held and in what way that information might be used. In this electronic age our information is at risk all the time. We dealt with that in a previous bill in the House about privacy, electronic information, selling of credit card numbers and no end of things.

Those are some of the reasons we cannot support Bill S-22. Starting with its place of origin, the other place, we disapprove of that wholeheartedly. We have made that clear. I predict, Mr. Speaker, you are going to hear that from all the members on this side of the House. The origin of the bill is our first problem with it.

A key problem is clauses 33 and 34. We do not believe it is necessary to create Canadian offences for resisting the enforcement of foreign laws on Canadian soil. Also, we would like to see amendments to clause 12 which authorizes the preclearance officers to use "as much force as is necessary" without even adding

the word "reasonably" or if there are reasonable grounds to think that someone is doing something wrong.

There is a problem with clauses 10 and 22, holding people against their will. If I walk into that preclearance area and the U.S. customs official, the foreign officer, looks at me and says, "It looks to me like you are carrying some kind of contraband", I cannot just turn around and walk out and say, "I have changed my mind, this is too much trouble. I think I will go home". The foreign officer can arrest me and detain me. We certainly want that amended.

● (1045)

Foreign officers can arrest for any number of reasons. I just used contraband as one example. They might think I am carrying an exotic plant, a parakeet, or whatever I might have up my sleeve.

We want to know how long they are allowed to keep this private information and what they intend to do with it. We need that section amended. As well, we remain firmly opposed to the creation of Canadian offences for resisting or misleading a foreign preclearance officer. I have summarized that one already. Unless we see serious amendments to the bill we cannot vote for it.

[Translation]

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise a second time to speak to Bill S-22.

Our party supports this bill. We do not share the criticism of some of our colleagues in the House that the bill comes from the other place.

I listened to Reform members, among others, speaking of the other place. They announced that next week our Reform friends are to have a social event outside the Senate. We wonder whether they will be wearing sombreros. Perhaps they will be in bikinis. Who knows. Next week, Reform members will be made fun of once again in the Senate, so the invitation is open to everyone.

They are also saying that people in the country want a complete reform of the Senate, even its abolition. It is true that the Senate must be reformed. It is also true, I think, that we must look at all parliamentary institutions. They quote figures. They say that 45% of people in Canada would like the Senate to be reformed. Why not? They say that 41% of the people in Canada would like the Senate to be abolished.

There may be other polls, but they fail to cite them. If we asked Quebecers and Canadians what they think about their politicians, I am not sure that the rating would be very good. Does that mean that we should commit hara-kiri? There must be a minimum of credibility.

A credible poll was taken in Ontario—a Reform member was speaking of Ontario earlier—not too long ago, which revealed that 91% of Ontarians would not vote for the Reform Party. This was the latest Gallup poll. In Ontario, 91% would not vote for the

Reform Party. Does that mean that the Reform Party should disappear or be reformed? Perhaps.

We have to be careful with figures. What I say is that the Senate needs not to be dumped on, but co-operation with this House and a look at how the system could be improved.

This week there was a report on the reduction in the numbers of French speaking Quebecers. There are political safeguards in the Constitution. The fact that 24% or 25% of senators come from Quebec is protection. The fact that one-third of the justices of the supreme court come from Quebec is protection.

We must first respect the Constitution, not denigrate it. We can make disparaging remarks about the other place, but are we not at the same time criticizing this House? We should be very careful.

We do not have a problem with the fact that the bill originated in the other place. On the contrary, people in the other place, particularly those who belong to my party, proposed amendments to Bill S-22, thus making it a very interesting piece of legislation. They are asking, among other things, that the bill be reviewed in five years. Now this is interesting.

After the five-year pilot project, it would be proper and timely to review the preclearance system in terms of its effectiveness. This system could be very beneficial to the whole country, and particularly to Quebec and Canadian travellers, by facilitating transportation and trips to the United States.

There is also an economic issue involved. It is said that Canada is becoming a gateway to the United States. As members know, one of the Canadian carriers is currently experiencing serious problems

An hon. member: It is flying low.

Mr. André Bachand: Indeed, it is flying very low.

• (1050)

Having international travellers make a stopover in Canada would have a significant economic impact.

Earlier we talked about free trade. Thank God we signed free trade agreements that opened doors for us.

As I said at second reading of this bill, let us not forget that this does a service to Americans. We must not overlook this fact. For quite some time now we have been telling Americans "Let us facilitate the movement of people from this country". We have been telling them "If ever undesirables want to enter the United States"—very few of them Canadians, of course, but people from elsewhere—"they will be arrested before they even set foot on U.S. territory".

This is another thing preclearance does. It has advantages for Canada and advantages for the United States. They tell us "Before

entering the United States, travellers from all over will be stopping over in your country. You will have the economic advantage, but we will have an advantage too. If they do not suit us, we will just hand them back over to you". Then the Canadian justice system will deal with them. They will be protected by the charter. The Americans wash their hands of all this.

It has to be said that this is to their advantage. They will have far less trouble dealing with a possibly undesirable international clientele, because now it is Canada that will deal with it all. They will be returned to their country of origin at Canadian expense, or be processed through the Canadian legal system.

My colleague from the New Democratic Party said "Yes, but the Americans are going to apply their own legislation very strictly". That may be the case, but they will not do it very often. Someone undesirable will simply be turned over to the Canadian authorities. We will be the ones stuck with dealing with them and expelling them from the country.

We are familiar with the problems often encountered with illegal immigrants involved in crime, and how difficult it is to get rid of them with all the appeal processes there are here. They will come under Canadian jurisdiction.

That said, there is one interesting aspect for this country. This bill casts some light on practices that were already in place. It is a bill that comes to us from the other place and I must draw attention to the work that was done there.

It is often said that in that other place they do not have much to do. If that is so, it is because there is not much happening in this place as far as legislation is concerned. Where is the government's vision on legislation? There is none.

The main work of the other place is to review, analyse, re-examine and possibly amend bills before returning them to us. If they have nothing to do in the other place, it is because there is nothing much doing here.

There are some top-notch people in the other place, as there are many in this House. There are some so-so people in the other place, as there are here too, perhaps. Not many, of course, but there are some.

Let us try to focus the energies and strengths that exist in this parliament. Let us also try to improve what is being done and how it is being done. It is not by running down the other place that we will improve things.

If Quebecers and Canadians were asked who they trusted least, the answer might well be this country's politicians—with the exception of yourself, Mr. Speaker, perhaps. That does not mean we should all go out and commit hara-kiri. We must continue to work at improving our credibility and showing that we can make a difference. All members of the House are motivated by one thing: to make a difference for those we represent.

Bill S-22 can also make a difference for those we represent by simplifying business and pleasure travel toward destinations in the United States.

• (1055)

Once again, it is not because the bill comes from the other place that it is bad. I would even say that it is not because an idea comes from the Reform Party that it is bad. Absolutely not. Nor does this mean that all their ideas are always sensible and well thought out. However, the fact remains that we cannot be running each other down. We must get one thing straight, which is that each time we say something bad about the other place in the House, we are saying something bad about ourselves as well.

I am therefore pleased to support Bill S-22, and I wish to congratulate the people in the other place, as well as members of this House, for the very fine work that was done.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): We are getting into the period for Statements by Members. If the member desires, he may use the 10 minutes remaining in his allotted time following question period.

[Translation]

Mr. André Bachand: Mr. Speaker, the position of the party I represent is very clear. I know that other members wish to take part in the debate. So with great generosity—one big difference between us and certain other parties is our great generosity—I am going to turn the floor over to other parliamentarians. I think that all parliamentarians and the people in the other place should have this positive and open attitude toward the Chair and toward the Canadian public. I will therefore leave my time for other parliamentarians.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

WHIG STANDARD

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased for the opportunity to recognize the Kingston *Whig Standard* as the oldest continuously published daily paper in Canada.

The *Whig* has served well the interests of the people of the vibrant historic city of Kingston and surrounding areas. The Kingston *Whig Standard* has provided me with a daily account of local, national and international news and happenings for many years.

The many excellent reporters and columnists, led by publisher Fred LaFlamme and joined by the *Whig Standard* community editorial board, inform, provoke and entertain us all.

The Kingston Whig Standard has won many distinguished awards nationally and internationally for journalism and photographic achievements.

I am sure none of these are more valued than the 150 year record of service to eastern Ontario. On behalf of the Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons, who is the member of parliament for Kingston and the Islands, myself and our constituents, I send hearty congratulations and best wishes for ever success into the future.

PEDAHBUN LODGE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week in the *National Post* it was reported that the Pedahbun Lodge in Toronto, a government funded addiction treatment centre for natives, had spent money on paying off the executive director's parking tickets, hiring her family, and flying staff to California. There were also allegations that a clinic van was used to smuggle illegal immigrants into Canada from the U.S.

Needless to say there are many troubling questions still be answered. Why was 15% of the budget spent on travel that was meant to treat addicts? This is inexcusable.

My suggestion to the Minister of Health is that \$500,000 given to this dysfunctional organization may be better spent on a lodge in Manitoba by the name of St. Norbert Foundation/Selkirk Healing Centre.

I know that the ministers of health and foreign affairs are aware of this establishment and its success rate. It provides long term residential programming for aboriginal men, women, youth and family units experiencing a variety of addiction problems.

This organization is desperate for funding. Why not give it a chance to prove itself and replace those that are hurting, not helping our aboriginal people?

~ ~ ~

SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE SYNAGOGUE

Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on May 21 it was my distinct privilege to witness the presentation of a heraldic coat of arms to the 231 year old Spanish and Portuguese

Synagogue of Montreal. Its design reflects the cultural origins of this unique institution.

Red and gold colours encircle the crest representing its members Sephardic Jewish origin from Spain and Portugal. Four columns in silver symbolize the four different locations they have occupied since 1768. The 10 commandments crested by a red maple leaf on the crown reflects Canada, where the Jewish population found haven and security from war and discrimination.

This synagogue has evolved over the years. Today it is multicultural and multilingual, with members coming from the Middle East and Europe.

● (1100)

The congregation, led by Rabbi Howard Joseph, has had many distinguished community and civic leaders who have contributed to our society's growth and development, including a Montreal police chief, as well as the founders of the Montreal Waterworks, the Montreal Board of Trade, the Bank of Montreal, la Banque Nationale, Canada Steamships Lines, the Theatre Royale and its members who continue to be active and contributing citizens.

In essence, this coat of arms says-

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am very sorry but we are over the allotted time.

* *

ACCESS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. Rick Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, May 31 to June 6 marks Access Awareness Week in communities across Canada. This week reminds us that access to full participation in Canada's economy and society for people with disabilities involves all of us as citizens.

The Government of Canada has introduced a number of initiatives aimed at helping people with disabilities to access the workforce. These include the opportunities fund, the Canada study grants for students with disabilities, the employability assistance for people with disabilities initiative in partnership with the provinces, as well as support to national disability organizations and improvements to the Canada pension plan disability program.

[Translation]

In coming months we shall be working in conjunction with the provinces and territories as well as with the disabled themselves to ensure that Canadians with disabilities may take full part in all aspects of Canadian society, at work and at play.

National Access Awareness Week gives all of us an opportunity to ask ourselves what we can do-

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. The hon. member for Nipissing.

[English]

D-DAY

Mr. Bob Wood (Nipissing, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the upcoming 55th anniversary of D-Day this Sunday, Canadians will honour members of all our armed forces who played such a decisive part in the assault on Normandy.

Over 15,000 Canadians, a fifth of the total allied invasion force, successfully won a seven kilometre stretch of France from a desperate enemy. The Royal Canadian Navy and the Royal Canadian Air Force added to their reputations during the Neptune offensive. The tragedy of Dieppe two years earlier was avenged.

The many cemeteries in Normandy are a timeless reminder of the terrible cost of war. Our D-Day casualties were 359 killed and 715 wounded. More than 5,400 Canadians have their graves in Normandy that tell of the ferocity of the battles that were to be fought later.

The bridgehead to victory was firmly secured on June 6, 1944 and 11 months later the liberation of western Europe was complete.

We thank all of those men and women who participated in this campaign. We will remember them.

TIANANMEN SQUARE

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today, June 4, marks the 10th anniversary of the brutal suppression of China's democracy movement at Tiananmen Square.

The world watched with horror 10 years ago as the government of the People's Republic of China ordered its military to open fire on young, unarmed students peacefully demonstrating their support for freedom and democracy. Over 2,000 demonstrators died that day. This House would never condone such government action.

Today hundreds continue to be locked up in jails for promoting freedom and democracy. The flames of democracy have not been extinguished in China. On this 10th anniversary we call on the government of the People's Republic of China to release those students still in prison for supporting freedom and democracy that day

TIANANMEN SQUARE

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago television cameras revealed to the world horrific scenes of the brutal suppression of civil and political rights on Beijing's Tiananmen Square.

In the early hours of June 4, 1989 the tanks and soldiers were sent into the square by Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping to end a pro-democracy student protest. The protest had lasted seven weeks. Martial law had been declared on May 19 by Chinese Premier Li Peng and the troops began to arrive in the centre of the city on June 3.

Reports indicate that the first soldiers arrived in the square at 12.50 a.m. on the morning of June 4. By 4.00 a.m. the troops had crushed the protest in a bloody massacre.

We will never know how many people died that night. Estimates, however, put the number into the thousands. Remarkably, unbelievably, the government of the People's Republic of China stated that the massacre never happened.

We must resist any attempt to rewrite the history of Tiananmen Square and we must never allow the memory of those who died in the quest for democracy to be forgotten.

* * *

[Translation]

CHILDREN VICTIMS OF AGGRESSION

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today is International Day of Innocent Children Victims of Aggression.

June 4 is the day designated by the United Nations to draw attention to the tragic lives of thousands of children around the world. We cannot think of the war in Kosovo without thinking of the Kosovar and Serb children, who are the helpless victims of adult evil, violence and perversion.

• (1105)

It is the duty of the elected representatives of Canada and Quebec to speak out on behalf of the most vulnerable and weakest members of society and to come to their defence.

The day we are able to eradicate atrocities involving children victims everywhere in the world will mark a giant step forward for humankind.

To be aware of this reality, to speak out against and to use every means possible to combat it on all fronts must be the daily responsibility of each and every one of us.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week a young man was convicted of raping a toddler and he got six months in jail. A 48 year old woman came forward and finally charged her brother with raping her from the time she was nine. He was convicted, sentenced to five years and served not one day. In the same two day period 11 other victims saw their rapists get virtually no jail time.

Do judges not realize the damage this kind of assault does? I implore the Minister of Justice to address this issue with her provincial counterparts. Otherwise victims will not come forward and we will simply sweep the problem under the rug forever.

* * *

[Translation]

BLOC QUEBECOIS

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we read that certain members of the Bloc Quebecois were sick of the concept of partnership. How terrible.

The truth is that separatists never wanted anything to do with this partnership. They simply do not believe in it.

What the Bloc Quebecois really wants is for Quebec to separate from the rest of Canada. We do not need referendums to understand this.

The exasperation of certain Bloc Quebecois members is therefore easily understood: a die-hard separatist wants nothing to do with any form of partnership or association between Quebec and the rest of Canada.

What separatists really want therefore is to leave Canada, period.

I firmly believe that Quebecers will remember this during the next referendum on the future of Quebec.

* * *

[English]

ONTARIO ELECTION

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last night part two of the common sense revolution began. Congratulations to Mike Harris and the Conservative Party. The victory marked the first back-to-back majority government since 1971 and with 59 seats the common sense revolution was a victory for sound fiscal management and tax relief for Ontario.

Is there a message here for the federal Liberals? For those federal Liberals like the member for Burlington, who claimed some sort of moral victory in her comments last evening, may I remind her that the united alternative vote in her home riding of Burlington was double that of the Liberal candidate. For the federal Minister of Health, who said that the Harris health care plan would sink the Tories, maybe he should reflect on what the voters said about health care in their voting patterns.

Ontarians want less taxes, back to basics education, work for welfare and a get tough approach on crime, including a new young offenders act, a sex offenders registry, harsh penalties for drug pushers, drug testing for parolees and making parents more responsible for property damage caused by their children. Yes, there was a message for our Liberals last night from Ontario.

* * *

TIANANMEN SQUARE

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on the 10th anniversary of the massacre at Tiananmen Square the NDP pays tribute to the memory of those who were killed that day and to the courage of the students and others who stood up for democracy.

Since then progress on the all important political and human rights front has been tragically absent in China. The NDP calls on China to realize that while we understand the concern about stability in a country with a history of internal conflict, the reality of the world today is that countries which bottle up dissenting views and squash dissenters are courting disaster. We therefore call on the government of China to release those still in prison.

We also call on China to moderate its views on Tibet, and on the World Bank not to approve a project which would move Chinese farmers into an area used by Tibetan and Mongolian herders for centuries.

We have seen all too recently the ethnic conflict that eventually occurs when the historic population of an area is demographically attacked by an influx of a politically dominant group. The World Bank should not finance such a scheme.

* * *

• (1110)

[Translation]

RENÉ LÉVESQUE

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the presence of several dignitaries, including Premier Lucien Bouchard, Corinne Côté-Lévesque and former PQ ministers, a bronze life-size statue of René Lévesque, the politician who played a pivotal role in the history of Quebec, was unveiled.

Mr. Lévesque was one of the principal architects of the quiet revolution and, in 1968, he founded the sovereignty-association movement that would lead to the creation of the Parti Québécois. Elected premier of Quebec in 1976, and returned to office in 1981, he and his government were responsible for major reforms, including the farmland protection legislation, Bill 101 and the electoral reform legislation.

We join with all Quebecers in paying tribute to the force behind the greatest political movement in Quebec; the movement that will carry us to sovereignty.

Despite the referendum defeat of May 20, 1980, René Lévesque never lost faith in the people.

We heard Mr. Lévesque loud and clear and we too say "À la prochaine".

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the week of June 6 to 12 marks National Transportation Week. This annual celebration recognizes the important role played by Canada's transportation system in the social and economic life of our nation, providing hundreds of thousands of jobs and moving Canadians and their products throughout the country and to international destinations and markets.

The theme of National Transportation Week '99, "Transportation: Safe, Reliable, Efficient", draws attention to the ongoing dedication to the safety and reliability demonstrated by Canada's transportation community and to the sector's continued efforts to maximize its use of the latest transportation technology.

The kick-off is in Moncton today, National Transportation Day. Celebrations include a day-long conference and the annual awards dinner. Other events are planned throughout the week and throughout the country.

It is my hope that Canadians will take time this week to reflect on the central role that transportation plays in maintaining our quality of life and to consider how Canadian innovation can help prepare transportation for the challenges of the upcoming millennium.

ONTARIO ELECTION

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada I congratulate Premier Mike Harris and the Ontario Conservatives for their convincing re-election to government.

Premier Harris and his team have shown that reducing taxes is one of the fundamental tools to create jobs and spur economic growth, economic growth which generates the revenues needed for quality health care and education. Ontario embraced progressive change to get the province back on track, reversing the status quo of failed Liberal and NDP policies.

Voters from my province are also hungry for a similar agenda for change at the federal level. Last week's Gallup poll shows that the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada is the clear choice of 31% of the Ontario electorate. Just as Ontario voters chose the

provincial Conservatives yesterday, Ontario voters are starting to choose the federal Conservatives as the only true alternative to the federal Liberals.

* * *

ENVIRONMENT WEEK

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is the last day of Environment Week, a week set aside each year for Canadians to recommit themselves to environmental action.

Canada's environment is important to all Canadians. The Government of Canada is committed to protect all species at risk, all plants and animals, wherever they are in Canada. We will do so with a holistic Canadian strategy that includes legislation, programs, partnerships and citizen engagement.

Let us be clear. Across Canada we have a long list of laws and regulations put in place to protect wildlife, such as the Canadian Wildlife Act, the Migratory Birds Convention Act and the Fisheries Act, just to name a few.

Canadians are concerned about the state of wildlife and its habitat and that support continues to increase. This government and this minister are determined to make the right environmental decisions so we can pass on a proud natural legacy to future generations of Canadians.

* * *

ONTARIO ELECTION

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, common sense prevails. Last night Mike Harris and his team held their heads high and claimed the first back-to-back Conservative majority in Ontario in 30 years.

What makes this victory all the sweeter is knowing that the federal health minister declared all-out war against Mike Harris and proved to be as influential in provincial politics as he is at the cabinet table. Unfortunately for Dalton McGuinty, his greatest handicap was neither himself nor his platform, but the high tax, soft on crime, unethical spending and health care gutting policies of the federal Liberals.

Not only were the hapless Liberals soundly rejected, but more importantly from a B.C. perspective, the socialist, protectionist NDP was relegated to non-party status. History does repeat itself. Its meagre nine seats is a carbon copy of its 1993 federal failure.

The people of Ontario have spoken. They want lower taxes, safer streets and a sound commitment to education and health care spending. They want Mike Harris.

Oral Questions

• (1115)

[Translation]

CHANTALE TREMBLAY

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to pay tribute to the exceptional work done by Chantale Tremblay, a nurse in the riding of Jonquière and recipient of 3M's innovation clinique award.

Mrs. Tremblay was the leading force behind a program introduced in the fall of 1998 at the Résidence Georges-Hébert to ease the transition of new residents to the long term care facility. Activities were set up for the pre-admission period, the day of admission, and the post-admission period.

Mrs. Tremblay liked to say that she did not invent the wheel, but she played a key role in supervising, co-ordinating and assessing each stage of the program in co-operation with the 50 or so employees at the facility.

We wish Mrs. Tremblay, good luck as she joins the list of candidates for the Grand Prix innovation clinique to be awarded next fall at the Congrès des infirmiers et infirmières du Québec.

* *

[English]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada claims to welcome new Canadians to our country. In fact we rely on immigration to grow our population. Yet the road to becoming a Canadian is fraught with barriers, roadblocks and pitfalls.

First, there is the landing fee head tax of \$975, plus \$500 of other fees and charges. This is a huge barrier to people from poor and developing nations.

The head tax is bad enough, but even more and more frequently landed immigrants wishing to reunite their families are being forced to produce DNA evidence to prove they are related. The cost of over \$1,000 per person in advance is absolutely prohibitive and completely unfair.

On behalf of the Somalian community and other ethnic groups that are disproportionately inconvenienced by these harsh and punitive measures, I urge the government to change its policies regarding the DNA testing and stop deterring those who seek to make Canada their home.

HALIFAX RIFLES

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, this summer is the 250th birthday of the city of Halifax and would be an apt time to reactivate the Halifax Rifles.

This regiment began in 1749 when the city of Halifax was founded. Historically, among the distinguished Nova Scotians who served with the Halifax Rifles were a father of Confederation, two prime ministers of Canada, five premiers of Nova Scotia and five lieutenant governors of Nova Scotia, along with numerous mayors of the city of Halifax.

The defence minister has consistently refused to reconsider reactivating the Halifax Rifles, using the excuse that he would have to deactivate another unit. This is simply not true.

It is time for the Minister of National Defence to recognize the importance of the Halifax Rifles to the city of Halifax and Canada by reactivating the Halifax Rifles. It would make a terrific 250th birthday gift to the city of Halifax.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister defends his Shawinigan spending spree by saying that he was just doing good for Shawinigan. That sort of depends on whether one is a long suffering taxpayer or one of the lucky beneficiaries of a government grant.

The \$6 million CIDA contract to a man who donated \$10,000 to the Prime Minister's campaign, bought a half million dollars of land from the Prime Minister's company and then received an untendered contract to pave the driveway to the Prime Minister's cottage is just a bit coincidental.

Can the Prime Minister not see that doing good for his riding also means that he should have been a mile away from these obvious conflicts of interest?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister had no contact whatsoever with the process of deciding on the CIDA contract in question. The decision was made by an arm's length committee, with the majority of voting members being part of the Government of Mali.

Is the hon, member suggesting that these people are part of some Malian branch of the Liberal Party? No wonder the hon, member's party is losing all credibility. What he is saying is totally ridiculous.

Oral Questions

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals could make it an arm of the government they probably would.

It is kind of him to be the human shield for the Prime Minister, but the Prime Minister has allowed himself to get into an obvious conflict of interest and then justified it by saying he was just doing something good for his constituents.

The unemployment rate in that region remains at over 12%. It does not matter how many grants, loans, political contributions and election rhetoric come from the Prime Minister. That rate has remained chronically high for far too long.

Why did the Prime Minister allow himself to get into this obvious conflict of interest, a mess that has left his constituents with chronic high unemployment?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the premise of the hon. member's question is totally wrong and inaccurate. There is no conflict of interest. Yesterday the member for Calgary Southeast when referring to the Prime Minister said:

—he accuses opposition members of having benefited from HRD grants going into their ridings when no one has presented a shred of evidence of a personal financial benefit on the part of a member of the opposition from a grant made in their riding.

● (1120)

No one in that party or in the opposition has presented a shred of evidence against the Prime Minister of any wrongdoing. They should apply to the Prime Minister the same standards they want applied to themselves.

There is no conflict of interest. This is evident from anything that has been said. The Prime Minister has acted perfectly properly.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if it was just a shred it would be one thing, but there are too many coincidences to be believed. The Prime Minister says, for instance, that he does not own his shares in the Grand-Mère golf course any more.

The dictionary defines sold or sale as "the exchange of a commodity for money". The Prime Minister defines sold as "I still own them and I am trying to exchange them for money, but while I own them it is okay if the value of that property goes up because of some taxpayers funds".

Which definition will the Deputy Prime Minister choose?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said in the House that he sold the shares in the company in question in 1993 before he became Prime Minister. He does not own the shares.

I would like to ask the hon. member why he keeps raising this matter. Is it, as I said the other day, to hide the disintegration of the

Reform Party, to hide the failure of the united alternative concept, and to hide the revolt of Reform members against their leader? Is that not what is going on?

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, our questions are designed to uncover the truth. As the Deputy Prime Minister just stated, the Prime Minister told the House that he sold his shares in the Grand-Mère golf course in 1993.

However, in a public interview just this year the Prime Minister's lawyer, Debbie Weinstein, said she had been trying to sell these shares since 1996. How can the Prime Minister sell shares he does not even own?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as far as the Prime Minister is concerned the shares were sold in 1993. There may be a debt owing to the Prime Minister through his blind trust, but the Prime Minister does not own the shares.

If the hon, member is interested in uncovering the truth, the truth is there. All she and her party have to do is listen to the answers of the Prime Minister.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, is the Deputy Prime Minister trying to tell us that the Prime Minister's lawyer, his legal agent, is trying to sell on the Prime Minister's behalf shares that the Prime Minister does not even own?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to check the accuracy of the language that she attributes to the Prime Minister's trustee. That is the first step.

We often find out that what the Reform Party asserts in the premises of their questions do not turn out to be exactly connected with the facts. That is the first step I want to take before answering further because, as I said, the credibility of the Reform Party becomes less and less the more it goes into this matter.

* * *

[Translation]

KOSOVO

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this morning the French President clearly indicated that Serbia would not get aid to rebuild as long as Slobodan Milosevic remained in power.

Mr. Chirac said "It is perfectly legitimate for us to help a country on the condition that it makes the efforts necessary to establish institutions and a government that respects human rights requirements".

Could the Deputy Prime Minister tell us whether his government shares this point of view?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker,

we are aware of the fact that an agreement may be reached between the NATO countries and the Government of Serbia.

We are currently confirming the details of this agreement, and there will be meetings tomorrow between NATO spokespersons and Serbian spokespersons to work out the details of the agreement.

It will be easier to see how this situation will unfold once we receive confirmation from the NATO people on the position of the Serbian government on this agreement.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the response to my question is rather embarrassing.

(1125)

On April 12 the Bloc Quebecois made two specific proposals for the reconstruction of Kosovo and stability in the Balkans: a conference on the national minorities in Europe under the aegis of the OSCE, and a new Marshall plan.

Will the government wait until Slobodan Milosevic is no longer in power before initiating the process to rebuild Kosovo, or does the condition proposed by France apply only to the rest of Yugoslavia?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Sunday the ministers of foreign affairs of the G-8 countries will

Our minister will be there. In these discussions they will try to set out a resolution for the United Nations. This will be clear once we have the text of the resolution to be prepared on Sunday by the foreign affairs ministers of the G-8 countries, including our own Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Yugoslavian parliament's acceptance of all G-8 conditions is perhaps the most important development pointing toward a return to peace in Kosovo since the conflict first began.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister not think that a temporary halt to the bombing would send the Yugoslavian population a clear signal that NATO wanted peace in addition to facilitating the speedy and verifiable withdrawal of Serbian forces from Kosovo?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at this time we do not have details on Serbia's position with respect to withdrawing its forces in a verifiable manner.

A meeting tomorrow in Belgrade between representatives of NATO and Serbia will provide a better indication of the degree to which Serbia will go along with the plan. Once we have these details, and after there has been a genuine and verifiable withdraw-

Oral Questions

al of Serbian forces, we will be in a position to consider with our allies a halt to the bombing in Yugoslavia.

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, by continuing to bomb military targets in Kosovo, despite the Yugoslavian parliament's acceptance of the G-8 conditions, NATO is asking Serbia's military leaders to come out of hiding and offer themselves up as targets.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister not see this as a contradiction in the government's position, and would it not be better for NATO to temporarily suspend the bombing?

[English]

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government of Mr. Milosevic knows very well that NATO's position was that it would not stop military engagement while ethnic cleansing was ongoing and until the troops began to withdraw from Kosovo.

That has to be verifiable. Mr. Milosevic has gone back on his word a number of times before. We are definitely prepared to make the move when those things are verified.

FISHERIES

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians were appalled yesterday to see that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans signed a deal which guarantees Americans the ability to catch Canadian coho when Canadians themselves will not be able to catch them.

I want to ask a question of the Deputy Prime Minister. Why is it that the government continues to put the wishes and the interests of the people of British Columbia and Canada secondary to the wishes of the Americans and to the pressure put on the government by the Americans? Why does it not just take down the Maple Leaf, run up the white flag and keep it there?

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth.

In fact the agreement moves fish to Canada. On the coho that he just mentioned, restrictions will be introduced on Alaska trollers so they cannot catch what they could have caught in other years.

In 1997 the season would have been closed three weeks earlier if this agreement would have been in place, and in 1998 and 1992 it would have closed 10 days earlier.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think the member who just rose and others should get together with the Minister of Canadian Heritage. They could practice how to

Oral Questions

defend the indefensible sellout of our culture, now our fisheries, and before that Nanoose Bay. The list goes on and on of the way in which the government has capitulated to American interests.

• (1130)

When does it end? When does the surrender end? When do we begin to fight back instead of signing these sell-out deals on various fronts?

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is not a sell-out deal. This moves fish to Canada. We can look at Fraser River sockeye for instance. The United States share under this agreement will be 16.5%. This compares with last year where their share was 24.9% and where the historical average was 20.5% between 1985 and 1986. That is moving fish to Canada.

This agreement is for Canadians and for the future of the fisheries. The member should be congratulating the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Government of Canada for negotiating this agreement, with no thanks to the B.C. government.

TAXATION

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Ontario voters re-elected a Conservative government that cut taxes by 30%. They gave Mike Harris a strong mandate to continue cutting taxes for Ontario families, communities and businesses. This morning Premier Harris said that federal taxes are too high and are a barrier to job creation, investment and growth.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. When will the Liberals follow the lead of Mike Harris and cut taxes?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our first task was to eliminate the \$42 billion deficit burden created by the Conservative government of Mr. Mulroney of which the member is a current spokesman. We eliminated that deficit and we moved to a balanced budget. At the same time, we have begun massive tax reductions of \$16.5 billion over the next three years.

We do not need to follow Mike Harris' lead on this. We are doing this through a mandate from the Canadian people, including those in Ontario. Unlike Mike Harris, we are not doing this with one cent of borrowed money.

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberals broke promise after promise, from free trade to the GST, from health care to an independent ethics counsellor. The Harris Conservatives took a different approach. They said what they would do before an election and actually delivered. While the Liberals are the party of trickery, cynicism and low integrity, the Conservatives are the party of honesty, hope and opportunity.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister tell Ontario voters why they should trust the Liberals when Conservative policies have caused Ontario to grow and the federal government to balance its books?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Ontario voters have already said what they think of the federal Conservative Party. I am sure they are going to give a similar verdict in the next federal election and return an overwhelming number of federal Liberals.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Due to the new ruling by U.S. customs on softwood lumber, thousands of Canadian forestry jobs and even the fate of some Canadian companies are threatened. Why has the government allowed Canada's softwood lumber trade with the Americans to suffer this new blow? Were the trade officials too busy defending the magazine industry to recognize this new serious threat of the softwood lumber agreement?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the member rather than joke about incredible non-starting comparisons should treat the issue with the seriousness it deserves.

We have an agreement that his province and that industry urged the federal government to get into two and a half years ago. It is obviously disappointing that the Americans are trying to expand the focus of this agreement. We have taken action. We have taken action against them at the world customs. The world customs has agreed with us again. If they continue to persist on the softwood rougher headed issue, we will continue to take action against them.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we know of the action the government has taken at the world customs, but there has been no action taken on this most recent decision on the rougher headed lumber. Whatever happened to the five years of lumber peace the Liberals promised by signing the softwood lumber agreement?

It does not matter if it is softwood or split-runs, we are getting the same scripted answers. Canadians want to know what specifically will the government do before parliament rises to guarantee that these forest workers do not lose their jobs?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have an agreement with the United States. It is an agreement that was agreed to by all the four provinces within the agreement and by the entire industry from one coast to the other. The member knows this.

• (1135)

Now the commodity sector has come under great pressure both in Canada and the United States. That clearly does not justify the single-handed action the United States has taken. We will use every possible aspect of this agreement as well as the world customs and NAFTA to redress in the proper way the proper functioning of the agreement between our two countries.

[Translation]

MILLENNIUM SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs made a very troubling statement. He said the agreements signed by officials of the federal government and those of a provincial government would not be binding on governments and that, accordingly, cabinet was not obliged to honour them.

Does the Minister of Human Resources Development think that his negotiator will have the trust of the Government of Quebec on the millennium scholarships after what the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said and after what occurred in the matter of Nanoose Bay?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I understand is that the other agreement the member for Lac-Saint-Jean is referring to-

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Order, please. The hon. Minister of Human Resources Development.

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew: Mr. Speaker, as the member for Lac-Saint-Jean has just said, I can say one thing, and that is that the agreement had been signed by officials. That is what the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs was referring to.

In the matter of the millennium scholarships, I can reassure the member for Lac-Saint-Jean that the representative of the Government of Canada enjoys my full confidence and that of our government.

There will soon be another meeting between the representatives of the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada. I am confident that we will resolve this dispute very soon so that Quebec students may enjoy the millennium scholarships.

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is all very well to play a semantics game and call someone a facilitator when in fact they are a negotiator. Basically, is the mandate of the federal facilitator not simply to facilitate the life of the Minister of Human Resources Development by providing him

Oral Questions

with a pretext to avoid getting on with it and assuming his ministerial responsibilities?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when there are technicalities and administrative standards it is absolutely clear that we trust our officials to come up with solutions and ways to harmonize the systems.

Once the issue becomes political, it is clear that the ministers must speak to each other. I can assure the hon, member that minister Legault and myself are on the very same wavelength. We are equally impatient.

For myself, I count on reaching an agreement so that Quebec students may benefit from something to which they are entitled. The Government of Canada wants to help them finance their studies more easily.

[English]

TRADE

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is a bill before the Michigan legislature that if passed would impose a tax of over 2% on Canadian companies selling into Michigan. Should this legislation go ahead, the cost to Canadian companies, especially the automotive sector would be more than \$100 million per year.

What is the trade minister doing to ensure that this legislation which flies in the face of the principle of national treatment never gets passed?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is correct in raising a very serious issue which I think is going to be equally negative for companies from Canada doing business in Michigan and for the state of Michigan. I think it is going to discourage and scare away trade and investment in that state.

We have for the last number of months been dealing directly with the office of Governor Engler. We have been able to persuade him to take away the retroactivity going back 10 years. The fact remains that for companies doing business in the state of Michigan he is still contemplating at this time imposing a 2% tax.

FISHERIES

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we know the government's spin doctors are working overtime selling the Pacific salmon treaty and we now see that the parliamentary secretary is becoming part of that spin machine.

Let us look at the facts. We know the minister is afraid to bring this treaty before the House of Commons. We know the minister has and will spend millions of dollars buying prime time media to

Oral Questions

sell this deal to the Canadian people. We know the minister announced this deal in a room full of Americans and hired armed police to keep Canadian fishermen out of the room.

If this is such a good deal for Canada, why the armed police? Why does he have to spend taxpayers' money to sell this deal? Whose side is he on? The Americans, obviously not ours.

● (1140)

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have seen from past action that the kind of tactics the hon. member opposite takes on does nothing for the negotiations. When we want to get a good message out there, we have to get it out.

Had this new arrangement been in place between 1985 and 1996 there would have been 4.1 million more fish available to Canadian fishermen. That is a good deal. The hon. member, as the Vancouver *Sun* did this morning, should be congratulating the minister. It said that the minister certainly deserves—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Laval Centre.

* *

[Translation]

FRANCOPHONIE

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in her little summer kit for MPs, the Minister of Canadian Heritage suggests some very interesting activities to help anglophone senators and MPs celebrate, as she puts it, Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day.

Suggested activities include reading a French Canadian book in translation, viewing a sub-titled French Canadian film, and—get this—learning Canada's national anthem in French.

With such a caricature of the French fact in this Year of the Francophonie, can the minister tell the House why she did not think of suggesting wearing a traditional French Canadian Assomption sash for a swim, or sampling a bowl of pea soup?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot see why the Bloc Quebecois would be afraid of francophiles.

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in her crusade to save the French language from coast to coast, can the minister confirm that, again this year, Quebec will be getting 60% of federal funding for Canada Day celebrations, while her constituents in Hamilton East will have to be happy with eight times less money than that set aside for the constituents of the member for Bourassa?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the most pitiful thing about the Bloc Quebecois is that it claims to support the French fact in Canada, but that same Bloc Quebecois found nothing to say when the Government of Quebec refused to recognize this year as the Year of the Francophonie in Canada.

For people who claim to be the defenders of the francophonie in Canada, their track record with respect to the French fact in this country is pathetic, and they owe an apology to French Canadians from Nova Scotia to British Columbia.

* *

[English]

TRADE

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in April the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Trade said there would a 120 day moratorium on U.S. export regulations targeting Canadian defence and aerospace industries. We now know there has been no moratorium as Canadian companies have been forced to acquire export permits. It is obvious the intervention by the foreign affairs minister has produced nothing. We are talking about \$5 billion in trade and 50,000 Canadian jobs.

Will the Prime Minister personally intervene on behalf of the Canadian defence and aerospace industries?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to suggest that the involvement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs has been absolutely ineffective, far from it.

Through his actions in talking with his counterpart, the secretary of state in the United States, they have been able to put in the four month review. In this respect industries are talking. We have made it abundantly clear to the Americans that this is as negative for Canadian firms as it is for American firms. If they have been integrated for the last 40 years, our message is do not fix something that clearly is not broken.

* * *

PESTICIDES

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the amount of pesticides on fresh fruit and vegetables sold in Canada has more than doubled since 1994. The amount of illegal pesticides on our domestic produce has tripled since 1990.

Canadians want to know that their food is safe. Why will the health minister not allow the pesticide management agency to release pesticide ingredients lists to Canadians? Why is there the secrecy?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this morning the hon. member was good enough to mention before question period that he was going to raise this issue.

I will provide a more detailed written response. For the present, let me point out that while the numbers quoted by the member are accurate, it should also be observed that none of the levels comes up to the point where the experts consider there is any danger. In other words, the amounts have doubled but the total concentration is still within safe limits of the total maximum allowable.

• (1145)

When we created the pest management regulatory agency some years ago, it was for the purpose of examining all pesticides before approval. They are looked at from the point of view of safety in advance of going onto the market. We will continue doing that.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is a Canadian heritage website which offers Canadians the opportunity to vote for a hero.

This site was funded by Heritage Canada, yet it operates only in English, right at this midpoint in the Année de la Francophonie.

Can the minister explain how this site is unilingual English when it is her responsibility to protect both official languages of this country?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, this is not the website of Heritage Canada. Second, it is a bilingual site.

What I find pitiful is to see the Bloc Quebecois shedding big crocodile tears for francophones outside Quebec while, when the time comes for a concrete gesture in support of French Canadians, the Bloc Quebecois and the Parti Quebecois want nothing to do with francophones outside Quebec. That is pretty pitiful during the Année de la Francophonie canadienne.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as NATO prepares to deploy a peace implementation force, there is a great deal of speculation about the level of resistance our troops will meet. How prepared are our Canadian forces troops for deployment to this region, and how capable is our equipment?

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by

Oral Questions

saying how proud we are of the job our military is doing in the Balkans, in Aviano and on other missions.

Our people and our equipment are up to the task. They will be using the Coyote reconnaissance vehicle, which is very highly mobile, well armed and well protected; the Bison armoured personnel carrier; the Griffon military helicopter; and, let us not forget, the CF-18s in Aviano.

We have no doubt that our professional soldiers have the training, the leadership and the equipment they need to do a good job.

* * *

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we hear the government is drafting new endangered species legislation. Let us hope it gets it right this time. Rural Canadians are insisting that the bill include three fundamental principles: First, there must be equity. All Canadians must bear an equal cost of protection, not just rural Canadians.

Second, it must be incentive based. Landowners should be compensated not punished for compliance.

Third, there must be consultation. Rural Canadians must have a say in how the legislation impacts on their lives.

Will the environment minister and the Government of Canada commit today to these principles, yes or no?

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the member opposite is interested in this legislation.

The minister has been consulting across the country with her provincial and territorial counterparts and is prepared to table legislation in the near future. I attended some of those meetings and I can tell the House that some of the various issues were considered and possible solutions were raised. We will continue to work on the right solution.

* * *

ATHABASCA RIVER

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last year the government discontinued the marking and dredging of the Athabasca River from Fort McMurray to Fort Chipewyan. This is a service that has been provided for as long as anybody in the area can remember.

As a result, the federal and provincial governments had to spend \$1 million on an emergency airlift of supplies to Fort Chipewyan last spring. Right now the barges are aground, making the likelihood of another emergency airlift of crucial supplies, such as food and fuel, very possible.

Oral Questions

My question is for the Minister of Transport. This historic trade route is a lifeline for the people of Fort Chipewyan. Why is the government abandoning the people of Fort Chipewyan?

(1150)

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question under advisement and get back to the hon. member with an answer.

BILL C-32

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

Environment Week of 1999 will be remembered as a lost opportunity. Canadians will remember when the Liberal and Reform Parties picked polluters as their priority and not our environment or our health by weakening Bill C-32.

The environment commissioner states that there is confusion between departments for taking immediate action against toxic substances, and that it is now common knowledge that the government buckled and sold out to industry's polluter's.

Can the Minister of Industry explain why strict environmental laws are a nightmare for his department?

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a complete misinterpretation of the legislation we passed this week.

The legislation puts in place a strict enforcement mechanism reflecting the commissioner's report and what the committee wanted. It sets in place a toxic management review policy. It forces the government to do research on endocrine disrupters. It forces the government to evaluate 23,000 substances in Canada.

It is a good bill and an important bill for the country. It is a win for the environment of the country.

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my second question is for the Minister of Health.

At a televised committee hearing on Wednesday of this week on pesticides, the pest management regulatory agency and various government departments explained regulatory actions for banned pesticides. In response to a NDP question to the director general of the DFO on the use of non-registered pesticides in fish pens in Canadians waters, he stated this was illegal.

This illegal use of pesticides was reported last year. Can the Minister of Health explain why he is ignoring the illegal use of pesticides in Canadian waters?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was not at the hearing, but I am sure a close examination of the transcript will show that the officials who testified are committed

to enforcing the laws that parliament passes, enforcing standards of safety in pesticides and dealing with environmental issues consistent with our objective, which is to maintain a safe environment for all Canadians.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, last night we received another two and a half inches of rain on already rain-soaked land.

In 1997 in the Red River Valley only 1,200 acres were affected. Right now, in my area of Manitoba, over two million acres are affected.

In 1997 the Government of Canada provided \$26 million to address farm losses in the Red River Valley. To date, the Minister of Agriculture has announced nothing, zero for the people who are being affected by this terrible disaster in southwestern Manitoba.

What is the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food going to do for those constituents of agriculture?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification for the hon. member, much of the assistance to the producers in the Red River Valley a couple years ago was part of a memorandum of understanding and part of a disaster funding assistance agreement. That is how much of that was handled at that time between the province and the federal government.

To date, the province of Manitoba has not asked to call on the disaster funding assistance agreement. It may or may not apply. It is up to the province to make its judgment call on that.

What I am doing is not leaving any stones unturned as far as looking at how we can use programs that are already in place and getting the flexibility in them that we can to assist these hard-pressed producers.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of rocks that can be unturned.

In the Red River Valley there was a program where \$10 per acre was allowed for custom seeding. There is a small window that a lot of these producers may well take advantage of if the minister would look at a program like that. He may want to look at the JERI program which would also help producers to recover some of their lost input. Those are the options and those are the programs.

I would ask that the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food reply to those and perhaps put them in place right now so that people can see their land.

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member and the producers

Oral Questions

that we are looking at every possible way to assist within existing programs. I will also be visiting the area a week from today.

I am not questioning the disaster situation that is there at the present time, but I will be reviewing that. I will also continue to discuss with my provincial colleagues, the industry people, provincial officials and my officials the different ways that we can help.

* * *

• (1155)

HEALTH CANADA

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

Many Canadians suffer from the disabling effects of conditions such as fibromyalgia and multiple chemical sensitivity. Can the minister tell the House what Health Canada is doing to help people suffering from these conditions?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all of us admire the initiative the member for Ottawa Centre took in putting a motion before the House on this subject. It is a motion that I am very proud to support.

Health Canada has been active for some time supporting members of the scientific community to try to find out the causes of these very difficult and often disabling diseases and working with sufferers and others to look for ways of treating them.

Recently, the Laboratory Centre for Disease Control at Health Canada has been working on issues of research to find out how we can learn more about causes, treatments and hopefully cures. Working in concert with those most affected by providing funding where necessary, Health Canada is committed to advancing the frontier—

The Speaker: The member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

* * *

NAV CANADA

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the conciliator's report on Nav Canada's dispute with the air traffic controllers was released on Monday. We could be facing a strike before the end of June.

Does the transport minister have any plan, other than the traditional Liberal approach to labour relations, which is heavy-handed, back to work legislation or essential services designation, to avoid a crippling shutdown of the aviation industry? Will he endorse final offer selection arbitration, a civilized approach in which the controllers have expressed interest?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the parties

intend to resume negotiations today. I would urge both sides to make every effort to settle their remaining differences.

* * *

[Translation]

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the decision making centre for the Farm Credit Corporation has been moved from Ste-Foy to Kanata, Guelph, Winnipeg and Regina. This meant the loss of 19 positions in my riding, which were filled by competent professionals providing service in both official languages. Only front line staff is now left in Quebec.

My question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food. Can the minister explain the reason for this decision, apart from distancing Quebec farmers from the policy centre and putting competent professionals out of work?

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we make any changes in the administration of the roles and duties of the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food in Canada, we do it in such a way that we can maintain the efficiency and effectiveness of it so that every producer in Canada and everybody in the agri-food industry can be treated fairly and equitably. Wherever the actual people are does not really matter because the department is there to service all Canadians and all of the industry in every province.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, six provinces are delivering AIDA directly to their farmers, while four, including Manitoba and Saskatchewan where the problems are worse, are being administered by the federal government.

Where the program is administered provincially, almost 60% of the claims have been processed and paid to date. It is a much different story where it is supposed to be administered by the Government of Canada. There were 3,815 claims as of June 1, three days ago, and only 115 claims paid. That is an abysmal rate of less than 3%.

Even allowing for start-up time, what is the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food doing to revamp and revitalize this fundamentally flawed program?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member points out the fact that applications are coming in now in response to all of us urging the producers to do that. The staff is working 12 hours a day, 6 days a week on a rotating basis so that we can make best use of the facilities, the administration and the equipment that we have.

Privilege

I can pledge to the hon. member that we are turning the applications around as quickly as we possibly can because we know the need that the producers have for the support.

* * *

[Translation]

KOSOVO

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the conflict in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, one element that existed prior to it were the sanctions imposed on Yugoslavia. During the conflict the economic and military sanctions were applied once again.

I would like to know the position of the Government of Canada with respect to an immediate lifting of the economic sanctions in order to permit the people of Yugoslavia, including those of Kosovo, to rebuild their country as quickly as possible. What is Canada's position on the removal of economic sanctions?

(1200)

[English]

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since this agreement was ratified by the Government of Yugoslavia it has initiated a flurry of political activity and meetings that are ongoing at the present time.

I say to the hon. member that it is rather premature to look at exactly what will come out of these meetings. There are meetings being held today, tomorrow, Sunday and into next week to put together the details of how this whole agreement will be worked out.

* * *

[Translation]

SAFE BOATING

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are very concerned about the nearly 200 deaths and 6,000 serious accidents that occur annually in pleasure boating. With National Safe Boating Week, which begins tomorrow, what measures will the Department of Fisheries and Oceans be taking to meet the concerns of Canadians?

[English]

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, DFO has consulted the boating community. With that input we have implemented stricter training requirements. We have implemented restrictions on age and horsepower to protect our youth from being killed in dangerous actions.

Promotion and boating safety awareness is key to the reduction of accidents and fatalities. I would like to take this opportunity to thank singer Loreena McKennitt for helping the Canadian Coast Guard to promote these new safety boating regulations.

POINTS OF ORDER

* * *

ONTARIO ELECTION

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Blackstrap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a point of national concern today. As I did not have access to the media last night or today, I wonder if someone in the House could inform me what the election results were in Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I will check with the clerk to see if that is indeed a point of order.

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, responding to that point of national interest, the Reform Party in Ontario yesterday got 93 votes.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I have given notice.

My question of privilege arises from a Canadian Press news story which appeared in today's *Globe and Mail* under the heading "Seal herds to be culled". It gives its source as the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands deliberately divulged information from an in camera meeting of the Standing Committee of Fisheries and Oceans held yesterday morning, at which the committee was discussing the draft report as related to our study of the east coast seal issue.

The story carried in the Globe and Mail reads as follows:

The size of Atlantic Canada's seal herd must be reduced to save depleted cod stocks, the Commons fisheries committee decided at a closed meeting yesterday where it rewrote a report on the industry.

• (1205)

The story continued:

"The committee, acting on recommendations from the Fisheries Resource Conservation Council, will urge the federal government to come up with a five year plan to reduce the size of the seal herd significantly", said Reform fisheries critic Gary Lunn.

I draw the attention of the Speaker to citation 851 of Beauchesne's sixth edition which states:

When a committee chooses to meet in camera, all matters are confidential. Any departure from strict confidentiality should be by explicit committee decision which should deal with what matters should be published, in which form and by whom.

Privilege

The statement attributed to the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands was not delivered in the heat of debate in the House. This was not a mistake in judgment or any kind of oversight. This was a deliberate act, and one which demonstrates a disrespect and contempt for the privileges not only of every member of the Standing Committee for Fisheries but of every member of the House.

As well, I was informed that there was a major interview on CBC in Newfoundland also divulging information that was talked about in that in camera meeting.

If you rule this to be a prima facie question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to move the appropriate motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): As all members know, the question of leaked committee reports in our parliament is one that has plagued virtually all committees and is of great concern to the Speaker.

I see the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands is in his place. In a moment I will ask him to put his comments on record and I invite anyone else who would like to put their comments on record to do so.

I will take the question of privilege under advisement and bring it to the attention of the Speaker who will in due course report back to the House.

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the fisheries committee with which I have been involved for the past year and a half has been plagued with this problem. In fact, some of the reports that we have done in the past have gone out of there by the truckload, by various people in various departments. We are never given a chance to respond and I agree it is a very serious problem.

In this specific case, the day before this report was in the public domain. It was in the media. It had been released.

Members never seem to get an opportunity to respond. In fairness, once this was in the public domain and I started to receive calls from reporters, I first of all notified the parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Malpeque. I also notified the member for Burin—St. George's in Newfoundland. I told them that my phone lines were burning up with media interviews and it was just to let them know that I was speaking to the media.

Out of courtesy I advised them that the report was out there. Of course we knew that. We talked about the committee. It was in the *Globe and Mail*. The report was already in the public domain.

When I did these interviews, what I talked to the media about was the comments that I had brought forward to the committee, not what other members of the committee had said. I talked about my comments, what I was pushing for in the committee. I made it very

clear. I said "This report is not completed. We will be meeting next week. These are the areas that I will be pushing for and I hope to get a recommendation".

I was speaking only on behalf of myself; but out of respect for the member, and he will verify it, I notified him prior to that, that I was making these comments.

With respect to the CBC interview, that person also informed me when she called that she had received calls from other members of the committee whom I will not name and said "This is what they are telling me. Would you like to comment?"

It was in the public domain the day before. As a courtesy I notified the members. I only did interviews with respect to my comments. I made it very clear that the report is still not final at this time, that it can still be changed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Much of what has gone on right now is debate that could take place within committee. The problem that we have is the question of trust within parliament as a whole in terms of the leaking of committee reports.

● (1210)

Committee work needs to take place in committee and perhaps the committee can look at this matter, make a recommendation and come back to parliament.

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, there is the issue of committee leaks. I think the Chair is quite correct, but this is quite aside from that.

Three or four weeks ago the hon. member for Provencher, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, accidentally released information from a committee and was forced to apologize on the floor of the House for something accidental and did so. The exact same thing was done deliberately this time and deserves no less consideration. That is the point that is different from the initial leak.

If there was a leak made by whoever it is who leaked it, and that is totally unacceptable as well, that is one matter. However, the matter of someone else deliberately after that saying "given that someone already leaked it I am exonerated from my obligations", is not correct. That is separate issue and I would ask the Chair, perhaps not now, but to review that matter as well.

Mr. Bill Matthews (Burin—St. George's, PC): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans I want to make a brief comment on what I consider to be a very serious problem which has plagued the work of the fisheries and oceans committee since I came here two years ago.

Every report gets leaked to some extent, but I think what differentiates this circumstance is that before the committee did not

Routine Proceedings

know who was leaking the reports and everyone was guessing it was everyone else. In this case I think what makes it different is that this time we know who gave the information to the news media. I think that makes it quite different.

This kind of thing undermines the work of the committee. It weakens the committee and in my view breaches the privilege of members of parliament.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I know you have not ruled on this matter and you may want to check into it in further depth before you do so. However, I agree with your preliminary comment, as Beauchesne's says, that reports from committees may be presented to the House. Beauchesne's says that the committee has the authority to report back to the House if it feels that its privileges have been compromised. By all means it is free to do so. I would encourage committee members to check into it if they want. I do believe that is the proper way to go about it.

It is true that the draft report of the committee was already in the public domain. Unfortunately, as has been mentioned before, I think every draft report of every committee in the House of Commons in a year has been released to the media.

We have a report from the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs that dealt with leaked reports, and that report was leaked to the press by someone before it was released. In other words, even that report having come to the House has not even yet been concurred in. The suggestions in that report are put forward as a means to try to help solve this continuous problem.

I urge the government as it considers this matter to take that report, look at the recommendations that are contained therein, and implement them as a first step toward solving the problem with continuing leaked reports.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I know the Speaker takes this matter very seriously. Aside from the specifics of this instance, the questions of trust between us as members of parliament and our ability to do our work in an atmosphere of trust are seriously affected when people in trust are not able to make a comment or ask a question in camera.

I know the Speaker takes this matter very seriously. I will consult with the Speaker. The Speaker will read the transcript and will make a decision on where it will go. I will recognize the Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and that will be it.

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to confirm what the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands said. He did send me a note yesterday saying that he would possibly be talking to the press based on the report. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, what I sent back and I confirm it. I said "This report has not been tabled yet and I would advise you that if you talk on this report you are in breach of parliament, in my view".

• (1215)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): That is it. It is over and I wish to thank everyone for their interventions. I understand that everyone takes this very seriously and I acknowledge the fact that we want to have an end to this.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

WAYS AND MEANS

NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 83(1), I wish to table a notice of ways and means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act, a related act, the Cultural Property Export and Import Act, the Customs Act, the Income Tax Act and the Tax Court of Canada Act.

I am also tabling explanatory notes and a background document and I ask that an order of the day be designated for consideration of the motion.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to seven petitions.

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

THE FAMILY

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased today to present two petitions signed by people from in and around the city of Edmonton, Alberta. Both petitions call for the same thing.

The petitioners would like parliament to pass legislation incorporating the rights of children and principles of equality between parents for the benefit of our children. The petitioners and I think that this kind of legislation would be an excellent opportunity for the justice minister to finally accomplish something.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Blackstrap, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present this morning from 54 people in my riding concerning the EI fund and its intended purposes.

MACKAY TASK FORCE

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Blackstrap, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I also have a petition containing 312 names of people in my riding who are asking the House to reject the recommendations of the MacKay task force with regard to the banking industry becoming involved in the insurance business.

Finally, I would like to say with regard to the point of order that was brought up that I think the question is not who leaked more, but rather—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Order, please. This is the time to present petitions.

REFUGEES

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to present a petition that was brought to me on the subject of undocumented convention refugees in Canada. The people who have signed this petition believe that the waiting period should be two years rather than the current five.

THE SENATE

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I also have a petition from residents of Winnipeg who believe that the Senate should be abolished and not reformed.

CANADA POST

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have another petition regarding Canada Post. These people believe that rural route mail couriers should have the right to form a union. They are the only group of workers in Canada who do not have the right to bargain collectively. Therefore, they would like the government to delete section 13(5) of the Canada Post Corporation Act.

* * *

• (1220)

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PRECLEARANCE ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill S-22, an act authorizing the United States to preclear travellers and goods

Government Orders

in Canada for entry into the United States for the purposes of customs, immigration, public health, food inspection and plant and animal health, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak today to Bill S-22, the preclearance bill.

I would like to state upfront that my only reservation is the fact that it was introduced in the Senate. Many of my colleagues have raised the same point. I do not think this bill has the same credibility, having been introduced by a body which is not elected and therefore not accountable to the Canadian people.

Many in this House would have liked the opportunity to speak to or speak longer to this bill. We are down to the wire with the closing of parliament and we have approximately one hour of debate at third reading, which makes it a bit difficult and also leads to some misunderstanding.

As the trade critic for the Reform Party, the official opposition, I think it is very important that this bill be passed as quickly as possible. The reason I say that is because of our tremendous trade relationship with the United States, our biggest trading partner. Over 83% of our exports go to the United States. Therefore, a lot of Canadian companies and Canadian business people are involved and they need increased ease of access.

The amount of trade export and imports between the United States and Canada is massive. We have the biggest trade relationship in the world. There is \$1.5 billion a day in trade crossing our border. It works well in most instances, but we have to continue to work to make it easier to do business across that important border.

I returned about three weeks ago from meetings with U.S. senators in the western states. There was a meeting in Great Falls, Montana. I saw the problems facing the border states and the border provinces. I saw sweet grass in Montana cross the line from Alberta. I saw thousands of Canadian trucks moving cattle into the western United States.

Commerce is going to do nothing but increase. We have a number of integrated economies. We see it continuing to develop. These economies include steel, the automotive sector and the cattle industry, and there are going to be more and more integrated economies with the United States in the future.

We are in the process of trying to negotiate a hemispheric free trade agreement, free trade for the Americas, which will bring South America, Central America and North America into one trade agreement. Therefore, there is all the more need for arrangements which make it easier for our business people to cross those borders in a timely fashion. Time means money and these people have to have ease of access. That is what this is really about.

This is a preclearance bill. Preclearance means that we do not have to clear customs in the United States. It can be done in Canada prior to boarding a flight to the United States, for example.

As my colleague said, as well as making it easier, it will build economies at some Canadian airports. Vancouver is a good case in point, where travellers coming from Asia will probably use the Vancouver airport to access the United States. We want to encourage that. We do not want to put roadblocks in the way. Hence, the need to have this preclearance bill.

I want to talk for a moment about the trends in trade. In the 1960s Canada exported approximately 60% of its goods to the United States. People were concerned about that. I remember at the time trade minister Allan MacEachen and Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson wanting to diversify that trade into other areas, Europe for example. However, that was not to be because Europe was looking inward to the European Union. We know the kind of arrangements they have there. They have a customs union, which means that the trucks do not even stop at the borders in the European Union. Commerce flows across those borders every day.

(1225)

I am not sure if that will ever happen between Canada and the United States, but we know that the trend is that more business people will be travelling and there will be closer linkages.

There is an excellent article today in the *Globe and Mail* by Heather Scoffield which suggests that integration is speeding up more and more and there are calls for tax harmonization and a common currency. We hear that right in this House.

The trend after the free trade agreement with the United States, and following that the NAFTA, is that more Canadian companies are looking for markets outside Canada. They see that a 30 million person market is not good enough to serve them in the future. They look at the big market south of the border and they want a piece of it.

In fact, because of the free trade agreement and the NAFTA with Canada, Mexico and the United States barriers have come down. That means that tariffs and duties have come down. Between Canada and the United States all duties are gone except for a couple of selective industries. Small Canadian companies which were doing business in Canada only had a protected market here because of high tariff walls. They no longer have those high tariff walls. There are companies from Mexico and United States that are looking at Canada as an attractive place to do business. There is fairly heavy competition for these Canadian companies right in their home market. Therefore, they have to look elsewhere for markets and they are looking into the United States and Mexico where duties have also disappeared.

I am suggesting that the trend will be to more movement of business between our three countries. As we expand free trade into the Americas, into the hemisphere, there will be more need to accelerate programs that can ease the way we do business in Canada and how we clear customs in this preclearance fashion so that goods are moved quickly.

I was at a conference in Mexico last year, five years after the NAFTA. There were legislators there from Canada, the United States and Mexico. I think all of us agreed that we will have to move quickly to try to remove any impediments that we can to the movement of goods and services, and people.

The air cargo industry made excellent points. The way business was conducted some time ago in Canada was that small companies would build a product which they would sell in their home community, and that was it. Things have changed. Those companies started looking at bigger markets, the province and the country. Now, with barriers gone, those small companies are building products and are sending them to destinations all over the world, and they want it done in a timely manner. Hence, the growth in air cargo. Products are being shipped by plane.

Companies want legislation such as Bill C-54, the electronic commerce bill. I would suggest to the government that it is important to have that bill passed quickly. There are a lot of Canadian companies that are asking for that electronic commerce bill to be passed because it will speed up how they can get paid for their products. That is what this is all about.

Bill S-22, although I disagree with its origins, is a good bill. It needs to have speedy passage and our party will support it.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

● (1230)

CARRIAGE BY AIR ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-23, an act to amend the Carriage by Air Act to give effect to a Protocol to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air and to give effect to the Convention, Supplementary to the Warsaw Convention, for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air Performed

by a Person Other than the Contracting Carrier, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Hon. Allan Rock (for the Minister of Transport) moved that the bill be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Allan Rock (for the Minister of Transport) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill S-23 on the occasion of its third reading in the House.

On May 27 the members of the Standing Committee on Transport examined the proposed legislation in detail and voted unanimously to send it forward for third reading. I thank my colleagues for having dealt with this bill so expeditiously.

Members will recall that the purpose of Bill S-23 is to amend the Carriage by Air Act so Canada can officially ratify and become a party to two international instruments dealing with air carrier liability, those being Montreal protocol No. 4 and the Guadalajara convention. These two documents update and modernize elements of the Warsaw convention which sets out the legal rights and responsibilities of the carrier, passengers and shippers in relation to international air transportation.

This bill will enhance air carrier liability coverage and requirements.

Montreal protocol No. 4 amends the liability regime as it applies to cargo by providing stricter carrier liability and establishing maximum limits. It also simplifies the cargo documentation requirements and authorizes the electronic transmission of information. This transmission of cargo information usually means other than the traditional multicopy air waybill and will provide significant cost savings to carriers and shippers.

It has become extremely important that Canada act quickly to see to this protocol as it came into effect internationally in June 1998. This means that until Canada has been able to deposit its own ratification documents and have the protocol come into effect in Canada, our carriers and our shippers are at a competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis their counterparts.

The Guadalajara convention on the other hand clarifies the relationship between passengers and shippers for the first part and carriers for the other. This convention is already widely in force. It distinguishes the contracting carrier from the carrier performing

the carriage on its behalf and sets out the varying liability of each. This sharing of the liability between contracting and operating carrier when they are not the same has become increasingly important as international carriers, including both Air Canada and Canadian Airlines, join together in global commercial alliances and carry each other's passengers.

Both Montreal protocol No. 4 and the Guadalajara convention have the unanimous support of the aviation industry. The industry supports Bill S-23 without reservation and urges parliament to pass the bill as quickly as possible.

• (1235)

I conclude by saying that the intent of Bill S-23 is both timely and non-controversial. It will provide clarity and certainty not only for our Canadian carriers, but for the international carriers with whom they co-operate or compete. It should reduce the potential for litigation and bring improved economies of time and cost to carriers and shippers.

We should move quickly to adopt this short but important bill. To delay would be to increase the length of time our carriers will be at a competitive disadvantage.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to briefly address Bill S-23, an act to amend the Carriage by Air Act.

This is routine legislation to amend the Carriage by Air Act and bring Canada into line with other countries in order to implement Montreal protocol No. 4 and the Guadalajara supplementary convention. These were themselves extensions of earlier agreements, the Warsaw convention of 1929, which is the basis of all rules governing international carriage by air, and The Hague protocol of 1995 which updated the Warsaw convention.

Among other things, the Montreal protocol simplifies and decreases cargo documentation and brings air billing into the 20th century by authorizing electronic transmission of documents. Unfortunately, it took 23 years to round up the requisite 30 national ratifications of the protocol in 1998, but at least the new rules are in place for the 21st century. It is now imperative that Canada get on board to help its carriers remain competitive.

The protocol also clarifies limits of carrier liability in order to avoid complex international conflict over the settlement of claims. A carrier will be responsible for damages even if it is not overtly negligent, but on the other hand, it cannot be assessed for damages beyond a mandated maximum even in the event of gross negligence. Thus both shipper and carrier are protected from catastrophic losses.

The Guadalajara convention extends the rules of the Warsaw convention to carriage performed by a carrier other than the one

with whom the passenger or shipper actually entered into his contract. Why we are adopting this convention 38 years after its initiation is beyond me. The mills of the gods may turn slowly, but compared to the adoption of international rules with respect to air cargo, they are spinning wildly. In any event the bill is now before us and I urge the House to pass it without further ado.

My only serious problem with this legislation derives from its origin down the hall in what, because we are not allowed to call it by its proper name, I generally refer to as hog hollow. Some members refer to it as the other place. The hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans refers to it as the other house. Perhaps outhouse would be more appropriate.

The Senate as currently constituted has no legitimacy and it is not supported by the people of Canada. Nobody elected it and although I would be the first to admit that it does include a few hard working and public spirited individuals, it is overflowing with defeated Liberal and Tory candidates, retired bagmen and other assorted political hacks. At the moment it even has a couple of convicted felons clutched to its bosom.

One might think that because I so thoroughly dislike the institution as currently constituted that I would share the view of those MPs including the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs who at one time or another have called for its abolition. Not at all. The Fathers of Confederation created the institution for a good reason. That reason, although they referred to it as sober second thought, was really to protect the citizens of Canada from their own duly elected legislature.

(1240)

Now that the House of Commons has degenerated into a rubber stamp for an elected dictatorship, we need an effective Senate more than we ever did. Right now it is not protecting anybody. Why not? Because its appointed Liberal majority has become a mere extension of the PMO, a yes sir, of course sir institution, as malleable and ineffective as the Liberal backbench.

The answer to the problem is not to precipitously trash the institution. The answer is to fix it. The ideal Senate would be a triple E Senate, elected, effective and equal. This is a concept I heartily endorse. I realize there are barriers to getting such an institution and that these barriers are formidable since this would require a major constitutional amendment requiring the consent of all provinces. But reform can proceed as it did in the U.S.A., incrementally.

The United States did not always elect its senators. As a matter a fact the first state to do so was the state of Oregon around the turn of the century. Once it set the precedent, the idea caught fire. It was only about a decade before all of the then lower mainland states had fallen into line.

One E, effective, already exists in theory in the Canadian Senate because the Senate has great power under our constitution. However, it is not generally exercised because of the institution's illegitimacy.

The second E, elected, requires no change other than a change in the heart of the Prime Minister. We have already had one highly respected elected senator, the late Stan Waters. We have right now revved up and ready to come to Ottawa two Alberta senators in waiting who were elected at large by the electors of the entire province of Alberta, Mr. Ted Morton and Mr. Burt Brown. However, the government of today refuses to recognize the wishes and desires of the people of Alberta and those two senators, even though senators—

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. member going to deal with this piece of legislation at any point in time in his diatribe?

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I must ask the hon. member who has the floor to try to be more careful in the words that he chooses when he speaks of the other place and also to debate the bill before the House.

Mr. Lee Morrison: Madam Speaker, had the hon. member for Brandon—Souris had his ears open, he would have heard me speaking at some length on the details of the bill. I am sure the hon. parliamentary secretary will confirm that.

There is a direct relevance and connection between the use of the Senate as a vehicle for transmitting bills to the House and the bill which was actually transmitted. To me this is a fairly logical connection.

This is a matter of grave importance to the people of Canada. Nothing is more important at the end of the day than the way in which we are governed. All of the other decisions that are made hang on that particular aspect of our lives. If we do not have a good framework for government we cannot have good government. That is fairly simple.

• (1245)

I would reiterate that I never again want to see important legislation coming to the House from that other place and, in effect, taking over the powers of the House of Commons. This is not right. It is not done to my knowledge in the mother of parliaments on which we base our procedures here. It is high time that we brought ourselves into the 20th century and have in the Government of Canada an elected, effective and, hopefully one day, equal Senate.

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to speak directly to Bill S-23. Everyone has concerns

about the origin of the bill, but we also have to acknowledge to Canadians and to parliamentarians that the bill is to amend the Carriage by Air Act. Canada passed the Carriage by Air Act in 1947 to enact the 1929 Warsaw Convention. Back then, we had biplanes.

Flying to orbit the globe, as Ms. Payette, one of our honourable Canadians, has done and who is now on her way back home, and this whole evolution of air transportation and aerospace transportation is now before us. However, with this modernization came two agreements: the 1988 Montreal protocol and the 1961 Guadalajara convention.

This modernization by amending the Carriage by Air Act is long overdue. The last update, as we said, was over 40 years ago. We have challenges before us in this whole development.

I would like to place a challenge before the House, the government and I guess the Senate. Perhaps there was shortsightedness in the Senate, or perhaps the day was a little blurry or a little too busy, but I think it has overlooked a major issue, a passenger bill of rights for Canadians. We recently witnessed the drafting of such a bill of rights in the United States which will protect the rights of passengers.

The bill is not only about modernizing the whole issue of primary carrier responsibilities. If I board an Air Canada plane tonight and I then have to switch planes, which happens to be Canadian Airlines or Athabaska Airways, the primary responsibility for any rights or liabilities I have would rest with the primary air carrier, which would be Air Canada. Whichever carrier owns the plane I first board becomes the primary carrier. This is highlighted in the bill.

The Montreal protocol is very interesting. It allows air carriers to now use new technology to transmit documents electronically and updates the currency references in the conventions from French francs to the International Monetary Fund of conversion units.

I would like to speak about the first issue of new technology and the whole issue of the environment and how much paper is being wasted on the issue of air transportation in the country.

When we board a plane today, our plane tickets and boarding passes are all made out of flimsy paper that is derived from the fibre of trees. With the millions of passengers, not only in Canada but worldwide, this whole issue has to emerge to a new format. It could be done through the electronic monitoring of passengers in some shape or form, either by card registry or as we do with Interac. A few years ago we dreamed of not seeing a plastic based currency but it is now a reality.

This bill amending the Carriage by Air Act will require and challenge the air transportation industry in Canada to look at the new technologies that will be available for them to be competitive.

● (1250)

In my closing comments, I will speak about competitiveness. I read an article about Canada being pushed on several fronts toward integration with the United States. There is a fear that our Canadian airlines, such as Air Canada and Canadian, would be swallowed up and integrated into an American interest in the future.

We are here to protect our sovereign rights and to make our rules, regulations and passenger bill of rights. We must protect our needs and our industries and make them competitive. One way of doing it is by bringing this forward into the House and by regulating and modernizing our laws.

Unfortunately, the bill before us originated in the Senate and it might be a little shortsighted in terms of not expounding on a bill of rights. If there are opportunities for the government and the minister to possibly amend this bill, it should be done in the near future. Maybe in this parliament we will see that take place here in Canada.

A passenger bill of rights and electronic forms of transactions for passengers, which will eliminate the use of cutting down trees for paper, will protect our aviation industry and the rights of passengers.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Madam Speaker, I do not wish to take up an extraordinary amount of the House's time, but I would like to speak on behalf of our transportation critic for Cumberland—Colchester.

I would like to take a moment to express our support for Bill S-23. The bill not only receives our support but the support of the Air Transport Association of Canada, a body representing the major airlines and many cargo operators as well. The industry regards this legislation as long overdue and essential for the modernization and commercial viability of Canadian commercial aviation.

I would be remiss if I did not respond briefly to the member from the Reform Party who suggested that because the bill is an S-bill that came from the Senate that perhaps it does not provide a good service for Canadians. Nothing could be further from the truth. Not everybody has a lock on all the ideas. The Reform members should certainly recognize that because, quite frankly, I do not believe they have a lock on any good ideas.

The Senate, in its wisdom, decided to bring forward a piece of legislation that is needed and necessary in the industry. The bill amends the Carriage by Air Act by implementing two international agreements respecting air flights, the Montreal Protocol No. 4 and the Guadalajara Supplementary Convention.

These multilateral agreements modernize the rules regarding airline liability for passengers and cargo, and also simplify docu-

mentation for the international carriage of that cargo. They were originally established under the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and its amendment, the Hague Protocol of 1955.

The Montreal Protocol No. 4 deals exclusively with cargo. It provides that a carrier is liable for damages to cargo to the limits of the liability, but only after those damages have been estimated. As a result, the carrier cannot escape liability by taking all necessary precautions and cannot be assessed damages beyond the maximum limit, even in the event of gross negligence.

Another important feature of Protocol No. 4 is that it changes airline liability for damage to cargo on board an aircraft by removing the requirement that a plaintiff prove that the airline was at fault. Together, these changes will reduce the litigation and contribution to controlling costs associated with insurance and cargo rates.

The Montreal Protocol No. 4 came into effect in the United States in March of this year and thus puts U.S. carriers at a competitive advantage over Canadian carriers.

The Guadalajara Convention clarifies the relationship between passengers and shippers on the one hand and air carriers on the other. It is also widely in force and clarifies the application of the Warsaw Convention to situations where the contract of carriage was made by a carrier that did not actually perform some or all of the carriage by air.

Bill S-23 has received unanimous support. I say that again. Bill S-23 has received unanimous support. All potentially affected parties, including carriers and their associations, the Air Transport Association of Canada, manufacturers, shippers, tour operators, consumers and the legal profession were consulted.

• (1255)

As I have stated, the legislation is long overdue. All aspects of the bill are already in practice worldwide. Canadian carriers and airlines realize it is good business, so does the PC Party. We support the bill and urge quick passage.

Because it came from the Senate does not mean that it is an inferior piece of legislation. What it means is that it was brought forward by a group of individuals who saw a need, reacted to that need and brought it forward to this House.

The Reform Party will never accept that. It never has, it never will and it never can accept that principle. Quite frankly, it is very frustrating for not only myself but most Canadians.

We will support the bill regardless of the letter on it because it is the right thing to do.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

FIRST NATIONS LAND MANAGEMENT ACT

Hon. Allan Rock (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved the second reading of, and concurrence in, amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-49, an act providing for the ratification and the bringing into effect of the Framework Agreement on First Nation Land Management.

Mr. David Iftody (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak once again in this place to Bill C-49, the First Nations Land Management Act.

I would like to inform my colleagues that I will not be exercising the full time allocation to speak to this. I thank the members across the way for agreeing to move quickly so that we can proceed with the bill. I also have a colleague from the Bloc who wishes to speak to this after I have concluded.

I want to say that we thank the members in the other place, the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs in the Senate, for their very constructive work on the bill. We met with them and made representations to them and they to us. We have understood one another and clearly worked out what I think are some of the more contentious elements of the bill.

I am pleased to state that I believe when the bill comes forward hopefully next week that we will again have unanimous support in the House.

I would ask my Reform Party colleagues to join with all of us in the House of Commons to once again support this very important legislation, which will move along in those 14 first nations in respect to areas of land management. It will deal with the very important topic of private sector investment so that they too can participate in the 21st century. It will ameliorate the poverty and the concerns that are expressed here every day in the House by the opposition, particularly the Reform Party, raising those even again this morning on those questions. This will deal with those matters in a very capable way and will act as a precise instrument to move those first nations to places where we all want them to be, which is to participate in Canada and become full members in that process.

With that, I will thank my colleagues for their help here this morning. I look forward to their help again next week when the bill comes back before the House.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill C-49 and the amendments that have been passed in the Senate.

The reason the bill went to the Senate for amendments was that the Liberal government did not have the courage, or maybe I should say did not want to admit to the serious flaws in the bill when they were brought to their attention late last fall and again early in the spring.

(1300)

These flaws were not only brought to the attention of the government by the Reform Party but by many Canadians, particularly aboriginal Canadians across Canada and especially those in my home province of British Columbia.

The Senate amendments are a small step in the right direction. They certainly are an improvement to the bill. We had three major concerns with Bill C-49 which we presented to the government in December 1998 and again in the spring 1999. They had to do with the vast expropriation powers granted under the legislation; the lack of matrimonial property rights, particularly for aboriginal women; and the fact that there was no requirement on the part of aboriginal bands and adjacent municipalities to consult with one another on areas of mutual concern and interest when it came to development issues such as sewer, water and road projects and so on

The bill came back from the Senate. It addresses in a small way our concern with respect to its expropriation powers. However, it does absolutely nothing to address our concerns with respect to the disposition of matrimonial property in the event of a marriage breakdown. It does nothing to address the concerns of adjacent municipalities that wish to be consulted and are quite willing to provide an obligation to consult them on issues of joint concern when it comes to land development.

I will talk a bit about private property rights issues, a key question aboriginal people living on reserves in Canada face today. Aboriginal people do not enjoy property rights like all other Canadians when they choose to live on reserve. The reserve lands are owned collectively. They are not even owned by the band council, by the band or by the collectivity of the particular tribe or tribal council. The underlying title is vested in the crown, which is to say the federal Government of Canada.

When there are no private property rights there cannot be a proper disposition in the event of marriage breakdown. There is not even the ability to provide an inheritance for children and their children when it comes to the house or property parents have resided in all their lives.

Government Orders

Speaking to that point for a minute, I had an opportunity to meet a wonderful lady several months ago. I hope she is watching today. Her name is Mazie Baker and she comes from the Squamish reserve. She has been fighting for a long time for the right to be able to pass along to her children the house in which she has lived all her life, the house she grew up in, the house she considers her home but to which she has no title. She does have a certificate of possession but she does not have title to the home because there is no such thing as title on reserve. There are no private property rights.

Mazie is very concerned about Bill C-49. She is representative of many aboriginal people living on reserve we have talked to. I spent a couple of hours with her in Vancouver in February this year. She asked me how the fruits of her labour, the house that means everything to her and her family, where they had their Christmas and Thanksgiving dinners together, could be passed on to her children if there were no property rights. Then she looked at Bill C-49 and said that it was not taking her closer to a private property right, that it was taking her further away.

(1305)

The bill is concentrating the decision making power of who is to possess what land and live in what house on reserve in the hands of chief and council. Band members will be dependent on the good will and the sense of fairness and justice of the band council.

In many cases band councils will be fair about it but in other cases they will not. That is human nature. I would not want to be dependent on the municipality I live in right now to be fair about the inheritance of the property I own by my children. I would not want to be dependent on them. I would want something firm and solid, a property right, but that is not granted on reserve.

I want to talk about what happens in the event of a marriage breakdown. Aboriginal women in Canada do not enjoy the same rights as all other Canadian women. I could provide many examples. I think I may have spoken about the case of an aboriginal lady who splits from her husband but it bears repeating.

In the last election I was campaigning in Prince Rupert, a significant community in my riding. A relatively young aboriginal lady came up to me in tears and asked whether I could help. I asked her what was the problem and said I would see what I could do. She had three young children all below the age of 10. If my memory serves me right, two of them were below the age of 5.

Her husband had left her on her own. She could not get a job because she had to look after her kids. Her husband was not paying any child support. He was making good money. He was a fisherman.

I asked why she did not do what what everybody else does, go to court and get a court order forcing him to pay child support. That is

what we do in Canada. That is how we protect not the women but the children. That is what it is all about.

She said that she went to court and obtained a court order, but he moved back on to the reserve where the court order was not enforceable.

How is that fair to this woman and thousands of other women who end up in the same situation? How can Canadians sit back and say this is the best country in the world in which to live when that kind of inequity exists?

If one spends time talking with aboriginal people and visiting them on reserve and off reserve, one will find out that most often when an aboriginal woman marries a man she moves on to his reserve. Most of these communities are small communities with small populations, so he is living in a community where he is either related to or has a very close association with some of the people on the band council.

They live in a house which is not owned by them but by the band. They may get a certificate of possession if they are lucky, but the band decides who will live where. People in the community do not decide that; the band council decides that.

Let us take the situation of a couple that is married for some 5, 10 or 15 years. For whatever reason marriages breakdown, they decide to live apart and their marriage is dissolved. In that situation who will be out on the street?

Most of the time it is the woman because she has no private property rights. She is not protected by any of the other laws that protect Canadian women from coast to coast. The chief and council make the administrative decision about who will retain possession and custody of the house.

Is that what we in Canada want to see? Is that fair to women who are already dependent on government because of the paternalistic system that has been constructed around aboriginal people over the last 130 years?

• (1310)

Is it fair for the Government of Canada to do that? I would argue that it is not. I would argue that we have a very serious moral and possibly even legal obligation. Certainly we have a moral obligation to make sure that aboriginal women who end up in that situation are protected.

Bill C-49 does nothing to address that issue. It puts the decision making power in land management and land use in an even more concentrated form into the hands of the chief and council. How will that advance the cause of aboriginal women?

I know all parliamentarians have received pleas for help from aboriginal women. The Aboriginal Women's Association of British Columbia and the Aboriginal Women's Association of Canada have come to us. We were not the ones who raised the issue. These people came to us when they became aware of Bill C-49. They came to me and to my colleagues on all sides of the House and asked us not to compromise their interests but to do something in the bill to protect them so they have the right not only to protection for themselves but for their children.

When a marriage breaks down, most often it is the woman who ends up with the care and custody of the children. We said this to the government last fall in the debate on Bill C-49. In committee we asked the government to rethink the bill and to include some clauses in the legislation that would provide some guaranteed protection for aboriginal women in the event of marriage breakdown.

Some kind of property right should be included even if it is not the fee simple land ownership the rest of us enjoy, something that moves further in the direction of the private property rights we all enjoy. The government said no, that it would leave that up to the chief. It did not want to interfere in what the chief and council were doing.

We have an obligation. We live in a democracy. The party across the way and some of the other parties in the House have lost sight of this fact. I say very seriously that in a democracy we ought to have a deeper commitment and a deeper obligation to the rights of individuals over the rights of collectivities.

That is the crux of what is wrong with the bill. It speaks to the rights of collectivities. I know our friends in the NDP would be happy with that because they believe very much in collectivities. We believe in individual rights. Democracies are founded on the principle of individual rights. The bill is not founded on the basic principles of democracy. It talks about buttressing and strengthening collective rights.

There are collectivities in all democracies and there is nothing wrong with collectivities. The Reform Party of Canada is a collectivity of some sort. There is no question that collectivities are legitimate and have a place in society, but we must ensure individual rights supersede collective rights.

The government across the way has been in government for most of the past 30 years but not all of it. Our friends close to the door were in government for about 9 of those years. However our friends in the Liberal Party have lost their way.

Back in the latter part of the 19th century liberalism meant something completely different from what it means in modern day terms. A liberal in the latter part of the 19th century was a person who was very much committed to the notion of individual rights, a person who was very much committed to the equality of all people in society. They have lost this and the bill reflects that point very clearly.

I will talk a bit about what happened when the bill went to the Senate. The government and some of its backbenchers, actually the member for Vancouver—Quadra made statements that were printed in the Vancouver newspapers. He talked about the fact that this bill was seriously flawed and needed to be fixed. He said that before the bill went to the Senate. The government did not have the courage and not just that, I submit it did not want to suffer the embarrassment of acknowledging in the House that the bill was flawed. It would put its own political interests ahead of doing what was right.

(1315)

What the government did is it made some backroom deal. The evidence of that is everywhere now. It has spilled out to the media. Some of the government's own backbenchers said they were not going to deal with the problems in this bill in the House. They said they would send it over there and instruct the Senate to bring in the amendments to fix it. So the government sent the bill to the Senate as it was unwilling to address the serious flaws in the bill.

An hon. member: We cannot instruct the Senate.

Mr. Mike Scott: The member says we cannot instruct the Senate. He knows full well that the Prime Minister is the one who appoints the senators and the senators are beholden to the him. He knows full well that the Senate will do the Prime Minister's bidding virtually every time. That is one of the problems my colleague from Cypress Hills was alluding to a few minutes ago.

The government sent the bill to the senate. A backroom deal was made and the government got the Liberal senators to agree to propose amendments to it.

The Senate decided to hold committee hearings on the bill. We found out about this and made sure that the people who had approached us, the Aboriginal Women's Society of Canada, the Aboriginal Women's Society of British Columbia, Mazie Baker and Wendy Lundberg from Vancouver had the knowledge that this would be in front of the Senate. They came to Ottawa and testified in front of the Senate. I could not sit in on all the Senate committee meetings unfortunately because my parliamentary duties would not allow it, but I sat in on as many as I could. It was an eye opener to hear what those ladies had to say.

Judging by the looks on some of the faces of the senators, they were absolutely astounded and had no idea how to deal with this. It was almost as if everybody was afraid to say that the emperor has no clothes. I can assure everyone that the emperor has no clothes. We cannot pass this kind of legislation on the one hand and on the other hand say that we are concerned about the rights of aboriginal women. The two are incompatible.

These women came from British Columbia and other parts of Canada and made presentations to the committee. They were very compelling in the arguments they advanced and in the stories they told in their own languages and in their own words. They were plain spoken, direct and no nonsense. They did not use six and seven syllable legalese terms. They talked about how it affected them, their families and their children. The senators sat and listened.

I talked to some of the senators. I did have personal contact with some of the senators on this. Many of them felt at a loss as to what they could do. I think the Liberal senators, who are a majority in the other place right now, were instructed by the minister and her department as to what they could or could not do in terms of amendments. Judging by the amendments we see today, I think the minister gave them a very short leash.

There are some changes with respect to expropriation but they are not sufficient by half. There is nothing with respect to marriage breakdown and marital property. There is nothing with respect to inheritance and nothing with respect to any kind of requirement for adjacent municipalities and aboriginal communities to have some kind of consultation when it comes to property development.

I want to talk for a minute about what happens when government passes this kind of legislation without wanting to think about what the ramifications are. Some of its members are very intelligent people. They do not act like it a lot of the time but I know them and they are very capable people. I submit that at times they do not want to look into the future, they do not want to admit what the net effect of these policies are going to be.

(1320)

Let us look at what happens when government deals in this kind of legislation without that kind of consideration.

Back in 1965 the Government of Canada, the department of Indian affairs, encouraged the Musqueam band to get into the land development business. The Musqueam band owned a piece of property located in Vancouver. There was nothing on it. I am sure this is how it happened. The Department of Indian Affairs told the band that since it did not need this property it should subdivide it and lease it out.

The band, the department and a private enterprise developer in Vancouver entered into a deal. The Department of Indian Affairs signed on behalf of the band. It signed on behalf of the Government of Canada actually because the property is still in the name of the crown. The Musqueam leaseholders came into being. That was in 1965.

When the master lease was signed in 1965, 74 leasehold properties were created. The department of Indian affairs signed the master lease and all of the subleases. The master lease governs the entire 74 properties but each individual property is considered a sublease.

Once the department of Indian affairs had signed the master lease people living in Vancouver started to buy the leases. At the time it cost \$18,000 to buy a lease and people had an obligation to pay so many dollars a year. The lease price for this land was negotiated in 1965 at about \$350 a year but on top of that property taxes had to be paid. It was a 99 year lease with the initial term being 30 years. It was up for renegotiation in 1995.

The people living in these houses believed they had a 99 year lease with a 30 year term which would be renegotiated in 1995. They believed they were dealing with the department of Indian affairs, the Government of Canada. They thought they could not go wrong. Surely the Government of Canada would never do anything to compromise good taxpaying Canadians, some of whom were veterans of World War II. The Government of Canada would never do anything to compromise their interests.

In 1980 the federal government, the minister of Indian affairs signed a deal without giving any notice, without any consultation or discussion with the leaseholders and transferred the federal government's authority for the leases over to the band. Nobody was aware of this except the band. No disclosure was made at all.

Through the 1980s and into the early 1990s people continued to buy and sell houses which everyone understood were on leased land. Nobody ever bothered to tell the leaseholders that this huge change in administrative authority had taken place. It was done under section 53 of the Indian Act which the minister of Indian affairs at the time was empowered to do, but there was no disclosure.

In 1991 the federal government signed a further deal with the Musqueam band allowing it to enter into direct taxation for property taxes on these leases. Until that time there was a deal between the federal government, the band and the municipality of Vancouver wherein the municipality of Vancouver would provide the services and collect the taxes.

In 1991 the band became the property tax collector. It passed on some of the money to the city of Vancouver because the city of Vancouver had to be paid for the services it was delivering. The residents had no knowledge that this was going to happen. There was no consultation. It was just done. It was done without their knowledge as a fait accompli.

• (1325)

After it was a fait accompli residents became aware of it very quickly. Their property taxes skyrocketed. The band since that time has been collecting property taxes. It will argue that it is not collecting school taxes, but I would argue it is collecting much higher levels of taxes now than what was collected when the city of Vancouver was the property tax assessor and collector.

The band is not providing school services to those residents. It is not turning over any of the tax revenues it is collecting to the Government of British Columbia in aid of providing school services for the children of the leaseholders who live on that reserve. In some cases it has almost as much as tripled the property taxes these people pay.

In the municipality in which I live, and all municipalities are the same, property taxes are not there as some kind of cash cow for the municipality to do whatever it wants. Taxes are tied to the services the municipality delivers. Municipalities by law are not allowed to run either a deficit or a surplus. They collect only as much taxes as are required for them to operate the municipality on an annualized basis. I would submit that because the people who pay the property taxes in municipalities get to elect their municipal councillors, these people are also very accountable for how those tax dollars are spent.

We have a completely different situation in Musqueam. There are 74 people who are paying property taxes to the Musqueam band council but they are not allowed to vote for any of the band councillors. They are not allowed to run for office. In fact, they are not legally entitled to even show up at the council meetings. Now I ask, is that a very wise decision on the part of government?

This is why I am very concerned about this bill. The government makes decisions and it does not consider the long term impact of those decisions. On the Musqueam reserve, because of this taxation policy, there is the absolutely unbearable prospect of taxation without representation. The American break from Great Britain happened over taxation without representation. That is how important it is to people.

Do we in Canada think we are so clever and so intelligent that we can reinvent these failed policies and somehow make them work? I do not understand the thinking behind this. There are far too many people involved in the policy making decisions in this country, particularly in the bureaucracy around here, who are clever, well educated and totally impractical and who totally blind themselves to history.

I would submit that the Musqueam leaseholders story in the chronicles of modern Canadian history is an absolute nightmare. It is absolutely beyond my ability to comprehend. I have gone there and met with the leaseholders. I know what kind of pain and suffering these people have been through and are still going through.

A fellow the other day sent me the lease bill he had just received from the Musqueam band. His lease bill was \$74,000 for the property that his house is on. There was a tiny little polite note at the bottom to please pay it within 30 days. Is that not interesting? I wonder how the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development would like it if we sent her a bill like that. I wonder how

anybody else in the House would feel if they received a bill like that.

We have to be so politically correct we are not even supposed to discuss these issues in the House of Commons. We are not even supposed to raise these issues.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member.

[Translation]

It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business according to the order indicated in today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1330)

[English]

NATURAL GAS

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should provide initiatives to deliver natural gas to unserviced regions, to address environment concerns and high energy costs.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am truly proud to rise to speak to my first private member's bill of the 36th Parliament on behalf of Canadians in the riding of Churchill River, Saskatchewan, and all Canadians.

The initiative of Motion No. 292, which was deemed votable, will be a benefit which all Canadians will be able to enjoy, as well as future generations.

Motion No. 292 reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should provide initiatives to deliver natural gas to unserviced regions, to address environment concerns and high energy costs.

Canada is the third largest producer of natural gas. Without a doubt, continuing developments and discoveries such as the Northwest Territories and Sable Island fields will ensure that a fair share of our natural gas resources will be distributed in the country, not

only in royalties or opportunities but the distribution of natural gas itself.

Natural gas presently is distributed to more than four million customers in six provinces. Natural gas provides 26% of Canada's energy needs and this number is increasing each year.

In addition, Canada's natural gas exports are experiencing exponential growth. When we have natural gas exports it means we have surplus supply. In terms of trade we must take care of our own families first before we share with the rest of the world. That is the whole context of sharing with unserviced areas of this country.

We share our natural gas with major cities in the south, but there are entire regions of this country that do not have natural gas service which are being disadvantaged because of lost economic development opportunities. Natural gas provides an opportunity for economic development in unserviced regions. When major industries and manufacturing companies, pulp mills, sawmills, grocery stores, schools, hospitals and university campuses calculate the energy costs of certain communities and certain neighbourhoods, energy is the major portion of their high cost of maintaining these facilities. If natural gas were to be provided equally to certain neighbourhoods, certain communities and certain regions, this disadvantage would not be there. Not having this service is detrimental to job creation, community growth and community maintenance.

I believe that we as parliamentarians can contribute to the progress of this country into the next millennium. We have the opportunity to ensure that all regions can afford the economic and environmental benefits that natural gas presents. There are several options to look at. The biggest option for us to consider when natural gas is being distributed is that it is one of the cheapest and most economically sound of all the fossil fuels.

The fossil fuel industry in Canada has been a growing and vibrant industry. However, in recent years greenhouse gas emissions and the Kyoto protocol have challenged what we can do in the future. The first thing we can do is consider the cleanest of the fossil fuels, which is natural gas. This should be shared with all our communities so that we make a conscious effort to use heat and energy without polluting in the extreme our environment and our children's health.

At Kyoto I had an opportunity to look at the future development of the Kyoto protocol and its implications. One of the issues that I would like to raise is the domestic greenhouse emission credits that should be considered. When Europe considered the Kyoto negotiations it considered itself a bubble, so that certain regions of economic and industrial development would not suffer in terms of their commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Canada has to look at itself as a bubble as well. There are regions that are heavily dependent on fossil fuels, on coal-fired electrical generation and on the coal industry. Greenhouse gas is another consideration. We could equalize these industries. We could normalize our total output and meet our commitments.

(1335)

The scary side of emission credits is that if we continue to increase our greenhouse gases we will be paying hard cash to other countries when they diminish their greenhouse gases in the future. This credit trading will be a major issue. I would rather see that hard earned Canadian cash invested in our own communities.

Any initiative to increase a cleaner carbon source is of course environmentally sound. As part of environment week, I am very honoured to raise Motion No. 292. There should be a conscious effort by parliamentarians to rally behind this motion and to challenge the federal government to undertake initiatives to share our natural resources.

Access to cleaner fuels is an economic advantage, but it is also a major win. The Kyoto credits would be another win. In terms of air pollution there is another consideration which we cannot overlook and that is health care. There are health care costs such as asthma and other illnesses caused by air pollution in our communities and neighbourhoods, especially in major urban centres. If there is any way we could reduce air pollution it would be a major win for the health care of the country.

In terms of high cost, there are far northern communities which do not have natural gas. There are major subsections of our communities, even here in Ottawa, which do not have natural gas, especially in older sections of town. Maybe the older sections of Montreal, Halifax, Toronto, Vancouver, Edmonton and Calgary have been overlooked, but some of them have been served for many years and it is taken for granted.

I ask that parliamentarians consider all Canadians in an equal light and share our natural gas. Families could realize savings against the high cost of living, not only those living in remote areas but those living in the high cost regions of the country. Savings would be made on the maintenance of their homes. Canada has a northern climate where 40 below is a natural phenomenon in January and after Christmas when people are huddled around. Natural gas would certainly be an advantage.

Looking into the future we see the development of fuel cells and the whole technology of solar and wind energy. That might take a decade. It might take a few decades to bring forward, but natural gas will always be accessible to all of our communities.

Natural gas is being used by many taxi companies. Many communities have had opportunities to look at other sources of energy for transportation. If it is distributed equally throughout the country, it would mean that vehicles adapted for this type of fuel could be used by Canadians to travel more widely. Travel would be more accessible.

Motion No. 292 is a votable motion. I would humbly ask for the support of all parties and all members of the House. I believe it is a win-win situation. It is a win situation for the natural gas resources

industry. We have distribution companies all over the provinces and regions. It is also a win situation for the health and educational industries. We have institutions that have high costs. Imagine the cost of heating and cooling the House of Commons.

These institutions, which we take for granted, might be generations old. They need to be retrofitted. It is a win-win situation for the trades industry. Tradespeople will retrofit the heating units of many facilities. It is a job intensive situation. It will take people off the unemployment lists. There could be seasonal work for young people. If this work could not be done in the winter, it would certainly have to be done in the summer when heating systems are shut off. Students could gain employment and maybe valuable apprenticeship positions as a result of this.

(1340)

Industries would consider our small communities that do not have the distribution. Industries certainly look at high energy costs and natural gas has proven itself as an energy efficient and a cost effective way to provide energy to any facility, including manufacturing facilities. For example, the lumber industry uses kilns for drying lumber. We have kilns in the arts industry. We have heating systems in many car plants and hospitals. To make Canada a more self-sufficient country, let us consider sharing the abundant natural resource of natural gas.

There could be a major development in relation to the Sable Island project. Big pipelines will be installed along highways, but they will not be shared laterally. Lateral pipes will not be available to the neighbourhoods which this major pipeline will run through.

I challenge this government to look at initiatives. It might be a new infrastructure initiative. It might be a millennium initiative. It might be a greenhouse gas initiative. Let us not overlook natural gas.

While we are ripping up our highways and redoing the potholes in our back roads, highways, streets and sidewalks, while we are fixing up the infrastructure of this country, let us lay down natural gas pipelines and share our resources with all the people of this country. It is a win-win situation which we should not miss. Our children will have to do it if we do not. We should consider our infrastructure in that vision.

I ask for a national vision. I know there are provincial interests and industry interests, but I think the federal government could tie up all of the initiatives. The Department of Finance, the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of the Environment and the Department of Industry all deal with major resources. All of these departments may have separate initiatives, but let us share a national vision. Let us make sure that all Canadians are treated equally and that we share our natural resources equally.

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to private member's Motion No. 292. I

support the principle which the member speaks of, but the initiative is perhaps somewhat misplaced in that this motion proposes that the federal government provide the delivery of natural gas to rural regions in Canada. While I can accept that the federal government would and should make a contribution to the process, the provision of public utilities falls under the responsibility of provincial and municipal governments. As well, there are existing federal programs which might apply to this kind of program. Accordingly, I do not support this motion for the simple reason that it brings federal interference into an issue of provincial jurisdiction.

Many provinces already have in place programs to address the intention of this bill, to deliver natural gas to unserviced regions. I will quickly go over an example of such a program in my province of Alberta. Alberta has had just such a program and has been helping Albertans since 1973.

The natural gas distribution system serving rural Albertans began in the early 1960s with small systems built and operated by local groups and co-operatives. Interest in natural gas services grew throughout the decade. In the early 1970s the provincial government took action to expand the provision for natural gas to rural Albertans at a reasonable cost. This action was taken in accord with the general conclusion that it was in the public interest to improve the economic viability of smaller centres and that the family farm should be preserved.

• (1345)

It was felt that all Albertans, including those in rural Alberta, deserved a fair share of the benefits enjoyed by the people of that province from the ownership of natural resources and the revenue that flows from the development of those natural resources.

Because of the higher cost of serving scattered rural areas, it was decided that a provincial funding program to support construction of rural gas distribution systems was needed. To support this initiative the rural gas act was enacted in 1973 and soon after the rural gas program administered by the rural utilities branch of Alberta Energy was established.

This program brought many benefits to program users. The primary benefits included affordable installation costs where adequate gas sources are available, lower costs and reliability of fuel supply. Obviously all these benefits are crucially important to those living in rural areas.

Under this program approximately 4,000 new rural gas services are installed each year. Eligible services include uses such as homes, outbuildings, irrigation, grain drying, poultry and hog barns, greenhouses and more. Until this program was established individuals simply could not afford to access gas distribution in rural areas past already established transmission lines.

However, this program attempts to reduce consumer costs to a reasonable level by establishing a grant program under which participating utilities could receive grants based on a cost sharing formula from the provincial government. Under this arrangement consumers in the same class pay the same contract amount in any year, even though the costs to provide the service may vary widely.

Funding for the new gas installation is based on a formula that calculates the pooled costs per service within each franchise area. For example, for a rural installation service that has a capital cost of up to \$2,600, the capital cost is shared 100% between the distributor and the customer. However, for a rural installation that costs above \$2,600 and up to \$15,000, the distributor or consumer covers 25% of the cost and 75% is covered by the provincial grant. With this formula a typical farm installation costing \$5,000 would receive a grant of \$1,800. Obviously this makes the convenience of natural gas much more affordable to those living in rural areas.

There are a number of factors that contribute to the success of the rural gas program. First, with the expansion of natural gas services into rural areas, a new system of franchising had to be created to focus on the special requirements of rural areas. This concept of franchise areas was applied in the rural gas act to ensure a customer base for future viability of the new distributors.

Other criteria included consideration of major obstacles to pipeline construction such as rivers or highways. Under an assigned franchise a distributor has the right and responsibility to offer service where economically feasible to all potential rural and urban residential customers who did not have natural gas service prior to 1973.

Second is the formation of member owned co-operatives in the less populated areas of the province. The provincial government recognized the dedication, initiative and independent spirit of rural dwellers and felt the program had a better chance of success in these areas if the local community controlled its own destiny. Where have we heard that statement before?

Third is the provision of grant funding on a cost shared basis to make rural gas systems economically viable. Through contributions by the customer, government and co-ops, the resulting gas rates could be competitive with urban rates.

Finally, Gas Alberta was established to negotiate price and arrange for gas supplies for the co-ops. Through a postage stamp wholesale rate throughout the province, all co-ops were on an equal footing with respect to gas costs.

The rural gas program has been very successful in Alberta. To March 31, 1999, services have been provided or systems upgraded for over 171,600 rural, urban, irrigation, grain dryer services by over 90 distributors throughout a network of pipelines totalling 116,521 kilometres.

The point I make by referring to the Alberta example is that obviously programs such as those proposed by the motion already function and are doing well under provincial jurisdiction. As well, keeping in mind it is the province that collects royalties from the export of natural gas and oil, the provinces already have a built in funding system without asking Canadian taxpayers to unnecessarily subsidize a rural gas installation program.

(1350)

The Reform Party supports the principle that the provinces should have exclusive jurisdiction over natural resources and that citizens of the provinces should all benefit from the development of those resources.

Alberta is not the only province that receives substantial royalty income from the sale of natural gas. The province of Saskatchewan received \$44.5 million last year in natural gas revenue. It would seem reasonable to me that all the residents of Saskatchewan, even those in remote northern communities, should benefit from the development of natural gas resources as much as any other province.

However, the prime responsibility for making that happen lies first with the local community and second with the province. Third, there is room for federal participation through existing programs such as the PFRA or prairie farm rehabilitation program.

For all these reasons I will not support the motion and I would encourage other members of the House to do the same.

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Churchill River is proposing that the federal government should subsidize natural gas expansion projects for remote communities as a way of reducing the cost of living of residents and achieving environmental benefits.

I thank the hon. member for his interest in this very valuable natural resource. Natural gas is a cleaner burning, efficient, cost effective fuel which is why it has become one of Canada's number one natural resources. Canada also has an abundant supply with an estimated available total of between 504 and 617 trillion cubic feet.

It is the stated objective of the Minister of Natural Resources to make Canada into the world's smartest natural resources steward, developer, user and exporter. To become the world's smartest resource developer means in part adopting a considered, practical market oriented approach that balances the needs of all interests. It is this type of approach that is behind the natural gas success story. It is a thriving competitive industry that has followed a course of continuous and sustainable growth.

To understand the present, it is important to look at the past to see how the natural gas industry developed in Canada. Members in the House may remember the energy crisis of the 1970s and the concern for Canadian energy security that followed. In response, a group of off oil programs were designed to expand the use of domestic natural gas in Canada. These programs were phased out in the early 1980s when world crude oil markets stabilized and crude oil prices fell.

In the mid-1980s the crude oil and natural gas markets in Canada were deregulated. For the Canadian natural gas industry this resulted in lower natural gas prices and a surge in natural gas activity. Since then natural gas production, along with associated transmission and distribution infrastructure. has increased at a healthy and in some cases dramatic pace. Expansions to Canada's natural gas infrastructure whether of a local or international dimension have been governed by a combination of economic opportunity, economic viability and technology development.

It is the government's current energy policy not to fund energy megaprojects but to leave it to the competitive market to decide what goes forward and what does not. This is one reason we have difficulty in supporting the hon. member's motion. This policy has not resulted in a stalled natural gas industry, far from it. The result has been some very exciting private sector driven developments, including the expansion of natural gas distribution and production into new previously unserviced regions.

Let us consider the Sable offshore energy project. In late 1999 natural gas resources from off the coast of Nova Scotia will be coming ashore. The onshore maritimes and northeast pipeline will make natural gas available in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for the first time. Natural gas was first discovered at Sable Island in the 1960s, but it had never been economically viable for production until now, thanks to new drilling technology and new alliances between oil companies and engineering and construction contractors.

• (1355)

I must emphasize that the building of laterals within a province such as the hon. member is suggesting falls under the jurisdiction of the provinces as my hon. friend from Athabasca said. In the member for Churchill River's case it is the province of Saskatchewan.

In these cases expanding the distribution system is the responsibility of provincially regulated local distribution utilities. Provincial regulators set financial tests for new projects. Where a project cannot generate enough revenue to justify its capital cost, the local distribution company will ask potential gas consumers to make financial contributions, as my friend from Athabasca so ably pointed out. They are known as grants in aid of construction to bring the project to the point of economic viability.

If converting to natural gas offers an opportunity for reduced fuel bills, consumers can use a portion of their savings to finance the cost of conversion. From 1995 to 1997 there was an average of 125,000 new residential hookups per year. Of these customer additions, 70,000 were new constructions and 55,000 were conversions from other energy sources. What this means is that 48% of Canadian homes are now gas heated on a normal commercial market driven supply system.

From an energy policy point of view it would not be sensible to depart from the principle of the market must decide where laterals are built. However, for other non-energy policy reasons there may be programs in other departments which seek to achieve economic development or environmental or other goals through the subsidization of laterals. I invite hon, member to investigate those.

In the hon. member's home province of Saskatchewan, for example, the western economic partnership agreement between federal and provincial governments allowed for such funding. Indeed the federal government approached the provincial NDP government to explore whether a portion of the economic partnership agreement funding could be reserved to build laterals in remote areas. The provincial NDP government said no, not the federal government.

Another example of federal funding that was available to help with laterals was the Canada infrastructure works program which the government introduced some five years ago. In the province of Manitoba natural gas laterals to rural communities were identified as a priority and a portion of Manitoba's infrastructure funding was set aside to help build these laterals, not for energy policy reasons but for local economic and community development purposes.

Let me assure the House that the Government of Canada is also very sensitive to the fact that many remote rural areas face high cost energy and general environmental sensitivity. That is why the department has specifically designed alternative and renewable energy programs, as well as energy efficiency in conservation programs, that will help these communities meet their energy needs, lower their cost of living and receive environmental benefits

Pursuing these initiatives is the most workable, economically viable and environmentally friendly way of meeting the needs of rural and remote areas. Adapting these new technologies could bring these communities savings of \$200 million per year, not to mention significant environmental benefits.

For example, some communities are totally dependent upon fuel oil that is shipped at great expense. There are new technology programs in the energy section of NRCan that focus on developing alternative and renewable sources of supply, including bio-energy, small hydro, wind, photovoltaics and active solar energy.

In addition to these technology initiatives the department has developed tools to help communities analyse what kind of supply source would be reasonable and what they would need to pursue it.

Another initiative is the development of community energy systems to improve energy efficiency and allow the better use of waste heat. Under this approach energy use is reduced by integrating conventional energy supply, renewable energy sources, the energy demands of the building, transportation and industrial sectors, and the use of waste heat. The department is also working toward increasing the energy efficiency of buildings. Consider the following example: This year's federal budget allocated \$1.6 million over three years for Natural Resources Canada to establish a program with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to identify opportunities for energy efficiency retrofits in municipal buildings. Under this initiative, municipalities expect to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 30% to 40% and save \$108 million to \$175 million.

• (1400)

Initiatives like this are the best options for delivering a lower cost of living and environmental benefits to rural and remote communities. They are the wave of the future for rural and remote areas. I urge the hon, member for Churchill River to investigate all of them thoroughly.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to debate Motion No. 292 put forward by the member for Churchill River: that the government provide initiatives to deliver natural gas to unserviced regions, to address environmental concerns and energy costs.

I listened to the other speakers, as well as the member for Churchill River, and I think he should be congratulated on an excellent motion. I also listened closely to the government's answer thinking that much of what the government member said was true. However, this was before the government signed the Kyoto protocol which will very much change the way we look at energy and the way we use energy.

We signed a commitment to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2010. We knew, the G-8 countries knew and the industrialized nations of the world knew when they signed that commitment that they would not be able to meet that commitment. I do think the countries signed the commitment in good faith and that they meant well. However, I am not sure they are willing to put their money where their mouths are.

The member for Churchill River raises a point that many of us who represent rural ridings face. We have significant areas in our ridings that are now serviced by fuel oil, diesel fuel, electricity, coal-fired electricity and various sources of energy that are fairly

expensive. If we could reduce the cost for our industries in the ridings we represent, that would certainly benefit our position as MPs and we would actually be able to bring something back to our ridings. We would actually be able to deliver a service.

The member for Churchill River discussed the various energy plays that are occurring in Canada at this time and the amount of natural gas which is abundant in this country. I am discussing fields such as Venture, South Venture and Thebaud off Sable Island. I am also talking about fields and potential fields in the Laurentian Channel and the Sub-Laurentian basin, exciting new discoveries in the high Arctic such as Fort Liard, and a lot of natural gas exploration in northern Alberta and northern B.C. now which will be put into the alliance pipeline and sent all the way to Chicago.

We are becoming major exporters of natural gas to other places on this continent. The Sable fields will go to the maritimes northeast pipeline. Much of it will go into New England. I have seen the plans put forth by the present provincial government in Nova Scotia but I am not convinced it will service the rest of the province. I am not convinced that P.E.I. will be serviced at all. I am not convinced that some of the exciting natural gas discoveries off Newfoundland are going to put natural gas into Newfoundland.

Perhaps now that we have entered a new era and have signed a protocol which is going to force us to use cleaner sources of energy, it is time for the federal government to look at assisting rural areas in provinces that are not now serviced by natural gas to provide service to these areas.

• (1405)

The member for Churchill River should be aware of the flaw that is within the system on the east coast. Many households in the rural areas are now heated by fuel oil. The oil delivery people and the Canadian Oil Heat Association of Nova Scotia have never been subsidized. They put those oil furnaces in the homes and the people bought them with their own dollars. There were no subsidies. We are now talking about putting in natural gas, which is subsidized, and giving the natural gas distributors an unfair advantage.

However, that does not mean that we cannot find ways to overcome that or that we should stop looking at this very good motion put forward by the hon. member.

There are several other areas that we need to look at, but the most important one is how we go about delivering the natural gas. In Nova Scotia in particular, it is absolutely asinine to discuss natural gas delivery if we do not have a plan to build a lateral pipeline from the Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline which will allow a large enough pipe to come off the Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline down to somewhere in Stewiacke and into the Musquodoboit Valley area. It should be a line that is at least 18 inches in diameter that can then be split and fed into the urban and metro

areas of Dartmouth and Halifax, with another line that will split off and go down into the Annapolis Valley and hopefully into the Yarmouth area and then another line off that which will go down the South Shore.

We have a natural asset in the province of Nova Scotia with our abandoned rail bed. We could lay a natural gas pipeline along this rail bed to service all of the communities along the South Shore area, the riding I represent, and not disturb the road system or the highway system. It would be very convenient and very economical to use that existing rail bed, the railroad that has long since been torn up, to lay a natural gas pipeline. We could continue to use the same bed for recreational purposes and other purposes.

The other asset that would certainly service the South Shore riding would be the fact that we have some heavy industry. We have a hardwood mill in East Chester, a pulp mill in Liverpool, and Michelin Tires in Bridgewater. We also have a number of small manufacturing industries that could be well serviced by natural gas.

There was one thing that I was not clear on and I am not sure if the member for Churchill River mentioned it: Can we use natural gas for refrigeration? Very clearly there are hundreds of fish plants in the South Shore that could easily convert to natural gas and be able to use that to generate refrigeration.

The opportunity for major savings and a major benefit for the majority of the citizens in the South Shore is there, but there is a problem problem for the existing oil heat people who have already been servicing the area for domestic heat. I think the problem can be worked out to the satisfaction of both the consumers who are looking for a cleaner and more efficient source, and the consumers who have already invested in oil heat.

In conclusion, I recognize that the member on the government side said that this was provincial jurisdiction. However, I think that was true before we had a hole in the ozone layer, before we had signed the Kyoto protocol, before we became a major exporter of natural gas, and before much of the world was turning to natural gas. They cannot get enough of it.

The thing that has not been mentioned is the potential for us to bring liquefied natural gas out of the high Arctic. Some very exciting wells were drilled in the high Arctic on some excellent fields. We have been trying to bring more infrastructure, more jobs, more economic opportunities and more industry into the high Arctic. We abandoned the high Arctic years ago when we never should have. We left for no good reason. Now it is time that we went back there and reopened those fields so that we can bring liquefied natural gas out of the high Arctic by containers and use it in southern Canada or use it for export. If we are to meet the Kyoto protocol we have absolutely no choice but to convert to more natural gas use within the country.

• (1410)

Fortunately British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and much of Ontario already have the infrastructure for natural gas. I am very envious of that and very thankful that they do because it certainly helps all Canadians. That does not mean we should not look at some way to service the other areas of Canada that do not have accessibility to natural gas at this time.

Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to address the motion on natural gas introduced by the hon. member for Churchill River.

It is the government's current energy policy not to fund energy megaprojects but to leave it to the competitive market to decide what goes forward and what does not. This is one reason we have difficulty in supporting the hon. member's motion.

This policy has not resulted in a stalled natural gas industry. Far from it. The result has been some very exciting private sector driven developments including the expansion of natural gas distribution and production into new previously unserviced regions.

From an energy policy point of view it would not be sensible to depart from the basic principle that the market must decide where laterals are built. However, for other non-energy policy reasons there may be programs in other departments which seek to achieve economic development or environmental or other goals through the subsidization of laterals.

I repeat what my hon. friend from Halton said earlier, that the western economic partnership agreement was a possible avenue for some federal government support in this area, but the NDP government in Saskatchewan turned it down.

I understand the hon. member's desire to ensure an environmentally friendly and secure energy source for his region. That is what Canada's approach to the complex evolving global challenge of climate change is all about. We see it as a challenge that is both environmental and economic.

The Kyoto protocol in December 1997 reaffirmed the conviction among some 160 nations that the six commonly identified greenhouse gases are accumulating in the world's atmosphere at such a rate and to such an extent that they are putting the world's future climate at risk. For Canada this could mean more severe and more frequent weather disruptions, more inland floods in some areas, more droughts in others, rising sea levels and flooded coastlines, more wind and hail and ice storms, and greater threats to public safety and economic security.

The vast majority of global scientific opinion suggests that human conduct is certainly contributing to the problem and making it worse. The protocol involved a commitment on the part of the industrialized world to bring down greenhouse gas emissions. This

Private Members' Business

action is much like an insurance policy against those future risks, and just like buying insurance one cannot get the coverage one should have had after the fact.

For Canada, our Kyoto target is to get our emissions down by the period between 2008 and 2012 to 6% below the level they were at in 1990. It will not be easy. Canada's northern climate and vast distances, its increasing population and increasing reduction, and its resource based and energy intensive economy all make our commitment much more difficult to meet. If we just carry on from this point forward with no changes, business as usual, by the year 2010 Canada's greenhouse gas emissions will rise to about 25% above our Kyoto target. We obviously have to slow that trajectory, flatten it out, and then turn it downward to reach our target within about a decade.

Where we will be when it ends will depend upon how astute we were at managing our domestic climate change challenges in relation to the rest of the world. We need to marry strong environmental performance with a strong economy.

About 85% of human made emissions are related to the way we produce and consume energy. The more energy efficient we become, the fewer emissions we generate. The more we achieve in this regard through greater energy efficiency, the less we will have to rely on other means to satisfy our Kyoto protocol obligations.

● (1415)

Across our entire national economy, in every sector and in the individual behaviour of each one of us we must achieve energy efficiency excellence. From a government policy perspective we have thus far used a variety of tools to achieve greater energy efficiency.

For one thing, we have tried to improve our own operations within the Government of Canada. We are on track to slash our emissions by more than 20% and to reach that goal by 2005.

Another tool is the provision of accurate information with which people can make informed decisions about energy use. The Ener-Guide label is a good illustration. A third tool is peer group challenges like VCR Inc., the voluntary challenge registry program where industries and businesses pledge to improve their performances and report their progress in a tangible and public way.

There are incentives like Natural Resources Canada's commercial buildings program which is putting up some cash to encourage developers and builders to incorporate best practices from the ground up.

Hand in hand with these tools we must achieve a faster rate of new technology development and timely deployment of new technology. This is a key underpinning for everything else.

Consider an innovation like the Solarwall developed by Conserval Engineering, a new solar based energy saving technique for large building ventilation systems. It requires modestly increased construction costs one time but it generates significant savings in ongoing operating costs year after year, a more efficient ventilation system, fewer greenhouse gas emissions and a growing market across North America and around the world.

We must build our capacity for efficiency innovation within government labs, in academic institutions and in the private sector and we must put that new knowledge to work quickly in the marketplace. For our part federally, we are moving in that direction, specifically in each of our last three federal budgets.

Within Natural Resources Canada about \$100 million each year is normally invested in the search for climate change solutions. Other federal departments add another \$50 million annually. The 1998 federal budget contributed a further \$150 million over three years to our climate change action fund. Altogether the annual federal financial commitment is now at \$200 million.

There is no one single silver bullet solution to the global climate change challenge. We cannot expect to get everything we will need from energy efficiency and technology alone. Among other things, we must take greater advantage of the diversified mix of energy sources with which we have been blessed, such as hydro, solar, wind, earth and bioenergy. We need progress on a range of other issues such as recycling in the metals industry, municipal landfill management, and biotechnologies that can save energy and agriculture.

We need to strongly engage the enthusiastic participation of the average Canadian consumer. Taken together our collective behaviour can make a big difference. We need to focus on how to get more and more people to think globally about a profound problem like climate change and act locally to do something meaningful about it through their own energy efficiency.

These and a host of other issues are currently being assessed through our national climate change consultative process. It is a very transparent and inclusive process involving more than 450 people representing every dimension of Canadian life working through a series of 16 issue tables. We will start to hear their detailed advice this summer.

The bottom line of all this is there is no one answer.

As we open the 21st century we must establish Canada as the world's smartest natural resources steward, developer, user and exporter, as the most high tech, the most socially responsible and environmentally friendly, as the most productive and competitive. With respect to energy in particular we need to be the very best, the most intelligent, innovative and efficient at finding, developing, producing, delivering, consuming and exporting the world's most

sophisticated and diversified energy products, skills, services and science.

I believe that is a worthy Canadian ambition.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am very happy to get involved in this debate. I compliment the member for Churchill River for raising this issue for two good reasons. It touches on two things people think about a great deal: one, saving operating costs for homeowners, businesses or property owners; and two, saving our environment.

We obviously have to do something about the urgent issue of greenhouse gas emissions. As much as the Reform Party denies it is an issue, we know it is an issue. We know that the hole in the ozone layer is growing. We know that Canada has an obligation to do something, to do all it can to bring down harmful greenhouse gas emissions.

• (1420)

I used to work on the oil rigs. I used to work in the oil patch on oil rigs, on those big triple rigs we see. There is something I am kind of ashamed of. I was always mystified frankly, but for the industry's sake I am ashamed of it, that every time we hit gas everybody would curse "Oh no, more gas". We would cap off the well, tear down the rig and move to another hole.

Sometimes that gas had such force, there was so much of it. It had such force it was actually dangerous to cap it off. It was very difficult to contain what we had tapped into. There were these huge massive reserves of natural gas, a precious energy commodity like that and nobody could have been more disappointed. The driller would be dejected and the engineer would probably be fired for putting us into an area where we would hit gas again. I just wanted to share that story.

That has been the attitude about something the rest of the world considers absolutely precious and we in this country do not take full advantage of it. It is our most abundant energy resource, yet we choose to heat our homes, businesses and factories et cetera with other more expensive means of energy.

Unbelievably, in much of Atlantic Canada homes are heated with coal thermal generated electricity, the most wasteful, expensive and polluting way to generate electricity. Some of these people have heating bills of \$900 a month I am told. I have never lived there but apparently \$800 or \$900 a month is not unrealistic. Imagine a working class family living in a harsh climate and the best system their government can think of to provide energy to heat their homes is thermal powered electricity. It is unbelievable.

It raises the question, should the government be involved in the distribution of natural gas? Should it ever be involved in it or

should it be left up to the private sector? I would remind members that one of the most famous debates that ever took place in this House of Commons was the great pipeline debate in the late 1950s. It is legendary. I still hear stories about it from the veteran parliamentarians who relish telling the story about that great debate.

Fortunately, saner heads prevailed and we did build the trans-Canada pipeline. We did build a national infrastructure. Frankly the plan then was how to sell our resources. It was not so much as how to distribute them in Canada. I am suggesting we need a whole new national pipeline debate.

Again, I am very proud that the member for Churchill River has brought this up today. Now we have to talk about something even more pressing, which is the distribution. How do we as Canadians benefit from our precious natural resources instead of finding ways to fire them out of the country?

Another thing that was raised was that with the FTA and everything else there are more and more opportunities to get our products on to distribution networks south of the border. I would caution hon. members that when they read NAFTA and the FTA carefully, whatever rate of export we have we are bound to. Even if we run short of that resource in our country and even if we do not have enough fuel to heat our own homes, we are committed to maintain the same level of export that we started. It is a tap we cannot turn off. It is one of the things we have always criticized about the free trade agreement.

The public should be involved in natural gas. It is a special thing and we have the luxury of having an abundance of this resource.

In the province I come from, which has a Tory government, Manitoba Hydro is publicly owned. It is a crown corporation. Centra Gas is a private gas distribution company owned by Westcoast Energy, I believe, or some massive conglomerate out in western Canada that owns all of the natural gas companies.

Just recently Manitoba Hydro, a publicly owned company, bought Centra Gas. It saw the sense in having gas distribution publicly owned because it is too important a thing to leave to the free market. Apart from that we were being jerked by Centra Gas. Being a privately owned company it was making bad real estate investments and then passing on its losses to gas customers. Homeowners were getting jacked up rate increases because Centra Gas made some bad flip on the real estate market.

That is an example and it is a Tory government. It sounds like a socialist idea that maybe we should nationalize the natural gas industry. I am not saying we should go that far, but in Manitoba we just did. In 1999 with a Tory government Manitoba saw the sense in having a government role in the distribution of natural gas. I wish

we could convince the members on the government side that there is nothing wrong with that idea.

● (1425)

We seem so afraid to start national projects. Somebody even mentioned that we should not be diving into megaprojects.

In my province we have what we call Duff's ditch. Somebody in the 1960s had the sense to dig a diversion around our town so the town would not flood every spring. They called Duff Roblin a madman for digging Duff's ditch. It was the largest engineering project ever undertaken in the country at the time and it has saved our bacon every year thereafter. It was the best couple of million dollars ever spent. Yes, it was a megaproject and yes everybody dumps on megaprojects these days but it was a necessary megaproject.

We are arguing that government get involved in a natural gas distribution project of this kind. Yes, it could be called a megaproject but it would be spread out evenly throughout the whole country. Every rural area that needs that break and an abundant supply of cheap clean energy would benefit. The megaproject would not be concentrated in any one area where all the jobs would be, it would be all over the place.

The hon. member for Churchill River mentioned the unbelievable job creation opportunities. We could put a generation of kids back to work in the new burgeoning field of rural gasification, if we did it in a big way and not in little minor flare-ups where it was financially profitable.

I really like the idea of one of the Tory members who said we should use the old rail lines. We are ripping up railroads all across the prairies. In every small town that used to have a rail spur they are ripping them up. We could turn something bad into something positive by using them as the road beds for natural gas pipelines.

Imagine the difference it would make if we could reduce the operating costs of our homes and businesses. Every dollar not spent on energy could be spent elsewhere in the economy. We would achieve the multiplier effect where every dollar is spent four times before it finds its natural state of repose. It usually winds up in the pocket of somebody like Conrad Black but it does circulate into the economy many, many times first. That is a benefit. Then there are the jobs.

We are talking about energy retrofitting. We are talking about job creation through energy conservation. The natural gas heating system is only one aspect of a comprehensive energy retrofit.

Let us start with all our publicly owned buildings. There is a good reason right there to bring a natural gas spur line into a

smaller community where there might be a federal government building. We could bring down our own operating costs and provide ourselves an energy cost break.

We did a lot of research on this. When I was the head of the carpenter's union we did abundant research on the job creation opportunities in energy retrofitting as opposed to new construction. There is seven times the person years in employment per dollar invested in energy retrofit construction as opposed to new construction. There are the benefits of reducing operating costs by 30% and 40% and creating seven times the number of jobs. It is an absolute win-win situation.

Of course that involves the building envelope and the HVAC system. The heating system is where the natural gas aspect of it comes in.

One of the things industries look for most when they are looking for a place to locate is an abundant supply of cheap clean fuel. The clean is not usually that much of a consideration; cheap energy is what they really want. There is almost the feeling of build it and they will come. If we are trying to expand the economic development in rural and underdeveloped areas, one of the most important things that can be done is to provide a constant supply of cheap clean energy.

I want to thank the hon, member again for raising the issue. I hope we can convince more people in the second and third hours of debate.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

[English]

It being almost 2.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.29 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron

Mr. Bill Blaikie

Ms. Marlene Catterall

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

Mr. Peter Milliken

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

MR. RANDY WHITE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session – Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member C			itical ïliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in			
the House of Commons	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy			
Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	
-	Galidei — Grand Palis	Newfoulidialid	LIU.
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and	A1	0 1	T '1
Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Quebec	
Barnes, Sue	London West	Ontario	
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga		
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian			
Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	_
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères — Les-Patriotes	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles- de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National			
Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora .	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories .	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview —	New Brunswick	
Braithrauz Cliff	Dieppe		
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member		Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brison, Scott	. Kings — Hants	Nova Scotia	PC
Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human			
Resources Development	. Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Bryden, John	. Wentworth — Burlington .	Ontario	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	. Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resource		ie	
and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	. Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	. Davenport		
Cadman, Chuck	•	British Columbia	Ref.
Calder, Murray	. Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	C		Lib.
Canuel, René	•	Quebec	BQ
Caplan, Elinor, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	. Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Cardin, Serge			
Carroll, Aileen	. Barrie — Simcoe — Bradfo	rd Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill			
Casson, Rick	<u>-</u>		
Catterall, Marlene	. Ottawa West — Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Economic Development			
Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)		•	
Chamberlain, Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	-		
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific)			
Charbonneau, Yvon	3	•	
Chatters, David			
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister			
Chrétien, Jean–Guy	Č	Quebec	BQ
Clouthier, Hec	. Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Coderre, Denis			
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport			
Comuzzi, Joe		Ontario	210.
Condention	North	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	. Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	. Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup — Témiscouata — Le		
	Basques		BQ
Cullen, Roy	. Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	. Delta — South Richmond .	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond–Guiral, Madeleine	. Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Davies, Libby	. Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	. Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	. Laval East	Quebec	BQ
Desjarlais, Bev			NDP
Desrochers, Odina	. Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul			
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue	. Vancouver South — Burnat	by British Columbia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for			
Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	. Saint-Laurent — Cartiervill	e. Quebec	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	. Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Dockrill, Michelle	. Bras d'Or — Cape Breton .	Nova Scotia	
Doyle, Norman			PC
D '1 G D I' (G (M''' CT	. Thunder Bay — Atikokan .	Ontario	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport Drouin, Claude			

Name of Member		Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la- Chaudière	Quebec	BQ
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche		PC
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte–Marie		BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	-	
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel		
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North		-
	Halifax West		
Earle, Gordon Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and			
Oceans	Malpeque		
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre		
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan		Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island		
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	-	
Finlay, John	Oxford		
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government	Saint-Léonard — Saint-		
Services	Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec		
Gallaway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	•	-
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval		
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	•	_
Girard–Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière		
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West		_
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay		
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst		
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East		
-	Wasaana	Caskatahawan	Lib.
responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana		
Graham Bill	Okanagan Toronto Centre — Rosedale		
Gray Hon Herb Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West		
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister Grewal, Gurmant			
,	Surrey Central		
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North Oshawa		
Guarnieri, Albina	MississaugaEast	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency - Côte-de-Beaupré —		DO.
Hangar Art	Île-d'Orléans		
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast		
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre		
Hardy, Louise	Yukon		
Hout Lim	Valley		
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	British Columbia	Ref.

Name of Member (Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi		
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	•	
Hill, Grant	Macleod		
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace Rive		
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake		
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar		
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi		
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury	windiniciii	New Drunswick	Liu.
Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and	-	Ontario	Lio.
Northern Development	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey		
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona		
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	11100144	101.
50, Autono	Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jones, Jim	Markham		PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt .	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore		
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast		
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap		
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West		Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast		Lib.
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — Lond	on Ontario	Lib.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert		Ref.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	NDP
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	Ontario	-
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Quebec	-
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	•	
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge Rive		
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain		
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway		
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth		NDP
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair		
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis		
Longfield, Judi	Whitby — Ajax	•	
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot .		
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	-	
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands		
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan		
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish —		
3,	Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Mahoney, Steve	MississaugaWest	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore —		
	Malton — Springdale	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member			Political Affiliation
Maloney, John	Erie — Lincoln	. Ontario	Lib.
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	. Nova Scotia	NDP
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	. Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	. Alberta	Ref.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	. Quebec	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East		
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West		
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River		
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and	•		
Minister responsible for Francophonie	Sudbury		
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca		
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre		
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	. Quebec	Lib.
responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	. Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	•	
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin		
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest		
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac —		
	Lennox and Addington	. Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	. Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and			
Agri–Food	Egmont	. Prince Edward Islan	d . Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	. Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of	C		
Canada	Edmonton West	. Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	. British Columbia	Ref.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridg		Lib.
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra		
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve .		
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	-	-
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White		
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State	Rock — Langley	. British Columbia	Ref.
(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	. Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the	Conception		
Whole	Kingston and the Islands	. Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer		
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood		
Minna, Maria	Beaches — East York		
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound — Muskoka		
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands.		
	West Nova		
Muise, Mark	Lanark — Carleton		
Murray, Ian			
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington		
Nault, Robert D.	Kenora — Rainy River	. Ontario	Lib.
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and	Bellechasse — Etchemins —	0	T '1
Agri–Food)(Fisheries and Oceans)	Montmagny — L'Islet		
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston		
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle		
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador		
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	. Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	. Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member C		rovince of constituency	Polit Affil	tical liation
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta		Ref.
Pagtakhan, Rey D	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Manitoba		Lib.
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan		Ref.
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International				
Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec		Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Ontario		Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works				
and Government Services	MississaugaCentre	Ontario		Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec		Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta		Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario		Lib.
Perron, Gilles–A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	Quebec		BQ
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial				
Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario		Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau — Saint-Denis	Quebec		Lib.
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National	•			
Revenue	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario		Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec		BQ
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham — Kent Essex	-		Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls			Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu — Nicolet —			
2 minoridon, 20m2 1111111111111111111111111111111111	Bécancour			BQ
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	Newfoundland		PC
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Ontario		Lib.
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead			PC
Proctor, Dick	Palliser			NDP
Proud, George	Hillsborough		ınd .	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie			Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot			Ref.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre			Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Halton	Ontario		Lib.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshin			
.,	Coast			Ref.
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario		Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and			
	Highland Valleys			NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	. Saskatchewan		Ref.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Westmount — Ville–Marie			Lib.
Robinson, Svend J	Burnaby — Douglas			NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois–Rivières	•		BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre			Lib.
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec		Lib.
St–Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie–James —	0 1		T '1
0 P A	Nunavik	-		Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny			BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna			Ref.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton			Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena			Ref.
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam —			Lib.
Sarrá Ranoît	Port Coquitlam			
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane .			Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham			Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat			Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre			NDP
	Cond	Suskutenewan		1.121

Name of Member		Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International	Haldimand — Norfolk —		
Trade		Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent			
St–Hilaire, Caroline	U		
St–Jacques, Diane	C		-
Steckle, Paul			
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment			
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern		Ontario	L io.
Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel			
Stoffer, Peter			
Strahl, Chuck			
Szabo, Paul	•		
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship	. wiississauga Soutii	Omano	L10.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
and Immigration	Kitcheller — Water100	Ontario	L10.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the	Caint I ambant	0	T 21.
Whole			
Thompson, Greg			
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the	D 1' /	0	7.11
Environment	6		
Tremblay, Stéphan			_
Tremblay, Suzanne			
Turp, Daniel		Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose–Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance			Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	New Brunswick .	NDF
Vellacott, Maurice	. Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Venne, Pierrette	. Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hube	rt Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	. Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia–Leis, Judy	. Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	NDF
Wayne, Elsie		New Brunswick .	PC
Whelan, Susan	. Essex		
White, Randy		British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	* ·		Ref.
Wilfert, Bryon			Lib.
Williams, John			
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs .			
VACANCY			

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.–Liberal; Ref.–Reform Party of Canada; BQ–Bloc Québécois; NDP–New Democratic Party; PC–Progressive Conservative; Ind.–Independent.

Anyone wishing to communicate with House of Commons members is invited to communicate with either the Member's constituency or Parliament Hill offices.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session — Thirty-sixth Parliament

lame of Member		itical iliatio
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Ref
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Ref
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Ref
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Ref
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Ref
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref
Hill, Grant	Macleod	
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	
Obhrai, Deepak		
· •	Calgary East Peace River	
Penson, Charlie		
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	
Thompson, Myron		
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref
BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	
	Victoria	Lib
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		D a
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Surrey North	Ke.
Cadman, Chuck	•	
Cadman, Chuck	•	Lib
Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John	Richmond	Lib Re
Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John Davies, Libby	Richmond Delta — South Richmond	Lil Re NI
Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John Davies, Libby Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue	Richmond Delta — South Richmond Vancouver East	Lil Re NI Lil
Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John Davies, Libby Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue Duncan, John	Richmond	Lib Re NE Lib Re
Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John Davies, Libby Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue Duncan, John Elley, Reed	Richmond	Lib Re: NE Lib Re: Re:
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John Davies, Libby Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue Duncan, John Elley, Reed Forseth, Paul Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Richmond Delta — South Richmond Vancouver East Vancouver South — Burnaby Vancouver Island North Nanaimo — Cowichan New Westminster — Coquitlam —	Lib Res NE Lib Res Res
Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John Davies, Libby Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue Duncan, John Elley, Reed	Richmond Delta — South Richmond Vancouver East Vancouver South — Burnaby Vancouver Island North Nanaimo — Cowichan New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	Lib Rei ND Lib Rei Rei Lib
Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John Davies, Libby Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue Duncan, John Elley, Reed Forseth, Paul Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women) Gilmour, Bill	Richmond Delta — South Richmond Vancouver East Vancouver South — Burnaby Vancouver Island North Nanaimo — Cowichan New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby Vancouver Centre Nanaimo — Alberni	Lib Rei ND Lib Rei Rei Lib
Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John Davies, Libby Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue Duncan, John Elley, Reed Forseth, Paul Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women) Gilmour, Bill Gouk, Jim	Richmond Delta — South Richmond Vancouver East Vancouver South — Burnaby Vancouver Island North Nanaimo — Cowichan New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby Vancouver Centre Nanaimo — Alberni Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan	Lib Rei ND Lib Rei Rei Lib Rei
Cadman, Chuck Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific) Cummins, John Davies, Libby Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue Duncan, John Elley, Reed Forseth, Paul Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women) Gilmour, Bill	Richmond Delta — South Richmond Vancouver East Vancouver South — Burnaby Vancouver Island North Nanaimo — Cowichan New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby Vancouver Centre Nanaimo — Alberni	Lib Res NE Lib Res Lib Res Res

Name of Member		olitical ffiliation
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	. Ref.
Riis, Nelson Robinson, Svend J.	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	
Scott, Mike	Skeena	
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port	. Kei.
Stinson, Darrel	Coquitlam	
Strahl, Chuck	Okanagan — Shuswap Fraser Valley	
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	
White, Ted	North Vancouver	
MANITOBA (14) Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for		
Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	. Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	. Lib.
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern		
Development	Provencher	. Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	. NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D.	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	. Lib.
Wasylycia–Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	. NDP
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	. PC
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe	. Lib.
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	. PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	. NDP
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	. PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	. Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	. PC

Name of Member		litical filiation	
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)			
Baker, George S. Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources and Minister	Gander — Grand Falls	Lib.	
responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Lib.	
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC	
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	PC	
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic	D	T .1	
Canada Opportunities Agency) O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception Labrador	Lib. Lib.	
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	PC	
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)			
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.	
NOVA SCOTIA (11)			
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	PC	
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	PC	
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or — Cape Breton	ND	
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	ND	
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC	
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	ND	
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	PC	
Mancini, Peter McDonough, Alexa	Sydney — Victoria Halifax	NDI NDI	
Muise, Mark	West Nova	PC	
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore	NDI	
NUNAVUT (1)			
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.	
ONTARIO (103)			
Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Peterborough	Lib.	
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.	
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Lib.	
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.	
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Lib.	
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Lib.	
Bélanger, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Lib.	
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Lib.	
Bennett, Carolyn Bevilacqua, Maurizio	St. Paul's Vaughan — King — Aurora	Lib. Lib.	
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.	
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Lib.	
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Lib.	
Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources	2 2		
Development	Oakville	Lib.	
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Lib.	
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.	

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — G	rey . Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Elinor, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Guelph — Wellington	Lib.
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North	
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	
Finlay, John	Oxford	
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	
Gallaway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board and Minister	Trinita. Cardina	т :1.
responsible for Infrastructure	Trinity — Spadina	
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	
Jones, Jim	Markham	
Jordan, Joe Karygiannis, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	
Keyes, Stan	Scarborough — Agincourt	
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenb	
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	•
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	
Longfield, Judi	Whitby — Ajax	
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton —	2101
	Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie — Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible		
for Francophonie	Sudbury	
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox an	.d
McVery John	Addington	
McKay, John	Scarborough East	
McTeague, Dan Millikan Peter Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	
Mills Dappis I	Kingston and the Islands	
Mills, Dennis J. Minna, Maria	Broadview — Greenwood	
tvinna, iviana	Deaches — East 101K	LIU.

Name of Member		olitical ffiliatio
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Li
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	
Nault, Robert D.	Kenora — Rainy River	
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Li
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and	No. 1	
Government Services	MississaugaCentre	
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	Hamilton Mountain	Li
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham — Kent Essex	Li
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Li
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Li
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Li
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Halton	Li
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	L
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma — Manitoulin	
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration .	Kitchener — Waterloo	
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	L
Ur, Rose–Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Li
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Li
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Li
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	L
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	L
Whelan, Susan	Essex	
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Li
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
		_
Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food	Egmont	
Proud, George	Hillsborough	Li
QUEBEC (75)		
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	В
	Gatineau	
Assad, Mark	Gatificati	
Assad, Mark Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	

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

Name of Member		Political Affiliation
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for		
Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food)(Fisheries and	Bellechasse — Etchemins —	
Oceans)	Montmagny — L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation		
and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Brome — Missisquoi	
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	
Perron, Gilles–A.	Rivière–des–Mille–Îles	
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau — Saint–Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancou	r. BQ
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	PC
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Westmount — Ville–Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie–James — Nunavik	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St–Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	BQ
SASKATCHEWAN (13)		
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for		
the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Ref.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Ref.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	NDP
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Ref.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	
VACANCY	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	
YUKON (1)		
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP

(16)

(16)

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of June 4th, 1999 — 1st Session, 36th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Guy St–Julien Vice–Chairmen: John Finlay

Derrek Konrad

Claude Bachand Louise Hardy Gerald Keddy Mike Scott
Sue Barnes David Iftody Robert Nault Myron Thompson

John Bryden Nancy Karetak–Lindell Lawrence O'Brien Bryon Wilfert
Ghislain Fournier

Associate Members

Cliff BreitkreuzPierre de SavoyeMaurice GodinKeith MartinRené CanuelGordon EarleRick LaliberteGilles PerronSerge CardinReed ElleyJohn MaloneyMaurice Vellacott

Bill Casey

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: John Harvard Vice–Chairmen: Murray Calder

Howard Hilstrom

Hélène Alarie Denis Coderre Larry McCormick Dick Proctor

Paul BonwickOdina DesrochersJoe McGuirePaul SteckleRick BorotsikJake HoeppnerIan MurrayRose-Marie Ur

Garry Breitkreuz

Associate Members

Peter AdamsRick CassonJohn MaloneyGreg ThompsonLeon BenoitMichelle DockrillLorne NystromMyron Thompson

Pierre Brien Allan Kerpan John Solomon

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: Clifford Lincoln Vice-Chairmen: Inky Mark

Ted McWhinney

Mauril Bélanger John Godfrey Wendy Lill Mark Muise (16)

 Paul Bonwick
 Joe Jordan
 Eric Lowther
 Jim Pankiw

 Sarmite Bulte
 Raymond Lavigne
 Dennis Mills
 Caroline St-Hilaire

Maurice Dumas

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Pierre Brien Monique Guay Louis Plamondon André Bachand Serge Cardin Albina Guarnieri George Proud Claude Bachand Denis Coderre Rick Laliberte Benoît Sauvageau Carolyn Bennett Antoine Dubé Suzanne Tremblay Francine Lalonde Rick Borotsik Gordon Earle Peter MacKay Elsie Wayne

Cliff Breitkreuz Christiane Gagnon Pat O'Brien

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF SPORT IN CANADA

Chairman: Dennis Mills

Denis Coderre Wendy Lill Inky Mark George Proud (9) Albina Guarnieri Peter MacKay Pat O'Brien Suzanne Tremblay

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Rey Pagtakhan Vice-Chairs: Leon Benoit

Raymonde Folco

(16)

Mark Assad Sophia Leung John McKay Charlie Power
Jean Augustine Steve Mahoney Grant McNally Jack Ramsay

Paul DeVillers Patrick Martin Réal Ménard Andrew Telegdi Jocelyne Girard–Bujold

Associate Members

Claude BachandSerge CardinMonique GuayBenoît SauvageauBernard BigrasLibby DaviesLouise HardyDiane St-JacquesPierre BrienGordon EarleDeepak ObhraiDaniel Turp

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Charles Caccia Vice-Chairmen: Bill Gilmour

Karen Kraft Sloan

Sarkis Assadourian Jean-Guy Chrétien Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Rick Laliberte (16)

Aileen Carroll Paul Forseth John Herron David Pratt
Rick Casson Roger Gallaway Joe Jordan Paddy Torsney
Yvon Charbonneau

Associate Members

Jim AbbottPierre BrienLouise HardyNelson RiisPeter AdamsChuck CadmanGar KnutsonBenoît SauvageauHélène AlarieSerge CardinClifford LincolnPeter Stoffer

Leon Benoit John Duncan David Price Stéphan Tremblay
Bernard Bigras Maurice Godin

(16)

(16)

(18)

FINANCE

Vice-Chairs: Nick Discepola Chairman: Maurizio Bevilacqua

Richard M. Harris

Carolyn Bennett Roger Gallaway Lorne Nystrom Monte Solberg Scott Brison Sophia Leung Gary Pillitteri Paul Szabo Odina Desrochers Yvan Loubier Karen Redman Tony Valeri

Ken Epp

Associate Members

Pauline Picard Diane Ablonczy Antoine Dubé Francine Lalonde Rob Anders Paul Forseth Peter MacKay Charlie Power Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Richard Marceau Gerry Ritz Chris Axworthy George Baker John Godfrey Alexa McDonough Yves Rocheleau Rick Borotsik John Herron John McKay John Solomon Marlene Jennings Stéphan Tremblay Pierre Brien Bob Mills Serge Cardin Lynn Myers Pierrette Venne Dale Johnston Michelle Dockrill Jim Jones Rey Pagtakhan Tom Wappel Norman Doyle Jason Kenney Gilles Perron

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Stan Keyes

Charles Hubbard

Vice-Chairmen: John Cummins

Carmen Provenzano

Yvan Bernier Gar Knutson Bill Matthews Lou Sekora Claude Drouin Gary Lunn Lawrence O'Brien Paul Steckle Keith Martin Wayne Easter Yves Rocheleau Peter Stoffer

Nancy Karetak-Lindell

Claude Drouin

Chairman:

Associate Members

Gilles Bernier Ghislain Fournier Denis Paradis Mike Scott René Canuel Bill Gilmour Angela Vautour Svend Robinson

Paul Forseth Philip Mayfield

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Vice-Chairs: Colleen Beaumier Chairman: Bill Graham

Bob Mills

Sarkis Assadourian Maud Debien Jerry Pickard Bob Speller Jean Augustine Sheila Finestone Julian Reed Darrel Stinson André Bachand Bernard Patry Svend Robinson Daniel Turp John Cannis Charlie Penson Benoît Sauvageau

Associate Members

Claude Bachand Aileen Carroll Patrick Martin Charlie Power Bill Blaikie Raymonde Folco Ted McWhinney Nelson Riis Paul Bonwick Gurmant Grewal Paul Mercier John Solomon Claudette Bradshaw Monique Guay Robert Nault Diane St-Jacques René Laurin Sarmite Bulte Lorne Nystrom Chuck Strahl Deepak Obhrai Murray Calder Richard Marceau Stéphan Tremblay

Serge Cardin Keith Martin Denis Paradis

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Colleen Beaumier

Jean Augustine Maud Debien Keith Martin Svend Robinson (9) Paul Bonwick Sheila Finestone Denis Paradis Diane St-Jacques

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chairman: Sarmite Bulte

Sarkis Assadourian Bill Blaikie Raymonde Folco Benoît Sauvageau (9) André Bachand Murray Calder Charlie Penson Bob Speller

HEALTH

Joseph Volpe Vice-Chairs: Reed Elley Chair:

Ovid Jackson

(16)

Elinor Caplan Robert Nault Karen Redman Rose-Marie Ur Gurmant Grewal Bernard Patry Caroline St-Hilaire Maurice Vellacott

Dan McTeague Pauline Picard Greg Thompson Judy Wasylycia-Leis

Maria Minna

Associate Members

Carolyn Bennett Libby Davies Christiane Gagnon Keith Martin Bernard Bigras Pierre de Savoye John Herron Réal Ménard Pierre Brien Michelle Dockrill Lynn Myers

Grant Hill Serge Cardin Antoine Dubé John Maloney

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chairman: Albina Guarnieri Vice-Chairs: Dale Johnston

Bryon Wilfert

Diane Ablonczy Hec Clouthier Jean Dubé John O'Reilly (18)

Bernard Bigras Denis Coderre Christiane Gagnon Andy Scott John Godfrey Bonnie Brown Paul Crête Maurice Vellacott

Brenda Chamberlain Libby Davies Larry McCormick

Associate Members

Antoine Dubé Karen Kraft Sloan Mark Muise Eleni Bakopanos Carolyn Bennett Maurice Dumas Wendy Lill Lorne Nystrom Yvan Bernier Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Judi Longfield Rey Pagtakhan Eric Lowther Yves Rocheleau Pierre Brien Yvon Godin Richard Marceau Deborah Grey

Serge Cardin Diane St-Jacques Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Patrick Martin Stéphan Tremblay Ovid Jackson Bev Desjarlais Réal Ménard Angela Vautour Joe Jordan

Michelle Dockrill Nancy Karetak-Lindell Maria Minna Norman Doyle

(9)

(16)

(16)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair: Carolyn Bennett

Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Joe Jordan Wendy Lill Mark Muise Nancy Karetak-Lindell Judi Longfield Andy Scott Deborah Grey

INDUSTRY

Chair: Susan Whelan Vice-Chairmen: Eugène Bellemare

Rahim Jaffer

Stan Keyes Sue Barnes Eric Lowther Janko Perić Antoine Dubé Francine Lalonde Ian Murray Nelson Riis Jim Pankiw Walt Lastewka Alex Shepherd

Marlene Jennings

Jim Jones

Associate Members

Peter Adams Serge Cardin Philip Mayfield Benoît Sauvageau Hélène Alarie Jean Dubé Réal Ménard Werner Schmidt Pierre Brien Christiane Gagnon John Solomon Val Meredith

Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Chuck Cadman

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: John Maloney Vice-Chairmen: Chuck Cadman

Paul DeVillers

Jim Abbott Aileen Carroll Peter MacKay John McKay

Reg Alcock Ivan Grose Peter Mancini John Reynolds Eleni Bakopanos Derek Lee Richard Marceau Jacques Saada

Michel Bellehumeur

Associate Members

Bernard Bigras Michel Guimond Réal Ménard Caroline St-Hilaire Pierre Brien Louise Hardy Mark Muise Diane St-Jacques

Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Richard M. Harris Lynn Myers Darrel Stinson Pierre de Savoye Jay Hill Tom Wappel Jack Ramsay Svend Robinson Christiane Gagnon Gary Lunn Randy White

Jim Gouk Keith Martin

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

Paul DeVillers Chairman:

Jim Gouk Peter MacKay Richard Marceau Jacques Saada (9) Tom Wappel Ivan Grose Peter Mancini Lynn Myers

LIAISON

Chairman: Bill Graham Vice—Chairman: Susan Whelan

Gurmant Grewal Gurbax Malhi Brent St. Denis Peter Adams Guy St-Julien Maurizio Bevilacqua Albina Guarnieri John Maloney Raymond Bonin John Harvard Pat O'Brien Joe Volpe Charles Caccia Charles Hubbard Rey Pagtakhan John Williams

Sheila Finestone Clifford Lincoln

Associate Members

Stéphane Bergeron Jay Hill Chuck Strahl Randy White

Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chairman: Pat O'Brien Vice-Chairmen: Art Hanger

David Pratt

(20)

(16)

(16)

Robert Bertrand Jim Hart Judi Longfield George Proud
Hec Clouthier René Laurin John O'Reilly John Richardson
Gordon Earle Ghislain Lebel David Price Bob Wood
Peter Goldring

Associate Members

Rob Anders Serge Cardin Peter Mancini Daniel Turp
Leon Benoit Monique Guay Patrick Martin Pierrette Venne
Pierre Brien John Maloney Janko Perić Elsie Wayne

NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chairman: Brent St. Denis Vice-Chairmen: Dave Chatters

Benoît Serré

Réginald BélairPierre de SavoyeTony IannoCarolyn ParrishGilles BernierJohn DuncanMarlene JenningsCarmen ProvenzanoGerry ByrneYvon GodinGhislain LebelWerner SchmidtRoy Cullen

Associate Members

Jim Abbott René Canuel Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Nelson Riis Hélène Alarie Serge Cardin Jim Jones Darrel Stinson Chris Axworthy Jean-Guy Chrétien Gerald Keddy Angela Vautour Cliff Breitkreuz Michelle Dockrill Gilles Perron Pierrette Venne Pierre Brien Ghislain Fournier

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Vice-Chairs: Chair: Peter Adams Marlene Catterall Chuck Strahl Roy Bailey Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Bob Kilger John Richardson (16) George Baker Joe Fontana Gar Knutson John Solomon Stéphane Bergeron André Harvey Lynn Myers Randy White Yvon Charbonneau **Associate Members** Jay Hill Bill Matthews Michel Bellehumeur Michelle Dockrill Bill Blaikie Norman Doyle Joe Jordan Grant McNally Don Boudria Gurmant Grewal René Laurin Réal Ménard Garry Breitkreuz Deborah Grey Steve Mahoney Suzanne Tremblay Elinor Caplan Mac Harb SUB-COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES Chairman: Garry Breitkreuz Norman E. Doyle Bob Kilger John Solomon (5) Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS Chair: Lynn Myers William Blaikie Deborah Grey André Harvey Joe Jordan (6) Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE Chairman: Bob Kilger Randy White Stéphane Bergeron Don Boudria André Harvey (6) Bill Blaikie

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

John Williams Vice-Chairmen: Chairman: Ivan Grose

Lynn Myers

(17)

(16)

Beth Phinney Jerry Pickard Mark Assad Paul Forseth Philip Mayfield Eugène Bellemare Lorne Nystrom Mac Harb Gilles Perron Elsie Wayne

Serge Cardin Jason Kenney John Finlay Steve Mahoney

Associate Members

Peter Adams Bev Desjarlais Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Derrek Konrad Roy Bailey Odina Desrochers Gurmant Grewal Ghislain Lebel Garry Breitkreuz Michelle Dockrill Michel Guimond Peter Stoffer Jim Jones Pierrette Venne

Scott Brison Antoine Dubé Rick Casson Christiane Gagnon

SUB-COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL REPORTING

John Williams Chairman:

Serge Cardin Mac Harb Lynn Myers (4)

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin Vice-Chairmen: Roy Cullen

Lee Morrison

John Maloney

Rob Anders John Cannis Stan Dromisky Ovid Jackson

Gérard Asselin Bill Casey Claude Drouin Stan Keyes Michel Guimond Roy Bailey Bev Desjarlais Lou Sekora

Murray Calder

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy Pierre Brien Maurice Dumas

Yvan Bernier Serge Cardin Ghislain Fournier Yves Rocheleau Rick Borotsik Paul Crête Rick Laliberte Elsie Wayne

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairmen: Eymard G. Corbin Joint Vice—Chairman: Roy Bailey

Gurbax Malhi

Representing the Senate: Representing the House of Commons:

The Honourable Senators

Roch Bolduc Richard H. Kroft Marlene Catterall Philip Mayfield (23)

Jerahmiel S. Grafstein

Vivienne Poy

Hec Clouthier

Paul Mercier

Louis J. Robichaud

John Finlay

Deborah Grey

Jim Karygiannis

Karen Redman

Raymond Lavigne Jacques Saada Wendy Lill Brent St. Denis

Associate Members

Libby Davies Maurice Dumas

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Rose–Marie Losier–Cool Joint Vice–Chairmen: Inky Mark

Sheila Finestone Denis Paradis

Representing the Senate: Representing the House of Commons:

The Honourable Senators

Gérald A. Beaudoin Jean-Claude Rivest Mauril Bélanger Val Meredith (24)

Joan FraserFernand RobichaudEugène BellemareMark MuiseJean-Robert GauthierLouis J. RobichaudDenis CoderreLouis PlamondonNoël A. KinsellaPeter GoldringAndy ScottBob KilgerSuzanne Tremblay

Bob Kilger Suzanne Tremblay
Dan McTeague Angela Vautour
Ted McWhinney

Associate Members

Pierre Brien Yvon Godin Maurice Dumas Lorne Nystrom

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Céline Hervieux—Payette Joint Vice—Chairman: Derek Lee

Gurmant Grewal

Representing the Senate: Representing the House of Commons:

The Honourable Senators

P. Derek Lewis Roy Bailey Ghislain Lebel Michael Cogger Marisa Ferretti Barth Léonce Mercier John Bryden John Maloney Normand Grimard Wilfred P. Moore Bill Casey Ian Murray William M. Kelly Joe Comuzzi Lorne Nystrom Paul DeVillers Jacques Saada Ken Epp Pierrette Venne Jim Gouk Tom Wappel

Marlene Jennings

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy Michel Guimond Michel Bellehumeur Richard Marceau (25)

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

CHILD CUSTODY AND ACCESS

Joint Chairs: Landon Pearson

Roger Gallaway

Representing the Senate: Representing the House of Commons:

The Honourable Senators

Erminie J. Cohen Mabel M. DeWare Eleni Bakopanos Judi Longfield (23)

Joan CookDuncan J. JessimanCarolyn BennettEric LowtherAnne C. CoolsMarian MaloneyRobert BertrandPeter Mancini

Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral Philip William Mayfield
Sheila Finestone Denis Paradis
Paul E. Forseth Caroline St–Hilaire
John Harvard Diane St–Jacques

Nancy Karetak-Lindell

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panel of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

Mr. Peter Milliken

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Commitees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien Prime Minister

The Hon. Herb Gray
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy
The Hon. David M. Collenette

The Hon. David M. Collenette

The Hon. David M. Collenette

Deputy Prime Minister

Minister of Foreign Affairs

The Hon. David Anderson Minister of Fisheries and Oceans

The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian

Wheat Board

The Hon. Sheila Copps
The Hon. Sergio Marchi
Minister of Canadian Heritage
Minister for International Trade

The Hon. John Manley Minister of Industry

The Hon. Diane Marleau Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for

Francophonie

The Hon. Paul Martin Minister of Finance

The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton Minister of National Defence

The Hon. Marcel Massé President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure

The Hon. Anne McLellan Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada

The Hon. Allan Rock Minister of Health

The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay
The Hon. Christine Stewart
Solicitor General of Canada
Minister of the Environment

The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano Minister of Public Works and Government Services

The Hon. Lucienne Robillard Minister of Citizenship and Immigration

The Hon. Fred Mifflin Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada

Opportunities Agency)

The Hon. Jane Stewart Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

The Hon. Stéphane Dion President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of

Intergovernmental Affairs

The Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew Minister of Human Resources Development

The Hon. Don Boudria Leader of the Government in the House of Commons

The Hon. Alasdair Graham Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food

The Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal Minister of National Revenue

The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw Minister of Labour

The Hon. Ethel Blondin–Andrew Secretary of State (Children and Youth)

The Hon. Raymond Chan Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific)

The Hon. Martin Cauchon Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the

Regions of Quebec)

The Hon. Hedy Fry Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

The Hon. David Kilgour Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)

The Hon. Jim Peterson Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)

The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western

Economic Diversification)

The Hon. Andrew Mitchell Secretary of State (Parks)

The Hon. Gilbert Normand Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri–Food)(Fisheries and Oceans)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Gar Knutson to Prime Minister

Julian Reed to Minister of Foreign Affairs Stan Dromisky to Minister of Transport

Wayne Easter to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans

Gerry Byrne to Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian

Wheat Board

Mauril Bélanger to Minister of Canadian Heritage Bob Speller to Minister for International Trade

Walt Lastewka to Minister of Industry

Denis Paradis to Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for

Francophonie

Tony Valeri to Minister of Finance

Robert Bertrand to Minister of National Defence

Tony Ianno to President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for

Infrastructure

Eleni Bakopanos to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada

Elinor Caplan to Minister of Health Brenda Chamberlain to Minister of Labour

Paddy Torsney to Minister of the Environment

Carolyn Parrish to Minister of Public Works and Government Services

Andrew Telegdi to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration

Bob Wood to Minister of Veterans Affairs

David Iftody to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Reg Alcock to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of

Intergovernmental Affairs

Bonnie Brown to Minister of Human Resources Development

Peter Adams to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons

Joe McGuire to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food

Beth Phinney to Minister of National Revenue Jacques Saada to Solicitor General of Canada

CONTENTS

Friday, June 4, 1999

GOVERNMENT ORDERS		Ontario Election	
Preclearance Act		Mr. Mayfield	15856
Bill S–22. Report stage	15845	Chantale Tremblay	
Motion for concurrence		Ms. Girard–Bujold	15857
Ms. Robillard		v	
(Motion agreed to)		Immigration	15057
Third reading		Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	15857
Ms. Robillard		Halifax Rifles	
Mr. Reed		Mr. Keddy	15857
Mr. Kenney	15846		
Ms. Meredith	15847	ORAL QUESTION PERIOD	
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	15848	Government Contracts	
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	15851	Mr. Strahl	15857
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	15852	Mr. Gray	
Mr. Penson	15852	Mr. Strahl	15858
		Mr. Gray	
STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS		Mr. Strahl	15858
XXII * C4 1 . 1		Mr. Gray	15858
Whig Standard	15050	Mrs. Ablonczy	15858
Mr. McCormick	15852	Mr. Gray	15858
Pedahbun Lodge		Mrs. Ablonczy	15858
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	15853	Mr. Gray	15858
Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue		V	
Mrs. Finestone	15853	Kosovo	15050
Wils. I mestone	13033	Mr. Gray	15858 15859
Access Awareness Week		Mr. Gray Mr. Bergeron	15859
Mr. Limoges	15853	Mr. Gray	15859
D-Day		Mrs. Guay	15859
Mr. Wood	15854	Mr. Gray	
TDI G		Mrs. Guay	
Tiananmen Square	15054	Mr. Reed	
Mr. Mark	15854		
Tiananmen Square		Fisheries	15050
Mr. Pratt	15854	Mr. Blaikie	15859
Children Victims of Aggression		Mr. Easter	
Mr. Cardin	15854	Mr. Blaikie Mr. Easter	15859 15860
With Culturi	13034	Wil. Easter	13600
Justice		Taxation	
Ms. Catterall	15854	Mr. Jones	
Bloc Quebecois		Mr. Gray	
Mrs. Jennings	15855	Mr. Jones	
O A CERTAIN		Mr. Gray	15860
Ontario Election	15055	Softwood Lumber	
Mr. Reynolds	13633	Mr. Stinson	15860
Tiananmen Square		Mr. Marchi	15860
Mr. Blaikie	15855	Mr. Duncan	15860
René Lévesque		Mr. Marchi	15860
Mr. Desrochers	15855	Millennium Scholarships	
THE DESIGNATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	15055	Mr. Tremblay	15861
National Transportation Week		Mr. Pettigrew	15861
Mr. Dromisky	15856	Mr. Tremblay	15861
Ontario Election		Mr. Pettigrew	15861
Mr. Jones	15856	•	
		Trade	1506
Environment Week Ms. Torsney	15856	Mr. Penson	15861

Fisheries		Points of Order	
Mr. Lunn	15861	Ontario Election	
Mr. Easter	15862	Mr. Kerpan	
Francophonie		Mr. Bélanger	15866
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	15862	Privilege	
Ms. Copps	15862	Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans	
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral		Mr. Easter	15866
Ms. Copps		Mr. Lunn	15867
**		Mr. Boudria	15867
Trade		Mr. Matthews	15867
Mr. Obhrai	15862	Mr. Strahl	
Mr. Marchi	15862	Mr. Easter	
Pesticides			
Mr. Grewal	15862	ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
Mr. Rock	15863	***	
a		Ways and Means	
Canadian Heritage		Notice of motion	4.50.50
Mr. Dumas		Mr. Rock	15868
Ms. Copps	15863	Government response to petitions	
Canadian Armed Forces		Mr. Bélanger	15868
Mr. Richardson	15863	•	15000
Mr. Bertrand		Petitions	
MI. Defualid	13603	The Family	
Endangered Species		Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	15868
Mr. Mayfield	15863	Employment Insurance	
Ms. Torsney	15863	Mr. Kerpan	15868
		MacKay Task Force	
Athabasca River		Mr. Kerpan	15869
Mr. Chatters	15863	Refugees	
Mr. Easter	15864	Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	15869
Bill C-32		The Senate	
	15061	Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	15869
Mr. Laliberte		Canada Post	1000)
Ms. Torsney		Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	15860
Mr. Laliberte			13007
Mr. Rock	15864	Questions on the order paper	
Agriculture		Mr. Bélanger	15869
Mr. Borotsik	15864		
Mr. Vanclief	15864	GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
Mr. Borotsik			
Mr. Vanclief		Preclearance Act	4.50.50
Till tulleller	15001	Bill S–22. Third reading	
Health Canada		Mr. Penson	
Mr. Harb	15865	(Bill read the third time and passed)	15870
Mr. Rock	15865	Carriage by Air Act	
New Councils		Bill S–23. Report stage	15870
Nav Canada	15065	Motion for concurrence	15871
Mr. Morrison	15865	Mr. Rock	15871
Mr. Pettigrew	15865	(Motion agreed to)	15871
Farm Credit Corporation		Third Reading	
Ms. Alarie	15865	2	
Mr. Vanclief		Mr. Rock	15871
Till valididi	15005	Mr. Dromisky	
Agriculture		Mr. Morrison	15871
Mr. Proctor	15865	Mr. Borotsik	15872
Mr. Vanclief	15865	Mr. Morrison	
Vacava		Mr. Laliberte	15872
Kosovo	15066	Mr. Borotsik	15873
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	15866	(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)	15874
Mr. Reed	15866	First Nations Land Management Act	
Safe Boating		Bill C–49. Second reading and concurrence in Senate	
Mr. Bellemare	15866	amendments	15874
Mr. Easter	15866	Mr. Rock	15874
	10000		10017

Mr. Iftody	15874	Motion	15879
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	15875	Mr. Chatters	15880
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	15877	Mr. Reed	15882
		Mr. Keddy	15883
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Mr. Murray	15885
Natural Gas		Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	15886
Mr. Laliberte	15879	Appendix	



Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442 Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to: Canadian Government Publishing, 45 Sacré—Coeur Boulevard, Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non—livraison, retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à: Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, 45 boulevard Sacré—Coeur, Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 089

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.

 $Additional\ copies\ may\ be\ obtained\ from\ Canadian\ Government\ Publishing,\ Ottawa,\ Canada\ K1A\ 0S9$

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9