



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 092 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, April 24, 1998

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 24, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1000)

[*English*]

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1998

Hon. David M. Collette (for the Minister of the Environment) moved that Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

• (1005)

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1998, the Minister of the Environment introduced Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development.

Today the minister is in Toronto for the first joint meeting of energy and environment ministers since Kyoto. The minister will be taking part in a CEPA debate on Monday.

I am pleased to begin the second reading of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

In 1988, only 10 years ago, the Canadian Environment Protection Act, or CEPA, became law. When first introduced CEPA was a significant shift in environmental law and in the way the federal government protected Canada's environment and human health.

The original CEPA contained several important measures including various approaches to the management of toxic substances, provisions for citizens to request an investigation and parliamentary scrutiny and review of the act after five years.

Similar provisions are internationally and domestically becoming more common in environmental legislation. In fact over the past 10 years environmental science and law have evolved considerably. We have much greater insight into the stresses that humans place on the environment. We know more about what must be done to reduce and remedy these stresses. We also have a strong and growing public concern for the environment and related impacts on human health.

Environmental protection is a core value for Canadians. More than 90% of surveyed Canadians are concerned about toxic chemicals, air pollution and water quality. Legislation must reflect the growth and change of society. CEPA must reflect the awareness and concern of Canadians.

I was a member of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development when it undertook the year-long review of CEPA in 1994. Our review, the government response to it and further talks with stakeholders including provinces, territories, aboriginal people, industry, environmental and other groups were included in the development of the bill. The new Canadian Environmental Protection Act must serve as a tool to help Canadians as we move into the 21st century.

Overall, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act covers pollution prevention, managing toxic substances, clean air and water, controlling pollution and waste. The act is further comprised of parts including public participation, environmental matters related to emergencies, biotechnology, federal government operations and federal aboriginal lands, enforcement and information gathering, objectives, guidelines and codes of practice. More important, Bill C-32 incorporates a number of policy directions or objectives.

Some important goals of environmental management are noted in the preamble and these include an ecosystem approach, the precautionary principle and the principle of pollution prevention.

I would like to address the following goals of environmental management: the ecosystem approach, the precautionary principle, user/producer responsibility, pollution prevention, the management of toxic substances, enforcement, and public participation.

Our environment is dependent on countless complex interactions among air, land, water and all living creatures. Ecosystem is defined under the act as a dynamic complex of plant, animal and

Government Orders

micro-organism communities and their non-living environment interacting as a functional unit.

An ecosystem approach to environmental management recognizes the fact that all of these components are interdependent. These interactions are key to our continued health and existence. We cannot, for example, protect our air by removing contaminants from smoke stacks only to dump them into our waterways. We cannot protect our waterways by removing pollutants from discharge pipes and sending them to landfills.

An ecosystem approach to managing our environment requires the consideration of the complete picture and all its interdependencies, not just specific pieces of it. The concept of the comprehensive, integrated whole must underpin all our research activities and the way we make decisions.

The earth is an existing single reality and it can survive—we can survive—only in its integral functioning. An ecosystem approach is an integrative, transdisciplinary approach. It recognizes the interplay and interdependence of various domains such as biophysical, socioeconomic, human health, political and ethical domains that make life possible on our planet. Protection and amelioration of the environment demands this integrative and transdisciplinary approach.

- (1010)

An essential component of the current CEPA is the minister's authority to carry out monitoring and research on environmental quality. Monitoring and research allows us to understand and respond to environmental challenges. Knowledge is a critical precursor to informed decision making. The new CEPA specifies that ecosystem health is included in the concept of environmental quality and provides authority to conduct studies to detect the state of and damage to ecosystems.

Bill C-32 also allows for the publication of a state of the environment report for Canada and the development of ecosystem objectives, guidelines, codes of practice and inventories. Efforts will be focused on maintaining the integrity of ecosystems and not just individual components.

In the preamble of the new Canadian Environmental Protection Act the government is committed to the implementation of the precautionary principle which is now clearly recognized as a fundamental tenet of international environmental law.

Precautionary principle means that we act to prevent environmental damage rather than react after the damage has occurred.

Under the precautionary principle science is an essential component of what is done under CEPA. We must act when the weight of evidence suggests that a potential threat to the environment and human health exists. The costs of inaction are simply too high.

I would like to briefly talk about the concept of user/producer responsibility which has also been included in the preamble to Bill C-32. User/producer responsibility means placing a greater onus on the producer, user or importer of a substance to ensure that it is safe.

This is consistent with current regulations under CEPA that require information and data to allow for an assessment of these products before they are introduced into the marketplace. The bottom line is that individuals who profit from a substance should ensure that it does not pose a risk to the environment or to human health.

The pollution prevention approach demonstrates that government must identify toxic substances, work with others who are in positions to devise effective solutions to change specific processes and reduce or eliminate pollutants and waste and, where necessary, aggressively control these substances.

Pollution prevention is a much better approach than trying to control or clean pollution up after it has been created. The pollution prevention approach benefits the environment, improves the health of Canadians and saves money. Good environmental practices make good business sense. They lower operating costs, increase value for customers and build loyalty.

Canadians are particularly concerned about the risks that toxic substances pose to their health, their children's health, as well as the long term sustainability of their environment.

It has been recognized that stricter management action is required for toxics if they result primarily from human activity, if they persist in the environment for long periods of time and if they bioaccumulate, that is, the toxins are stored in the tissues of living creatures.

Minute quantities of these substances can build up over time. When they do, they can reach levels that cause serious, long term adverse effects to the environment or to human health. Once in the environment, these substances will damage our health and our ecosystem over many generations through subtle effects to the endocrine, immune, reproductive and other sensitive biological systems.

A virtual elimination approach for these substances is required to protect our health and that of the environment.

Bill C-32 allows the government to completely prohibit the importation and manufacture of these substances.

Environmental protection compliance orders are a powerful new tool that work like injunctions. Our inspectors will be able to issue orders on the spot to stop illegal activity and, if necessary, require

Government Orders

an action to correct a violation so that the environment and public safety are protected.

Bill C-32 also creates a new category of enforcement officer called CEPA investigators. These officers will be investigation specialists with expertise in the gathering of evidence and court procedures. They will have all the powers of inspectors as well as certain peace officer powers such as the authority to serve court documents. Environmental protection alternative measures, EPAMs, are another enforcement tool. These alternative measures are essentially negotiated settlements to criminal charges. They allow the government to get companies back into compliance and make them pay fines or restore the environment without proceeding into costly and lengthy court cases. Charges are withdrawn only once the conditions of the environmental protection alternative measures are met.

• (1015)

Canadians have a role to play in maintaining a healthy and viable environment. Canadians want a healthy environment and they want to be involved in the solutions. Government alone cannot be expected to protect the environment. Canadians have throughout the years expressed their desire to be active participants.

While provisions for public participation were included by parliament in the original CEPA they were limited. The new CEPA seeks to improve opportunities for public participation. First, Bill C-32 requires the establishment of a registry of environmental information. It is currently proposed to make the registry accessible through the Internet. This will increase information available to Canadians. Use of the registry should increase public participation, how Canadians make more informed decisions and make it easier to hold the government accountable for its actions.

Second, Bill C-32 sets out an explicit requirement to establish and publish the national pollutants release inventory so that Canadians have access to information about pollutants being released in their communities. This inventory exists now on the basis of a policy decision. With Bill C-32 the government is going further by making it a legal commitment to provide the public with information.

Third, under the existing CEPA whistleblower protection applies only to individuals who report illegal releases of toxic substances. Bill C-32 also broadens this to include all violations such as improper storage of PCB contaminated material. Individuals who report infractions can have their confidentiality protected and all federally regulated employees can report violations without fear of dismissal, harassment or disciplinary action.

In addition, the current CEPA allows citizens to sue only if they can demonstrate that they have suffered loss or damage because of a violation of the act. In the original red book we stated our intention to use the review of CEPA to examine giving members of

the public access to the courts as a last recourse if the federal government fails to enforce an environmental law.

Bill C-32 allows citizens to sue when there has been a violation of CEPA and the government fails to enforce the act resulting in significant harm to the environment. In other words, a person can sue for damage to the environment without the need to prove they suffered personal harm.

These changes will foster greater public participation which will help ensure the protection of Canada's environment.

I call on all members of the House to enter into the debate on this very important piece of environmental legislation. The legacy we as members of the House leave our children and generations to follow is reflected in how we regard the natural environment.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure. I would like to address the bill before the House on behalf of the member for Nanaimo—Alberni, the Reform environment critic.

Reform's position on the environment is very clear. The Reform Party supports ensuring that all Canadians dwell in a clean and healthy environment. Reform believes that environmental considerations must carry equal weight with economic, social and technical considerations in the development of a project. This is the key to protecting our environment. We believe in public consultation, public participation and public commitment. Governments must work together to ensure our environment is a priority.

When the Canadian Environmental Protection Act came into force in 1988 the primary objective of the act was to protect the environment and protect human health. The act was intended to fill regulatory gaps in certain environmental matters, particularly with regard to toxic substances. It was also aimed at enabling Canada to fulfil international obligations. The Environmental Protection Act replaced and incorporated several previously existing acts such as the environmental contaminants act, the ocean dumping control act and the clean air act. Section 139 of the act requires a five year mandatory review of the administration of the act, and review began in the last parliament. The Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development held hearings which resulted in a report full of recommendations so that the then minister of the environment drafted Bill C-74 in the last parliament. But for many reasons, largely a result of its inadequacies, which I will get into briefly a little later, it died on the order paper and never made it through the House in the last parliament.

• (1020)

The bill we are talking about today is Bill C-32 which is a revamped version of Bill C-74 tabled in the last parliament. This

Government Orders

new legislation provides measures for protection of the environment and human health, pollution prevention, management of toxic substances, virtual elimination of releases of substances determined to be most dangerous, and partnerships to achieve highest levels of environmental quality.

Changes to CEPA contained in Bill C-32 include provisions to implement pollution prevention, new procedures for the investigation and assessment of substances and new requirements for toxic assessments, new provisions respecting fuels, international air and water pollution, motor emissions, federal and aboriginal land protection, disposal of wastes and other matter at sea and the export and import of wastes. That is quite an expansion.

The legislation provides for the gathering of information for research and the creation of inventories of data, publishing of objectives, guidelines and codes of practice, new powers for inspectors, investigators and laboratory analysts, environmental protection alternative measures and civil suit action guidelines.

Although we are still considering the merits of this bill it appears the legislation has resurfaced with amendments that work in favour of the bill. There are many areas in this bill that Reform supports. However, there is also concerns which must be addressed both in committee and in the House.

In speaking today there are four major areas that I want to discuss. Those four areas contained in the legislation are the main areas of jurisdictional issues, public consultation, science and enforcement. I will start off with the jurisdictional issues.

As it stands, environmental jurisdiction is not clearly defined and separated in our Constitution. Since the 1980s expanded environmental protection at the federal and provincial levels of government has caused considerable tension. Although the supreme court decision ruled last September that Ottawa has the right to enact legislation to protect the environment the federal government should not take this as a *carte blanche* to run roughshod over the provinces.

Although environmental issues transcend boundaries there is no reason for the federal government to interfere in provincial affairs. Federal-provincial co-operation is essential to ensure environmental policies are carried through. Clearly provinces must be involved in this process as Environment Canada simply does not have sufficient resources to take full responsibility for the implementation of the act.

Reform blue book policy clearly supports the establishment of clear federal-provincial jurisdiction over environmental matters. There have been some amendments to the bill introduced since the last parliament to require co-operation between levels of government and to better recognize the harmonization accord.

• (1025)

The preamble sets out a shared responsibility for the environment. This is a start. However, this can be improved as the bill does not spell out that the government will discharge its responsibilities by working co-operatively under the federal-provincial-territorial Canada-wide accord on environmental harmonization agreed to in principle by the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment and the subagreements.

Bill C-32 does not and should ensure that the provinces are able to advise the federal government on an international treaty requiring provincial implementation and that they take part in the treaty's implementation strategy. The bill also empowers the minister to control the movement of non-hazardous solid waste to or from the United States. As waste management is primarily provincial jurisdiction, this probably represents an intrusion on provincial powers that must be addressed.

Furthermore, Bill C-32 creates a national advisory committee. The concept of a national advisory committee appears quite meaningful at first observation, yet on examination of this section of the bill it is clear that the committee may be compromised by its very structure. The committee, surprise, is appointed by the minister and not by the provinces. Therefore it is very likely that this committee may function as little more than a political vehicle to promote the minister's agenda rather than a national vehicle to ensure that the provinces and territories are properly represented in the decision making.

I was going to talk about four issues, jurisdictional issues, public consultation, science and enforcement. I have talked about the jurisdictional issues. I am now going to talk about public consultation.

It is critical that the process for public consultation in the development of regulations and additions of new substances to this act be as fair and open as possible. The Reform Party is founded on the principle of grassroots participation and public consultation in policy development. This is particularly important when we deal with issues such as the environment that affect all Canadians.

In the last parliament one of the strong complaints voiced by many against the bill was that it lacked proper consultation. There were over 100 concerns regarding the bill when it was introduced in the last Parliament. Some areas of concern have been addressed in the new legislation, though there are still areas that need attention. Some of the issues concern the public consultation process. For example, the bill needs to ensure that all draft regulations and guidelines are released for public comment 60 days before the minister formally releases the assessment.

Government Orders

The bill creates an environmental registry. However, the form and access of the registry is at the minister's discretion. Access to this registry should be open and the form clearly announced.

The act allows for notice of final agreements to go into the *Canada Gazette* but it does not require that the final text of all agreements be published in full in the *Canada Gazette* or as an alternative that access be provided through the Internet. These are very common sense things.

The act does not allow the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development adequate time to review proposed administrative and equivalency agreements. Clearly it is important that we move away from the old way of doing business behind closed doors and into a more transparent manner of conducting business.

The third area I want to talk about is science.

• (1030)

When dealing with the environment, sound science is essential to good policy discussions and decisions. This is not always the case with the present government. Our legislation must ensure that political decisions do not overshadow making the right choices to protect our environment. Decisions made under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act must be substantiated by scientific study.

The last bill had serious problems regarding the minister's power to bypass section 65 and its risk assessment approach for determination of toxic substances. This section gave the minister unlimited powers to bypass science in her decision making. This was one of the critical reasons Reform, industry and many Canadians could not support the bill. It is likely one of the reasons for its demise in the last parliament. This section has now been amended. I look forward to receiving comments from witnesses as to whether this has been properly addressed in the new bill.

Some areas of concern regarding the science of the bill includes the fact that toxic is not defined in the preamble. Yet it is defined in the section on controlling toxic substances. This is clearly problematic because it may allow substances to be defined toxic without scientific evidence which proves that they are in fact toxic. This section may give the minister of the department authority to arbitrarily ban substances which, if true, is frightening to say the least.

This was a major concern in the last parliament. A separate piece of legislation went through parliament banning MMT without a scientific basis. We now have an ongoing legal suit from Ethyl Corporation that is held up by many as a fallout from things like negotiating the MAI as a complexity that can be made much worse through something like the MAI. If the decision on MMT had been done not on ramming legislation through the House without scientific basis but had been done on a scientific rationale the

whole argument would be moot. We must ensure that the legislation does not allow that kind of back door thing to occur again.

Another concern is the fact that provisions to provide for toxic assessment consultation failed to require that qualified experts from government, academia and industry be full partners in the assessment process.

Another controversial section of the bill is where it provides for a national ban on substances banned in other provinces or industrialized countries. Such a policy could negate the need for Canada to carry out a risk assessment as a basis for chemical control, which is the standard accepted internationally and by the science community. This policy could also undermine the necessity of requiring a scientific basis for decisions. It is critical that the role of science be clarified so that science forms the basis of decisions made under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. This needs to be spelled out clearly and precisely. Without that all else fails.

The fourth subject area I want to discuss is the whole area of enforcement, which is also critical to environmental policy.

The Reform Party has many clear positions on enforcement. Reform bluebook policy clearly supports the principle that the polluter shall pay for its pollution controls, that this be stringently enforced in an unbiased manner and that penalties be severe enough that polluters will not consider them a licence fee to pollute.

• (1035)

Reform also supports fines and jail sentences for officers and executives of companies violating environmental laws. The biggest problem with the Canadian Environmental Protection Act in this regard is its lack of enforcement. When CEPA was proclaimed 10 years ago the Conservative government bragged that it had introduced the toughest environmental law in the western hemisphere. Yet this has proven to be quite the exaggeration.

One of the principal concerns regarding this act is inadequate funding for enforcement. The Department of the Environment simply does not have the resources to ensure that the requirements of the act are fulfilled. The clearest way to state that is that the environment department has had almost two-thirds of its budget slashed since the Liberals came to power. That is quite a commitment to the environment.

No matter how tough the minister makes this act it will make no difference unless the department has the resources to enforce the legislation.

What must be emphasized, however, is more than enforcement. The operative word is compliance, not enforcement. Compliance is number one. It is always better to follow the carrot on the stick approach. A law must have the capacity to enforce its regulations. Yet it will be a more effective law if it can deter individuals from

Government Orders

breaking the law or, better yet, if it can encourage individuals to follow the law.

That applies to all legislation in the House. If we could follow the basic principle that incentives, all things being equal, work better than sticks, I think we would all be much further ahead. The business community certainly knows about natural incentives.

Other areas of enforcement contained in Bill C-32 also need to be examined and possibly amended for improvement. For example, the right to supervision contained within the bill may be improved if amended so that the government is made a mandatory party to any suit. Whistleblower protection contained in the legislation may also require expansion to include whistleblower protection for workers who report breaches of the law and bad environmental practices, not just to inspectors but to the public and through the media. Pollution is a public issue and workers should have the right to publicize it without fear of sanctions.

Despite the many needed areas of improvement, some of the other improvements to the bill include improved time lines for adding new substances that have been assessed to the domestic substances list. Pollution prevention planning guidelines have been further developed in the new bill. Recognition of voluntary instruments has also been added. Section 51 has been amended to ensure that pollution prevention, virtual elimination and environmental emergency plans can only be required by the minister for substances on the list of toxic substances. Greater flexibility has been provided in the preparation of pollution prevention plans to keep with the policy objective that these plans do not become akin to excessive regulatory burden.

How does a bureaucrat cut red tape? The answer is lengthways. As we can see many changes have been made to Bill C-32 to make the bill more acceptable to the public than Bill C-74 which died in the last parliament.

• (1040)

There are still areas of concern that need to be worked out. Canadians have waited a long time for the government to pass meaningful and realistic environmental legislation.

We had the recent example of the fiasco over Kyoto. We do not need another one of those. Canada went with no plan, no preannounced target. We abandoned our own negotiators for political reasons. We had no cost benefit analysis, no idea of how to get to our commitment. It was an international embarrassment due to a Liberal search for political correctness, without caring about the downstream consequences. It was almost as if we would not bother to measure them so that we could not be held accountable later. It is sort of like make it up as we go along.

I am hoping to see our government get away from its empty rhetoric and destructive political agenda and move toward some-

thing more realistic and acceptable to Canadians that will truly benefit our environment.

It appears there has been progress in amendments to the legislation since the last parliament. The bill has shortcomings and some revisions are certainly required, as I have pointed out.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on a subject of the utmost importance. We in the Bloc Québécois consider that the relationship between developing our economy and protecting the environment is one of the major challenges facing our society.

For the past few generations, the capacity of the human race to modify the world ecosystem has undergone a spectacular increase, as the result of the population explosion and our dizzying rate of technological progress.

World economic activity, for example, is more than 20 times what it was in 1900. Consequently, many human activities are on the verge of surpassing our planet's potential to replenish its resources.

Every year, the energy we consume is responsible for releasing billions of tonnes of CO₂ into the atmosphere and for using up more than 40% of the planet's organic material. Every year, we burn almost as much fossil fuel as the earth was able to produce in a million years.

Although we are forced to acknowledge that poverty and hardship exist throughout the world, and will continue to exist, we do not throw up our hands in despair at its scope. Similarly, we are capable of seeking solutions together to many of the challenges posed by our deteriorating environment, and the multiplication of substances that are a threat to human health.

A short-sighted view will not enable us to solve these problems. What we need is a fundamental change to our way of making decisions at all levels of society. We need to start incorporating environmental considerations in our day to day decisions as individuals, managers and legislators.

We must treat the environment as the limited and unique resource that it is. We must treat human life like the fragile thing that it is.

Let there be no illusions about this. The precarious state of our environment is the result of what will soon be two centuries of neglect. There can be no quick fix. There will be more crises, more ecological accidents. What is needed essentially is to restore the ecological balance that has been upset gradually over the centuries, and particularly over the past 100 years.

This is a long term undertaking, and one which will require the commitment of each and every one of us, from the various

Government Orders

governments down to the last individual. Any serious response to the environmental challenge will lay our present lifestyle open to question, because the environmental issue is more than just pollution, domestic and chemical waste, or land use management. These are just symptoms of a larger problem.

• (1045)

The main thing is the way we approach our relationships, define our prosperity and select a lifestyle. In this respect, we are witnessing a real revolution in attitudes. Recent polls, newspaper forums and radio hot-lines all agree.

The public, and young people in particular, consider quality of life more important than the mere accumulation of consumer goods. They choose health over the pursuit of economic expansion at all cost. These new values are priorities. They should be used as the basis for the political will to allocate sufficient resources to the preservation of the environment we all care about.

It is paradoxical that this government repeatedly drew upon this widely held public opinion to finally come up short in terms of a commitment to reduce greenhouse gases and protect the collective scientific tools used to assess our environmental situation.

This government cannot be satisfied with reacting to environmental crises. Never has the government developed a long term action plan which takes into account the collective diversity of the territory for which it is responsible under the Constitution. Never has the government given any serious thought to where it wanted to be five or ten years down the road and even after that.

In order to have a political will, governments must be able to set out the goals they wish to achieve through specific actions. For the time being, we must unfortunately express concern about this government's lack of vision on environmental issues in the current constitutional context.

In fact, since I have been sitting in this House as the member for Rosemont, not one federalist party has been able to come up with a vision of the future that reconciles two fundamental values in my view: respect for societies, including Quebec society, and implementation of sustainable development.

Bill C-32 as it stands symbolizes the failure of a unilateral federal approach, which denies the right of the Quebec people to decide their own future. This is my view of Bill C-32. Because of what I believe in, I cannot consider this bill simply from a sovereigntist or environmentalist point of view. I am opposed to Bill C-32, because this Liberal bill fails to reconcile two fundamental values for Quebecers.

First, my vision of sustainable development is based on the conclusions of the United Nations commission on the environment

and development, chaired by the then Prime Minister of Norway, Gro Brundtland. The commission defined this new concept that it was proposing to the world, namely that economic development must now be subject to environmental considerations.

Let us be clear: it is wrong to claim that the environment must now be at odds with economic development. These two basic realities are not at odds: they are essential elements of a type of progress that is now sustainable in our society.

The notion of sustainable development simply means that we must no longer endanger the resources of our planet and that we must make sure our natural resources will still be there for future generations. In other words, economic development must be achieved by preserving our planet's resources, rather than by using them up, or, to use a financial image, by using the interest and not the capital, in terms of our resources.

Economic development must not jeopardize the planet's natural balance. Since I first came to Ottawa, all too often I have seen people try to change the meaning of sustainable development. They closely link that concept to economic growth and then use it to oppose environmental concerns.

These people are not helping anyone's cause. If anything, they take us back 10 years, before the Liberals and before the work of the United Nations on development and the environment. We now have to recognize that the respect for individuals must be extended to their surroundings.

• (1050)

In other words, it is not a question of choosing between economic growth and environmental protection. Since both of these concerns are essential to global survival, what matters is finding an approach that takes both into account.

This environmental challenge still requires changes in attitude that force us to reconcile what might initially look like contradictory goals. I am convinced that we can forge a consensus in Quebec around these environmental and economic convictions. I am sure that a great many Canadians and Quebecers also share my vision of sustainable development.

The misunderstanding does not lie at this level. The difference resides in our identifying with distinct peoples. We want to acquire as many tools as possible for orienting our development.

Our wishes are the opposite of those of the majority of Canadians, who basically want to see Ottawa play an increased role in numerous areas, including that of the environment. Elected representatives from Quebec, whatever their political stripe, have

Government Orders

always fought to be able to retain the prerogatives that allow us to shape our future as we see it.

If there were any sign of this feeling of belonging and this desire for freedom in the other provinces, Bloc Québécois members would not be the only ones rejecting the federal government's attempts to keep on grabbing a little more power. We can only conclude that this wish for autonomy is confined to Quebec. The fact of the matter is that, every time this country wanted or had to make weighty decisions of the sort that reveal basic natures, it went into crisis.

Instead of finding comfort in the face of adversity, instead of being galvanized by a challenge, and united in trust and hope, like a normal country, it instead fell into painful division. From the Riel affair to the schools in Manitoba, from conscription in World War I to conscription in World War II, from the 1982 patriation to the passage of the free trade agreement, from the Meech Lake accord to the Charlottetown accord, each time the same wounds were opened anew, the same tenuous solidarity was torn apart along the same stress lines by the same tensions. Paralysis and uncertainty were the poisoned fruits of this inability to live together.

Two recent environmental initiatives provide another illustration of the forces blocking the legitimate aspirations of two peoples still bound together by one federal government. The first issue is of the highest importance for our future, since it involves climactic changes affecting the nature of life on earth as we know it today. As I speak, millions of tonnes of carbon dioxide are being released into the atmosphere. In North America alone, we are responsible for more than a quarter of these emissions, which are having an unprecedented effect on our atmosphere.

For some time already, scientists from the four corners of the globe have noted that the planet has been warming up at a rate unprecedented in the past hundred years or so. Naturally, many research teams have looked at this phenomenon to understand its origins. One after another, the teams have published their disturbing results, which have begun to reveal that human activity is responsible for global warming.

Their conclusions were immediately contested by many scientists, who were astonished to learn that humans could have such an impact on the atmosphere protecting us. For a long time these scientists and ecologists were reduced to preaching in the wilderness. However, by the mid-1980s, we were becoming increasingly aware of the seriousness of the environmental problem we now face.

Once the main concerns relating to the 1982 economic crisis were resolved, our societies began to realize the scope and the amplitude of our environmental problems. We all benefited from the expanded debate that ensued. It did not take long for the environment to become a concern to society as a whole.

Public awareness supported both specialists and political leaders in their efforts to further protect the environment. After facing the

many challenges necessitated by greater levels of protection of waters, air, forests and the earth, we looked to problems at the global level, such as those concerning our atmosphere.

The international scale of these problems necessarily involves global and co-operative action by nations.

• (1055)

This led to the signature in Helsinki, in 1984, of the first international protocol to reduce transborder emissions responsible for acid rain. Three years later, in 1987, Montreal hosted an international meeting that resulted in the signing of the Montreal protocol, the purpose of which is to reduce the production of gases harmful to the ozone layer.

Five years later, over 150 nations got together in Rio for the earth summit. This meeting led to the signing of a UN framework agreement to limit concentrations of greenhouse gases. At this unprecedented summit, developed countries adopted the common goal of stabilizing greenhouse gas emissions at the 1990 level by the year 2000.

Today, five years after the Berlin conference, Canada as a whole has achieved nothing but a resounding absence of concrete measures for meeting this challenge. Why? Because the Liberal government, which has been in office since 1993, seems to have devoted more effort to developing an environmental doublespeak than to implementing concrete measures for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

There is no lack of examples. In a self-congratulatory advertisement that appeared on April 24, the Liberals claimed to have demonstrated international leadership by helping reduce the causes of climate change in the world. Nothing could be further from the truth. Unless, in Liberal speak, leadership means one of the worst performances in the world when it comes to reducing greenhouse gases.

Indeed, compared to other OECD members, Canada has done poorly in terms of reducing greenhouse gases, in spite of the good results achieved by Quebec, which is still in a position to meet the objectives set in Rio. For Canada as a whole, however, observers expect that there will be an increase of 13% in emissions by the year 2000.

If, by international leadership the Liberals are not referring to this country's notorious failure to reduce greenhouse gases, perhaps they are referring to its apparent wish to be the last to present a reduction goal for the period up to 2010.

In fact, thanks to the Liberal government, Canada was the last G-7 country to present its negotiating position for the Kyoto summit. For a long time, the only public position that was endorsed by the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Natural

S. O. 31

Resources was the Regina position. Once again, this decision widened the gap between two blueprints for society. • (1100)

The Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but he will have 23 minutes left to conclude his remarks after oral question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

MAPLE SYRUP

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the maple sap is flowing in many parts of this great country of ours.

Around the world one of the things Canada is known for is the delicious maple syrup produced here. The most recent edition of the Canada Catalogue, a publication sponsored by the Canadian Tourism Commission to help sell Canada globally, includes two pages of information on Jakeman's Maple Products of Beachville in Oxford county.

I want to assure Canadians and those around the world who eagerly await the syrup season each year that high quality maple syrup and other maple products like maple sugar leaves, maple pops, maple crisp and maple brittle are being produced in my riding and many other ridings throughout Ontario and Quebec.

I look forward to taste testing this year's vintage of Jakeman's fine maple syrup in its many forms as the year progresses.

* * *

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, is there no limit to which this government will sink into the stinking swamp of political degradation?

How can an opposition motion ever cause a vote of confidence in the government? Only when the government is determined to strong arm its members into holding their noses and voting against what is right.

Hepatitis C victims are further victimized by this government's unwillingness to provide just compensation for the government's irresponsibility. Why is the government putting its politics before the needs of these victims?

Only a thorough reform of this parliament will allow it to be the democratic institution that represents the Canadian people and not a political machine. Call your MP, call the health minister and call the Prime Minister to let them know what you think, not only about their hepatitis C compensation package, but also about their refusal to listen to Canadians and the need for parliamentary reform.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, each year I like to stand and invite all of my hon. colleagues and their constituents to my riding of Hillsborough, and Prince Edward Island in general.

P.E.I. has in the past few years really strived to enhance its tourism sector. We are graced with beautiful sandy beaches, gentle rolling hills and inviting warm weather. We also have our eternal tribute to Anne of Green Gables with the various tourist sites and the famous stage production at the Confederation Centre of the Arts.

Prince Edward Island is now more accessible since the opening of the Confederation bridge. In fact the bridge has become an attraction in itself. As proof, last year there were over one million visitors. That is up substantially from the year previous. But we are not yet satisfied. The industry this year is aiming for 1.4 million visitors.

I invite everyone from across the country to come and enjoy everything Prince Edward Island has to offer. I can assure them they will not be disappointed.

* * *

BREAKFAST FOR LEARNING

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Canadian Living Foundation's Breakfast for Learning Program.

Research shows that children learn better on a full stomach. Their concentration skills and ability to retain information are stronger when they enter the classroom on a full stomach after having a good breakfast.

The Breakfast for Learning Program has been helping thousands of Canadian children. Since 1992, over 24 million meals have been served in many schools across this great country, including those in my riding of Bruce—Grey.

Even the best teachers cannot reach a child without the energy to learn. With a funding request now before the government I urge my colleagues in the House of Commons to support child nutrition programs like Breakfast for Learning. By sending our children into the classroom with full stomachs today we ensure the best possible head start for those who will steer Canada into the future.

* * *

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

Ms. Elinor Caplan (Thornhill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, volunteers open doors to a better world. That is the motto for this year's National Volunteer Week.

S. O. 31

With the goal of improving our communities and quality of life, thousands of volunteers and organizations devote their time and energy to many different worthwhile causes. Whether in times of crisis or in day to day life, volunteers from all over Canada are willing and available to help each other and strengthen our communities.

This week is a chance to celebrate, congratulate and encourage others to participate and enjoy the benefits derived from volunteerism. As I told volunteers last night from the York Region Children's Aid Society, volunteers can make a difference. They can make a difference for themselves, their children, their community and their country.

Get involved and make a difference. Be a volunteer.

* * *

CANADIAN WAR HEROES

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's brave young men fought, spilled blood and died on foreign soil 50 short years ago. Fifty thousand never returned to their homes. One million Canadians rose to their task in World War II.

Our country was third in allied military might. Canada trained all air forces of the free world. Canada's factories built 17,000 planes. Canada's navy and merchant seamen kept sea lanes free to feed the war effort. Now we shame this memory by neglect. Now we belittle our proud war effort. Now we extinguish Canada's war leader from view.

Quebec ought not drop the torch. Quebec must hold it high. Our Prime Minister Mackenzie King must stand shoulder to shoulder with other leaders of a war that allowed our flag to fly. All three must be remembered. Lest we forget.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last December in Kyoto this government agreed to a protocol that committed Canada to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 6% below 1990 levels by the period 2008-2010.

This week Shell Oil withdrew from the U.S. lobby group known as the Global Climate Coalition. This group opposes the protocol.

We, as a government, are committed to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions and honouring our Kyoto commitments. Since Kyoto, Canada and the international community have been directing our energies to how we will meet our commitment, because meet it we shall.

To achieve this Canada will be working with the provinces and territories, as well as with local governments, community organiza-

tions and the private sector. That is why today in Toronto the ministers of environment and energy are meeting their provincial and territorial counterparts. They want to work with all sectors to design Canada's national implementation strategy.

• (1105)

Companies like Shell and other people who believe that climate change is not an economic drain but rather an economic environmental opportunity are the leaders who will make our Kyoto commitments a reality.

* * *

[Translation]

ARMENIAN PEOPLE

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Armenian community is commemorating today the 83rd anniversary of the 1915 Armenian massacre.

As an expression of solidarity, I offer my deepest sympathies to the Armenian people, and I share their grief. Today, we commemorate the death of one and a half million Armenian martyrs, and the death of all the victims of the terrible carnages of our century.

In so doing, we are helping the international community in its efforts to end such killings. As you know, Canada has always been and will continue to be a great protector of human rights.

I take this opportunity to commend Montreal's Armenian community for its spirit of justice and for its constant efforts to have that historic tragedy recognized as it should be.

* * *

[English]

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, hepatitis C is a killer disease. Its victims suffer and die. Unlike other diseases, hep C is given by the government through tainted blood. Blood is not for sale in Canada.

Canadians trusted our government, but our government failed them.

The Liberal government continues to refuse to do the right thing by not compensating all the victims fairly. I believe the Prime Minister is confused about what the letter C in hepatitis C stands for: compensation, compassion or confidence vote.

Earlier the government made a mistake by not screening the blood supply. Then the government made another mistake by not compensating fairly all the victims. Now it will make another mistake by not allowing a free vote in the House for government backbenchers.

I remind all members in the House that principles should be more important than policies and—

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

* * *

TOBACCO

Ms. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage members of this House to join me in condemning any cigarette advertising or promotion that encourages youth smoking.

Tobacco addiction is a major public health threat. By some estimates, over 40,000 lives are lost each year as a result of smoking.

Tobacco use is an addiction that is almost always acquired in childhood. That is why I support the government's Bill C-71 initiative and I look forward to future initiatives that will discourage youth smoking.

Tobacco is a factor in 80% of all preventable deaths. We as a society must make an effort to prevent addiction among young people. Bill C-71 started us in the right direction by limiting advertising and promotion. It will also commit funds to education, enforcement, smoking prevention and cessation programs.

We have an opportunity to prevent some of the 40,000 annual tobacco deaths. Let us keep building on the momentum of Bill C-71 to ensure that some day this country raises a generation that collectively says no to tobacco.

April is cancer month, when thousands of volunteers will be knocking on doors all over the country. Please give generously.

* * *

[Translation]

ARMENIAN PEOPLE

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on this 83rd anniversary of the Armenian genocide, the Bloc Québécois wishes to express its deepest sympathy to the Armenian community and its admiration for the courage of Armenians who, for many years, suffered atrocities under the Ottoman Empire.

Unfortunately, the government opposite has always refused to recognize the Armenian genocide. Yet, the facts speak for themselves. From 1915 to 1923, close to two million Armenians were executed or deported by the Ottoman government of Turkey.

The commemoration of the Armenian genocide reminds Quebecers and Canadians that any country that resorts to violence as a political instrument—a genocide being the most extreme form of such violence—is committing a crime against humanity.

S. O. 31

Today, along with the Armenian community, the Bloc Québécois remembers.

* * *

[English]

FISHERIES

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans under the direction of the federal government has failed miserably in its management of fish stocks in Canada.

On the east coast stocks such as lobster, cod, crab, scallops, salmon, shrimp and silver hake are being mismanaged and poorly allocated. The same goes for salmon and hake on the west coast, and yet the livelihood of thousands of families and hundreds of communities on both coasts are in peril.

• (1110)

It is time this government lived up to its responsibility and allocated the resources necessary to compensate the victims of its actions by implementing a community based, comprehensive plan so that the fishing communities can get on with their lives and so that we can rebuild the depleted stocks.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour all our Canadian military personnel helping keep the peace in distant corners of the world.

[English]

Today when Canadians think of peacekeeping they think of Bosnia, Haiti, the Persian Gulf. These missions are Canada's most visible peacekeeping efforts, but are by no means our only contributions.

Today I wish to salute the efforts of military personnel in some of those unsung United Nations' missions around the world. I salute the following Canadians: the three people serving to maintain peace in Cyprus; the 28 people in the Sinai Desert enforcing the 1979 peace accord between Egypt and Israel; the 187 supervising the ceasefire between Israel and Syria; and the seven military engineers helping the people of Cambodia rid themselves of antipersonnel land mines.

I am sure that I speak for all of us in the House of Commons when I say we are proud of them all.

* * *

[Translation]

ARMENIAN PEOPLE

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC): Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate a tragic event in the history of humanity, the

Oral Questions

persecution and murder of a million and half Armenian men, women and children during the first world war.

Those who managed to flee this genocide have settled throughout the world, and many of their descendants are today citizens of Canada.

[English]

It has been said that those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it. We join today with members of the Armenian community and other Canadians in remembering the atrocity of crimes against humanity.

This grim anniversary is an important reminder to all of us. We share a responsibility to help build understanding between peoples and between nations so that the peace that was denied their ancestors can be experienced by future generations around the world.

* * *

PEACEKEEPING

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in September 1993 during a UN peacekeeping operation in the former Yugoslavia, Canadian troops of the 2nd Battalion of the Princess Patricia's Light Infantry found themselves in the middle of a conflict between Croat and Serbian forces. A UN sponsored ceasefire agreement called on the Croats to withdraw their forces and let Canadian soldiers deploy into the Medak pocket to establish a buffer zone.

However, the Croats had different plans. They attacked Canadian positions with heavy artillery and machine-gun fire. The Canadian soldiers returned fire to defend themselves. One unit came under repeated attacks but held its ground. Eventually the Canadians forced compliance with the ceasefire agreement and ended an ethnic cleansing operation in the area. The Canadians were given a rare unit citation by the French UN commander for their collective bravery and devotion to duty. Unfortunately, most Canadians know very little about the Medak pocket action.

On Monday the national defence committee will hear from Colonel Jim Calvin, the commanding officer, and some of his troops. I would encourage MPs to attend to hear their remarkable story.

* * *

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, family members, friends, constituents—many people have asked me for help because they were infected with hepatitis C from tainted blood. Through no fault of their own, no fault of their doctor or hospital, they received a product so poisonous that 20% or more will die and many others will be too sick to ever work again.

One woman from Vernon wrote to say that because her surgeries would require several transfusions she asked about their safety. She said "I was informed by Vernon Jubilee Hospital staff that the blood had been tested at least three times for all infectious diseases prior to me receiving it".

Somebody lied. Somebody assured Canadians that our blood supply was safe, even though they knew it was not. The Government of Canada stood behind that guarantee of safety. Now it is time for the Government of Canada to make good on our guarantee.

I ask all honourable members to look into the faces of friends who have lost a dear family member to tainted blood, as I had to do this week, and then vote with your conscience to compensate every victim.

* * *

[Translation]

CALGARY DECLARATION

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Jean Charest, the new federalist poster boy in Quebec, announced that he would accept nothing less than the distinct society concept. He also stated that the Calgary declaration was just the beginning of discussions.

Provided Mr. Charest has not changed his tune today, after being called to order by the Liberal Party brass, we need to remember that the Calgary declaration was dragged out of the premiers of English Canada after heavy negotiations behind closed doors.

● (1115)

The federal government is in a bind. It endorsed the Calgary declaration, the final offer from English Canada, and now Jean Charest deems it insufficient and Quebecers want to debate it in a referendum before they will endorse it.

Is the government going to go back to the drawing board on the Calgary declaration or will it tell Jean Charest, through its minister in charge of plan B—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. As the hon. member is well aware, she cannot refer to a member except by riding name or title in the House I trust that she will continue to comply with this.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is no valid reason to turn Tuesday's vote on hepatitis C compensation into a confidence vote, and it is a shame that the Prime Minister has chosen to do that. The only reason he is whipping his caucus into line is politics, pure and simple.

Oral Questions

In 1996 Liberals voted for the opposition motion on the victims of crime. In 1997 they voted for our national unity motion. Both these opposition motions passed and the government of course did not fall.

If he allowed his MPs a free vote then, why will he not allow his MPs a free vote on this important issue?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the debate yesterday that the Reform Party and other opposition parties are asking us to vote a lack of confidence, not just in the federal government but in all the provincial governments and territories, because they are all equally part of the agreement on compensation which the Reform Party and other opposition parties are wrongly opposing.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister knows that is simply not true. The House cannot vote non-confidence in a provincial legislature and it does not intend to on the federal legislature. Some issues are bigger than party lines and they are bigger than party discipline.

I am sure the Liberal whips are a powerful force, but then again a conscience can also be a powerful thing too. Having to look yourself in the mirror every day for the rest of your life, knowing you abandoned those suffering from hepatitis C, sort of puts party politics into perspective, does it not?

Why will the the Prime Minister not allow his members of parliament to do the right thing, vote for their constituents and vote with their consciences in a free vote in the House of Commons?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when members vote in the House on Tuesday I am sure they will be doing the right thing in the interest of hepatitis C victims, in the interest of relations with the provinces.

I ask members of the Reform Party to reconsider their position because when it comes to political points they do not have to give any lessons to anybody. They are doing their best to make this an unwarranted political issue.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last month the minister—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think I am hearing some language that is inappropriate for the Chamber and I ask hon. members to show some restraint.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, last month the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said “My country before my party”. He knew that some issues like national unity rise above and are more important than partisan politics.

Helping hurting hepatitis C victims is one of those issues. These people are sick because the government neglected to screen our

blood supply. These victims are not Liberals. They are not Reformers. They are not NDP. They are just Canadians and they deserve and they need our help.

Why will the Prime Minister not show some heart and say “my conscience before my party?” Why will he not allow members of parliament to vote their conscience?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are concerned, but speaking of politics I want to quote Judy Maddren of the CBC today who says “Saskatchewan’s health minister says the opposition parties in Ottawa are just trying to score political points in their protest against the hepatitis C package and Clay Serby says that includes his federal NDP cousins”.

I think Mr. Serby’s view on behalf of all provincial governments on this matter has a great impact and speaks for itself. It shows what the Reform Party and opposition members are really up to in this matter.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this vote is not a vote for anything but for the victims. It is simply wrong to say that there are partisan issues brought to bear here.

All opposition parties have stated very clearly that this will not be an election issue. The only person who is trying to raise the stakes is the Prime Minister.

• (1120)

Why is the government so willing to put everything on the line to defend a bad deal?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member, if it is a bad deal, why on the CBC radio news today did Clay Serby, the Saskatchewan health minister, say “this has never been a political issue. We should not be making it a political issue?” Mr. Serby went on to say “Now you have political parties today who want to try to make hay politically on this irrespective of who they are. I worry about that”.

Serby says “The package was put together by health ministers from all political parties”. He says “They managed to put aside their political differences and the opposition parties should do the same, including the federal wing of the NDP”. This should be something listened to by members of the Reform Party because it makes sense contrary to their position.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister were not strong arming his backbenchers he knows he would lose this vote. The victims know it. Backbenchers know it. The Prime Minister knows it. I am sure the Deputy Prime Minister knows it.

Is the real reason why the Prime Minister is treating this as an issue that is so important not that if he has a free vote he will lose that vote?

Oral Questions

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject the premise of the hon. member's question. We are confident that we will win the vote.

In any event I notice that the Reform member did not respond to my quotation of the representative of all the provinces who said he and his party colleagues and the other parties are just trying to play petty politics on that, and that he, Mr. Serby, on behalf of the provincial counterparts who are part of the arrangement, reject that and think it is wrong. The hon. member did not deal with that point and this speaks for itself.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CALGARY DECLARATION

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal member of Parliament for Sherbrooke, who is seeking the leadership of the Quebec Liberal Party, now contends that the concept of unique society included in the Calgary declaration must have the same meaning and scope as the concept of distinct society put forward in the failed Meech Lake accord.

Does the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs agree with this statement by the hon. member for Sherbrooke?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered yes to this question.

The concepts of "unique" and "distinct" mean the same thing: a commitment from this federation to show the necessary flexibility to adjust to the Quebec reality as it does to all other realities across Canada.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the hon. member for Sherbrooke clearly stated that the Calgary declaration did not go far enough. If there is no difference, and "distinct" means the same as "unique", why did they go through the trouble of drafting the Calgary declaration?

Will the minister admit that the Calgary declaration is the best Canada has to offer Quebec, despite the fact that even his federalist allies consider it does not go far enough?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member really believes that the member for Sherbrooke thinks Canada is not enough, she does not understand his political philosophy.

He has stated that Canada is a wonderful country, which we can always make better, and that the Calgary declaration outlines principles to help us further improve this country we intend to keep.

SASKATCHEWAN FRANCOPHONES

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, francophones from Saskatchewan denounced here in Ottawa the ethnocide—and that is their word—they are facing.

According to the 1996 census, although 20,000 of them claim French as their mother tongue, only 6,000 actually use it. The rate of assimilation in Saskatchewan is assessed at 71%.

What does the government have to say this morning to francophones from Saskatchewan, who consider their numbers to be disappearing?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we say to the francophones from Saskatchewan and to all other francophone minorities that we support them.

We in the government do not consider them dead ducks or warmed up bodies or paraplegics in wheelchairs or second class Canadians, all of which are descriptions that have been used by the members of the Bloc Québécois.

• (1125)

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a shame the minister chose to hurl meaningless insults instead of responding to something very specific and announcing a policy.

Why, instead of saying any old thing, does he not stop hiding his head in the sand and come up with some concrete measures to put a stop to assimilation?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member on recognizing that the remarks I have just cited were insulting, because we Canadians living outside Quebec have had it with separatist insults. We are full fledged citizens and do not deserve the separatists' insults.

* * *

[*English*]

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is impossible to hear the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Axworthy: Yesterday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health suggested those victims who contacted hepatitis C from the blood system prior to 1986 should seek a pension under the Canada pension plan disability provisions.

He will know that applicants under the scheme are uniformly rejected on the first opportunity and that the opportunities to get a disability pension under the Canada pension plan are very slim. One of my colleague has a constituents with one leg and one eye who was not declared disabled.

Is the Deputy Prime Minister not embarrassed that the government would offer a solution to hepatitis C victims when that opportunity is slim to none?

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I mentioned what I did yesterday I was trying to give an indication to all members who are concerned about hepatitis C sufferers that there are plans in the works to try to alleviate the most immediate consequences of this debilitating disease.

I gave an indication that the provincial health ministers together with the health minister of Canada are working on the plans available under the social safety net that included CPP and all other types of programs. Those discussions are ongoing and would be put into effect for—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Saskatoon—Rose-town—Biggar.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister a question on something he said earlier.

This should not be a political issue. This should be an issue of principle. The New Democratic Party in the last election argued that every hepatitis C victim should be compensated in principle.

Why does the Deputy Prime Minister not take muzzel off his colleagues? Why will he not let them vote on principle instead of making this a partisan political question?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is missing the point made on CBC radio news by the spokesman for all provinces: "Saskatchewan's health minister says the opposition parties in Ottawa are just trying to score political points in their protest against the hepatitis C package". Clay Serby says that includes his federal NDP cousins.

If he does not like that position he ought to go after Mr. Serby.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, this year's budget announced an increase in the emergency services volunteer tax free allowance. The difficulty is that unless they receive remuneration for their services, volunteers cannot claim any tax

deduction. Typically urban volunteer firefighters receive some form of remuneration while rural firefighters do not.

Why is the government treating rural volunteer firefighters as second class cousins compared to urban firefighters? Will the minister offer a tax deduction to rural firefighters as well?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this tax deduction has been offered in the case of essential services for small municipalities that may have trouble paying their emergency volunteers more than they usually give.

In this case it would be extremely costly to extend it more than has been done in the budget.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, we need to address this problem. Almost every member of the House has rural communities that are dealing with this issue. It is a problem that crosses party lines.

The Liberal government chose to extend benefits to urban firefighters without considering the deduction for their rural cousins. Rural firefighters across Canada deserve the same benefits as urban firefighters. They risk their lives in the same manner and deserve the same type of benefit and treatment as their rural counterparts.

• (1130)

This Liberal government has refused to assist in addressing this problem. We really hope it reaches out and tries to do better for the rural firefighters of Canada.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are many small communities and small rural centres that find it extremely difficult to pay their emergency volunteers. They can only give them a small contribution. The federal government has decided not to tax them in order to help these emergency service volunteers and we intend to continue that practice.

* * *

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is surprising how the government relies solely on the CBC to deal with such a serious problem as hepatitis C.

The health minister has insulted hepatitis C victims by comparing their tragic situation to random medical accidents. He pretends there is no moral difference between being negligently poisoned by the government and suffering a random medical mishap.

These hepatitis C victims did not suffer an accident. They suffered a cruel government decision. It is government policy that infected them, not fate.

He is a lawyer. Can he not see the difference?

Oral Questions

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would probably irk the member opposite to know that the Government of Canada and all its partners at the provincial level have been studying this very profoundly and have been relying on expert support for all their decisions.

I make reference to a report by Robert Prichard who is now the president of the University of Toronto and a blue chip committee concerning all compensation schemes for persons suffering significant avoidable health care injuries. We recommended general criteria for determining which significant medical injuries are compensatory under—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton—Strathcona.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there are normal risks associated with a tonsillectomy, for example, but everyone knows about them. It is an accepted part of life. However, being transfused with poison blood during that operation is not a normal or acceptable risk. It is the government's fault because it refused to screen the blood.

Why has the health minister said in the past that the government infected blood is just like any other natural medical risk?

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I just said to the member a moment ago. The Prichard commission recommended the general criteria for determining compensation should be under a scheme that would pass the test of avoidability, that the principal inquiry to determine if an event is compensatory should be whether with the benefit of hindsight the injury could have been avoided by an alternative diagnostic or therapeutic procedure.

That is what doctors, justices and lawyers presented as evidence to the governments of Canada—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Matapédia—Matane.

* * *

[Translation]

FISHERIES

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Last December, the Secretary of State responsible for Fisheries and Oceans announced in this House that the new fisheries act would be introduced in February 1998. For the minister's information, I would like to remind him that today is April 24.

What is the minister waiting for, when this legislation is so indispensable to the entire fishing industry?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, is very concerned about this matter. He is taking his time and deliberating on it very seriously before bringing in the required legislation.

[Translation]

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the reply, but it is no answer.

Since this legislation must be based on the broadest possible consensus, did the minister prepare it in secret, or did he make use of the input of the provinces and all segments of the industry?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague has consulted widely with provinces and stakeholders, as we all do when we are bringing in new legislation. Obviously parliament will have its opportunity to give its input when legislation is introduced. If the hon. member has any specifics that he would like contained in any potential legislation I am sure my colleague would be most accommodating.

* * *

• (1135)

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have heard from several people in my riding who have contracted hepatitis C. Recently one passed away. Another fellow in his early thirties who has two young children is fearful that he will not be able to support his family. People with hepatitis C cannot work. They are too sick.

My constituent would like me to ask this question. I will ask it of the Deputy Prime Minister. What is my constituent supposed to do to look after his children today? What will become of his family in the future?

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously this issue tugs at the heart strings of everyone. I indicated to all members yesterday that the governments of Canada, all of them taking into consideration the suffering of all the victims of hepatitis C, put together a package that addressed the most immediate concerns of a clearly identifiable group. All of them did that in partnership. They said at the same time we are not stopping any others from pursuing all avenues open to them through the procedure—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Wild Rose.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if it truly tugged at the hearts of everybody in this House and these people over here, there would not be this line of questioning. It would have been taken care of.

Oral Questions

This young man in my constituency wants to know what he has to do. Does he have to resort to begging, selling pencils on a street corner? He cannot get unemployment insurance. He cannot buy life insurance. He is looking at a way to put food on his table and to look after his children when he is gone because he knows that is going to be soon.

How can they sit over there and not offer some alternatives? Does he suggest they sue the government? Is that the only alternative? Come up with something better.

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the bluster is going to be impressive for all those going through this terrible time. It would be more helpful to recognize the fact that there is something available already.

In response to a previous question, I gave the House an indication of what the ministers of health of all the jurisdictions are considering and that is the assistance under the current social safety net which, by the way, we support but they do not. In addition, we have left open all the opportunities still available to them through every other type of procedure, both legal and governmental. I indicated—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue.

The Ontario Court of Appeal ruled unanimously that the Income Tax Act was unconstitutional because it did not include gays and lesbians in its definition of spouse, thus denying them benefits to which they are entitled.

Will the minister immediately undertake to follow up on this ruling and amend the Income Tax Act, which is now unconstitutional according to the Ontario Court of Appeal's ruling?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the ruling was published yesterday. The government has 60 days in which to respond. We are now going to look at the legal, social and political consequences of the ruling and respond within the time allowed us.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this lacks conviction.

Will the minister agree that the discrimination to which gays and lesbians are subject requires a review of all Canadian legislation containing a definition of spouse? Let us see some conviction, please.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in recent years the government has shown what it was prepared to do to decrease and eliminate discrimination, and allow the full exercise of human rights.

Again, in this case, the ruling was handed down only yesterday. We are going to study it and, within the 60 days, make a satisfactory reply.

* * *

[*English*]

ANTHRAX VACCINE

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Health Canada granted permission to use an anthrax vaccine on Canadian troops. The vaccine was produced by a United States lab that was cited by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. As a matter of fact, it was shut down for quality control violations.

Yesterday the defence minister said the vaccine had been retested and was in fact safe.

● (1140)

Could the government explain today why the defence minister neglected to tell Canadians that the retest was done by the same company that produced the vaccine?

Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the medical staff has assured me that the vaccine administered to Canadian forces was safe.

I understand that the U.S. military has hired an independent contractor to oversee the quality and safety testings of its entire stockpile of anthrax vaccine to ensure its safety.

Several million doses have already been cleared as safe. A batch of anthrax vaccine administered to Canadian forces personnel was among those retested and considered safe.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, maybe the government could tune in again because the company that is doing the retesting is the same company. The United States Food and Drug Administration cited violations for quality control, including cleanliness, faulty testing equipment and the wrong calibration on its testing equipment.

Will the government ensure that a made in Canada test is done on that anthrax vaccine immediately?

Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our approach is to ensure

Oral Questions

that Canadian forces personnel are protected. For their own safety and for the safety of the mission, the anthrax vaccine we have given to our troops has been proven to be safe.

An hon. member: By whom?

Mr. John Richardson: Certainly not by the Reform Party.

For this reason they have been vaccinated against anthrax and this approach is adopted by our allies and is supported by many members in this House.

* * *

[Translation]

ASBESTOS INDUSTRY

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, here is the result of what the federal government has been doing in the matter of asbestos in the past two years. In Asbestos, 250 people were laid off and the BC mine there has been closed. We have just learned that the Council of Europe has decided to prohibit the use of asbestos throughout Europe.

My question for the Minister for International Trade is quite simple. Is the government waiting until there is no more asbestos industry in Quebec before acting and lodging a complaint with the WTO?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is in fact continuing to work on this matter in partnership with the Government of Quebec.

We have taken a number of measures to date to help the manufacturers and producers of asbestos and to fight the European tendency to prohibit the import of asbestos. We will continue these efforts.

* * *

[English]

HATE CRIMES

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians were outraged to hear of the recent hate crimes and the tragedy that occurred in B.C.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice inform this House what initiatives government has taken to prevent hate crimes from happening in the future?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question. Existing laws in this country are already covered in Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Criminal Code and the human rights act.

Criminal Code provisions concerning hate propaganda, obscenity and the possession of child pornography apply to the Internet as they apply to other forms of communication. The enforcement of

the Criminal Code is the responsibility of the provincial attorney general.

This government takes its responsibility seriously. I hope that attorney general also takes his responsibility seriously.

* * *

BORDERS

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, American border authorities are taking an increasingly hostile attitude with Canadians, now barring anyone who has ever smoked marijuana and detaining MPs at airports. Yesterday the Minister of Foreign Affairs reiterated that he had extensive discussions with Secretary of State Albright to facilitate movement at the border.

It is obvious that these discussions are not getting anywhere. The situation is worse now than before these discussions. What other steps is this government going to take to stop the harassment of Canadians at the border?

• (1145)

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we did have some very positive news yesterday as a result of the amendment brought forth by Senator Abraham to section 110 of the U.S. immigration act. It has been adopted by the senate judiciary committee to exempt Canadians from the U.S. border controls, the draconian measures. That is a victory for constant representations by government members and by the minister to the United States government and the United States legislators. On the issue of the 1974 administrative controls and their applications, we would recognize of course that each country is sovereign.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for South Surrey—White Rock—Langley.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, he is quite correct that the senate judiciary committee did approve it. Yesterday Senator Dianne Feinstein of California vowed to fight Abraham's section 110 on the floor of the senate.

Since the minister is relying so heavily on his feelings that Albright is supporting this and on the support of the American congress, does the government really believe that its attitude on Cuba and the Prime Minister's visit to Cuba are going to assist support from the American senate?

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our discussions with the United States on the application by the U.S. of border controls on Canadians go back a long time. The results we have had have been pursued in that context and have been successful to date. We are working on the second question the hon. member is referring to. The United States government is sovereign. That is a fact of life but

we have succeeded by friendly persuasion so far by encouraging Senator Abraham and a group of allies in the United States senate.

* * *

HEALTH

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

If governments had to carry warning labels the Liberal government would be plastered with the message "Warning: Continued dependence on this product could be hazardous to your health". Hepatitis C victims learned that the hard way. Now young people and old people are in peril. The Department of Health intends to cut funds to programs that allow kids and seniors to stay active and improve their chances of staying healthy.

Will the government abandon these hazardous policies today and give Canadians the chance we all deserve to work and to stay healthy?

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has tried to confuse several issues here. I thought she was going to be talking about hepatitis C, but I gather that she abandoned that. She must have abandoned that after she heard what the Saskatchewan health minister, who is a member of her party, indicated about the cheap partisan treatment of this issue.

If the hon. member has another specific program she would like to address, I would be delighted to address it.

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or, NDP): Mr. Speaker, obviously the member was not briefed on my question.

If the Department of Health is not responsible in assisting Canadians when they become ill due to no fault of their own and intends to withdraw funding for proven preventive measures for seniors and children, my question is simple. What is the ministry responsible for if not for the health and welfare of all Canadians?

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member opposite will join all members in this House in applauding the wisdom of this government in some of the measures it indicated already in the budget.

We have indicated several billions of dollars worth of extended benefits through transfers to the provinces. There is a transition fund that is designed to improve research and development in the area of health sciences. There is an additional \$800 million that the federal government itself put forward for hepatitis C. The hon. member would probably be delighted to know that the CAPC program has been expanded to \$100 million.

I do not know how much longer she would like me to go on, Mr. Speaker, but I—

Oral Questions

The Deputy Speaker: That may not be clear, but I do not want you to go on any longer. I am sorry about that. The hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester.

* * *

HIGHWAYS

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Recently the New Brunswick minister of transportation said in the *New Brunswick Road Builder* magazine "The latest federal-provincial highway agreement worth \$300 million on a 50:50 basis will be used to upgrade the Trans-Canada Highway from Longs Creek to the Quebec border". The agreement has been finalized. Will the minister confirm the provincial minister's statement that this \$300 million agreement has been finalized, or at least indicate the status of the agreement?

● (1150)

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government has agreed to allocate more funds to the Canada-New Brunswick highway agreement. It will take three years. It will cost about \$150 million in terms of the federal contribution in that period of time. That is to afford the valuable twinning of the Trans-Canada Highway from the Quebec border into the Fredericton area.

This is good for tourism and it is good for the economy. It shows how this government is committed to putting funds into Canada's highways.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1998 the minister said in the House in discussions regarding the toll highway between Moncton and Petitcodiac "we intend to make sure that this kind of situation is planned for in future agreements with regard to preventing toll highways".

Would the minister absolutely and definitively assure the people of New Brunswick and all Atlantic Canada that this \$300 million agreement will include clauses and conditions that preclude and prevent any tolling of this section of highway?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the commitment was made before the hon. member drew the valuable options to our attention with respect to highways and the construction of highways in New Brunswick. As a result we now have to look at that particular agreement to see that it does reflect the concerns the member raised. This does not mitigate the points the member made earlier, but we will certainly look at it before any money is sent.

As the member knows, the money is only paid once the work is done. There is still time to realize the objectives he has raised in the House.

*Oral Questions***ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

Mrs. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for Western Economic Diversification.

The Government of Canada has pledged to break the cycle of economic underdevelopment in the aboriginal community. What is being done in western Canada to enhance and encourage the economic development and growth of aboriginal communities?

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are 100 points of service in western Canada serving all western Canadians. Among them there are seven community futures development programs that are exclusively for aboriginal communities.

Just a couple of weeks ago there was a \$950,000 investment to the Aboriginal Council of Winnipeg to develop entrepreneurship among the aboriginal and Metis peoples.

Just recently there was \$5 million for the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College for infrastructure for a college of their own to develop their human resource base.

Aboriginal peoples play a very important role in the economic development of western Canada. What is good for the aboriginal peoples of western Canada is good for western Canadians and is good for Canada.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, someone should tell the Liberals where the province of B.C. is. I did not hear that mentioned.

As Canadians are filling out their tax forms this year, they are reliving the nightmare of the high tax levels in this country while the government continues to dream up new spending programs.

While Canadian families are spending about \$4,000 less now because they do not have it since this government took over, why do they have to have tax nightmares while the Liberal government is dreaming up new spending programs?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if there is one government in the last 50 years that should be congratulated for its results and in particular for reducing the deficit in the country, it is ours.

As announced in the last budget, the government has indicated it would reduce taxes for 14 million Canadians. This is what was

done in the last budget. More than 400,000 Canadians have been taken off the tax rolls completely. This is what this government has done for Canadian taxpayers.

The government has also indicated in the budget that over the next few years it would continue to reduce taxes.

* * *

[Translation]

BURMA

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister for International Co-operation said she would be prepared to restore the programs to provide assistance to Myanmar.

However, Canada's ambassador to this country recently stated that Burma was one of the worst Asian countries for human rights violations and a major heroin exporter as well. He added that changing the existing system would be a protracted effort.

• (1155)

Does the government support the position of its minister, who is thereby condoning one of the worst dictatorships in Asia?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the facts as reported by the hon. member opposite are incorrect.

The Minister for International Co-operation has made it very clear on many occasions in this House that we would all want to be able to do more to help the people of Myanmar, or Burma, but we cannot do anything until conditions improve.

I hope we can count on the support of the hon. member opposite when conditions do improve—which will not be anytime soon, as we all know—to help these unfortunate people who are in dire need of help.

* * *

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

I just learned that three curing plants have been visited by armed Fisheries and Oceans officials. The owners of these plants were treated like criminals. What is criminal in this issue is for Fisheries and Oceans not to let herring fishers finish their fishing season last spring.

We have had it with being treated this way. We have had it with being harassed. Enough is enough. There is no work in our region. The time has come to get off our backs.

Oral Questions

Why does this government continue to attack our coastal communities while ignoring the criminal activities of large foreign vessels? People in my region want to know what is going on.

[English]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat amazed at the charges made by the hon. member. I am sure that my colleague will be equally amazed. If the member has some substantive information on these allegations, she should provide that to the minister so he can respond very quickly.

* * *

ENVIRONMENT

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

This government has not learned from its make it up as you go strategy for Kyoto and climate change. The environment minister announced that a key component of her post Kyoto strategy would be rewarding industries for early action.

Why did the government fail to provide a tangible sign that it was serious when it tabled its budget in February? We saw no serious tax incentives for research and development on energy efficiency and renewable sources of energy. The government spoke about the need for early action. Canadians would be happy with any action from the government.

Mr. Gerry Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member has effectively given me the opportunity to do is to point out that Canada is indeed very committed to providing solutions to this global problem. We will be participating with all Canadian stakeholders in a made in Canada solution.

I point out that in the February budget we did introduce measures which will provide solutions in terms of research and development. We will be working with industry, other governments, provincial governments, environmental stakeholders and all Canadians to come up with a made in Canada solution. We will be active.

* * *

ELECTRONIC COMMERCE

Ms. Susan Whelan (Essex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

Consumers across Canada are shopping on the Internet or doing their banking from their homes. Canadians want to know what initiatives the government has taken to ensure that they are protected as consumers when they engage in electronic commerce?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government recognizes the enormous potential that there is in

electronic commerce. We expect to see its usage increased dramatically over the next few years. We are intent upon making Canada a world leader in its use and in building the proper legal framework for electronic commerce.

Earlier today I addressed a group of consumers and business representatives at a consumer round table on electronic commerce. We are committed to bringing forward legislation as required to deal with consumer protection issues and other issues that concern consumers on electronic commerce, including the protection of privacy, cryptography and other issues that are of importance.

* * *

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the ice storm was in January. In February the minister of agriculture unilaterally created a \$50 million special program for Quebec part time farmers ineligible under current disaster relief criteria. Last month he announced a similar \$20 million for Ontario farmers, much needed quick action. However, for Peace River farmers devastated by two years of excessive moisture, there has been no help.

The Alberta agriculture minister wrote to the minister on April 1. He is still waiting for a response. Why is this minister stonewalling western farmers—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

• (1200)

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no double standard. The assistance put in place by this government for part time farmers in Quebec and Ontario was to make sure they got the same coverage as the disaster funding assistance agreement provided to full time farmers.

The farmers in Peace River are covered for all those things that are insurable, as were farmers in the Quebec and Ontario regions. They have been treated exactly the same for coverage as the farmers in the other areas.

* * *

[Translation]

SENIORS BENEFIT

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the current old age income security program has always been based on the principle of universality.

Yet, the proposed new seniors benefit is to be based on family income, which would deprive many women of their pensions.

Routine Proceedings

What is the government waiting to make changes to its proposed reform, so that all women get the equal treatment to which they are entitled?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the seniors benefit being implemented by the government gives special consideration to the situation of women in particular.

Indeed, the proposed reforms will ensure the sustainability of the seniors benefit program and will allow it to become even more generous for those who will need it in the years to come, particularly women. Our proposed amendments will help those who have the greatest need for that benefit, and will make the system—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt to hon. minister, but Oral Question Period is over.

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to the following motion.

I move:

That on Tuesday, April 28, 1998, at the ordinary time of daily adjournment, no proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 38 shall take place, but a minister of the crown shall propose a motion "That this House take note of the intention of the Government of Canada to renew its participation in the NATO-led stabilization force, SFOR, in Bosnia beyond June 20, 1998 in order to maintain a safe environment for reconstruction and reconciliation and a lasting peace for the people of Bosnia-Herzegovina"; and

That during the consideration of this said motion, the first spokesperson for each party may speak for no more than twenty minutes, other members may speak for no more than ten minutes, no quorum calls, requests for unanimous consent for any purpose or dilatory motion shall be received by the Chair and, when no member wishes to speak, the House shall adjourn to the next sitting day.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, to clear up any misunderstanding, could the government House leader clarify that this will take place after the votes that are scheduled for Tuesday.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, not only after the votes, because after the votes there is also private members' hour, but after the conclusion of private members' hour; in other words, as the motion indicates, at the ordinary time of daily adjournment which is immediately following the end of private members' hour, which will be delayed by the time of the votes. In other words, it will take place around 7.00 p.m.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1205)

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to five petitions.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 28th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the associate membership of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources and Government Operations.

If the House gives its consent, I move that the report be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

RAILROADS

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of identical petitions bearing a total of 1,236 signatures from residents of west central Saskatchewan.

These people in rural Saskatchewan are very concerned about the imminent threat to their railroads which are in the process of piecemeal abandonment by Canadian National railway. They are at this time attempting to negotiate with the railroad to have piecemeal abandonment stopped and wish to buy all the track in the area, some 300 miles of track, from the railroad.

The petitioners ask parliament that CN be required to abide by the spirit of the law and make available for purchase the branch line in its entirety.

Second, they want parliament to review the Canada Transportation Act to ensure that railways cannot obstruct the creation of short line railways on branch lines that they intend to discontinue.

HEALTH

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I present another in a series of petitions on behalf of the 18,000 Canadians who suffer from end stage kidney disease.

These over 300 petitioners work in places like Cogeco, the GM truck plant, the medical centre, Beaver Lumber and various branches of the CIBC in Peterborough.

The petitioners support the development of a bioartificial kidney in Canada. They recognize that kidney dialysis and transplantation are useful treatments for many people, but they believe that dialysis service is inadequate across the country and they call on parliament to work and support the bioartificial kidney which will eventually eliminate the need for both dialysis and transplantation for those suffering from kidney disease.

BILL C-68

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition with 50 signatures from my constituents in Courtenay, B.C. and Comox, B.C.

The petitioners are asking parliament to repeal Bill C-68, the firearms bill, and to direct the funds that are being used on the licensing of responsible gun owners into more cost effective programs to reduce violent crime by improving public safety through crime prevention programs, more police on the streets, more anti-smuggling campaigns and more resources for fighting organized crime and street gangs.

• (1210)

MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by 35 people from my riding on the multilateral agreement on investment. These signatures indicate that they are very concerned with the MAI and they are concerned with the impact on the environment, employment, social programs, health care and culture.

The petitioners are asking that there be public hearings before any of this goes on further.

AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition signed by some 480 citizens calling on parliament to raise the age of consent for sexual activity between a young person and an adult from 14 to 16.

Routine Proceedings

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or, NDP): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I would like to table multiple petitions that I continue to receive with respect to the opposition from hundreds of people of Cape Breton Island in the province of Nova Scotia with respect to the changes to the Canada pension plan.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by members of my constituency in the Regina area asking that parliament support the immediate initiation and conclusion by the year 2000 of an international convention that will set a binding timetable for the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

[English]

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I address my comments to the parliamentary secretary. I would like to draw his attention to my production of papers motion P-8 which has been on the order paper for five months.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has a problem. Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers are dealt with on Wednesdays and his intervention in respect of that on Wednesday would be entirely inappropriate.

If the member is seeking to raise something about the written questions, I would be glad to hear his point of order. If it is on Motion for the Production of Papers, I respectfully suggest he do that on Wednesday when those come up. They are not up for discussion today.

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I will raise that on Wednesday.

However, my Questions Nos. 78 and 79 are beyond the requested 45 day reporting window and I have yet to receive a response. I would like to know from the parliamentary secretary when I can expect a response.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the member if there is this delay. I have noted Questions Nos. 78 and 79 and I will do my very best to find out where they are. Even though it may be out of order, I will look into P-8.

The Deputy Speaker: I am simply trying to save the time of the House. I think it would be appropriate to raise this matter on that day and I hope the hon. member for Saskatoon—Humboldt understands the reason for the ruling.

Is it agreed that all questions stand?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT 1998

The House resume consideration of the motion that Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in this second part of my speech, I would like to draw members' attention to the fact that Bill C-32 is not part of a decentralizing approach.

It renews the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, which has been so vigorously opposed by the various governments of Quebec.

In the last parliament, the Liberal government attempted to get the previous version of this bill passed, but gave up the attempt in light of the huge outcry, which could have jeopardized the upcoming elections.

Bill C-74 therefore died on the Order Paper last session, but CEPA calls for a five-year review and that deadline is already past, so the government is at it again, introducing a bill that maintains the national vision, which still does not sit well with the members of the National Assembly.

What is the purpose of this bill? With it, the prevention of pollution becomes a national objective.

• (1215)

The government wants to amend Canada's legislation on the environment by changing certain technicalities while maintaining the essence of a centralizing vision of environmental protection.

The legislation introduces provisions to implement pollution prevention, new procedures for the investigation and assessment of substances and new requirements with respect to substances that the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Health have determined to be toxic.

There is a broad range of such substances. Investigators will be given new powers, for example, and there will be new regulatory measures to deal with offences. Barely a few weeks after the sensational statement by senior officials of the Department of the Environment, who wondered openly whether their department

could still monitor offending businesses as cuts had been so draconian, we may well ask ourselves what purpose is served exactly by tightening offence regulations if they cannot be enforced.

We are in favour of including the Native peoples in the environmental assessment process. We wonder, however, about the double standard in the degree of openness toward the Native peoples and Quebec. Native representation on a national advisory committee, as with the provinces and the territories, in fact diminishes the power of Quebec, which like the Native peoples wants to deal with the rest of Canada nation to nation.

What powers will the renewed CEPA delegate to Quebec and the other provinces in Canada? Although in theory Bill C-32 recognizes that responsibility for the environment is shared between the federal government and the provinces, in practice it delegates no powers to them, and this runs counter to real environmental harmonization between the various levels of government.

Bill C-32 unfortunately aims at strengthening the federal government's preponderance in the field of environmental protection. This centralization runs counter to the clearly expressed wish of the National Assembly to participate fully in the environmental assessment of any project on its territory. The bill is also in flagrant contradiction with the spirit of the harmonization process launched between the federal government and the provinces.

This is why the Government of Quebec has pulled out of negotiations, and is looking further into this promising process.

The bill thus opens the door to duplication of federal and provincial powers. The federal government is justifying its interference in Quebec's areas of jurisdiction by invoking the recent supreme court decision with respect to Hydro-Québec. This case has always been contested by Quebec.

All the courts that ruled on it, including Quebec's highest court, the Court of Appeal, declared the federal government's order invalid. Only the supreme court, with its unitary vision of Canada, overturned the Quebec court rulings.

Bill C-32 also contains a number of new features. For instance, the government wants to replace the existing federal-provincial CEPA committee with a new national advisory committee. This committee would consist of one representative each from Environment Canada and Health Canada, one representative from each province and territory, and up to six aboriginal representatives.

This committee will advise the two federal ministers on the drafting of regulations, the management of toxic substances, and other matters of mutual interest. The provinces will advise the federal minister through a national advisory committee. The bill contains provisions for the signing of co-operation agreements covering activities such as inspections, investigations and the collection of monitoring data.

The bill also includes provisions relating specifically to aboriginal governments. They will have the same rights and responsibilities

Government Orders

ties as provincial and territorial governments, including the right to conclude administrative and work-sharing agreements and equivalent provision agreements with the federal government.

In addition, they must be consulted with respect to all environmental matters affecting their territories. Up to six representatives will sit on the national advisory committee. Again, it is surprising to see that Quebec does not get such recognition of its specificity and its culture.

The new act also provides for increased public participation and for better protection for those who report CEPA violations. Individuals will be allowed to play a role in the decision making process, by submitting to the Minister of the Environment comments or notices of opposition following certain decisions, and by asking the minister to investigate alleged violations of the act.

• (1220)

The bill also provides that individuals' identity may not be disclosed, and it protects employees who report violations under the federal legislation. It will also allow individuals to bring civil action to protect the environment when the government is not enforcing the law.

As for public information, such information will no longer be limited to the data found in the *Canada Gazette*. The act will create a new public registry that will include all environmental information published under the CEPA, including decisions and regulations. This registry will complete the 1993 National Pollutant Release Inventory.

As regards pollution prevention, this issue will become a national objective. The minister will have the authority to require a pollution prevention plan in respect of substances deemed toxic under the CEPA. A tribunal will also be authorized to demand a pollution prevention plan, an environmental emergency plan, or to rule that research must be done on the use and the elimination of the substances involved in the violation.

The new act creates a national information centre on pollution prevention to help the industry share the knowledge and technologies that relate to pollution prevention activities. The new CEPA also provides for the establishment of a reward program to recognize the voluntary efforts made by the industry to prevent pollution.

As for the protection of water, the bill seeks to protect marine environment against land and atmospheric pollution sources. It also limits what can be disposed of in the sea to a list of non-hazardous materials, and will require those desiring to carry out such a disposal to prove that this is the best solution and that reuse or recycling is not possible.

The federal government feels that this bill will enable it to work, with the United States in particular, to prevent or restrict cross-border marine pollution.

Bill C-32 will enhance the EPA's authority as far as fuel and fuel additives are concerned. Imported fuels, as well as those crossing Canada's provincial and territorial boundaries, must meet certain requirements. The bill will confer the ability to establish a national fuel mark to indicate compliance with environmental standards for fuel.

Where international atmospheric pollution is concerned, the government wants to do onto others as they do onto it. When a state has not allowed Canada rights similar to those Canada has allowed, the federal minister's will have the option to take action in cases of international atmospheric pollution.

As for protection of the air, Bill C-32 calls for a national emissions mark for equipment meeting its standards. It incorporates the power to limit engine emissions. These provisions apply to motor vehicles in general, which include pleasure craft, construction equipment, farm machinery, snowblowers and lawn mowers.

The bill also includes enhanced federal power over cross-border traffic involving hazardous and non-hazardous waste, domestic garbage in particular.

We have touched on some of the aspects of this bill. We cannot explain why the bill clashes with the harmonization the government claims to have as a priority.

As we recall, Quebec refused to sign the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment agreement this past January 29.

When the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment met at that time, Quebec Environment Minister Paul Bégin refused to subscribe to that agreement, as long as the conditions called for by Quebec are not met by the federal government.

These conditions include recognizing that Quebec has primary jurisdiction in certain areas, under the constitution, a firm commitment on the part of the federal government to amend federal legislation accordingly, and finally, the signature by Quebec and the federal government of a bilateral agreement on environmental assessment.

• (1225)

Moreover, Minister Bégin stressed that the federal government's plans to revise the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, giving the federal government increased powers, contravened the spirit and goals of the environmental harmonization accord negotiations, especially with regard to preventing overlap and intergovernmental conflicts.

Government Orders

Minister Bégin's position underscored our own, as expressed in the Bloc Québécois' dissenting opinion made public in December 1997. This step followed the one taken on November 20, 1996. The Canadian Council of Ministers of Environment had then tentatively agreed to the Canada-wide environmental harmonization accord as well as two subagreements on inspections and standards. The subagreement on environmental assessment was negotiated during the winter of 1997.

It was aimed at improving the protection of the environment in order to contribute to sustainable development, while respecting each government's fields of jurisdiction in a more efficient manner. It contained general principles to be implemented through subagreements.

The Bloc Québécois has always supported harmonization between the federal government and the provinces if it eliminates overlap and administrative and legislative duplication between both levels of government.

So, we are in favour of environmental harmonization as long as it is not used by the federal government to hide its interference in provincial areas of jurisdiction or, conversely, to dump programs on the provinces without the appropriate funding.

It is essential that harmonization recognize the exclusive or primary jurisdiction of the provinces in the areas entrusted to them by the Constitution. The spirit of harmonization must be reflected in the changes the federal government is making to existing legislation.

Lastly, the Bloc Québécois thinks that only the Quebec environmental assessment process must prevail in the province of Quebec. The harmonization sought by the federal government must be reflected in its legislative agenda. However, we think that Bill C-32 does not take into consideration the legislative harmonization process envisioned by the federal government and the provinces and is simply another example of federal interference in a provincial area of jurisdiction.

The Bloc Québécois believes that this new piece of legislation goes against the past positions taken by Quebec and against the spirit of the federal-provincial harmonization initiative.

The Bloc Québécois thinks it is unfortunate that the federal government refuses to put into law its good intentions in terms of environmental harmonization and prefers to hide behind a Supreme Court ruling that it can use as an argument for centralization.

In conclusion, the bill confirms that, with the latest Supreme Court ruling on environmental matters, the federal government is trying to broaden its powers in this area. Although the federal and provincial governments share responsibility for the environment under the Constitution, the Liberal government clearly wants to

subordinate the role of the provinces to that of the central government.

The emphasis on pollution prevention as a method of priority intervention with the power to require pollution prevention plans, which are mandatory for substances included in the list of priority toxic substances, involves the development of a direct partnership between the federal government and industrial sectors that are already partly covered under Quebec programs, such as the industrial waste reduction program that has been implemented in the pulp and paper industry.

The measures contained in Bill C-32 will allow the federal government to establish national priorities for intervention. Therefore, the provinces will have no choice but to adopt federal regulations, otherwise they will be forced to see the federal government serve the same clientele.

• (1230)

The legislative and regulatory powers that the federal government is giving itself are very important, and while the Liberal government is constantly talking about its willingness to work in partnership with the provinces, it nevertheless institutionalizes its powers in order to play a paternalistic role towards the provinces. That is what the Bloc Québécois deplors.

In conclusion, in light of what I just said, we in the Bloc Québécois are against the principle of this bill at the second reading stage.

[English]

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development.

On behalf of my colleague, the member for Churchill River, my constituents of Sackville—Eastern Shore and the New Democratic Party, we are opposed to Bill C-32. The New Democratic Party is not opposed to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. We are opposed to Bill C-32 which continues the Liberal policy of devolution and the removal of federal responsibilities for environmental protection.

Bill C-32 is a reintroduction of Bill C-74 which died with the election call last year. I will not speak today on it section by section, clause by clause, point by point. The legislation spans 200 plus pages and contains 356 clauses. I wish to address the reasons for and the basic principles behind the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, also known as CEPA.

CEPA was developed in the mid-1980s when there was growing concern about the presence of toxic substances in the environment

Government Orders

and the adverse impacts on the environment from a variety of pollution sources and industries contributing thereto.

This consciousness was not an oversight revelation that something was suddenly wrong with the environment. The move toward and calls for improved environmental protection came from a heightened awareness that man can damage the environment, that man can poison the air we breathe, that man can contaminate the waters we drink and that man can destroy the soil we walk upon.

A key turning point was the publication of a book written by a very brave woman ahead of the times, a book of revelations and thoughts so contrary to the industrial complex and the misguided beliefs that the earth is an endless supply house for our personal use and pillage.

The book provoked controversy. The very idea that someone could espouse such views was considered an outlandish travesty. The book was *Silent Spring* by Rachel Carson. I urge my colleagues to read it as we embark upon the review and restructuring of CEPA. It paints the picture I believe we are revisiting in the current Bill C-32.

Environmental protection is a requirement. Environmental protection is not an option. The Brundtland statement on sustainable development is not words. It is a practice few countries embrace by deed or implement by actions. It is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

The founding principles for sustainable development can include some compromise adaptation for different regions or socio-economic concerns. However there are lines we cannot cross if we are to avoid the mistakes of the past, the environmental degradation we must acknowledge if we are to move forward as a society and protect the environment for future generations.

Bill C-32 states "the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development". The environment and human health cannot be considered as separate entities. They are tied together as one. A healthy environment provides healthy living. Rachel Carson identified the link in the basic process through language easily understood by individuals.

Several events contributed to the original CEPA: beyond *Silent Spring*, the travesty at Love Canal, the accident at Bhopal, the poisoned Beluga whales washing ashore along the St. Lawrence, the acid rain carried between countries and the near loss of North America's Great Lakes ecosystem.

The original CEPA provided the first steps toward recovery, a check and balance between dangerous environmental practices and sustainable policies.

• (1235)

Why do we need the legislation? We were being poisoned. Our children's future was being compromised. Legislation to ensure the protection of the environment which supports us as a species was required. The polluters polluted; the victims suffered and died. By victims we cannot consider man as the sole reason for action. All species suffered: the wildlife, the flora and the fauna.

The original CEPA provided an ability to act to protect the environment, to levy fines, to expose polluters and to support sustainable development beyond the generation.

Bill C-32 has strayed from the original principles to protect and to provide recourse. As science and technology evolved in the past decade, the ability and capacity for corporations and people to act responsibly toward the environment and to demonstrate environmental stewardship also evolved.

The industrial complex has discovered that clean operations equal efficiency and increased profits. The majority of former polluters practise environmental stewardship. This is a fact. It is recognized internationally that environmental protection and sustainable development can flourish together.

Going green does not cost jobs or decrease productivity, a principle the New Democratic Party has stated time and again in the House and across the country. The original CEPA followed a command and control regulatory framework to be reviewed for its adequacy every five years. A decade has passed and we are revisiting our responsibility as a federal government and as members representing Canadians from all regions and provinces.

Bill C-32 is straying from that original regulatory structure and visiting the very policy that required CEPA in the 1980s: voluntary measures and limited federal intervention.

The Liberal government has demonstrated a consistent approach to environmental policy: ignore until an issue climate change and global warming; finances first before the environment or, as my colleagues have described, Environment Canada decimated by resource and staff cuts; economic concerns first and environmental consideration second, an example is Cheviot mine in Alberta; unit politicking and devolution to the provinces, the harmonization accord; international embarrassment for failed targets, Rio and in a few years Kyoto; and global competitiveness as a moral marker.

The Liberal government has demonstrated time and time again that the environment is not important. "Let the provinces handle the problem, similar to what they are doing with hepatitis C. We can wash our hands clean of the responsibility. The next Plastimet will be someone else's travesty. The Swan Hills plant will continue to spew poisons. The Sydney tar ponds, the United States abandoned military sites, the Lachine canal, northern contamination

Government Orders

through the Arctic and poisons in mothers' milk, not our problems".

What is wrong with this Liberal picture? It is not protection by design and legislation: sign an accord, cry co-operation and put the Canadian public at the mercy of economics and global competitive policy.

It took a year for the House Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development to complete the last review of CEPA. Its report entitled "It's About our Health: Pollution Prevention" echoes Ms. Carson's *Silent Spring*. This massive report contained 141 recommendations to improve Bill C-32's predecessor, Bill C-74.

The Liberals refused the majority of the recommendations and the majority of the 400 responses received by the government during the public review. They ignored the consensus and followed a detrimental path: devolution, voluntary programs and voluntary participation. In most cases this practice works and the New Democratic Party recognizes this fact. There are however bad apples.

The rules and regulations are necessary to ensure that when damage occurs, when environmental degradation occurs, when protection is required, there is a mechanism for redress, a legal course of action.

We do not believe that Canada's environment requires a command and control regulatory framework as the sole parameter or measure of environmental protection. There should be co-operative measures including sharing of responsibilities between provinces and territorial governments, indeed at all government levels, to ensure environmental protection of the highest possible standard.

On a more personal note, my family and I firmly believe that the bill does nothing to protect my children's future or my children's children's future. I encourage the government to revisit Bill C-32 and to listen to the voices out there to improve these regulations.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Chris Axworthy): The hon. member for Fundy—Royal.

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, my sincere congratulations on fulfilling your role as Speaker this afternoon. I must say decorum and conduct in the House are almost unprecedented.

• (1240)

It is a pleasure to speak to Bill C-32, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, a most comprehensive piece of legislation with respect to environmental management and development.

It is an extremely complex piece of legislation. It is long. It is over 200 pages and covers a wide variety of subjects from toxic substance and waste management to vehicle emissions and air and water pollution. It has been called everything from an environmental war measure to a piece of legislation so vast and sweeping that it defies categorization.

I do not wish at this point to go into any great detail on any specific clause. That will be our role in committee. There are a couple of areas of concern to me. First is the issue of pollution prevention. The government has stated that pollution prevention is the cornerstone of the bill. It calls it a national goal, which is fine for me because I believe it is a very laudable intention.

However I am concerned about the consequences of this commitment. Has the government thought it out? The bill gives the minister the authority to require any person or business to develop and submit a pollution prevention plan. How much will it cost? How detailed will it have to be? Will it be the same for small business as for big industry?

What about time? The bill states that the government can tell a business how much time it has to draw up and implement a plan. Will there be any guarantee that business will be given enough time to study the problem and consult the people who will help draw up the plan, or will everything be left merely to the discretion of the minister?

I make reference to a clause found in paragraph 6. It states essentially that lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental damage. Any kind of environmental legislation must be based upon science. At the end of the day it is imperative that we take a very prudent approach to our sustainable management if there is any thought that any kind of environmental initiative or toxin could potentially harm any citizen's health or the environment of the country. The government should be applauded for this very prudent initiative.

This is a different era in terms of political parties in Canada. We can look at the number of parties we have on this side of the House. We talk about the Progressive Conservative Party. We talk about the Reform Party. I make clear that I respect individuals who chose to vote Reform in past years for different reasons. In some situations it was a way to express a desire for better representation for the western provinces. We applaud that.

More often than not, the media and the electorate are looking at areas that actually distinguish political parties. One such area is a prudent approach to science. We believe categorically in the science of climate change. The Reform Party has chosen to ignore the science of climate change because it believes there is some doubt. The primary scientific body on climate change set up by the United Nations said there was a discernible human influence on climate change. This is a case in point for people looking for areas to distinguish the two parties. Ours is a prudent approach to the environment.

Government Orders

My second area of concern is about the enforcement clauses contained in the bill. These are found in part 10 which contains almost 100 clauses of the 356 clauses in the legislation. They cover areas like inspection, search, detention, forfeiture, offences and punishment. In light of the preponderance of enforcement clauses in the bill, almost one in three, I am surprised no mention is made in the preamble of the government's position on the matter of enforcement. To me 100 clauses says that we are determined to do something.

The Progressive Conservative Party believes the bill is important. The Progressive Conservative Party of Canada introduced the Environmental Protection Act in 1988. It was brought forward by the Hon. Jean J. Charest.

• (1245)

We think that protection of the environment is important, but recent reports of the auditor general and the environment commissioner have raised doubts about this. Not only do they take issue with this government's ability to manage the environment properly but, more fundamentally, they seriously question its very commitment to protect Canada's environment and its ability to enforce environmental legislation.

In January of this year the federal, provincial and territorial governments, with the exception of Quebec, signed an environmental harmonization accord. This accord, like much of what this government attempts to do in the environment field, has been the target of much criticism. People are asking why it contains no provision guaranteeing environmental enforcement. They are upset that the federal government is offloading its responsibilities to the provinces, particularly in the areas of environmental inspection, assessment and standard setting.

One of the other criticisms they have on the harmonization accord is the fact that the government actually chose to do inspections of environmental regulations during the first subagreements with the provinces, but not enforcement. So inspections can be done, but violations cannot be enforced. Perhaps the government understands this. However, the environmental community and common sense Canadians understand that enforcement and inspection should have been part of the first set of subagreements.

The government claims that it is not downloading its responsibilities to the provinces. It is simply harmonizing environmental programs and policies. It is making sure if one level of government is fulfilling a task competently that another level will not come in and begin doing the same job. That is the intention of harmonization and that would be a good thing. However, according to the information on the accord I obtained from the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment's website, it is clear the government is devolving power to the provinces.

Looking at the objectives of the accord, they include using what the government calls a co-operative approach. Under the principles of the accord we see that decisions pursuant to the accord will be consensus based. In the part entitled "Subagreements", No. 8 states specifically that in areas where governments have been unable to reach a consensus on a Canada-wide approach, each government is free to act within its existing authority and will advise the other governments accordingly.

Co-operative approach and consensus approach are words that mean only one thing. The federal government is getting out of the environment business. It is abandoning its role as a setter and a guarantor of national standards.

The government's haste to relinquish power and responsibility to the provinces over environmental matters is going to have a direct consequence on environmental enforcement. This much is certain. Regional disparities or the so-called patchwork effect are going to become the rule rather than the exception. The environment is a shared jurisdiction and we know that shared jurisdictions lead to unequal application of laws and regulations.

I would refer to a question that I asked on March 19 in the House during question period with respect to this very issue. I believe it would be very important for us to revisit the question at this time. Essentially, I pointed out to the minister that when it comes to enforcement in the province of New Brunswick there is only one enforcement officer for a province of 750,000 persons. There is only one enforcement officer for an economy that is resource based, with industries such as pulp and paper and other heavy industry. I believe it would be more prudent to have better investigations.

It is not just New Brunswick. In the province of Ontario one of the minister's officials stated in committee on February 26 that if there are not the resources for a CEPA regulation that needs to be investigated, then it basically sits in a file until an investigator is freed up. If an investigator is not freed up over a period of a year or two years, then a file is simply closed. That is shameful. Canadians want to know how many environmental regulations which are violated end up in a file that simply gets closed.

The environment is a shared jurisdiction. It is known that shared jurisdictions lead to the unequal application of laws or regulations. This is especially true when there are no national benchmarks and no single points of authority.

In this country each province and territory has its own political culture, its own employment needs and its own set of relationships with business and industry. Each applies and enforces laws and regulations according to their needs. Lacking in overall authority, namely the federal government, it is clear that the chances of CEPA being enforced with any rigour or consistency are remote. They get

Government Orders

even more remote when we consider how little money and resources are being allotted to enforcement.

• (1250)

With 100 clauses the government is making a major commitment to enforcing CEPA. Yet as the draft report of the environment committee points out, at the same time the government is failing to provide the department most responsible for enforcement the necessary wherewithal to accomplish its task.

When this government came to office, Environment Canada's budget was approximately \$750 million and it employed nearly 6,000 persons. Today the department's budget has been reduced to a touch over \$500 million and the number of employees has shrunk to a little more than 4,000; a 33% cut on environmental management. That is the record of this government.

Obviously these reductions have not been without consequences on the department's ability to enforce CEPA properly. Last summer, in fact, things got so bad that the director of the department's enforcement branch admitted publicly that it was considering asking the RCMP to help track polluters. The Mounties would be going after polluters.

Just last week we learned that this same branch plans to cut more staff, meaning that Environment Canada will be dedicating the grand total of approximately 1% of its staff to enforcement. This is a bizarre situation.

If we really think of it, one in three or 33% of this bill's clauses deals with enforcement. Yet out of a total budget of \$500 million, a mere \$16 million is allocated to enforcement. These are hardly the types of figures a government claiming to be committed to protecting the environment and enforcing CEPA's rules can accept. If it can, Environment Canada cannot realistically be expected to play anything but a minor role in the enforcement of environmental regulations in this country from now on. This means that by default the task in enforcing CEPA will fall to the provinces.

These statistics are very sobering; indeed, alarming. We are going to ask the provinces to actually carry the enforcement ball even more so. Let us look at what the provinces are doing these days with respect to environmental management.

In New Brunswick annual spending on enforcement, planning and so forth has dropped from \$17 million in 1991-92 to a mere \$12 million today. In Newfoundland the environmental department has had to absorb a 60% cut in its budget since 1994-95.

These statistics are indeed sobering. They also point out that the environment is not a priority of this government any more. It does not take a nuclear physicist to judge the impact that these continued and sustained cuts to environmental budgets are having on the

ability and the will of different environmental departments to enforce regulations. Governments simply cannot continue cutting budgets and staff while maintaining, in some cases increasing, the mandate of their environment departments.

I would like to point one thing out. I am what I consider to be a devout fiscal conservative. I think it is very important for governments to live within their means. We need to ensure that we have very strong debt reduction targets so that there is an actual investment in our future and we do not continue to mortgage the future of younger generations.

High debt levels actually affect our country's competitiveness to be able to compete. Why? It is because taxes actually impede our ability to compete, but we can never lower taxes unless we eliminate the pressures that cause high taxes and those pressures are spending.

What we need to do is pay down our debt so we actually pay less money in interest charges on a year to year basis. Then it comes to establishing our priorities. A government that has too many priorities, by definition, does not have any.

What I am pointing out is that the government should be investing in its people and its future. We should allocate our moneys where the citizens of this country want them, in the health care system and in the education system. As well, Canadians want to be assured of a healthy, sound environment in which to live.

• (1255)

My last concern about this bill relates to the proposal to allow anyone over 18 to provoke an investigation of any person or business felt to be contravening the act. This particular clause makes me very uneasy. I am in favour of measures to increase public participation in the environmental process, but we are opening the door to malicious and vexatious investigations by individuals and groups with personal grudges or corporate agendas.

Overall, I am somewhat disappointed with the scope of this bill. This is particularly so in light of the great expectations engendered by the Liberals over the environment issue. In fact, *Great Expectations* could well be the title of the Liberal environmental policy since 1993.

Members will recall that one-eighth of the first red book was devoted to the environment, thanks to the efforts of one of its authors, the present finance minister, who was then the opposition environment critic. The red book was not the only promise. Since coming to government one environment minister after another has made promise upon promise to do great things for the environment. That is why this bill is so disappointing. It simply does not live up to its billing. It fails to meet the hopes raised through years of unbridled rhetoric.

The question that inevitably comes to mind is: Why, after so much debate and so many promises, has this bill fallen so short of the mark? The first and most obvious reason is that the Liberal Party has lost interest in managing the environment. In its rush to adopt as many of the previous government's policies and positions as it could, there is no longer any room on the policy plate for the environment.

The second reason is that the former environment critic, the current finance minister, has other things on his mind these days than the protection of the environment.

After this government was hit hard by its pre-Kyoto "make it up as we go strategy", we would have thought that one of the principal actions of the government in the new year, given the minister's comments in January that the cornerstone of its post-Kyoto strategy was rewarding industry for early action on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, would have been to put an initiative in the budget for tax incentives for research and development on energy efficiency, for the use of renewable energy sources and for the development of renewable energy sources.

I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that the Progressive Conservative Party will support Bill C-32 in its current form. We will have to look at in terms of what comes out of committee. It is a more workable bill than Bill C-74 was. It is an extension of what the Canadian Environmental Protection Act was initially set out to be. It is our cornerstone bill of legislation with respect to the environment. It is a bill that the current member for Sherbrooke brought in when he was environment minister between 1990 and 1993.

That gentleman had a very successful record in managing the environment. This House will actually miss his leadership and his commitment to the environment, as well as his commitment to Canadians as he takes on other challenges for our country.

In the time remaining I would like to point out that this government must be challenged over the coming days and weeks to ensure that the environment becomes a priority again.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated my Conservative colleague's presentation. I know from often discussing environmental issues with him that we often share concerns in this respect. We sit on the same parliamentary committee and we often attend the same international conferences, including the one in Kyoto, to reduce greenhouse gases.

We also agree on the federal government's inability to resolve the problem. I think that we can agree on that.

• (1300)

What we never agree on—"but that is how our system works"—is which level of government should be responsible for environ-

Government Orders

mental issues. Is it a centralized or central government? Is it the responsibility of the federal government or the provinces? Does the Government of Quebec have jurisdiction?

The harmonization process and the agreement were quite clear. There was a principle which stated that every effort would be made to eliminate duplication and overlap. Today, the government brings in Bill C-32. Every aspect of this bill is set in a national context or spirit.

I have a simple question for my colleague from the Conservative Party. Does he agree that the national principle underlying Bill C-32 is contrary to the stated principles of harmonization?

[*English*]

Mr. John Herron: Mr. Speaker, everyone knows there will be a long answer, but my short answer to the question generally is no.

Canadians believe that the management of the environment is a shared jurisdiction. All levels of government, provincial, federal and I may also add municipal, have a role to play with respect to environmental management.

That said, it is imperative that our federal and provincial governments work in a more co-operative manner so we can manage and utilize our resources to ensure that whichever level of government is best served to deliver a certain function with respect to environmental management, that level of government should do it. At the end of the day, I believe the provinces should deliver a number of services which the federal government does today.

The population of Canada wants to know that the federal government is the principal governmental body that provides leadership for this country.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since I was the official opposition environment critic in the last parliament, I will make a few comments.

In the last parliament, we studied Bill C-74 for almost a year and a half. The Bloc Québécois had tabled a minority report during that study and our concerns remain the same. They are still related to the fact that, in the bill, the federal government is again interfering in provincial jurisdiction.

Here are my concerns: are there not some risks, in this bill, of never ending legal challenges between the federal and provincial governments, once again? If we look at the CEAA, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, that was passed during the last parliament, and if we look at what is happening at this time, we realize that legal challenges have already been launched, involving

Government Orders

Quebec and the federal government, again because the federal government is interfering in provincial jurisdiction.

In Quebec, we have the BAPE, which does some extraordinary work with environmental assessments. If the federal government comes and interferes in assessments that have already been done, and says it is not satisfied with our assessments, this will delay some projects, business projects, big projects, major projects that will not be undertaken because for five, six or seven years, money will be spent going around in circles because of dry legal challenges.

That is my concern. Is the federal government not again interfering in a provincial jurisdiction? Having been involved for more than three years, I think the environment is better managed close to the people than at a higher level.

If we look at the cuts in the federal environment department, how are they going to properly enforce an act when, because of the huge cuts, they do not know who will enforce it? How will they succeed in doing this? Will there be an environmental police on the highways? That is impossible, because they do not have the means to do it.

• (1305)

Are the revision of the CEPA and the meddling in provincial jurisdiction and causing endless legal wrangling nothing more than window dressing?

I do not know whether my colleague has any comments in this regard. Clearly the environment is a priority because it involves our future. On the other hand, we must ensure, if legislation is to be properly applied, that we do not systematically block what is already happening provincially.

Let us look at the broader picture and cut in financial terms as well. If we try to come up with situations that are intolerable and unliveable we will be doing the environment no favours, in fact, quite the opposite, we will harm it. I would like to hear what my colleague in the Conservative Party has to say.

[*English*]

Mr. John Herron: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for the question. She raises a number of very relevant points some of which I would like to touch on.

I understand that where my colleague is coming from is that the government has shown a tendency to interfere in a number of provincial jurisdictions where it is just not welcome. At the end of the day it does not make sense for the federal government to interfere in areas which are clearly within provincial jurisdiction.

A case in point is that of education. Education is something that belongs in the provincial realm. Except for maybe post-secondary education, the federal government really has no direct role in interfering with the provinces unless the provinces want to participate in a particular program. For instance if the province of Quebec wanted to do something about post-secondary education with the federal government and it was more Quebec's idea than that of the federal government, then maybe they might go ahead and do that, but education is something that belongs to the provinces.

Another case in point is Quebec's right to self-determination. Clearly Quebec's right to self-determination and the unity issue of this country is a political decision. It is not a legal decision. There is no reason for the government to privatize the political process and send this issue to the supreme court.

If the hon. member has concerns about federal interference in provincial areas, I understand where she is coming from because there are times when the federal government interferes in areas where it does not belong. That said, I fundamentally believe the environment is an area of shared jurisdiction.

The hon. member touched on a couple of points. One of the things I would like to comment on is that this is the first piece of environmental legislation of any note that the government has brought forth since being elected on October 25, 1993. Bravo. It is a good piece of legislation because we first brought it in back in 1988. The only piece of legislation the government has actually brought forth was to update a solid piece of legislation which our party first introduced in 1988.

The hon. member raised some questions and concerns with respect to enforcement of environmental regulations. There are 100 clauses in the legislation which refer to enforcement but the federal government does not allocate the resources to have enforcements in the first place. If the hon. member is concerned that it is really nice that we have this legislation but we are not going to enforce it, I think at the end of the day the federal government is required to send the resources to the provinces to ensure that the environmental regulations are actually carried out.

As to the other points the hon. member brought forth, perhaps I could catch up with her at a later time to finish this conversation to permit other questions in the House.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the member is spinning so hard he is driving himself into the ground in terms of this and other legislation.

My question relates to the member's comment. He is justifying the legislation on the basis that because it was introduced during the time of the Tory administration in 1988 it has to be good. Does the member feel the same way about all legislation introduced by the previous government?

Government Orders

Mr. John Herron: Mr. Speaker, the short answer to that question is absolutely no. The fact is that the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, known as CEPA 88, was a solid piece of legislation, something that should continue on a regular basis.

• (1310)

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me on behalf of the Minister of Health to support the opening remarks made by my colleague the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment on Bill C-32 and to bring to this debate the perspective of the Minister of Health.

Health Canada's mission is to help the people of Canada maintain and improve their health as a colleague opposite indicated during question period. To protect and promote the health of Canadians is a federal responsibility embedded in the constitution.

[Translation]

The Department of Health plays an important role in the application of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and will continue to do so under the new legislation, which bears the appropriate title of an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development.

I would take this opportunity to remind members of our responsibilities under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

In conjunction with Environment Canada, the Department of Health conducts investigations to identify substances requiring immediate attention, it evaluates the risks presented by such contaminants, drafts regulations under the act, such as regulations on the provision of notices and the evaluation of new substances and, finally, develops national strategies to control toxic substances.

The Canadian Environmental Protection Act was and will remain a significant legislative measure for protecting public health. Other legislation generally focuses on controlling substances in products, whereas this act controls the dumping of contaminants into the environment at source throughout their production and use.

[English]

Canada's action on lead is a good example of the significant and measurable benefits to human health that environmental legislation can and does make. We have a variety of legislative means of controlling exposure to lead in Health Canada through for example the Food and Drugs Act and regulations, the Hazardous Products Act and the Pest Control Products Act. These have all played their part in reducing risks to human health.

It was only through the use of CEPA that we could control a major environmental source of exposure for the general popula-

tion, lead in gasoline. Similarly, regulatory controls have been put in place under CEPA for PCBs, polychlorinated biphenyls, used in the past as insulation fluid for transformers; and dioxins and furans, polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and furans, which are toxic byproducts from the incomplete combustion of chlorinated material.

The Canadian Environmental Protection Act is an important mechanism for addressing the issue of toxic substances because of its framework for identifying, assessing and managing toxic substances. This is what Canadians want, a comprehensive approach for managing toxic substances throughout their life cycle, that is, from production, through use, to disposal.

The basis for economic progress is wealth creation. At the core of wealth creation is the contribution of knowledge, knowledge of how to transform the gifts of nature into wealth. It is essential to remember first that nature's gifts and how abundantly we have them here in Canada are not infinite. This is not a bottomless treasure trove. Second, it is salutary to remember that human development is at the core of sustainable development. One cannot have sustainable development without healthy people, a fact that we have underlined in our department's sustainable development strategy entitled "Sustaining Our Health", tabled in parliament in December 1997.

• (1315)

I know my colleague who spoke a moment ago would want to take note of that as being a little different from his recollection of history and parliament at least as it relates to innovative legislation from this government.

I would like to take this opportunity, though, to remind hon. members that the preamble to the declaration on sustainable development to which Canada committed by signing agenda 21 of the Rio declaration states: "Human beings are at the centre of concern for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature".

It is these twin targets that the Canadian Environmental Protection Act has in its sights. It is an act respecting the protection of the environment and of human life and health. This legislation then is intended not only to protect our environment for its own sake but it aims also to protect the environment because of its direct links with human health. These are not disparate targets but vitally linked, linked for life.

One is reminded of the saying that our fate is connected with the animals, from Rachel Carson's book *Silent Spring* published in the early 1960s, a book which did so much to promote the awareness of the need for environmental protection.

I know Mr. Speaker remembers the environmental movement of the 1960s. You lived through it as a young person in university. I recall your activist days at Queen's University and then later on in Toronto. You earned quite a name for yourself in this regard. I know you did not want me to draw attention to that. But in view of

Government Orders

the fact that members opposite are interested in the activities of all members of this House prior to their presence here in this institution, I thought it would be appropriate to draw attention to the fact that you were not always a Speaker nor a member of parliament but quite an active and interested citizen of this great land.

While we are happy that movement generated your presence in this House, it is also worthy of note that the environmental movement of the 1960s culminated in the establishment in Canada of a strong federal presence on the issue with the formation of the Department of the Environment in 1972.

We have come a long way since then when a series of high profile ecological disasters worldwide spurred on the environmental movement. Our view of the issues has changed as has our means of protecting the environment.

In Canada this federal involvement began with the environmental contaminants act in the mid-1970s, legislation which seemed fine at the time. By the mid-1980s it was clear the act needed expanding and strengthening. In 1988 the Canadian Environmental Protection Act was launched.

As the cornerstone for federal environmental protection with the arrival of the 1990s it was time for the review once again of the administration of our environmental protection legislation by a parliamentary committee. I might take a moment to compliment the committee on its whole and on its individual representation for the fine work it has done over the course of this last parliament and in this current parliament in coming forward with suggestions that have been incorporated in this legislation.

I would like to express on behalf of the Minister of Health my appreciation and admiration for the work of the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development in laying the groundwork for the bill before us today.

It became clear from the committee's review of the present act that it could be and should be enhanced in several ways to focus more on pollution prevention and so contribute in a more significant way to sustainable development and the health of future generations.

• (1320)

With this very concern about the future there is the need for all of us not think in terms of business as usual or development without regard costs but about what we should do now to build a sustainable future for generations to come. That makes this bill to renew and revitalize the Canadian Environmental Protection Act of critical importance as we prepare to enter the new millennium. We believe the new Canadian Environmental Protection Act is an essential tool in helping to shape the future of sustainable development.

The renewal of this act will satisfy at least two federal priorities by increasing the effectiveness of the environmental protection in Canada and by meeting the objectives of the Liberal government such as making pollution prevention a national goal and enhancing the role of the public and setting timetables for phasing out releases of those toxic substances which are of most concern.

Members will know that chemicals in one way or another are an essential part of technological development. Because of our dependence on the environment for our well-being both now and in the future, those chemicals that are assessed as toxic persisting in the environment and tending to build up in animal and human tissues must be prevented from gaining entry into the environment.

[Translation]

I therefore support Bill C-32 for the following reasons: its prudent approach, which consists in taking steps to avoid possible damage; its adherence to the principle of pollution prevention, which consists in taking steps to prevent contamination; its concern with reducing the overall costs associated with environmental pollution, that is to say, not just repercussions on the public's health and well-being, or its costs in financial terms, but also its impact on the cost of health care in Canada; and its science-based decision-making process.

Under the provisions of Bill C-32, the Department of Health, in conjunction with Environment Canada, will continue to assume responsibility for setting objectives and drafting guidelines and codes of practice for the protection of human health.

In addition, and in order to respond to public concerns about the effects of pollution and toxic substances on health, the department will step up its efforts to assess and manage risks associated with new and existing chemical substances and with biotechnology products.

The federal government is increasingly aware that international action is required to address pollution from outside the country. In response to this new priority, the Department of Health will take the opportunity offered by the new bill to broaden its sphere of activity and move from a mere assessment of international atmospheric pollution to a more global assessment of international air and water pollution.

[English]

To provide comprehensive protection for Canadians in the most effective of manners, Bill C-32 complements but does not duplicate other legislation. As an illustration of this effort the federal government has included a consequential amendment to the Food and Drugs Act and regulations as part of Bill C-32. This amendment allows the Minister of Health clear authority for the first time to collect and assess information on the environmental impact of foods, drugs and medical devices under the Food and Drugs Act. To provide comprehensive protection for Canadians in the most

effective manner, Bill C-32 complements but does not duplicate other legislation.

• (1325)

The Canada-wide accord on environmental harmonization was recently signed by the federal, territorial and most provincial environment ministers. The accord is evidence of a strong national desire to provide a co-ordinated response to environmental protection. In this context I mention the recent endorsement of the principles of co-operation on health and the environment by all levels of government which ensures a co-ordinated approach to the protection of human health from environmental contaminants.

These principles underscore the importance of environmental integrity to human health and affirm that governments in Canada are responsible for ensuring their decisions to protect the health of people and the environment for creating conditions that encourage individuals and communities to adopt sustainable practices. But we recognize that governments alone cannot solve the problems. I am encouraged by the efforts of the chemical industry which has been on the forefront of engaging in the challenge of sustainable development with its reasonable care program.

Environmental protection is an important matter for all Canadians. As we have seen in the results of recent public opinion polls, most people see issues of environmental quality largely in terms of health, their own and that of their children. They are willing to take part in protecting the environment to accomplish those goals.

In response to the recommendations of the standing committee, Bill C-32 explicitly recognizes that protecting the environment and human health is a responsibility that must be shared by all sectors of society. The present Canadian Environmental Protection Act includes participation rights. The renewed act will give the Canadian public the right to examine all phases of risk assessment and management and to provide recourse if it has reason to believe the government has failed to live up to its obligations.

Aboriginal people with their unique history and knowledge of environmental management have an important role to play. For the first time the Canadian Environmental Protection Act will include aboriginal peoples as partners in environmental protection.

[*Translation*]

Concepts such as pollution prevention and sustainable development had just emerged when the first Canadian Environmental Protection Act was drafted. It was also the case for concepts such as globalization. Today, the world is smaller. No country can live in isolation, particularly when it comes to toxic pollutants.

Canada must be ready to face the challenge of globalization. The new Canadian Environmental Protection Act will be an essential

Private Members' Business

element of the federal government's strategy to take a proactive approach with environmental issues, in a global context.

The act provides a whole range of options beyond direct regulation to monitor toxic substances, and this should help us move toward an approach that better reflects the principles of sustainable development.

[*English*]

I provide a quote from a previous minister of health, Mr. Marc Lalonde, who did so much to promote the emphasis on preventive care in public health with his report "A New Perspective on the Health of Canadians". He closed this report with a quotation from the Bible: "Who shall prepare for battle if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound?"

The proposed new CEPA gives a very clear and certain sound. It signals to all Canadians this government is serious and is truly committed to pollution prevention and sustainable development. Canada needs this legislation for the 21st century and beyond. I strongly urge all members to support it and I thank them for their attention.

The Deputy Speaker: When debate on this matter resumes there will be 10 minutes of questions and comments to the hon. member.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1330)

[*English*]

POLICE AND PEACE OFFICER NATIONAL MEMORIAL DAY

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

That, in the opinion of this House, the last Sunday of September should be formally recognized from this year forth as "The Police and Peace Officer National Memorial Day" to honour the memory of those officers killed in the line of duty.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured and pleased to rise in the House today in support of Motion No. 342, a motion I introduced some two months ago.

As a quick recap for members present, Motion No. 342 states that in the opinion of this House, the last Sunday of September should be formally recognized from this year forth as the police and peace officer national memorial day to honour the memory of those officers killed in the line of duty.

Private Members' Business

I would like to thank the Canadian Police Association for bringing the lack of formal recognition for the memorial to my attention. As always the CPA has been a strong voice on behalf of the police officers in the street. In particular Scott Newark has assisted me in my efforts in bringing this motion forward.

In September of last year one of my first public engagements as the Progressive Conservative justice and solicitor general critic was to attend the 20th annual memorial service for police and peace officers on Parliament Hill. It was a very moving event in which thousands of people, law enforcement officers from all parts of Canada, the United States, their families and friends, participated. They gathered not only to honour the memory of their comrades or loved ones, but also to remind all Canadians of the law enforcement community's dedication to public safety, a dedication for which men and women have been willing time and time again to pay the ultimate sacrifice.

From my own perspective, it allowed me to pay personal tribute to the many police officers I had worked with during my time as a crown attorney. Their commitment and contribution to public safety and community on the front lines helped me to do my job in a more satisfactory and professional way in the courtroom.

The national memorial service for police and peace officers is a story of how a single incident can provoke something of a much grander scale.

On this day 21 years ago there was not any memorial service for law enforcement officers in Canada who had lost their lives in the line of duty. That situation changed one tragic summer night in 1977. A 21-year old rookie officer with the Ottawa-Carleton police by the name of David Kirkwood paid a professional visit to 710 Gladstone Avenue, about a 20-minute walk from Parliament Hill.

The young constable with only four months service on the force went with two other officers to serve Frederick Koepke, himself only 22 years old but with severe emotional and psychiatric problems, with two warrants for assault causing bodily harm. The three officers were met at the door with gunfire and a stand-off ensued.

While awaiting reinforcements, David Kirkwood was assigned to cover the rear of the residence where, upon attending that position, he was shot at point blank range. He died instantly on July 11, 1977 leaving behind a pregnant widow and a police force fraught with grief and sorrow. A veteran constable who served with David Kirkwood described the loss of the young officer as a death in the family.

The members of the Ottawa Police Association wanted to do more than grieve, they wanted to send a clear message to the entire country. On September 24, 1978 David Kirkwood's comrades held a service on Parliament Hill to honour his memory and remind elected officials that peace officers continue to be killed in the streets daily in the name of public safety.

The 1978 ceremony began with a two-gun salute fired by members of the 30th Field Regiment of the Royal Canadian Artillery. After the salute, one brass shell case was saved and mounted on a commemorative plaque. This plaque contained a simple yet powerful inscription: To fallen comrades, Parliament Hill, September 24, 1978.

Although Ottawa police officers continued to hold the ceremony subsequent to that year, the number of participants increased in size and scope. This memorial began to take on a more national focus.

The ceremony's evolution through the past two decades was incremental. At the 1984 service a memorial book of remembrance for police officers and correctional officers killed while on duty was unveiled by the Office of the Solicitor General and the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police. In 1994 the Prime Minister joined with more than 700 police officers and relatives of slain officers at the site just behind these parliament buildings as the Canadian Police Association and the CACP dedicated the new Canadian police memorial pavilion.

● (1335)

That granite stone at the base of the pavilion contains the names of more than 200 officers killed in the line of duty since 1879. Two other stones were also erected, one for peace officers who died in the line of duty and the other explaining the pavilion's history. In 1995 the memorial honour roll was expanded to include the names of slain officers from other Canadian law enforcement agencies such as customs and excise, natural resources and fisheries and oceans.

I am proud to say that my father in his last ministerial portfolio of public works played a key role in realizing the site in the early 1990s. In fact there is a photo in my office showing my father speaking at the ground breaking ceremony.

Recently I have been advised that construction near the site has jeopardized the integrity of this pavilion. It is certainly hoped that great care will be taken.

In expanding the memorial to include peace officers the event's organizers cited the basic principle behind the annual ceremony: to pay tribute to those who have sworn an oath to protect the lives of others.

The Canadian Police Association and the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police established three criteria to establish the names of those who should be listed in the memorial book and on the stone.

The deceased must have been a sworn police or peace officer and death must have occurred as a result of a traumatic event influenced by an external agent. The deceased must have been on duty at the time of death, or if off duty, acting in their capacity as a police or peace officer, or the death must have been brought about because of the victim's official status. Lastly, the deceased must have acted in good faith in doing all that was expected, while

bearing in mind the incident, the rights of those involved and the safety of all concerned.

The names of the more than 200 Canadians displayed on this memorial, all of whom have met these extraordinary benchmarks, distinguishes the highest act of sacrifice and selflessness. So long as we add more names each year to this memorial, Canadians and their elected representatives will be challenged to do more, to strive to bring about better policy and legislation in the hope of ensuring that fewer names will be added to this gallant but tragic list.

It is most certainly time for parliamentarians to take the next step in the evolution of this memorial and to grant formal recognition to this very special occasion.

By passing Motion No. 342 parliament can send a strong message of respect and gratitude to our law enforcement officials who have made the alternate sacrifice for public safety. It would also express our collective solidarity with the families and friends who have lost loved ones, along with those men and women in the law enforcement profession who put their lives at risk each and every day.

Let us rise above the usual political fray that exists in this place and pay tribute to one of society's most demanding and important vocations. Let us accord the respect that many law enforcement officials presently feel that perhaps they do not receive from their elected officials.

Although the procedure and House affairs committee opted not to classify Motion No. 342 as votable, I would ask that all hon. members give unanimous consent to allow the motion to be voted upon in the House.

I would like to quote from a passage of the Bible which was read at last September's memorial service. It is taken from chapter 3, verses 1 to 6 of the Book of Wisdom:

But the soles of the righteous are in the hands of God,
and no torment will even touch them.

In the eyes of the foolish they seemed to have died and their departure was thought to be an affliction and their going from us to be their destruction but they are at peace.

For though in the sight of men they were punished,
their hope is full of immortality.

Having been disciplined a little,
they will receive great good

Because God tested them and found them worthy of himself;
like gold in the furnace he tried them, and like a sacrificial burnt offering he accepted them.

Sombre but telling words. I hope all members of the House will support this motion and as requested, make this motion a votable item.

The Deputy Speaker: Is their unanimous consent that the motion be a votable item?

Private Members' Business

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is no consent.

● (1340)

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on the motion to designate the last Sunday in September as a national police and peace officer memorial day. I do so on my own behalf and especially on behalf of my colleague the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General and I hope on behalf of all other members on this side as well.

For the past 20 years Canadians have honoured police and peace officers in a memorial ceremony and reception for the families and colleagues of officers killed in the line of duty. That memorial takes place on the last Sunday of every September. Each year this memorial service has been conducted on Parliament Hill. It is always a well attended event. In fact it is a day when all of us set aside our differences and pay our respects to those who sacrificed their lives so that we can live safely in our communities.

Chief Thomas Welsh first introduced the service in 1978 in response to the shooting death of Ottawa Police Constable David Kirkwood in 1977. Since then Constable Kirkwood's memory is honoured each year along with others who lost their lives so suddenly and tragically.

Now in its 21st year the memorial service has had in attendance special guests such as the Governor General of Canada, numerous solicitors general, members of the fallen officers' families and police officers from around the world. It is a solemn occasion to pay tribute to the men and women who have given their lives over the years to protect all Canadians. It is an occasion for families and friends to remember their loved ones. More important it is an occasion for all of us to remember that part of the reason we live in a safe and just society is because of the dedication of police and peace officers.

Each year we hope that new names will not be added to the list of the memorial. Sadly this has not been the case. While Canadians live in one of the safest countries in the world there have been times when danger could not be avoided and when those on the front lines have lost their lives while protecting the safety of others.

Although those in law enforcement garner a great deal of respect from Canadians they are also facing unprecedented challenges.

In our current social environment there is a public perception that crime is much more prevalent than it actually is. Even though crime rates have been steadily decreasing in recent years, the perception is that crime is on the rise. Police race relations, youth gangs, violent crime, organized crime, drug trafficking, smuggling, hate crime and even fear of crime are at the forefront of the daily challenges police face across this country.

Private Members' Business

These competing demands make it even more necessary for police, our communities and government to continually look at how we can do things better and to find new ways to meet these problems directly. Responding to crime and criminal behaviour is no easy task. The very nature of police work involves some intrusive and at times aggressive interventions in order to control situations and to solve crimes. It is important to provide a fair and equitable framework for police work in legislation.

As part of this government's safe homes and safe streets agenda, we have done much in the way of improving the tools with which police are able to carry out their duties. We have worked very hard to introduce legislative reforms that strike the right balance.

In addition to the memorial tribute each year, this government continues to honour the work of peace officers across Canada by doing what we can in our capacity to provide the tools that those in law enforcement need to do their jobs as safely as possible. That means providing legislation that tackles crime head on such as the anti-gang legislation which was passed last year. It means focusing correctional resources on those who need it most. It means ensuring that we continue to live in safe homes and safe streets.

This motion speaks to the need to officially recognize a service that has taken place for over two decades. It has become a tradition we observe each year and it is clear that the families and colleagues of fallen officers count on all of us to pay tribute to the memories of those who are no longer with us. It is a time when we all pause to reflect on the contribution our police and peace officers make to our society and to honour the fallen.

A formal national memorial day such as the one proposed in this motion will serve Canadians well. Quite often it takes a ceremony of this magnitude for us to realize that our safety sometimes comes at the cost of our best and brightest peace officers.

While many of us take public safety for granted, Canada is one of the few countries in the world where we can walk in our streets and feel relatively safe.

• (1345)

Public safety is a priority of law enforcement for this government. This is demonstrated on a number of fronts. It means providing legislation to tackle crime head on such as the anti-gang legislation which was passed last year. It means focusing correctional resources where they will be most effective. It means taking crime prevention seriously to ensure that we will continue to live in safe homes and safe streets.

An official recognized national police and peace officers memorial day would provide Canada with a specific occasion to express our appreciation for what we have. This government is committed to taking a balanced approach to reducing crime in Canada which includes the underlying factors that lead to criminal behaviour.

The hallmark of our efforts includes close co-operation with federal, provincial and territorial governments. It is essential in order to build an effective and efficient criminal justice system.

The record on public safety speaks for itself. Since the last peace officers memorial, this government has taken steps toward making Canada a much safer place to live. First, we have introduced legislation to create Canada's first national DNA data bank so that repeat offenders can be apprehended more quickly.

Second, we have supported studies that tell us more about the nature of crime and what we can do to change the behaviour of those who commit criminal acts.

Third, we continue to work with our partners across Canada and beyond our borders to stop crime in its tracks.

Fourth, we will continue to take tough measures against violent and dangerous offenders.

Fifth, we remain committed to making improvements to the legislative foundation of Canada's correctional system, the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, where the need for change is demonstrated.

There is more to be done and this government is prepared to take on the task. In the name of public safety and for the safety of those who work each day to enforce our laws on the front lines, we will continue to build on our successes and to learn from our past.

This government supports Motion No. 342 and I am sure all members will do the same.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the last member speaking from the government side was from the Eglinton—Lawrence riding. I also believe that is a member who called out no when there was a request for a votable motion here today.

Listening to his comments and remarks with regard to this motion, it borders absolutely on being anti-police. It was nothing more than a self-serving discussion, a brag of what is perceived to be great accomplishments in the area of crime fighting and support for our police forces and peace officers.

This is a very important motion and I do not intend to dwell on the kind of speech I heard. The mover of this motion has devised an important motion for all of us in Canada because there is no one in this country who is not either related to a police officer, has been served by a police officer or has supported police officers as they go about trying to do their work.

As such, I can assure the member that the Reform Party totally supports his motion and that it should have been allowed to be a

votable motion. A special day should be set aside for these people who serve our communities so well.

In my comments today I will not go over the slightly more technical, historical, chronological events that have occurred to bring this about. I would like to expand a bit on the human face that was put on this motion by the presenter and just expand a bit on his comments in support of him.

As members know, I am a former police officer in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I have attended these memorial functions, not in Ottawa here on the Hill but in other divisions, and attended the funerals of members slain on the duty days when they went to work not expecting anything unusual.

• (1350)

Who are these police officers who serve in front of us every day in uniform and in plain clothes? They started out as boys and girls in our high schools thinking about the occupation they would like to take up. The ones who lean toward public service, toward helping their fellow man, recognize right from wrong, these are the people who have traditionally joined police forces across this country.

I speak of all police officers and peace officers designated by the various provincial and federal statutes and who serve with every municipality, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Surete, the Ontario Provincial Police.

Of course we should not forget either those members of yesteryear police forces that are no longer in existence. Those members also gave up their lives on occasion for the Canadian public and the Canadian good.

These young boys and girls graduated from high school in days past and currently graduate from university and then continue on to police work. They do not realize at the time they go into police work the full extent to which they are dealing with the most unpredictable animal on the face of the earth. That happens to be a human being.

These people go into cadet training and training at the RCMP academy full of idealism, hope and a sense of service, little expecting and little knowing what lies ahead. While they are in training they begin, through the studying of the Criminal Code and the training programs they go through where instructors start to speak of the reasons why they are hammering home self-defence and the law, to fully understand their rights and authorities in carrying out their duties.

This is done for two reasons. One is obviously so that the maximum quality of service can be given to Canadians, and the second is for the protection of those peace officers as they go about their duties.

Private Members' Business

It is certainly a concern of mine that these future members of our police forces not be lulled into a false sense of security through government propaganda about all the protection they are going to get out of Bill C-68, the Firearms Act, that they will somehow know before going into a dangerous situation, a family dispute or whatever, that so and so is not the owner of any guns or in possession of any firearms. That is not true and I sincerely hope that the trainers of these young police officers do not put forward the government's propaganda with regard to Bill C-68.

I was putting a human face on these young police officers, that first patrol when they are first assigned to their duties, whether it is walking in the tough end of a city or driving their first patrol car at night. As they pull over that first car for a spot check or attend that first alarm indicating the possibility of criminals in a building, their hands start to sweat a bit and there is a knot in their stomach. They know at that point that their safety is not guaranteed and cannot be guaranteed. Relying on their training and knowing they have in essence volunteered to put themselves on the line on behalf of the rest of us so we can sleep safely at night, they proceed along with their duties taking the best precautions possible but knowing they cannot protect against everything.

• (1355)

As they go through their service in the police force they end up doing specialized duties such as highway patrol duty, traffic duty. They are exposed to more dangers than just firearms, knives and being assaulted. They are subject to contamination from blood and other bodily fluids at different scenes.

When a member is killed on duty a terrible situation obviously arises for the family, and there is always family. These people need a place to go from year to year for the rest of their lives to make sure they can see their son or daughter is being recognized. Such a place is in Ottawa, such a place is in their home provinces and towns. It would be really nice if there were one day that everyone could point to as being the day that recognizes their sons' and daughters' contribution to Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in this House today to speak on the motion put forward by my colleague, the parliamentary leader of the Conservative Party.

I must say, however, that I am terribly disappointed that my colleague opposite, the hon. member for Eglinton-Lawrence, would refuse to make this motion votable and turn this into a political, partisan issue, when in fact every member of this House should support the motion.

The motion reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the last Sunday of September should be formally recognized from this year forth as "The Police and Peace Officer National Memorial Day" to honour the memory of those officers killed in the line of duty.

Private Members' Business

The Bloc Québécois enthusiastically endorses this motion and will support it.

Society as a whole is indebted to police and peace officers for the work they do so we can live in peace and security within our families, in our homes, at work and everywhere else. Men and women have paid with their lives for this dedication to their communities, and their families too deserve our gratitude in recognition of the great sacrifice resulting from the choice made by their spouse, father, mother or child.

Everywhere in Quebec and in Canada, police and other law enforcement officers perform their duties under difficult circumstances, and we become aware of the importance of what they do only when some tragic incident wakes us up to the harsh reality of it.

On behalf of my colleagues in this House and the general public, I wish to thank all those who work tirelessly to make our society a fairer and a safer place to live.

The media report only the most spectacular tragedies, so we tend to be collectively unaware of what these law enforcement officers go through every day, as they live with the possibility that their future may be jeopardized if a seemingly routine incident turns sour on them.

• (1400)

I urge the government to implement the measures needed to eliminate human dramas altogether. Whole families are being torn asunder, and, as lawmakers, we have a moral obligation to ensure that social and family dramas are not repeated.

I encourage the government to take note of the motion and to support it so the will of this House may be realized. The issue is not political and therefore there is no need for speeches to promote party positions.

I am pleased to support the motion of my colleague and friend, the House leader of the Progressive Conservative Party.

[English]

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to support the motion of the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough:

That, in the opinion of this House, the last Sunday of September should be formally recognized from this year forth as "The Police and Peace Officer National Memorial Day" to honour the memory of those officers killed in the line of duty.

I congratulate the member for bringing this matter forward. As we heard from the Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health,

this matter is supported by members from the other side although they oppose making it votable. The parliamentary secretary says that the government supports the motion. He also says that there is more to be done and that the government is prepared to take on this task. Obviously the government is not prepared to take on the very modest task of voting in support of this most worthwhile motion.

From time to time police officers, firefighters and others with the job of protecting and assisting many in difficult situations, at risk or in danger, are prepared to risk their lives in doing so. They have asked not only for recognition of this sort but also for a public pension to be available to their families if they are killed in the line of duty.

That is a financial question that most members of the House would support. However it is not what is being asked today. The motion does not ask the government to provide funds. It merely asks all members of the House to have a day to recognize the most supreme sacrifice made by Canadian police and peace officers in the continuance of their duties to ensure we live in a secure and safe community. Most Canadians would find it odd to think that the government was not prepared to support what is a modest yet important provision.

The Prime Minister was involved in the 1994 ceremony in which over 700 police officers and relatives of slain officers gathered at the site behind the Parliament Buildings to dedicate the new Canadian Police Memorial Pavilion. The Prime Minister and his government were supported then in their initiative to recognize and respect those police and peace officers who had lost their lives in the line of duty. The year 1994 is not very far in the past, yet here we are five years later with the same Prime Minister and the same government not being prepared to recognize a day to honour officers who died in the line of duty. Canadians would wonder why.

The sacrifices and the risks taken by police officers in the line of duty may not be better described than by the words of dignitaries at a memorial ceremony that was held just behind the House in 1997. I will quote a couple of those dignitaries. Neal Jessop, president of the Canadian Police Association, said:

Once again we gather to honour our fallen comrades and keep faith with them and their families left behind. It is a duty most sacred of all of us within the law enforcement family and a commitment that exemplifies the bonds in our larger family.

• (1405)

It is a duty and commitment of all of us. He continued:

This service honours those who gave their lives in service of us all. It is also our way of ensuring that the family members of those we remember today know that they are forever in our thoughts and prayers.

This year's service stands as a stark reminder that the duties, responsibilities and risks of law enforcement are a 24 a day reality.

Private Members' Business

Vincent Murray, president of the Canadian Peace Officers' Memorial Association, said the following important words:

Today is the twentieth anniversary of the Memorial Service, a service which commemorates the great sacrifice our officers have made. They have lost their lives protecting society from the evils of violence and crime. These officers served their country with integrity, honesty and courage, well known values of the law enforcement family.

Let us now remember and honour those brave officers who gave their lives in service to their country. Let us remember them as they were, for time does not age them as it does us. They will stay forever young in memories, but we will not forget them.

Surely all of us in the House share those words and sentiments. It would not be asking very much to have the motion votable and to have this day set aside to remember peace officers.

I have a few words to say about the police service in my community of Saskatoon. I have spent time, as I am sure have many members of the House, with them in the line of duty. I have watched the tasks they have to perform and the risks they have to endure. Nobody could but be impressed by their commitment to all of us and their preparedness to take on risks in the line of duty.

It is incumbent on all of us to recognize that and to do what little part we can to make sure that they know and that the families of those who have died in the line of duty know how important Canadians regard their work, understand it, and consider with compassion the circumstance in which they find themselves having lost a loved one. It is incumbent upon us to ensure that our thanks is provided in any way we possibly can do so.

One police officer who died in the line of duty comes from outside my community of Saskatoon. His name was Brian King. He was hijacked, taken hostage and killed in the most outrageous circumstances. All in Saskatoon and indeed all in Saskatchewan remember this police officer and his family. There is a centre named after him in the town of Warman where he served with the RCMP.

It is not enough to say thanks to those police officers who have provided services to date. It is not enough to say to the families of those police officers who died that we are sorry, concerned about them, appreciate the service that was provided and understand the circumstances in which they live. It is not enough to say that and go no further.

I hope members opposite would reconsider their opposition to voting on the motion and would support it. I cannot imagine any Canadian would be opposed to this important motion except maybe a few on the Liberal benches. Surely the Parliamentary Secretary for the Minister of Health is not opposed to setting aside this day. Surely the member from Prince Island is not opposed to setting aside this day to respect and honour police officers who lost their lives in the line of duty. Surely the member for Nunavut is not opposed. Surely, if they are opposed, they would be one of four or five people in the whole country who are not prepared to come forward and support the motion.

• (1410)

Let me close by just asking once again if the members would reconsider and by asking for unanimous consent to make the motion votable.

Mr. Joseph Volpe: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My hon. colleague opposite has been in this place for such a long time that he should know his party and the parties on both sides have members on the House procedures and affairs committee that make decisions about how to deal with the motion.

While the government side supports the intent of the motion, it also respects the decisions made by the all party committee.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not think that is a point of order. It sounds like a point of debate to me.

In accordance with the request for unanimous consent by the hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, is there the unanimous consent of the House to make the motion votable?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak today in support of the motion to designate the last Sunday in September as the police and peace officer national memorial day.

Since 1978 Canadians have been afforded the opportunity to officially commemorate the memory of police and peace officers killed in the line of duty. The annual Canadian police and peace officers memorial weekend service is a solemn occasion for family colleagues and all Canadians to honour and pay tribute to the men and women whose job it is to enforce the law and to protect society.

I have attended these services and they are an occasion to honour the memory of those who did so at the price of their own lives. The participation at last year's service is testimony to the increasing respect and esteem we all have for our peace officers whether they be police, correctional people or others in law enforcement.

It is because of the work of these officers that we as Canadians live in a safe society. However we sometimes take for granted the security we enjoy and it is commemoration ceremonies such as a memorial that remind us of the courage and dedication police and peace officers display day after day.

More important, it brings us all together to thank them for a job well done. Each year we hope that new names will not be added to the list of those to remember. Unfortunately this has not yet been the case.

Despite the fact that Canadians are fortunate to live in one of the safest countries in the world, adversity is a real risk and a real danger. Peace officers are vigilant about the safety of the entire community but the safety of their own lives may be compromised

Private Members' Business

as they carry out their duty. In this regard I am especially grateful for the services provided by Canadian police and peace officers.

I have firsthand knowledge about police service in Canada. I sat as a member of the Waterloo Regional Police Services for 10 years. As chairman I was intimately involved with the work of police and the police service. I certainly applaud the loyalty, the commitment, the dedication and the outstanding professionalism of not only Waterloo Regional Police but of police and peace officers across Canada wherever they may be.

The motion speaks to the need to officially endorse a national police and peace officer memorial day on the same day as what has become an unofficial tradition for the past 20 years. It is a time when we all pause to reflect on the contribution our police and peace officers make to society and to honour the fallen. In addition, it is a time when we can pay our respects to the families who have also lived with the risk that each day brings and who have been called upon in their own way to make great sacrifices.

In addition to the memorial tribute each year, the government continues to recognize the work of police and peace officers across Canada during National Police Week. Again I have been intimately involved with that.

The government also provides practical support through the provision of new and innovative tools required by law enforcement officers to carry out their duties as safely as possible.

This means passing legislation that will prevent crime as well as legislation that will tackle crime in many ways simultaneously whether it be targeting high risk offenders or putting in place special measures to deal with criminal gangs.

• (1415)

This government will continue to make public safety its priority. This is demonstrated on a number of fronts. For example, through our efforts to combat organized crime, to develop crime prevention initiatives, to fight drug abuse and to redefine correctional strategies. The record on public safety speaks for itself.

Since the last police and peace officers memorial this government has taken steps toward making Canada a much safer place to live. The last Sunday of every September gives us all an opportunity to appreciate the difficulties and the importance of the work of police and peace officers.

Therefore, it is my belief that to designate the last Sunday of September as the date of the memorial service for the police and peace officer national memorial would entrench our respect as Canadians for police and peace officers who protect us, sometimes at the price of their own lives.

A formal national memorial day, such as the one proposed in this motion, would serve Canadian police and peace officers. It would serve their families, their colleagues and indeed all Canadians.

This government supports Motion No. 342. I am honoured to do likewise and I urge all members to do the same.

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a couple of brief comments.

I rise to support Motion No. 342 brought forward by the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough. As he stated in his comments, I too attended the memorial last September on the Hill. I attended with the widow and the son of a member of the old B.C. highway patrol who was killed in the line of duty on his way to responding to a traffic incident.

I also remember some two decades ago, just after I moved into the area of Surrey, how a young RCMP constable was purposely drawn out of the police station by two people driving a car wildly. He was purposely drawn to them and was shot at point blank range as he walked up to the window of the car. These two people were convicted of first degree murder at that time and sentenced to death. The death penalty was withdrawn and, to the best of my knowledge, at least one of those persons was successful on a 745 application. However, this is not the time nor the place to debate that issue.

I think for most people in this country the most common contact with police officers is through speeding tickets and roadside breathalyzer tests. Fortunately, for most people, that is their only contact. However, I have a personal connection. Five and a half years ago there was an incident within my family and I was forced to deal with the police for about two years, on a very personal level. I saw their dedication and the honour these people work with and how diligent they are at their jobs, especially in the investigative process.

Since that time I have had many opportunities to ride along with the constables on the streets of my city, to see them work and to see what they are exposed to. I advise all members of this House and any member of the public who has a problem with the police to go out and spend a Friday or Saturday night on the streets of their community to see what policing is really all about. It is a lot more than just speeding tickets and roadside breathalyzers.

Fortunately, in most cases, police officers are not forced to put their lives on the line. They realize when they leave the house every morning to go to work that it is a possibility, but very fortunately for us and for them they do not have to always deal with it. However, occasionally they do and far too often, in my estimation, these people lose their lives and widows and families are left behind to suffer.

I speak in support of this motion because I think it is long overdue. There should be full public recognition and a recognition by this place and a day should be set aside to remember these people and what they have given for their country.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am very encouraged by the remarks and words of support that have come from all present here today. I know as well, Mr. Speaker, that you have been very supportive of the police in your community. Again, I think this is a time and a place for us, as a House, to express our support for those in the law enforcement community.

● (1420)

The hon. member opposite, the Liberal secretary for the Minister of Health, spoke of crime and crime prevention as being a major priority for his government. I can certainly advise that it is a priority for all here in Parliament and in fact all Canadians.

The hon. member did take the opportunity today to talk about the government's moves toward combating this most serious problem of crime in Canada, the DNA data bank legislation still before the House which we are hopeful will include the ability of the police to taking samplings at the time of charge to ensure they have the opportunity to use this important technology in crime prevention.

The member also spoke of the anti-gang legislation and changes to the Young Offenders Act. Quite frankly, those are certainly legislative moves we support but we are yet to see and yet to have the opportunity to vote on the floor of the House to bring about the necessary changes.

We have also heard mention of ill conceived gun registry. Unfortunately I can state uncategorically we do not believe this is going to help the legal community or Canadians, nor is the continuation of section 745, as alluded to by the hon. member for Surrey North.

I reiterate the importance of an opportunity for us to rise above the fray and be unified in our support of day that would recognize those in the law enforcement community, the men and women who are daily out there on the streets willing to put their actions forward for the protection of all; not to talk about it in the way the government talks about what it will do, but these men and women

Private Members' Business

are out there daily putting forward their actions, not their words, toward this cause.

I am disappointed and saddened by the position taken by the Liberal members opposite. Many of these individuals should go home to their communities and consult with police officers, look them in the eye and tell them why they were not prepared to do more than just talk about it in the House but allow this motion to be votable which would then bind them to make this happen.

This is not a vote of confidence. This is not something like they are going to face on Tuesday where the Prime Minister has decided to make this a vote of confidence. This is an opportunity for a non-partisan commitment, a commitment that everybody in the House should be quick to embrace.

In the name of conscience, good will and patience I ask members present to give unanimous consent for this motion to be made votable. I ask members to check their conscience and if they are not willing to do so they should go home to their constituents and to the police community and hang their heads in shame. This is an opportunity for us to do something right for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to make the motion votable?

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is no consent.

[*English*]

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped from the order paper.

[*Translation*]

It being 2.25 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.24 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	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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	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	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	PC
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or	Nova Scotia	NDP
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland	PC
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	New Brunswick	PC
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	Ref.
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	NDP
Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	West Kootenay — Okanagan	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Charleswood — Assiniboine	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	Quebec	PC
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	Manitoba	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Manitoba	Ref.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jones, Jim	Markham	Ontario	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Ontario	Lib.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	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	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby — Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Labour	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
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	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Ref.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	PC
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	British Columbia	Ref.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Muise, Mark	West Nova	Nova Scotia	PC
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Ind.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	Ref.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt ...	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Saint—Eustache — Sainte— Thérèse	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	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Kent — Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	Quebec	BQ
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	Newfoundland	PC
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	PC
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island ..	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	Ref.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	British Columbia	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration ...	Westmount — Ville—Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Saada, Jacques	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma — Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Quebec	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	Charlotte	New Brunswick	PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	Ref.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	Ref.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	Ref.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	NDP
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody—Coquitlam	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	Ref.
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.
MANITOBA (14)		
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Charleswood—Assiniboine	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage—Lisgar	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Wasylcia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique—Mactaquac	PC
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	Lib.
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska—Restigouche	PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	Charlotte	PC
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, George S.	Gander—Grand Falls	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Mathews, Bill	Burin—St. George's	PC
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Lib.
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	PC
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)		
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
Karetak—Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or	NDP
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	NDP
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
Mancini, Peter	Sydney—Victoria	NDP
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Muise, Mark	West Nova	PC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP
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, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton—Gloucester	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth—Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Elinor	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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor—St. Clair	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce—Grey	Lib.
Jones, Jim	Markham	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont—Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	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	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview—Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark—Carleton	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo—Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South—Weston	Ind.
O'Brien, Pat	London—Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria—Haliburton	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Kent—Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean—Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Halton	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Perth—Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Labour	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Hillsborough	Lib.

QUEBEC (75)

Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	PC
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac—Mégantic	BQ
Coderre, Denis	Bourassa	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphonde—Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil—Papineau	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard—Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	PC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonnette	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food) (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse—Etchemins— Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Saint—Eustache—Sainte—Thérèse	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau—Saint—Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	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	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St—Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St—Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
St—Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Lib.
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 (14)		
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	NDP
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	Qu’Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Ref.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Ref.
YUKON (1)		
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Colleen Beaumier

Jean Augustine Paul Bonwick	Claudette Bradshaw Maud Debien	Raymonde Folco Keith Martin	Svend Robinson Diane St-Jacques	(9)
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chairman: Bob Speller

André Bachand Bill Blaikie	Sarmite Bulte Raymonde Folco	Robert Nault Charlie Penson	Julian Reed Benoît Sauvageau	(9)
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----

HEALTH

Chair: Beth Phinney

Vice-Chairs: Elinor Caplan
Reed Elley

Carolyn Bennett Aileen Carroll Claude Drouin Maurice Dumas	Grant Hill Dan McTeague Lynn Myers	Pauline Picard Greg Thompson Rose-Marie Ur	Maurice Vellacott Joseph Volpe Judy Wasylcia-Leis	(16)
---	--	--	---	------

Associate Members

Pierre Brien Libby Davies Pierre de Savoye Michelle Dockrill	Antoine Dubé Christiane Gagnon Sharon Hayes John Herron	M. Sophia Leung Keith Martin Réal Ménard	Caroline St-Hilaire Paul Szabo Stéphan Tremblay
---	--	--	---

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chairman: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairs: Bonnie Brown
Dale Johnston

Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders Carolyn Bennett Claudette Bradshaw	Brenda Chamberlain Paul Crête Libby Davies Nick Discepola	Jean Dubé Christiane Gagnon Albina Guarnieri Larry McCormick	Bob Nault Stéphan Tremblay Bryon Wilfert	(18)
---	--	---	--	------

Associate Members

Yvan Bernier Pierre Brien Jocelyne G. Bujold Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Antoine Dubé	Reed Elley Yvon Godin Sharon Hayes Wendy Lill	Inky Mark Patrick Martin Réal Ménard Maria Minna	Lorne Nystrom Yves Rocheleau Diane St-Jacques Angela Vautour
---	--	---	---

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

Vice-Chairmen: Art Hanger
Bob Wood

Chris Axworthy
Leon Benoit
Hec Clouthier
Maurice Godin

Peter Goldring
Judi Longfield
Pat O'Brien

John O'Reilly
David Pratt
David Price

George Proud
John Richardson
Pierrette Venne

(16)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Denis Coderre
Monique Guay

Jim Hart
John Maloney
Peter Mancini

Patrick Martin
Bob Mills

Daniel Turp
Elsie Wayne

NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chairman: Brent St. Denis

Vice-Chairmen: David Chatters
Ben Serré

Réginald Bélair
Gilles Bernier
Jocelyne G. Bujold
Gerry Byrne

Roy Cullen
Pierre de Savoye
Yvon Godin

Jim Gouk
Ovid Jackson
Jerry Pickard

Carmen Provenzano
Darrel Stinson
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Hélène Alarie
Chris Axworthy
Bernard Bigras
Pierre Brien
René Canuel

Jean-Guy Chrétien
Michelle Dockrill
Ghislain Fournier
Bill Gilmour
Jim Jones

Gerald Keddy
Derrek Konrad
René Laurin
Réjean Lefebvre

Gilles Perron
Nelson Riis
Angela Vautour
Maurice Vellacott

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chairman: Peter Adams

Vice-Chairs: Marlene Catterall
Chuck Strahl

George Baker
Stéphane Bergeron
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Ken Epp
Mac Harb
André Harvey

Bob Kilger
Rey Pagtakhan
Carolyn Parrish

John Richardson
John Solomon
Randy White

(16)

Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur
Bill Blaikie
Don Boudria

Garry Breitkreuz
Michelle Dockrill
Norman Doyle

Jay Hill
René Laurin
Bill Matthews

Réal Ménard
Suzanne Tremblay

SUB-COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Chairman: Randy White

Garry Breitkreuz
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

André Harvey

Bob Kilger

John Solomon

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair: Carolyn Parrish

William Blaikie Yvon Charbonneau	Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Ken Epp	André Harvey	(6)
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	---------	--------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Chairman: Bob Kilger

Stéphane Bergeron Bill Blaikie	Don Boudria	André Harvey	Randy White	(6)
-----------------------------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	-----

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: John Williams

Vice-Chairmen: Ivan Grose
Andrew Telegdi

Mark Assad Sue Barnes Elinor Caplan Odina Desrochers	Gurmant Grewal Mac Harb Jason Kenney René Laurin	Steve Mahoney Philip Mayfield Lynn Myers	Lorne Nystrom Rey Pagtakhan Elsie Wayne	(17)
---	---	--	---	------

Associate Members

Roy Bailey Garry Breitreuz Scott Brison Jocelyne G. Bujold	Rick Casson Bev Desjarlais Michelle Dockrill Antoine Dubé	Michel Guimond Jim Jones Derrek Konrad Denis Paradis	Gilles Perron Alex Shepherd Peter Stoffer
---	--	---	---

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Roy Cullen
Lee Morrison

Roy Bailey Murray Calder John Cannis Bill Casey	Bev Desjarlais Claude Drouin Joe Fontana	Ivan Grose Michel Guimond Stan Keyes	Inky Mark Paul Mercier Carolyn Parrish	(16)
--	--	--	--	------

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy Yvan Bernier Rick Borotsik	Pierre Brien Paul Crête John Cummins	Ghislain Fournier Rick Laliberte John Maloney	Yves Rocheleau Elsie Wayne
---	--	---	-------------------------------

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint-Chairmen: Philippe D. Gigantès
Gurbax Malhi

Joint Vice-Chairman: Philip Mayfield

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Eymard G. Corbin
Mabel M. DeWare

Richard J. Doyle
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein
Louis J. Robichaud

Marlene Catterall
Hec Clouthier
John Finlay
Deborah Grey
Howard Hilstrom
Jim Karygiannis
Raymond Lavigne

Wendy Lill
Paul Mercier
Louis Plamondon
David Price
Karen Redman
Jacques Saada
Brent St. Denis

(23)

Associate Members

Libby Davies

Maurice Dumas

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Sen. Rose–Marie Losier–Cool
Sheila Finestone

Joint Vice-Chairmen: Denis Coderre
Rahim Jaffer

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald A. Beaudoin
Jean–Robert Gauthier
Noël A. Kinsella
Jean–Claude Rivest

Fernand Robichaud
Louis J. Robichaud
Lucie Pépin
Jean–Maurice Simard

Eugène Bellemare
Claudette Bradshaw
Cliff Breitreuz
John Godfrey
Bob Kilger
Dan McTeague
Ted McWhinney

Val Meredith
Mark Muise
Denis Paradis
Louis Plamondon
Suzanne Tremblay
Angela Vautour

(25)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien

Lorne Nystrom

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Céline Hervieux–Payette
Derek Lee

Joint Vice–Chairman: Ted White

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michael Cogger
Marisa Barth Ferretti
Normand Grimard
William M. Kelly

P. Derek Lewis
Léonce Mercier
Wilfred P. Moore

John Bryden
Bill Casey
Paul DeVillers
Ken Epp
Marlene Jennings
Ghislain Lebel
Gary Lunn
Gurbax Malhi

John Maloney
Inky Mark
Ian Murray
Lorne Nystrom
Alex Shepherd
Caroline St–Hilaire
Tom Wappel

(25)

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy
Michel Bellehumeur

Michel Guimond
Richard Marceau

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

CHILD CUSTODY AND ACCESS

Joint Chairs: Landon Pearson
Roger Gallaway

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Erminie J. Cohen
Joan Cook
Anne C. Cools

Mabel M. DeWare
Duncan J. Jessiman
Lucie Pépin

Eleni Bakopanos
Carolyn Bennett
Robert Bertrand
Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral
Sheila Finestone
Paul E. Forseth
John Harvard
Nancy Karetak–Lindell

Judi Longfield
Eric Lowther
Gary Lunn
Peter Mancini
Denis Paradis
Caroline St–Hilaire
Diane St–Jacques

(23)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	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	Minister of Labour
The Hon. Christine Stewart	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. Andy Scott	Solicitor General of Canada
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

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Wayne Easter	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Gerry Byrne	to Minister of Natural Resources
John Godfrey	to Minister of Canadian Heritage
Julian Reed	to Minister for International Trade
Walt Lastewka	to Minister of Industry
Claudette Bradshaw	to Minister for International Cooperation
Tony Valeri	to Minister of Finance
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Eleni Bakopanos	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Brenda Chamberlain	to Minister of Labour
Karen Kraft Sloan	to Minister of the Environment
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
George Proud	to Minister of Veterans Affairs
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Peter Adams	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
John Harvard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada

CONTENTS

Friday, April 24, 1998

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1998

Bill C-32. Second reading	6065
Mr. Collenette	6065
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	6065
Mr. Duncan	6067
Mr. Bigras	6070

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Maple Syrup

Mr. Finlay	6073
------------------	------

Hepatitis C

Mr. Mayfield	6073
--------------------	------

Prince Edward Island

Mr. Proud	6073
-----------------	------

Breakfast for Learning

Mr. Jackson	6073
-------------------	------

National Volunteer Week

Ms. Caplan	6073
------------------	------

Canadian War Heroes

Mr. Goldring	6074
--------------------	------

The Environment

Mr. Murray	6074
------------------	------

Armenian People

Mr. Patry	6074
-----------------	------

Hepatitis C

Mr. Grewal	6074
------------------	------

Tobacco

Ms. Parrish	6075
-------------------	------

Armenian People

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	6075
----------------------------	------

Fisheries

Mr. Stoffer	6075
-------------------	------

Canadian Armed Forces

Mr. Richardson	6075
----------------------	------

Armenian People

Ms. St-Jacques	6075
----------------------	------

Peacekeeping

Mr. Pratt	6076
-----------------	------

Hepatitis C

Mr. Stinson	6076
-------------------	------

Calgary Declaration

Ms. Alarie	6076
------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hepatitis C

Mr. Strahl	6076
Mr. Gray	6077
Mr. Strahl	6077

Mr. Gray	6077
Mr. Strahl	6077
Mr. Strahl	6077
Mr. Gray	6077
Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	6077
Mr. Gray	6077
Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	6077
Mr. Gray	6078

Calgary Declaration

Mrs. Tremblay	6078
Mr. Dion	6078
Mrs. Tremblay	6078
Mr. Dion	6078

Saskatchewan Francophones

Mr. Marceau	6078
Mr. Boudria	6078
Mr. Marceau	6078
Mr. Boudria	6078

Hepatitis C

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	6078
Mr. Volpe	6079
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	6079
Mr. Gray	6079

Taxation

Mr. Brison	6079
Mr. Massé	6079
Mr. Brison	6079
Mr. Massé	6079

Hepatitis C

Mr. Jaffer	6079
Mr. Volpe	6080
Mr. Jaffer	6080
Mr. Volpe	6080

Fisheries

Mr. Canuel	6080
Mr. Collenette	6080
Mr. Canuel	6080
Mr. Collenette	6080

Hepatitis C

Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6080
Mr. Volpe	6080
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6080
Mr. Volpe	6081

Income Tax Act

Mr. Ménard	6081
Mr. Massé	6081
Mr. Ménard	6081
Mr. Massé	6081

Anthrax Vaccine

Mr. Hart	6081
Mr. Richardson	6081
Mr. Hart	6081
Mr. Richardson	6081
Mr. Richardson	6082

Asbestos Industry

Mr. Bigras	6082
------------------	------

Mr. Manley	6082
Hate Crimes	
Ms. Leung	6082
Ms. Bakopanos	6082
Borders	
Ms. Meredith	6082
Mr. McWhinney	6082
Ms. Meredith	6082
Mr. McWhinney	6082
Health	
Mrs. Dockrill	6083
Mr. Volpe	6083
Mrs. Dockrill	6083
Mr. Volpe	6083
Highways	
Mr. Casey	6083
Mr. Collenette	6083
Mr. Casey	6083
Mr. Collenette	6083
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mrs. Karetak-Lindell	6084
Mr. Duhamel	6084
Taxation	
Mr. Harris	6084
Mr. Massé	6084
Burma	
Mrs. Guay	6084
Mr. Boudria	6084
Department of Fisheries and Oceans	
Ms. Vautour	6084
Mr. Collenette	6085
Environment	
Mr. Herron	6085
Mr. Byrne	6085
Electronic Commerce	
Ms. Whelan	6085
Mr. Manley	6085
Disaster Relief	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6085
Mr. Vanclief	6085
Seniors Benefit	
Mr. Dumas	6085
Mr. Massé	6086
Business of the House	
Mr. Boudria	6086
Motion	6086
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	6086
Mr. Boudria	6086
(Motion agreed to)	6086

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government response to petitions	
Mr. Adams	6086
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Motion for concurrence	6086
Mr. Adams	6086
(Motion agreed to)	6086
Petitions	
Railroads	
Mr. Morrison	6086
Health	
Mr. Adams	6087
Bill C-68	
Mr. Duncan	6087
Multilateral Agreement on Investment	
Ms. Vautour	6087
Consent	
Mr. Cadman	6087
Canada Pension Plan	
Mrs. Dockrill	6087
Nuclear Weapons	
Mr. Proctor	6087
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Adams	6087

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Environmental Protection Act (1998)	
Bill C-32. Second reading	6088
Mr. Bigras	6088
Mr. Stoffer	6090
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	6092
Mr. Herron	6092
Mr. Bigras	6095
Mr. Herron	6095
Mrs. Guay	6095
Mr. Herron	6096
Mr. Duncan	6096
Mr. Herron	6097
Mr. Volpe	6097

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Police and Peace Officer National Memorial Day	
Mr. MacKay	6099
Motion	6099
Mr. Volpe	6101
Mr. Hilstrom	6102
Mr. Marceau	6103
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	6104
Mr. Volpe	6105
Mr. Myers	6105
Mr. Cadman	6106
Mr. MacKay	6107
Appendix	

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :

<http://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 Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada – Édition, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.