



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 071 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, June 4, 2001

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 4, 2001

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1105)

[*English*]

THE ACT OF INCORPORATION OF THE CONFERENCE OF MENNONITES IN CANADA

Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move, seconded by the member for Provencher:

That notwithstanding any standing order and the usual practices of the House, Bill S-25, an act to amend the Act of incorporation of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada, be now called for second reading; and

That the House do proceed to dispose of the bill at all stages including committee of the whole.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.) moved, seconded by the hon. member for Provencher, that Bill S-25, an act to amend the act of incorporation of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada, be read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to committee of the whole.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is very straightforward business for the House. The act is being brought forward at the request of the Mennonite Conference of Canada. The church has undertaken some work over the last few years on its articles of incorporation which were originally passed by this House in 1947. It wishes to

change the name from the Mennonite Conference of Canada to the Mennonite Church of Canada. As well, there are some other organizational and operational changes contained within the bill.

The bill was introduced in the Senate at the request of the church, and I am now introducing it on the floor.

I appreciate the support and assistance that has been offered by all parties. As everyone here knows, the Mennonites have contributed enormously to the quality of life in Canada. They do tremendous work not just in Canada but around the world. It is a great honour for me to be part of the process of assisting them in this renewal.

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bill coming forward and I appreciate the opportunity to speak very briefly to it.

The Mennonite community in Manitoba, of which I am a part, has a long history and a proud and distinguished place in the religious, educational, cultural and business life of my province. Their contribution to the industrial development of Manitoba has been outstanding and continues to grow. Their commitment to fundamental values is a positive force at home, across Canada and around the world.

The Mennonite community is an outstanding example of how immigrants bring their distinct qualities, character and beliefs to the building of our nation.

Although this bill is routine in character, I think it is always timely to note the contributions of the Mennonites who first immigrated to Canada in a number of immigration waves. My own people, both on my father and my mother's side, came to Canada in the 1920s, escaping famine and Lenin's brutal communism in the Soviet Union.

The Canadian Mennonite Church and its agencies, specifically the Mennonite central committee, were instrumental in bringing my family to Canada. I thank the government member for his sponsorship of the bill and for his kind words. It is my pleasure to support the bill.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to take this opportunity to put a few comments on record pursuant to Bill S-25.

Private Members' Business

I thank the member for Winnipeg South for sponsoring the legislation which, as he indicated, is routine by nature and reflects the will and interests of the Mennonite community to change its incorporation from the Conference of Mennonites in Canada to the Mennonite Church of Canada.

It is an opportunity and a time for us to reflect on the contribution of Mennonites to this country and the work of that community internationally.

I think we often overlook the kinds of inroads that have been made by newcomers to this country and the very important contribution they have made to building this country.

• (1110)

As the member for Winnipeg South indicated, the Mennonite community of Canada has played a very important role in developing this country and in ensuring Canada's responsibility is met with respect to international concerns and disastrous situations facing people around the world.

I want to personally reflect for a moment since my roots with the Mennonite community run deep. I was raised in a Mennonite community in the Waterloo county area of Ontario. I went to school with old order Mennonites where we had many opportunities for interaction. I am also married to a Mennonite. The Leis portion of my name is Amish Mennonite and I carry it very proudly along with the traditions of the community.

Let me put on record the very important contribution of the Mennonite Church and, in particular, the Mennonite central committee in our deliberations on Bill C-11 pertaining to immigration and refugees. The Mennonite community has been leading the charge in terms of ensuring Canada carries on a humanitarian, compassionate approach to refugees, displaced persons and people in need of protection around the world. They have made some very important recommendations throughout our debate. I want to acknowledge the work they have done and I want to add my support and the support of our caucus for the bill.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of Bill S-25. Those were the shortest speeches I have ever heard made by the member for Winnipeg North Centre and the member for Provencher. I am shocked. It is also nice to see that all members can come together on legislation in a non-partisan manner and put forward a breath of fresh air in the House.

I speak in favour of the legislation. I too have numerous constituents of the Mennonite faith in my riding. I would like to add to the words of the previous speakers that it is the Mennonite faith that brings together church, family, community and generosity. I am shocked that the member for Provencher did not recognize that the Mennonite community is the most generous. Manitoba in particular has been recognized as having the largest charitable givings anywhere in the country. This is part of the philosophy and

mindset of the Mennonite Church and the Mennonite people themselves.

Bill S-25 is housekeeping legislation that can and should go through the House very quickly. It is a name change and it brings the new corporation into the 21st century and allows it to expand and prosper. The Progressive Conservative Party supports the legislation.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about the administrative aspect of the legislation. It is time that we seriously considered freeing up parliament from the necessity of passing legislation to change a name. I know the act was originally passed by parliament so only parliament can change it, but surely we could figure out some way that name changes and other changes in the incorporation of various institutions that come to the House from time to time could be done in a more efficient manner.

I also have roots in the Mennonite community. The name Epp has the characteristics of a typical Mennonite name, as do the Dycks, the Friesens, the Klassens and on and on. I hesitate to say that I am proud to come from a Mennonite background because of the fact that pride is one of those things that we do not pride ourselves on. Pride is one of the seven sins that we try to avoid. The object is to walk humbly, to serve other people and to serve God. It is a very strong religious commitment made in the Mennonite community.

• (1115)

I have never said this before in the Chamber, and maybe it is slightly inappropriate, but I grew up in that kind of environment with my parents and grandparents all very solidly teaching us to follow the ways of the Scriptures, the Bible as we call it in the Christian tradition, and to live by it, not just say we believe it but to actually act on it.

It says we are to love our enemies and pray for those who use us spitefully. That is a very important teaching of the Mennonites. I honestly believe that if more people of all kinds of different cultural and religious backgrounds would practice that, it would certainly help to reduce the total amount of conflict, not only domestically and socially within our own country, but around the world.

One of the reasons my family, as with the member for Provencher, was basically forced out of then Russia was that the Mennonites being pacifists were not ready to take up arms and shoot their fellow man. Because they were not friends of the revolution, they were considered enemies. Therefore, the Bolsheviks and the other revolutionaries entered Mennonite communities and shot the men and boys who were old enough to fight. The Mennonites offered little or no resistance, at least for the most part. Many escaped serious injury because of their philosophy. A lot of people were actually let go because they were not a threat to the other side.

Also, there were many sad stories of the atrocities committed. Those are also in our history book. They really tear me apart when I think of them.

I remember reading a little book, the *Diary of Anna Baerg*, which I got from the Liberal House leader, who some may know has studied the Mennonite way of life. Recognizing that I was of that background, he lent me the book, for which I was very grateful. It made good reading. I have to admit that at times there were tears in my eyes because of some of the atrocities that occurred.

In one case she talked about attack and invasion by government officials of the day, and listed a number of people who were killed. She then talked about one young girl who was not killed. Her next sentence said there were some things that were worse than death. When I think of that, I have nothing but respect for the people who lived through that kind of persecution, yet came to Canada and positively made a contribution to the country.

I would also like to emphasize that in my family, in our church and in the part of the country in which I grew up, frequent statements of thanksgiving for being in Canada were made. I do not think I ever went to my grandparents place without realizing my grandmother was particularly overwhelmed by the freedom and opportunity. That was back in the thirties and forties. I obviously do not remember too much from the thirties, but in the forties I remember my grandmother said over and over how blessed we were to be in this wonderful country.

Not only have the Mennonites as a group contributed to Canada, as has already been stated, but they were very grateful recipients of what Canada offered. I would simply like to say that I share that gratitude. I am very happy that my grandparents made the decision, even though it was under some coercion, to bring their family to this country.

• (1120)

This is sort of a free for all, a time to talk a little about the Mennonites. The actual purpose of the bill is to change the name, and some of the articles of the constitution of the Mennonites, from the conference to the church. They are a church and a solid faith community. They have much to offer.

Another aspect they have become involved in under the auspices of MCC, the Mennonite Central Committee, is with respect to justice in our country, and it has been a very important intervention. They have emphasized being involved in restorative justice by bringing victims together with the perpetrators of crimes and having them work that out. They have found that, when young perpetrators break into homes or things like that and go through

Private Members' Business

that process, the recidivism rate is way lower than when we simply put these young offenders in prisons and teach them better ways of doing crime.

I thank the House for this opportunity to speak about what I think are very important social issues as they affect the very deep meaning of the people who live in our country.

Mr. John Cannis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too am very pleased to participate in this debate today on Bill S-25, sponsored by the member for Winnipeg South. Let me also add my comments, after hearing the member for Elk Island give us an historical perspective. It gives everybody the opportunity to maybe appreciate why we are doing this. It is such a unique experience, as we begin a Monday in this House, to see such tremendous co-operation among members. It is amazing what can be accomplished when everybody comes together and rises above political stripes.

I will also point out, as the parliamentary secretary, that the bill is very straightforward. None of the changes proposed in the bill are unusual or revolutionary in any way, as the House heard from other members. Rather the changes are designed to ensure clarity of operation for the Mennonite church.

The bill was requested by the Conference of Mennonites of Canada and was sponsored in the other place by Senator Kroft to start with. Senator Carstairs then sponsored the private bill in the last parliament, but unfortunately it died on the order paper so here we are today.

I would like to point out that even though the bill is routine and non-controversial, it speaks to the larger issue that builds on the foundations of Canada's economy. That issue is important for the framework of legislation affecting corporations as well.

Whether these corporations are aimed at making a profit in the global economy, or whether they are co-operatives aimed at advancing the interest of their members, or whether they are not for profit corporations, or in this case churches as was mentioned earlier, any corporation must have its rules and regulations built upon a solid base of framework law.

Over the past years the government has worked to modernize its corporate framework legislation as we all know. A sound corporate governance structure is a fundamental requirement for healthy investment, innovation, trade and economic growth. In recent weeks we have debated Bill S-11 which amends the Canada Business Corporations Act and the Canada Cooperatives Act.

These are the framework laws that establish basic rules for corporate governance in these kinds of bodies. For example, they set out the rights and obligations of directors, officers, shareholders

Private Members' Business

and co-operative members. Part of the objectives of Bill S-11 are to eliminate duplication and reduce costs of compliance. Let me emphasize, we want to allow business corporations and co-operatives the flexibility to organize their affairs within a sound legislative structure.

We place a high priority on this kind of co-operative framework legislation because it helps Canada compete in the global economy. We amend these pieces of legislation to position Canadian businesses, investors, shareholders and co-operative members to respond quickly and creatively to rapid developments in the marketplace.

This brings me to the bill before us today, Bill S-25. At first it may seem that there is very little in common between the corporate framework law affecting companies and co-operatives and that which affects the Mennonite church.

• (1125)

After all, the House will see in subclause 3(4) that the first objective of the corporation in question is:

—to promote the spiritual welfare and the unity of spirit of the members of the Corporation and, by mutual assistance, to foster, diffuse, encourage, advance and strengthen the work of the kingdom of God;

We rarely find these objectives as part of the corporate goals of the business covered under Bill S-11.

The next object listed for the corporation is:

—to build Christian communities in the Mennonite tradition;

That tradition has existed in Canada since the 18th century when the first Mennonites came to Canada from the United States following the American revolution. It was clearly pointed out by the member for Elk Island. I appreciate him providing the history, because it gave everyone the opportunity in the House and across our country to understand fully what the bill is all about.

Let me point out that another wave of immigrants came from Russia, as I mentioned earlier, in the 19th century following the Russian revolution. More recently Mennonites from many different backgrounds have made Canada their home, including Chinese, Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian, Taiwanese, French and Spanish, as well as German.

Over the centuries the tradition has produced a unique socio-religious culture based on self-sufficiency within tight communities. It is a culture that emphasizes peace and relief projects.

Since its incorporation in 1947, the needs of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada have changed. Corporate governance laws in Canada have also changed. This is why, even though the aims and objectives of the Mennonite conference are different from the kinds of corporations covered in Bill S-11, there is a unity of

purpose in the need to provide framework law that meets today's needs.

Bill S-25 would give the Mennonite church in Canada greater flexibility to carry on its affairs and makes its incorporation status consistent with modern corporate legislation. The bill would remove the factors that limit the corporation from operating internationally. In this way we can see a commonality of spirit between the bill affecting a church and our corporate framework legislation designed to make industrial corporations competitive internationally.

This is a routine piece of legislation. I am sure and know, as we have heard, that my colleagues unanimously support this effort. At the same time, the bill reminds us all of our importance to work together in the House co-operatively.

In closing, I personally want to thank everyone here for this co-operation. I know that as we move forward we will do the right thing.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as a member of parliament from Winnipeg, Manitoba, I too would like to take this opportunity to add my support for Bill S-25. I am very pleased to hear of the level of co-operation and good will from all parties in the speeches we heard to date.

I will briefly point out that my riding of Winnipeg Centre is home to quite a large Mennonite population. It has been my very good fortune to get to know many of the activists in the Mennonite faith in my neighbourhood and in the area.

I will add some comments on how impressed I have been with the level of commitment Mennonite people in my riding have shown to issues such as building a sense of community, social justice, goodwill on a number of levels and certainly a sense of personal sacrifice. The Mennonite people feel very strongly that their faith in their day to day lives must be integrated to the point where I believe the social gospel really is the overwhelming motivating influence.

If Bill S-25, as has been said, would enable Mennonites to restructure their administrative side so they could be more effective in the work that they do, then it is incumbent upon us to support it without any hesitation.

One of the things that I have been most impressed about is meeting anti-war activists, pacifists in the truest sense of the Mennonite faith. As recently as this month, I received a number of letters at my offices from people of the Mennonite faith pointing out that they did not choose to pay income tax that would be put toward military development. They did the mathematics which showed that if 6% or 7% of the total budget goes to the military, they would withhold that amount of money from their income tax. They would not give it to the government to spend on those things.

• (1130)

It is a longstanding gesture in the pacifist anti-war movement and I have nothing but admiration for those who make that comment with their spending power, with their taxation dollars. I believe it becomes an administrative nuisance, certainly for Revenue Canada, but it is the type of peaceful demonstration that very clearly puts their point of view front and centre.

To speak briefly on the work that they do in my immediate area, I have said many times that the riding of Winnipeg Centre is an area of great need, it being the core area of Winnipeg. The Mennonite activists, to their credit, have actually targeted this part of my city to move into deliberately in order to try to elevate the standard of the neighbourhoods in that area.

There are middle class people, be they teachers, nurses or whatever, who could afford to live out in the suburbs where it might be safer and more pleasant and where there would be more access to services, but they consciously choose as a group, en masse, to move into an area of the greatest need and therefore bring the stability of their two parent families and well educated children with them to elevate the overall standard of the neighbourhood. That in itself is a level of civic duty that we do not really see. When people go beyond making a donation to a charitable organization, when they actually alter their own personal lives to do what is right for their home community, I think there is nothing more admirable.

Others have pointed out that they have personal contact with the Mennonite faith. My family as well has integrated with the Mennonite community in that I have cousins, uncles and aunts in the Schroeder family from the Portage area. Even though I was raised as a Catholic, not as a Mennonite, I did gain a great deal of personal knowledge about the Mennonite faith by virtue of our shared family issues.

The other thing I would like to point out is the development work that they have done in the Mennonite communities of Winkler, Altona and Morden in Manitoba. This part of Manitoba is actually the most stable and prosperous part of the province now, due in no small part to the entrepreneurial skills and industrialization of the area brought about by the Mennonite people. It was otherwise just an agricultural community. They started small businesses and small manufacturing such as the wood manufacturing industry in Manitoba. The largest single private sector company in Manitoba is Palliser Furniture, which is the largest wood products manufacturer in all of Canada.

I just wanted to take this opportunity as a member of parliament from Manitoba and from Winnipeg to add my enthusiastic support for the bill. If it helps the Mennonite community in the structuring of the good work it does, we should certainly be foursquare in their corner on this.

One of the other services the Mennonite community has brought to us in the province of Manitoba is the mediation and conciliation service they offer through their church. Whenever there is an issue

Government Orders

like two neighbours arguing over a fence, they have the option of taking it to the mediation service offered by the Mennonite church rather than going to litigation. It has been and continues to be of very great value.

I am very proud to be part of this. Bill S-25 is one of those things that we should be able to do as a cleanup at the end of parliament, with multiparty support and easy passage.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I just want to comment on the procedure behind the bill and to object formally to having the bill originate in the Senate. The Senate is not elected, is not democratic and is not accountable. It seems to me that any bill should originate in the House of Commons, not in the other place, which is not accountable to anyone.

I want to file that objection as a matter of principle. I think we have to do something about the Senate. I believe it should be abolished. Some members, like my friend from Calgary, would like to see an elected Senate, but the polling I have seen shows that only 5% of the country supports the existing Senate.

• (1135)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed)

• (1140)

Mr. Joe Jordan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe if you seek it you would find unanimous consent to see the clock as 12 p.m. so we may then proceed to government orders.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PATENT ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-17, an act to amend the Patent Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Government Orders

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for the Minister of Industry) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those in favour of the motion will be please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): At the request of the government whip the vote is deferred until later today at the end of government orders.

* * *

PROCEEDS OF CRIME (MONEY LAUNDERING) ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-16, an act to amend the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): At the request of the government whip the vote stands deferred until later today at the end of government orders.

* * *

• (1145)

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT

The House resumed from June 1 consideration of Bill C-11, an act respecting immigration to Canada and the granting of refugee protection to persons who are displaced, persecuted or in danger, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 2.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 7 at report stage of Bill C-11 respecting the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act.

The bill has raised a lot of concerns at the hearings that have gone on across the country. A lot of people have expressed opinions on the immigration bill. The bill talks about the granting of refugee protection to persons who are displaced, persecuted or in danger. It also talks about supposedly bringing the Immigration Act into line after such a long period of time.

One of the problems is that our immigration policy requires a tremendous amount of review. The current legislation has not been implemented in the way it should have been. If it had, we would have no need for a haphazard bill that is trying to address the issue but failing to hit the key point.

An hon. member: They are our amendments too.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai: That is right. Our amendments were made after consultations with many groups across the country. My colleague who is the critic for immigration brought in amendments to address what is viewed out there to be a very flawed bill and an immigration system that needs a complete administrative overhaul. We do not need a legislative overhaul; we need an administrative overhaul.

The cuts that have taken place have resulted in a situation where the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is having a difficult time meeting the growing needs of what has become an attractive place to which to come. We are happy that a lot of people want to come to Canada. Nevertheless, sitting in my office I have seen my workload in immigration increase. I am sure every member of parliament has seen an increase of immigration inquiries in their offices.

This is a direct result of the cuts that have taken place, which threw the burden on members of parliament to try to address the

Government Orders

concerns. I had an opportunity to travel with the minister of immigration and I have seen firsthand the problems. Even spousal applications, which the minister said should take six months, have extended to the level where they are taking eight or nine months.

When we make inquiries of the department or of our missions overseas the delays are longer. The typical response is that they do not have the resources to address the growing need. What is the solution to all these things? The bill tries to address some of them, but it fails to provide for effective administration of our current policy which would see cases of legitimate immigrants and those who jump the queue, who bypass the system, handled expeditiously. If they have a legitimate claim they can stay. If they have an illegitimate claim they should leave.

• (1150)

We are mired in so much bureaucracy, so much red tape and so many issues of a smaller, frivolous nature that genuine immigrants are finding it difficult. Those who abuse our system are taking advantage of these lax laws and the result is that Canadians are losing confidence in our immigration policy.

We are all immigrants. This is a land of immigrants and immigration will be a focal point in Canada for years to come. Let us do it right. Let us get the confidence of the Canadian people. Let us attract the people we want to attract. Let us give hope to refugees who are fleeing their homes and do it in such a manner that the message goes out that yes, Canada is a land of opportunity which welcomes genuine refugees and genuine immigrants.

However because of the cuts, the way administration is done and the haphazard laws that are brought in, confidence in immigration is evaporating. This is true not only for Canadians but for prospective immigrants who would come to the country, build it and bring prosperity to it.

I have spoken to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I have heard from a lot of people that we have a system in which they do not feel comfortable. When they apply we go through a process that is too long, a process where we challenge small things. It is interesting that the focus is on smaller administrative issues and ignores the bigger picture, which is that we have almost 230,000 immigrants coming into the country. All the resources are focused on smaller issues while ignoring the real objective: making the process easier and faster for the legitimate immigrants Canada needs.

Let us be realistic. There is competition out there to attract good immigrants. There is competition from Australia, Britain, Germany and the U.S.A. They are streamlining their procedures. They are out there aggressively trying to attract good immigrants. What do we do in Canada? We work slowly. We are mired in small administrative issues that in the long term would not have a major impact.

We should rightly be concentrating on those who are queue jumping. However we have dragged it out so long, as my colleague

said, that we now have a higher load of refugees in Canada whose issues have not been addressed.

The opposition parties have called on the government to look at the issue to see if amnesty can be given so that we can clear the backlog and carry on. However, as the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has said, it would mean rewarding those who come through the back door.

However they have come through the back door because our system allows that to happen.

• (1155)

Our appeal process allows it to happen. Smugglers and others have used the system and this has eroded confidence in it. We need to restore confidence in our immigration system so that everyone is comfortable with it and can trust and have confidence in it.

It is difficult to achieve this with the bill the government has brought in. As usual, it is a haphazard band-aid solution. My colleague will speak to it further.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will say a couple of words at this stage of the debate about immigration and Bill C-11 that is before the House today.

Our party, through our critic from Winnipeg North Centre, has moved at the committee stage some 80 amendments to the bill. I will make a couple of general comments and observations about the bill.

We have somehow along the way lost our vision in terms of immigration and the value of immigration to this great land of Canada. Many of us in the House are either immigrants or sons or daughters of immigrants. My father emigrated from Sweden in 1910. My mother's parents both came from Britain at roughly the same time. I am a first generation Canadian on my father's side and a second generation Canadian on my mother's side.

Saskatchewan is a tremendous province that has been settled by immigrants. A lot of people from the Ukraine, Russia, Germany and many countries around the world came to Saskatchewan and founded the province in 1905. In doing so they joined with the first nations and Metis people who were there well before the Europeans and people from other lands came.

During those days, following the great national policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Wilfrid Laurier talked about the value of immigration and how we had to bring in skilled people from all over the world to build this great country with its vast regions, vast resources and lack of population.

We had that vision of the country for 50 to 80 years. We welcomed immigration as much as possible and tried to build this great mosaic of people from many lands and cultures along with our two great languages and first nations people. That was the whole vision of the country.

Government Orders

I remember the Trudeau years in the House of Commons. I was elected in 1968 when this vision was recharged. It started recharging during the Pearson years from 1963 to 1968. The vision was about what the country could be in terms of bringing in immigrants. The Official Languages Act, which was enshrined in our constitution, established the two official languages of Canada. In 1982 the charter of rights and freedoms enshrined in our constitution multiculturalism, which was a reflection of those who came or whose ancestors came from other lands; languages; and the rights of first nations people. These included treaty rights and a reference to the Metis people.

That was the whole dream, to create this big cultural mosaic. Canada became like a pearl necklace with all these beautiful pearls, all of them a bit different and all of them connected to form this great country of Canada.

Somehow during the Mulroney years and then continuing on through the most recent government, this dream and this vision seems to have been tightened up. We seem to be looking at obstacles to uniting families and bringing skilled people into the country.

During the committee stage our critic, the member for Winnipeg North Centre, moved several amendments to try to recreate the vision and the dream, which is what the bill was supposed to be. It was supposed to be an overhaul and a revamping of the Immigration Act. We in our party believe it has fallen far short of doing that. Before the bill becomes law, we encourage the government to seriously consider taking a look at some amendments that would once again make our country more visionary in terms of immigration.

• (1200)

I would like to give the House a couple of examples. What we see in the legislation is the continuation of a landing and administration fee commonly referred to as the head tax. This is something that is repugnant in a modern day society and in fact came in a number of years ago because it was not part of our general practice in terms of immigration in Canada. The bill does not address the issue of a head tax and it should when we are talking about a major revamping of immigration laws.

There is a failure in the bill to expand the family class category. This is one of the amendments suggested by my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre that would expand the family class category to include an immigrant's immediate family, such as brothers, sisters and grandparents.

This is particularly important when we look at provinces like Saskatchewan or Manitoba which have populations of slightly over one million people apiece. When immigrants come to Canada they tend to go to the larger centres, such as Montreal, Toronto or Vancouver, and, to a lesser extent, to places like Ottawa. It is more difficult to get people to go to Saskatchewan or Manitoba. Howev-

er, by changing the family class category it would be easier through family unification to get immigrants into smaller towns in rural Canada and to provinces like Manitoba, Saskatchewan, the Atlantic provinces and so on. This was a suggestion made by our party and we believe these are some of the things that should be done.

The United States, Australia and in some cases western Europe are winning the battle to get more highly skilled and educated immigrants into their countries. We should look at being more aggressive in terms of getting more highly skilled and trained people into Canada because it would have a direct impact on our economy.

Canada is the third largest country in the world and yet its 30 million people are spread over various parts of the country. Canada is a country with vast resources and reserves that could be spent bringing in more people from around the world and creating a more dynamic and exciting country in the process.

Canada has the greatest potential in the world. It is still ranked number one by the United Nations. We should not be hesitant in revising the Immigration Act to ensure that we bring in more highly skilled immigrants and unify families. We should get rid of the head tax and all kinds of discrimination based on economics or whatever and create a great mosaic.

I spent much of last weekend in Regina going to what is an annual tradition in that city. It is called a cultural mosaic. This year there were some 17 pavilions celebrating the heritage of people from places like China, the Philippines, Hungary, Ukraine, Austria and Germany. There was also a francophone and first nations pavilion. This has become an event with tens of thousands of people lining the streets waiting to go into the pavilions to taste the traditional foods of these countries.

On Saturday night I could not even get near the Ukrainian pavilion because it was so popular. People were lined up around the block. There were hundreds of cars containing people who wanted to see the shows, the dancing and the traditions as well as looking at souvenirs from these countries.

This event has worked well in bringing people together in a celebration of a great cultural mosaic that Canada really is. This cultural mosaic has made us more tolerant as a nation in terms of preserving our two official languages and in terms of enshrining some rights for first nations and Metis people in Canada.

I urge the government to be a bit more generous in terms of the legislation and the proposed amendments.

In conclusion I would like to make reference to Alex Kuziak who is over 90 years old and lives in Yorkton. He was the first Canadian of Ukrainian descent to be a member of a cabinet in Canada. He was a member of the CCF cabinet of Tommy Douglas back in 1948 in the province of Saskatchewan.

Government Orders

• (1205)

I was here in 1969 when that act came in and there was a great division in the country over it. Mr. Kuziak was a very strong supporter of the Official Languages Act. What he said to me has always remained in my mind. He said that because our country was more tolerant of diversity and was open in terms of immigration of people from all lands, it made us more tolerant in other ways as well, including recognizing that Canada has two official languages.

There is a lot of wisdom in Alex Kuziak's words. He referred to diversity and how it made us a more tolerant, loving and caring nation in terms of how we treat all peoples from all over the world.

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle is indeed a learned member of this institution. I do however want to square part of the immigration comments he made with respect to the Conservative government.

I remember former prime minister Brian Mulroney stating that there was no obligation more compelling and no duty more irresistible in Canada than to ensure that our minorities, linguistic and otherwise, live at all times in conditions of fairness and justice.

The hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle probably remembers Gordon Fairweather as well. In that regard it was the Mulroney government that initiated the IRB concept because refugees' rights are indeed human rights and by no means do we want to determine on mere paper the future of individuals, whether they live or die, or face persecution. Establishing the IRB and an oral hearing was a testament of that time and ironically it is the Liberal Government of Canada that now appears to be the most reticent of any political party in the House to protect the rights of permanent residents and protect refugees in that perspective.

The amendment that we are advocating would ensure that permanent residents who have been in Canada for at least three years would have the capacity to apply for an appeal should they face being removed under the criminality clause of Bill C-11. Permanent means that there is a right to due process and we should embrace that particular issue.

On Motion No. 5 the Canadian Alliance wants to be able to define danger to security. Right now it is far too broad. It wants to utilize the definition used in the CSIS Act, and we support that initiative.

Motion No. 6, which would amend clause 50, deals with removal orders and enforcement. The initiative is supported by groups such as the Maytree Foundation. We consider it to be a question of accountability. It is an important issue that a ruling made by SIRC would be utilized should CSIS step out of bounds. The intent is that SIRC is supposed to be a watchdog over CSIS in the event that it

makes an intervention which is potentially over the top, unfair or just not Canadian. That is a good initiative.

In short, a watchdog must have teeth to serve any protective function and that is why our party supports the Canadian Alliance initiative in that regard.

• (1210)

Finally, Motion No. 7 is the compromise amendment that I spoke about a few moments ago. It would provide permanent residents the opportunity to have appeal rights if they maintain residency status for three years.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Group No. 2 at report stage of Bill C-11.

The amendments being proposed in Group No. 2 deal with very fundamental concerns with respect to Bill C-11. The concerns pertain to our ability as a nation to ensure that all people on Canadian soil are guaranteed basic rights and liberties. We are talking about the application of the charter of rights and freedoms for all people on Canadian soil, which is one area where Bill C-11 falls down very seriously.

I do not need to encapsulate the numerous presentations made by many presenters on Bill C-11 but we do need to talk about how to make the bill better. It is a seriously flawed bill and it must be amended in order to bring us in line with our traditions, both in terms of being a compassionate humanitarian nation and in terms of applying the charter of rights to all our citizens.

One of the most egregious sections in Bill C-11 is clause 64. One of the amendments before us today tries to deal with that serious problem in the bill.

We heard from many groups, not just the Canadian Bar Association, about the problems with clause 64. I hope the minister and the government will read those broad ranging concerns because, in the view of my NDP colleagues and in terms of members in all opposition parties, the notion that is contained in clause 64 is repugnant. It is a denial of the rights of citizens with permanent resident status in this country to pursue normal appeal procedures in the event that they face a deportation order. The clause reads:

—on grounds of security, violating human or international rights, serious criminality or organized criminality.

As many groups said to us in committee, no one condones any criminal actions nor believes that we should ignore or be lenient regarding any such charge that falls into one of those categories. What we are talking about is the right of an individual to appeal a decision and the right to pursue through the courts what we have come to accept as a normal course of action pursuant to a civilized society.

Government Orders

It is not just the Canadian Bar Association that has raised those concerns. Earlier today we debated and discussed in collegial terms Bill S-25 pertaining to the Mennonite Church of Canada. I want to put on record the concerns of the Mennonite Church of Canada and, in particular, the Mennonite Central Committee regarding Bill C-11, particularly the clauses that we are trying to amend today and the clause that deals with human rights and civil liberties.

The Mennonite Central Committee noted very clearly that Bill C-11 would create inadmissible classes of people in an unjust and unnecessary manner. Grounds for inadmissibility include: security, human or international rights violations, serious criminality, organized criminality, poor health, being poor or being from a country against which Canada has imposed sanctions.

The committee went on to state that those provisions would take us beyond the limits called for in the United Nations convention relating to the status of refugees. It also stated that the provisions would take us beyond what is necessary for a humane and just society.

• (1215)

That is what we are talking about today: how to make sure that this bill has the provisions for taking all the necessary actions in terms of criminal elements while assuring that we adhere to the principles of the charter of rights and that applied basic rights of appeal and rights for proper review be incorporated into that process.

Time and time again Canadians came before us at committee as we dealt with Bill C-11 and told us that we will have missed a golden opportunity if we allow Bill C-11 to go forward as drafted. What has caused Canadians so much concern is the tone of the bill. It is not just the tone in terms of words and rhetoric, but a tone that is carried through into the actual application of the law. Time and time again Canadians and organizations in the country who appeared before the committee and have written to all of us on numerous occasions have said "Goodness gracious, we have operated for 25 years under an old law that needs revamping". They said that we have new circumstances to deal with, the world has changed and Canada is missing the boat by not coming forward with a visionary piece of legislation that will take us forward into the millennium.

The questions for us today are threefold. First, how do we uphold and maintain Canada's past involvement in terms of offering refuge for Canadians and ensuring that we operate always on the basis of humanitarian and compassionate grounds? Second, do we always, at every step of the process, ensure that the charter of rights applies to everyone on Canadian soil? Third, are we able to compete for immigrants internationally, globally, in a very competitive world?

I think what we have all come to conclude from discussions on the bill is that we have missed the boat on all three of those

fundamental issues. We have missed the opportunity to be visionary and to educate and challenge Canadians about the most fundamental reason for having an Immigration Act for the next century.

Some of the concerns that we heard during our committee hearings had been brought to the attention of the government earlier, when the previous minister of immigration actually embarked upon a major consultative approach and heard from Canadians in the spring of 1999. That was a process to hear from Canadians in order to revamp the legislation and resulted in a report called "Not Just Numbers". That title says a lot about what we are supposed to be about as a country and where we have missed the boat here today with Bill C-11.

It should not be just about numbers, but about our vision for the future and our responsibilities on the global scene. It should be about our adherence to international conventions pertaining to refugees and torture. It should be about shaping the kind of society we want, not only for this country but the kind of example we want to pursue globally.

If we could go back and do this again, I would say this to the Government of Canada: listen to the voices of Canadians who have spoken out so clearly on this bill. I do not think we can point to any voices at all in Canada who are absolutely satisfied with Bill C-11. To the contrary, most people who have paid attention to this matter and are concerned about immigration and refugee policies feel that the bill is a bad bill and should not become law today.

If we are talking about entering this millennium with vision and with commitment to the principles that have built this country, then we have to reconsider. That is why we in the NDP feel so strongly about the bill, why we tried so hard to amend it and why, unless the government listens to some of the concerns being raised today, we will have to oppose it. It is not good public policy. It is not good legislation. It will not ensure that Canada is able to deal with the need to attract immigrants, the need to be welcoming to newcomers and the need to ensure that we play our role globally in terms of people in need of protection. Not to carry out that fundamental objective is to do a great disservice to parliament and to the country.

• (1220)

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I actually was not going to say much here this morning but I feel I must respond to the comments of the two previous speakers to the bill, the critic for the NDP and the critic for the Conservative Party.

When they talk about the fact that the government is not living up to its charter of rights obligations and that it is taking away appeals from people, I think there are a couple of things that are conveniently left out. One of them is who it is we are talking about here in terms of permanent residents who are facing deportation. A

permanent resident is a landed immigrant. I am sure everyone knows that no government would in any kind of a light fashion institute deportation proceedings against someone who has attained landed immigrant status. It would have to be pretty serious, and what exactly does it mean?

There is a rule in the bill that we refer to as the 10 and 2 rule. The people we are talking about who could, may or might face deportation proceedings in this instance are people who have committed a crime for which they have been charged, tried, convicted and sentenced. The sentence must be a minimum of 2 years and the crime must allow for a maximum of 10 years. It is the 10 and 2 rule.

If the crime is serious enough to have at least a 10 year sentence applied and the decision by the judge is that the person who has been convicted, and that is very important, must serve at least 2 years out of a possible 10, then the person has committed a crime that the ministry would see as serious enough, possibly, to institute deportation proceedings. It is not automatic. A notice would have to be sent.

The suggestion that people do not have a right of appeal is just patently false. What they do not have a right to do is jam up our federal courts in appealing. They do not have a right to come out after their sentence is over and they are facing deportation proceedings and then jam up the judicial system while they continue to stay in the country, avoiding the deportation order and perhaps reoffending.

Members opposite say the government has not listened to Canadians. I am sorry, but I represent a riding, Mississauga West, where immigration is one of the hottest issues. I can tell members that Canadians have told me loud and clear that they do not want Canada to be seen as a safe haven for criminals, convicted felons, violent perpetrators, terrorists or subversives.

Some would say this is against the charter of rights. Come on. There is a right within the bill for people who have been convicted and sentenced. By the way, they would most likely have appealed it, so they would have gone through the criminal justice system appealing everything all the way. If the appeal did not set them free, they would have been incarcerated. When they get out this government wants the right to say that it no longer wants those people in the country continuing with those kinds of offences. That is number one. Let us be clear about that. The government has done the test on whether or not the bill will stand up to charter challenges and it is absolutely convinced it will.

Canadian people have a right to feel safe in their communities. One of the arguments I hear from the Progressive Conservative critic is that people who come to this country could be here for 20 to 30 years and then the government would turn around and deport them because they have committed a serious crime. If they have

Government Orders

been in the country for 20 or 30 years and have not sought Canadian citizenship that clearly is their option. There is no obligation on them to become citizens, but if they want to become citizens and a productive part of our society then we welcome them to do that. If they choose not to do that and they simply maintain the status of being landed immigrants or permanent residents, as it is referred to in the bill, then they run the risk, and they should know they run the risk, following a conviction on a 10 and 2 crime, a serious enough crime, that they may well be deported.

• (1225)

They can appeal that decision to an independent adjudicator, who will make a decision as to whether or not that deportation order should be upheld. The decision of the independent adjudicator is judicially reviewable in the courts. If the order continues to be upheld, it can be appealed under humanitarian and compassionate grounds, which is also judicially reviewable in the courts. I count that as four reviews.

Members opposite would paint some kind of a clandestine approach to this, as if we are simply saying, no, they are out of here, they get the boot and they do not get a chance to have their cases reviewed. That is simply not the case.

Yes, the Canadian Bar Association did come before the committee and appealed to it to allow for continued extensive use of the court system. Frankly, in the bill we have listened to Canadians. They do not want these people abusing our court system while they are free to reoffend. We as a government must have the right to make sure our citizens are safe.

I have one final point with regard to refugees. The member for Fundy—Royal, the Progressive Conservative critic, wrote an article that was published in one of the Toronto dailies on Friday, wherein he said that refugees only get to apply once in a lifetime. I do not know why he would say that when he knows that in fact is not the case, that if there are changed circumstances a person can reapply every six months, not just once in six months but every six months. With new evidence, new information, with changed circumstances, refugees can apply again and again.

For people who have applied for refugee status and have no change in their circumstances, the bill does not allow appeal after appeal. We have all seen and heard of the abuse and we know about such situations. In fact there have been some recently mentioned in the media, about people who have stayed in the country illegally for five, six or seven years while they abused the system and used the appeal system.

To suggest that the bill is flawed because we have stripped people who are on Canadian soil of their rights is just fundamentally inaccurate, in my view, and is not a fair portrayal of the bill. Canadians have told us that they want our immigration system to be open and welcoming to immigrants and refugees who need our

Government Orders

protection and who will come here and help build a greater Canada, but they no longer want to tolerate the kinds of abuses they have seen where people have been free in our society to reoffend, to commit additional crimes. We have lost some of our best young people to such tragedies as the Just Desserts file and many others. We will simply not tolerate it. That is what Canadians have told us and that is what the government intends to do.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the proposed motions to amend Bill C-11, the immigration and refugee protection act.

Bill C-11 had a predecessor, namely Bill C-31, introduced during the last parliament, on April 6, 2000.

This is a bill that did not get passed in 2000 for the simple reason that the government decided to call an early election. As a result, more than 400,000 men and women in Canada or elsewhere in the world are still waiting on permanent resident status or permission to come to Canada.

The government has lost a whole year while men and women who view Quebec, for instance, as the promised land where they wish to spend their future, could have been allowed to immigrate to Canada.

The Bloc Québécois could not disagree with the principle that it was high time to amend the immigration and refugee protection act. This bill allows men and women who qualify as good potential citizens to settle in Canada, while closing the door to all those who, for all manner of reasons, do not and would not have the ability or the right to settle here.

• (1230)

The minister, who described her bill as tough and intended “to close the back door to those who would abuse our generosity—so that we can open the front door wider to the immigrants”, cites fine principles, which we must support. The Bloc Québécois supports all ideologies aimed at preventing people who are not good citizens from settling in the promised lands of Quebec and Canada.

However, those good citizens in the various parts of the world could still come and enrich our fine country, which has again set as a objective, it must be said, 300,000 new arrivals annually in order to consolidate the fabric of the community affected by the aging of the Canadian population. Canada must see immigration as promising for the future. The objective of 300,000 new arrivals Canada set for itself has never been met.

That means that its immigration policy never met projections or estimates or demands from coalitions made in the course of discussions and dealings with the stakeholders from the various

sectors. Finally, it means that the objectives set by the stakeholders, expert and elite, who can represent immigration across Canada, were creditable, but I repeat, Canada has never met its objective. In 2000, barely two-thirds of the objective of 300,000 new arrivals was met. All this to say that it is time we made a major amendment to the immigration and refugee protection act.

With regard to the motions tabled by our wise member colleagues, there are three I would like to comment on. They are the motions in Group No. 2, but I would like to return to the motions in Groups Nos. 1 and 3 as well. I would, by this, like to have the members understand the ideology and philosophy that should underlie any legislative amendment to legislation as important as that on immigration.

With this bill, we should always keep in mind a fundamental principle, namely the principle of coercion, concentration and discussion that has always guided previous amendments to the Immigration Act. All the stakeholders must be given a real opportunity to discuss things together. This is why critical work was done in committee to support the amendments that were tabled regarding this bill.

Motion No. 2 tabled by the hon. member for Laval Centre deals with clause 5(4) of the bill, which would allow the governor in council to make the regulation at any time after the proposed regulation has been laid before each House of parliament. The bill does not include all the components of the important immigration host system or program. This bill does not explain all the host programs. Regulations have been and will continue to be tabled from time to time to improve this legislation.

Regulations are adopted to improve existing acts. Clause 5(4) would allow the governor in council to make or approve regulations that were tabled in the House without first having been reviewed in committee. I can only agree with the hon. member for Laval Centre on this matter. The bill was considered in committee and it has already been the object of a major debate during the last parliament, as Bill C-31.

• (1235)

We have trouble seeing why the governor in council is being allowed to approve regulations tabled directly in the House, without prior discussion in committee, as in the past. I therefore support Motion No. 2 moved by the member for Laval Centre.

I hope that members will understand that the purpose of legislation as important as the Immigration Act must be debated. All stakeholders, all those who have made immigration as important as it is in Canada, must be allowed to continue their work in a climate of consensus. That is the purpose.

The consensus is there. All parties in the House are agreed that they do not want bad citizens settling in Canada, but they do want Canada to reach its objective of taking in 300,000 new arrivals annually, which it has yet to do.

What we therefore need is legislation which will create a climate conducive to consensus and discussion so that immigration may play its rightful role in our society.

As for Motion No. 5, moved by the Canadian Alliance member for Surrey Central, not only must there be the consensus to which I referred in my speech on Motion No. 2, but we must ensure that bad citizens are not allowed into Canada. I think that this is a view shared by all Canadians and recognized by all parties in the House.

Paragraph 34(1)(d) of the bill mentions:

34.(1) A permanent resident or a foreign national is inadmissible on security grounds for

...

d) being a danger to the security of Canada;

Obviously the word danger is open to interpretation. Our colleague from Surrey Central submits that it might be worthwhile to replace this wording with the following:

d) being a threat to the security of Canada—

Section 2 of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act provides a definition of threats to the security of Canada. Examples are provided, such as espionage or sabotage, foreign influenced activities within or relating to Canada that are detrimental to the interests of Canada, activities in support of acts of violence. These definitions are far more specific than the single word danger, which can lead to serious confusion.

I will close with a brief discussion of Motion No. 9 from my colleague the hon. member for Laval Centre. The purpose of her motion is to put an end to the interminable delays in processing new arrivals in Canada. As a result of these delays, the provinces often have to meet the costs of supporting people who are already on Canadian territory or, in the case of Quebec, on Quebec territory.

Hon. members must understand that all of us here in this House should support Motion No. 9, which will make it possible to reduce the long delays involved in examining people's status as immigrants to Canada.

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to speak to Bill C-11, the immigration and refugee protection act.

This is a very important matter for me. I have been interested in it for a number of years, because I sit on the board of the Greater

Government Orders

Montreal United Way. We manage assistance for agencies providing help to refugees and immigrants. We know that each is treated in much the same way. Often, problems related to the arrival of refugees impact the way we look at immigration.

As my colleague for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel said, legislation adapted to the new realities of Canada and Quebec and the world as a whole is most welcome. The environment has hugely changed the pressures of population movements that are a part of globalization. It is not said often enough, but the arrival in numbers not only in Canada but in all western countries of persons from southern countries is part of the globalization process we speak of daily.

• (1240)

This is an extremely important bill. It is also a bill that calls on the most fundamental values shared by Quebecers and Canadians and that reflects a commitment to international solidarity.

All members will agree that our primary concern with this bill must be to show extreme generosity toward those who, for reasons having to do with their political opinion, sexual orientation or religion, must leave their country to save their lives and those of their loved ones.

This commitment to international solidarity must transcend our concerns when we review Bill C-11. This is particularly important for Quebec and Quebecers, because as we know Quebec welcomes more than its fair share of refugees on a per capita basis, and we are proud of that.

At the same time, we must, as members representing Quebec's interests, remind this House that there are major costs involved. Quebec must pay some \$80 million to provide the necessary assistance to refugees even though this is a federal jurisdiction.

In this respect, Motion No. 9, to which the hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel referred and which was moved by the hon. member for Laval Centre, is an absolute priority for us.

Indeed, the system must be much more efficient, not only for administrative reasons, but also for reasons that relate to international solidarity and to which I referred. We need to create the proper environment to make the system much more efficient.

This brings me to a third point. When we talk about efficiency, we must think about the rigour with which we should deal with refugee and immigration issues in general, to admit to Canada and Quebec people who not only have refugee status, but who also meet immigration requirements. We must be able to prevent undesirables from entering Canada and Quebec. This rigour must not mean that the federal government can get around providing appropriate resources to administer the act.

Government Orders

Motion No. 9 deals with this issue. The proposed legislation could be extremely rigorous, extremely comprehensive with respect to this obligation to show solidarity, this obligation to ensure the safety of residents of Canada and of Quebec, but the government's primary concern in introducing Bill C-11 must not be to make this bill as repressive as possible in order to keep refugees out of Canada and to try to economize on the necessary resources.

In this regard, I think it is extremely important to remind the federal government, the Liberal government, that additional resources are needed to implement any legislation, although I do agree that this legislation must be rigorously enforced.

There is one final point I wish to make before looking at the individual motions. It is clear that the government's wish to introduce this bill is also motivated by a certain pressure from our neighbours to the south, whose view of this obligation to show solidarity towards refugees perhaps differs from that of Canadians and Quebecers.

I would not want decisions taken in the House to be coloured by this desire to comply with our American neighbours, as has unfortunately been the case in various connections in recent months.

In fact, we have noticed a certain anxiousness on the part of the government to comply with pressures that had less to do with public opinion in Canada or in Quebec than they had to do with public opinion in the United States or with what the U.S. government wanted. The missile defence shield, the energy agreement, and so forth, are just a few examples that come to mind.

I therefore think it extremely important that our concerns not be allowed to overshadow our obligation to show solidarity, that the necessary resources be made available to enforce the legislation, and that the toughness of the legislation reflect our values and needs, not those of our neighbours to the south.

• (1245)

It is in that context that the Bloc Quebecois views Motion No. 5, for example, as extremely important in order to better define what constitutes a threat to the security of Canada. As we have mentioned already, we feel that section 2 of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act would be a good basis for defining what is a threat to the security of Canada.

In that law, the definition includes espionage, sabotage, activities detrimental to the interests of Canada, activities in support of the threat of acts of serious violence and activities intended ultimately to lead to the destruction or overthrow of the constitutionally established system of government in Canada.

It is clear that those activities would indeed constitute threats to the security of Canada. However, it is also clear that people who defend causes in their countries, who protest or show their dis-

agreement with policy directions, who are doing it democratically whenever possible and with a will to resolve problems peacefully, should not be covered by that definition. In our opinion, the universal charter of human rights should be respected in the spirit of the legislation.

Therefore, we feel that a much clearer and more specific definition of the concept of threat to the security of Canada is absolutely necessary for this legislation to be applied to the fullest extent, but without arbitrariness and most of all without injustice toward people who, in all good faith, defend a cause with which we sometimes are in agreement.

In the same spirit, while we agree with the motion and the amendment to more clearly define through the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act the concept of threat against the security of Canada, we disagree with the idea that the Security Intelligence Review Committee would be the organization that should make recommendations to this effect. We question the appropriateness of involving the SIRC review committee in this regard.

I would like to focus mostly on Motion No. 7 proposed by my colleague from Laval Centre. Its purpose is to maintain a level of appeal for people who have been refused refugee status or admission into Canada on grounds of serious crime, security, violation of human rights or organized crime.

As we know, the present act provides for two stages. When the adjudication division takes expulsion proceedings, an appeal division can hear the arguments that the refugee or the permanent resident might make to challenge the decision. In our opinion, it is very important that this level of appeal be maintained. In this sense, clause 64 of the bill must be removed entirely. Once again, I feel that through clause 64 the government is trying to hide the lack of resources to apply the bill that will eventually be passed by invoking administrative reasons and removing a level of appeal.

In conclusion, the Bloc Quebecois hopes that Bill C-11 will be amended to respond to the real values of Quebecers and Canadians.

[English]

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, the speaker from the Bloc Party expressing concerns about a number of the amendments shows that if members in this hon. House have so many concerns about the legislation, undoubtedly there are a number of flaws in it.

• (1250)

I want to concentrate on clause 64 and the amendment suggested to it. Perhaps first we should ask, what does Bill C-11 do in relation to appeals for permanent residents?

Government Orders

Bill C-11 as it is, denies an appeal for permanent residents if they are subject of a report under section 44. Permanent residents can be deported without an appeal or without consideration of their circumstances as a result of a single criminal sentence.

I know it is hard sometimes for people to have patience. We say that people who come into the country should live by the laws and rules of the country. If they do not and they break the law, then they should be expected to pay the price. However, every court in the land has an appeal process. It is only fair that, regardless of how serious perhaps the offence is, at least the person should have the right to an appeal, because no one ever knows what might come up in the appeals process that will throw an entirely different light upon the case itself.

Even if they have lived here since infancy or whether they have been here for 20, 30 or 50 years, immigration officers will be solely responsible for making the decision as to whether deportation of these permanent residents is appropriate. Again, it is an awful onus or pressure to put on immigration officers of having the sole responsibility of deciding whether or not these people should be deported.

Once that decision is made, the wheels of enforcement turn and there is no review of that officer's discretionary decision. For all the talk from the department that these decisions are taken seriously, that they are serious decisions and that there will be safeguards to prevent inappropriate deportation for long term residents, the legislation provides no such safeguard at all.

We are reminded sometimes of the statement "I am from government, trust me". That is basically what is being said here, that we should not worry about it because there will be no problem. If the legislation does not give any protection, then I am afraid we are depending, as is said, on a rotten stick.

When the department speaks of an adjudicator making a tribunal decision and the subsequent possibility of judicial review, it is only with respect to whether the permanent resident has the necessary conviction and sentence. There is no jurisdiction for the tribunal or the federal court to look behind the decision to proceed with enforcement. That is what has been lost by taking away the appeal jurisdiction, one of the most fundamentally important parts of Bill C-11.

While it may be necessary to remove individuals since they have reneged on the responsibilities that come with having status in Canada, we must for reasons of fundamental justice give them a real appeal opportunity. That is what the amendment asks. Despite the fact that once they cross that line they know what lies ahead, they should in all fairness have at least an appeal.

I believe in 1985 the Singh case set out the importance of the oral appeal and said that people should not be deprived of the rights to have their case heard. Canada prides itself on being a land not only that accepts immigrants. In fact, our country has been built because

of people who have come from all over the world, settled here and have contributed so much. We also realize there are people who come here, break the law and must pay the consequence. Being the fair and honest government that we are, the type of free country where we feel everyone is equal, the least we could do for someone is to give him or her an appeal.

• (1255)

What the amendment suggests in this case is that the appeal rights shall be given to all permanent residents who have maintained permanent resident status for a three year period before being subject of report under section 44. The three year period is chosen in order to be consistent with the length of time one must be a permanent resident before applying for Canadian citizenship. Therefore, if within that three year period someone breaks the law, he or she then should at least have the right to an oral appeal.

There is a lot of good stuff in the bill, like most bills, but there are also some weaknesses. In passing legislation that is going to determine how we will treat immigrants coming to the country and how we treat immigrants who will be deported from the country, the least we should do is make sure the legislation is proper and that laws and rules apply in the spirit of the type of country Canada really is.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I rise to speak to Bill C-11. As the Chair can see by the interest of our party, this is a very serious issue with respect to immigration and the bill now before us. I am pleased to have the opportunity to echo some of the comments made by our critic from Fundy—Royal who has had the carriage of this bill, as well as others like the member for St. John's East.

Bill C-11 is a very important piece of legislation. As I mentioned earlier, my colleague from Fundy—Royal spoke to the salient points. However, it is important that we identify a couple of major issues in the legislation, which are necessary to bring forward because Canadians as a whole must recognize there are some deficiencies. The government itself has not seen fit to change some of those deficiencies in the legislation. Going forward with Bill C-11 as it is now is not going to resolve all of the issues with respect to immigration.

The first issue is with respect to the refugee status. We recognize it in the legislation. The refugee board itself will be reduced in numbers. There will be an adjudicator. Let us see this in proper perspective.

An individual from outside the boundaries of this great country of Canada who wishes to apply for refugee status makes a presentation, not to an adjudication board but simply to one person. That is not to say that the individual will not give full concentration to that one application, but a judgmental decision will be made. One person listening to an applicant in some instances may not hear the full story or may not be apprised of all the issues, may

Government Orders

make a decision based upon the judgment of the day, and perhaps the applicant was not as forthcoming as that one individual should have been.

Mistakes can be made. At that point the applicant unfortunately has no further appeal process. The applicant is then told that he or she no longer can file for refugee status in Canada and must go back to the country of origin.

● (1300)

At that point the adjudicator in this particular case may be sending an individual back to a circumstance that may well be a matter of life and death. There are other countries in the world that do not appreciate human rights as much and as well as we do in this country. We are perhaps sentencing this particular individual to life or non-life at that point.

It is important that there be another appeal process aside from the adjudication itself. That appeal process is there but it is only a paper appeal. When a paper appeal and not a verbal appeal is made, it is forwarded to the department and we do not know who in the department will be making the final decision.

My party is suggesting that if we are to go through this process we should allow the applicant to make an appeal in person. We never know what types of information or omissions were not given initially to the adjudicator. It is now only one person, not a board of three as before. Let us have the opportunity to make a verbal appeal to the department. It is a simple change that our party feels would enhance the legislation.

My second point deals with the clause that suggests that if a crime is being committed or has been committed and an individual who has landed immigrant status is accused and sentenced for that crime, it is immediate that the individual must then be deported back to the country of origin.

Let us walk through this closely. We all know the process of immigration in this country. People from all over the world have an opportunity to come to Canada. Once they have been given landed immigrant status they have the opportunity to work, raise their families and educate their children. They contribute to the community and to the taxation system of the country. They can do that as a landed immigrant for as many years as they wish.

A landed immigrant can make an application to become a Canadian citizen after living in Canada for three years. If I were a landed immigrant I would make sure that after three years I would make such an application to become a citizen, but others do not. They decide for a lot of good reasons to simply retain their landed immigrant status. People could in fact be landed immigrants for 20 to 30 years and contribute to our society in any number of ways, but

should they be charged and convicted of a crime after 20 years they could be deported because they are not Canadian citizens.

Our party says that if a crime is committed there have to be consequences, but we also believe that after three years as a landed immigrant, which is the timeline that it would normally take to make an application to become a Canadian citizen, an individual should have the opportunity to appeal. We are simply talking about fairness and equality. People who have been here and in fact have been Canadian citizens in everything but name only should have the opportunity to appeal their case. We are talking about human beings. We are talking about people, families and children who should have rights when they come to our borders and want to become members of our society.

I speak with some passion to the immigration laws. I suspect most members in the House would be able to point to the fact that I would not be here if it were not for the immigration rules of this country when my grandfather immigrated here from another culture. If he had not been allowed to come to this country, I would not have had the opportunity to stand in the House today as a representative in the parliament of this great country.

● (1305)

I thank the House for allowing me to speak to Bill C-11. There should have been an opportunity to make it better. Our job as parliamentarians is to make bills better and to make the best legislation possible so the people who we serve have the best opportunities.

Mr. Joe Fontana (London North Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by some members of the PC caucus. The member for Fundy—Royal was an active member of the committee and worked very closely with all members of the committee in a very co-operative way. The issue I wish to comment on has to do with the appeal rights of landed immigrants who have been in this country for a number of years

If in fact there was a serious criminality charge which caused a two year sentence, I want to assure the House that not only did we hear representations but the committee discussed this at some length. We did not take the issue lightly at all. The member who just spoke made the point that permanent residents who have been in this country for a great number of years may or may not choose to become Canadian citizens, that it is their decision. They are obviously fully engaged in Canadian society as they pay taxes, have families, have homes and so on. Therefore there is an attachment.

I believe there are a number of mechanisms before such a permanent resident would be removed from the country because of the serious criminality issue and they should be brought to the House for consideration. The committee took the issue very

seriously, debated it and discussed it to ensure that some of the things that have been mentioned would be taken into account. The removal of permanent residents, regardless of whether they have been here for 3 years, 20 years or 25 years, and the significance and the attachment they have to this country should be taken into account.

I want to ensure that the House understands that while the amendment was worthy of consideration in committee deliberations and is worthy of consideration by the House, the decision to remove a permanent resident under those circumstances would not be taken lightly. The bill would ensure that these removal orders were issued by an independent adjudicator of the IRB at an admissibility hearing. It would not be made by an immigration officer who would immediately move on a permanent resident who had been sentenced for more than two years. There would be a hearing of some sort by the IRB where the issue would be dealt with.

I should also indicate that before the referral to the IRB a CIC senior official would consider personal circumstances such as family ties and attachment to the cultural language of their home country. If people have been here for 15 or 20 years and for some reason, based on a serious criminality charge, they may be sent back to their home country, that home country may not have an attachment to them. They may have been here as children and yet not as Canadian citizens. Therefore we should take into account whether or not there is any cultural language attachment to their home country.

It is important to look at the immigration status and the length of time in Canada, as well as the type and nature of the crime. As we know, in the judiciary there is flexibility. A two year sentence may in fact be a little different for some other crime. We would look to see if the crime was of a violent nature. That must also be taken into account.

The final decision to send the report to the immigration division would be taken by a senior official to ensure that all factors have been given due consideration. In other words, it would be someone at the senior level. Once they look at the permanent residence, the sentence that they have received, the personal attachment and the value that they have to this country then the official would take this issue under full consideration.

• (1310)

I should mention that the IRB's decision is subject to judicial review. If the judicial review upholds the removal order there would still be the opportunity to seek ministerial authorization to remain in Canada for humanitarian and compassionate reasons. The member for Fundy—Royal wanted to make sure that the IRB decision did have judicial review, that its decision would not be

Government Orders

taken lightly and that it would be done by senior officials of CIC. He also wanted to make sure the minister could ultimately review a case under humanitarian and compassionate grounds.

The amendment speaks to how we could ensure that permanent residents are protected and the value they have given to this country would not be taken lightly. We have built in mechanisms that would not allow us to simply remove them from Canada on the basis of a charge without looking at their total contribution to Canada.

We sometimes wonder about the value of citizenship. As has been indicated, 80% of people who come to Canada move toward citizenship within three years. Why should people become Canadian citizens? These individuals realize that permanent residency does have status but citizenship offers more protection under the laws of Canada.

Everyone knows that we cannot deport citizens. Based on the bill, we may be able to remove permanent residents who have committed serious crimes or who have violated human rights and so on. In the past people did not want to make a decision as to whether or not they needed to give up their citizenship in their home country when they came to Canada. In one way this sends a message to those people that there is greater value to citizenship and that they ought to look at the additional protection they have as citizens of Canada.

Safeguards have been built into the system by the hard work of the minister, the committee and the member for Fundy—Royal. There is value to permanent residency. We cannot just throw people out of the country if they run afoul of the law.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the report stage amendments to Bill C-11 which have been spoken to previously by other members of our Conservative caucus and addressed very thoroughly by our critic for immigration, the member for Fundy—Royal.

We are discussing something that, quite frankly, I am surprised we would be discussing in this time, place and century. I am referring to the deportation of Canadian citizens. I fail to understand the logic behind deporting an individual to the country they came from who has declined to take out Canadian citizenship even though that person has been in Canada for 25, 30, 40 or even 50 years.

I have many friends and family members who have been permanent residents of Canada for 25 or 30 years. They pay taxes and enjoy all the rights and privileges of a Canadian citizen except that they cannot hold public office. That is the only difference.

• (1315)

Somehow we will say that an individual, after residing in the country 30, 40 or 50 years, does not have the same rights as any

Government Orders

other Canadian. Rather than sending them to prison for a criminal offence should they commit one, we would deport them to a country they may no longer have ties with. That is not what being Canadian is about. It is certainly not what I have always thought being Canadian is about.

Amendment and appeal rights would be given to all who have maintained permanent resident status for a three year period before being the subject of a report under clause 44. We have chosen a three year period to be consistent with the length of time one must be a permanent resident before applying for Canadian citizenship. That to me is a straightforward, plain speaking, very smart amendment to this piece of legislation.

We are not trying to be flippant or frivolous. We are not saying that one is given permanent resident status one day and deported the next. We are saying that someone who has been here for three years has some rights of citizenship even if he or she has not applied for citizenship status.

However it takes away from the issue of permanent residents who have been here for 20 years. There are not hundreds of them out there; there are thousands. I would dare say that there are hundreds of thousands. I do not expect that all of them will commit criminal offences. However should that happen, surely in this nation and at this period in our history we would not deport them to a country to which they no longer have ties.

What would Bill C-11 do? As it is, Bill C-11 would deny an appeal to permanent residents who are the subject of a report under clause 44, which I just mentioned. As a result of a single criminal sentencing, permanent residents could be deported without appeal and without consideration of their circumstances. I do not think anyone in this place is trying to justify criminal behaviour. However under the law as we embrace it every Canadian has a right to appeal.

I would further that by saying every permanent resident who has been here longer than three years has a right to appeal. It is a fundamental tenet of Canadian justice that if someone is accused of a crime or even sentenced for a crime then he or she has a right to appeal the judgment. I am not a lawyer and do not pretend to be. However that is a fundamental tenet of fair play and justice. We should surely be no stranger to that in the House.

This would include people who have lived here since infancy, which may be for 20, 30, 40 or 50 years. Immigration officers would be solely responsible for deciding whether deportation of permanent residents is appropriate. Many permanent residents have children who were born in Canada and are Canadian citizens even though the parents may not have obtained Canadian citizenship because, quite frankly, they do not need to. They can enjoy all the fruits and benefits of Canadian society except for and precluding the holding of public office.

Those are the rules as we have defined and made them. To say that people can be deported without the right of appeal because they have been sentenced to a crime is surely a mistake. Once the decision is made the wheels of enforcement turn and there is no review of the officer's discretionary decision.

• (1320)

For all the talk of the department that the decisions are taken seriously and that there will be safeguards to prevent the inappropriate deportation of long term residents, the legislation does not provide those safeguards. The legislation speaks of the possibility of safeguards but there is no safeguard.

I am amazed when the department speaks of an adjudicator making the tribunal decision and of the subsequent possibility of judicial review. It is only with respect to whether the permanent resident's conviction and sentence were proper. We are not appealing it. We are not taking a second look at it. We are asking if it is correct.

There is no jurisdiction for the tribunal or the federal court to look behind the decision to proceed with enforcement. What has been lost by taking away the appeal division's jurisdiction is one of the most fundamentally important parts of Bill C-11. While it may be necessary to remove individuals who renege on the responsibilities that come with having status in Canada, and specifically Canadian citizenship, for reasons of fundamental justice we need to give them a real opportunity to appeal.

That does not take away from the importance of recognizing that a country should have the ability to deport residents who are not citizens. However we need to take into account that there is a difference between someone who has been here three or four years and someone who has been here thirty or forty years. We need to rethink whether we are back in the days of Britain when they sent their convicts to Australia. Is that where we have gone?

Will deportation all of a sudden be one of the chief tenets of the Canadian justice system? Can we deport people because they have committed crimes? Let us take a look at what the crime is.

Mr. Joe Fontana: A serious crime.

Mr. Gerald Keddy: What is a serious crime? There is too much leeway in the bill. It gives the final say to review officers who may not have the clear credentials to make these decisions. It does this without appeal. It seems to me, based on the tenets of Canadian society as I understand them, that is not the Canadian way.

Mr. Dennis Mills (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to be on the record on this piece of legislation. I come from a downtown urban riding in Toronto where immigration matters represent a large amount of my constituency work. I like the member's amendment. I too believe that someone who has spent 25

or 30 years of his or her life in Canada is virtually Canadian and should be treated as such.

In my riding I have a lot of people from different communities. When these people initially came to Canada their facility with the language was such that they were almost apprehensive in approaching the department of immigration to put their personal files in order. For the last number of years they have been hard working, constructive Canadians in every way, shape or form except for that piece of paper.

• (1325)

We must remember that 40 years ago, when Toronto had a large influx of people from every part of the world, it was not an uncommon experience. In those days there was such fear of dealing with the Government of Canada that we had mobile citizenship vans. We would send public servants and judges out into the community to try to lower the apprehension of Canadians so they would come forward and put their personal files in order. I am hoping our colleagues on this side of the House can rethink that section of the legislation.

We are in the final days of this session of parliament before we go back to work in our constituencies for the summer. I would bring to the attention of not only members of the House but officials in the department of immigration, not just in Ottawa but in every region of the country and every embassy around the world, the important world youth days event which the department of immigration will be dealing with next summer.

The department will begin preparing for world youth days as we take our break this summer. As of the middle of July the world youth days website will be receiving information from registrants from every country on the planet.

One of the very special initiatives under the leadership of the current minister of immigration was that for the first time ever we have had a visa waiver fee for an event like this one. It was a decision of the whole House of Commons to support this important initiative. It will bring a million plus young people between the ages of 16 and 30 to Canada, to Toronto, where all will celebrate the values of sharing and caring for each other. The House of Commons supported the notion that a visa waiver fee be put in place.

I know that when a bill like this one is on the floor of the House officials monitor and read the proceedings. I would say not only to all members but to everyone in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration that it is a very special moment for Canada when we can reach out to young people from every part of the world and welcome them to our country.

Quite often the experience people have when they go into an embassy or are interviewed by an immigration officer can set the tone for how they feel toward Canada, their place of destiny. Many

Government Orders

of these young people will be coming abroad for their first time to a strange country and it will be very important that our officials abroad make them feel they are welcome in Canada.

I would say to all members of the House that over the last two months the support and execution of this project have been very special.

• (1330)

We will be celebrating the principles stated in the summary of the bill in Toronto next July. I want not only to participate in debate on the bill but also to say that we need to review the section that deals with retroactivity. I ask for the indulgence of the House to support all immigration officials that will be asking for counsel on this special event.

As far as Citizenship and Immigration Canada goes, it will be the largest processing event in the history of the country. It will be five times the size of the Olympics, should we be blessed with the Olympics in the middle of July. They at least have seven years to plan it. We in the House, along with all the various departments, have a year. I appreciate being given the opportunity to put these thoughts on the record.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The question is on Motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The recorded division on Motion No. 7 stands deferred.

I will now put the motions in Group No. 3 to the House.

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-11 be amended by adding after line 19 on page 41 the following new clause:

“95.1 The Minister shall assume the social and medical costs of refugee claimants as of the ninetieth day after the day of the claim and until a decision is made in respect of that claim.”

• (1335)

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-11, in Clause 101, be amended by adding after line 15 on page 44 the following:

“(1.1) Subparagraph (1)(b) does not apply and a claim for refugee protection shall be referred to the Refugee Protection Division for a new determination where:

(a) the relevant circumstances of the claimant have changed since a previous determination; or

(b) specific circumstances prevented part of the evidence from being presented during a previous determination.”

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-11, in Clause 112, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 8 on page 51 with the following:

“Canada for an offence that, if committed in Canada, would constitute an offence under an Act of Parliament punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of at least 10 years;”

She said: Mr. Speaker, I recognize my colleague's usual courtesy. They want me to be the first one to talk. We are now discussing the third group of amendments accepted by the Chair to improve Bill C-11. I am forced to admit that the government is convinced that Bill C-11 is nothing short of perfect.

However, this is not what we heard when we went to the big cities that receive immigrants and refugees. Ninety-nine per cent of those involved said that people are very concerned about how this act will be applied, even more so because there are no regulations associated with the act. Regulations will be drafted later on.

Fortunately, we managed to obtain that the bill would stipulate that the regulations will be tabled in the House and referred to a committee. It is a start. However, as for the amendment that the government should not adopt any regulations before obtaining an opinion, it seems that it has not been accepted since the governor in council will have the power to give effect to the regulations as soon as they are tabled.

There are three amendments in the last group, since one was not accepted. The first amendment, the one I am proposing, is designed to put pressure on the Liberal government.

We know that it takes a lot of time to deal with refugee cases. People have complained about it. Some refugee claimants have to wait for months and sometimes for years before they know where they stand.

I think the federal government is like most people: a bit of pressure helps. If no decision has been made on a claim 90 days after it has been filed, my amendment would require the federal government to assume the social and medical costs.

We know that Quebec is generous. Members need only look at the number of people who decide to live in Quebec when they claim refugee status. It is clear that the future mirrors the past.

Government Orders

• (1340)

However, on the one hand, we hear the minister say that the process should be more rapid and, on the other, the measures in the bill include, for example, the elimination of the appeal or a second refugee claim. We might also need a penalty of some kind. When a contractor does not abide by a contract, there are penalties. Essentially, that is what we are suggesting, a kind of penalty for the government.

I also tend to agree with the second amendment, which has been moved by my Progressive Conservative colleague. He proposes that part of the bill not apply and that a claim for refugee protection “be referred to the Refugee Protection Division for a new determination where the relevant circumstances of the claimant have changed since a previous determination, or specific circumstances prevented part of the evidence from being presented during a previous determination”.

I do not think it will be hard for me to convince hon. members that an individual’s circumstances can change very rapidly. We have recently learned of the terrible shooting in Nepal, which wiped out the entire royal family. What is going to happen there now? We do not know, but a week ago things in Nepal were relatively quiet, according to our viewpoint from this side of the world. This is therefore a recognition that, in the real world, individuals’ circumstances can change dramatically. The amendment by my hon. colleague from the Progressive Conservative Party is aimed at acknowledging this.

Can we believe that the government is going to support this amendment? If it does what it usually does, I think it will say no. That is its specialty, moreover. If one is convinced that what one already has is total perfection, why say yes to any changes? Yet we are told that the purpose of the opposition in a debate is to improve bills. That is all very fine on paper, but in reality we have trouble proving it.

The last amendment I presented is what certain of my Liberal colleagues would term a cosmetic amendment. It is not really that, for it states as follows:

(b) is determined to be inadmissible on grounds of serious criminality with respect to a conviction in Canada for an offence that, if committed in Canada, would constitute an offence under an Act of Parliament punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of at least 10 years;

The bill speaks of a term of imprisonment of at least ten years, but here we are speaking of a maximum term of imprisonment of at least ten years. Hon. members will grasp the difference. To us it is a very important one, as we do not, of course, want to keep major criminals in this country, yet we do believe that a minimum of justice needs to be applied, and that the terms must be clear. Amendment No. 12 is intended as a clarification to clause 112(3)(b).

Clearly, Bill C-12 is going to be passed before the summer recess. It is also clear that summer in the House of Commons will begin before June 21. I think it a great shame that this is preventing

us as parliamentarians and as individuals from taking decisions which could make the Immigration Act, which, let us remember, is already 25 years old, this being its first overhaul, a piece of legislation whose purpose would truly be to help hundreds of thousands of people, many thousands of families. Yet the government wants to pass the bill as is.

• (1345)

I find this disturbing. One wonders whether the government listened to the various stakeholders who shared their views with the committee. The people who appeared before us are competent individuals.

Those who testified included the Canadian Bar Association and the Canadian Council for Refugees. We also heard from academics, researchers, and community groups, who are daily trying to meet the basic needs of people who have applied for refugee status, immigrants who are arriving in a new environment and who need help in getting properly settled in Canada and in Quebec.

It is as though the government had decided, from its lofty perch, that all these fine people knew nothing, had seen nothing, and were incapable of analyzing a situation or showing any logic.

If this bill is any indication, logic which is coupled with a sense of humanity must frustrate this government. We on the opposition benches believe strongly in logic, but we believe just as strongly in a sense of humanity, generosity and openness to the world at large.

It is not too late. If, by chance, the government were to pass the 11 amendments under consideration today, that would already be a step forward. Right now, I will not be able to take such a step. I must take my seat.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): That is one way of putting it.

[English]

Mr. Joe Fontana (London North Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize. I think that last week I might have referred to the member as being from Laval East or Laval West. I want to make sure that it is Laval Centre and she is in the centre politically also.

Before she leaves the Chamber I want to give her some good news. The government will support her Motion No. 12, her amendment, because we believe that the motion introduced by the member is a technical amendment to ensure that serious criminality as defined in this section of the bill is consistent with serious criminality as defined in subclause 36(1). We believe that this amendment does not change the definition of serious criminality or substantively alter the amendment made by the standing committee to this clause, because again the member will know that we have discussed this issue beforehand.

Government Orders

We appreciate the fact that the amendment made by the member for Laval Centre further clarifies the government's intent. We are prepared to approve it, just as we have seen in committee when the member for Fundy—Royal came up with a good amendment and we approved it, and the Alliance critic's, so the committee has been very open.

I want to make one final comment as it relates to what the member for Laval Centre talked about in terms of Canada being generous and compassionate. I want to reiterate what I think all the members of the committee heard. Throughout the country all of our witnesses were proud of the country's heritage, of its proud culture and proud historical contribution toward Canada's generosity in terms of refugee protection around the world. Ours is one of four countries in the world that takes in refugees, is compassionate and understanding of their persecution, of their plight, sometimes in their countries. Our country is one of the most generous on a per capita basis of the number of refugees.

The bill continues to talk about Canada's historical record, about the fact that we believe that Canada has a part to play in trying to resettle some refugees who are being persecuted, around the world. The bill will make it easier for refugees to be processed through the system.

• (1350)

There are a number of changes in Bill C-11 that will allow for quicker adjudication and decision making by single panel refugee board members, by ensuring that the system works really well, especially for those who are in limbo. We have heard of cases where people are still here after eight or nine years but because of documentation problems or a number of different situations they cannot be permanent residents even though they have been given refugee protection. There have been some very positive amendments put forward on Bill C-11 which will make the situation a lot better than it is today.

I also want to tell the member for Laval Centre that the committee has moved on the issue of rehearing a denied refugee claim where there are changed circumstances. Perhaps there was violence in the relationship but the woman could not bring it forward during an IRB hearing because her spouse was there and she was afraid. We have made it possible, thanks to the good work of the committee, to ensure that those facts are reheard by the IRB. While it is not a revolving door or a second kick at the can in terms of a second appeal or a second refugee claim, we appreciate that sometimes there are circumstances that could not be brought up in the first hearing, and under the bill, those changed circumstances would be heard.

I would hope that the member for Laval Centre as well as my other colleagues on the committee appreciate that some of their hard work is found in the amendments to Bill C-11 that they and members of the government have proposed.

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the people of Surrey Central to participate in the report stage debate, Group No. 3, on Bill C-11, an act respecting immigration to Canada and the granting of refugee protection. I will address my remarks with respect to the four motions in the bill.

Motion No. 9 in regard to the refugee protection section of the bill is a Bloc amendment. It adds new clause 95.1, which states:

The Minister shall assume the social and medical costs of refugee claimants as of the ninetieth day after the day of the claim and until a decision is made in respect of that claim.

Since social and medical costs are under provincial jurisdiction and immigration is under federal jurisdiction, and because of the federal government's mismanagement of the refugee claims and the inefficient refugee claim process, why should the provinces bear the cost? It seems logical, even though the separatist Bloc member may have meant to show patriotism toward Quebec, but it is not fair to assume that the provinces can afford the entire cost of relocation and the medical expenses of refugees who are not yet permanent residents, landed immigrants or citizens.

The Canadian Alliance, through our chief critic for immigration, the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River, moved the amendment that the minister shall consult with the municipality with respect to resettlement for immigrants and integration programs where applicable. This amendment was not accepted by the Liberal government's immigration committee.

The government should be encouraging open and accountable discussion among CIC, Health Canada, HRDC and DFAIT as well as the provinces and the non-government organizations related to immigration. Rather than a co-operative approach, the arrogant, weak Liberal government always uses a confrontational approach with the provinces and territories. We should work with the provinces for policies on the settlement of immigrants. The Liberals are again missing that opportunity in the bill.

• (1355)

In regard to Motion No. 10, in the convention refugee and persons in need of protection clause, this Tory amendment will add, after the end of paragraph 1 of clause 101:

—Subparagraph (1)(b) does not apply—

That is a claim for protection by the claimant has been rejected by the board.

—and a claim for refugee protection shall be referred to the Refugee Protection Division for a new determination where:

- (a) the relevant circumstances of the claimant have changed since a previous determination; or
- (b) specific circumstances prevented part of the evidence from being presented during a previous determination.

In fact, new evidence should be one of the very few grounds to create a new hearing.

In Motion No. 11 the Tory amendment again deals with procedure for appeal to the refugee appeal division. In subclause 110(3) it proposes to delete the following the refugee appeal division shall proceed without a hearing, on the basis of the record of the proceedings of the refugee protection division, and may accept written submissions from the minister, the person. Then the clause continues. The amendment proposes to replace that with the refugee appeal division may proceed with a hearing where new evidence may be introduced, the record of the proceedings of the refugee protection division is used, and submissions may be made by the minister, the person. Then the clause continues.

The original clause supports a closed system and hinders the accountability and fairness of the act. This amendment will make the procedure allow a hearing to introduce new evidence instead of disallowing the hearing based on the record of proceedings of the refugee protection division.

The bill does not respect rule of law. Many witnesses, even including lawyers, told the committee that.

Motion No. 12 is a Bloc amendment that deals with pre-removal risk assessment. Under protection in paragraph 112(3)(b), the bill states:

(3) Refugee protection may not result from an application for protection if the person

(b) is determined to be inadmissible on grounds of serious criminality with respect to a conviction in Canada punished by a term of imprisonment of at least two years or with respect to a conviction outside Canada that, if committed in Canada, would be punishable by a term of imprisonment of at least 10 years—

Lines six to eight of that paragraph would be replaced by:

—Canada for an offence that, if committed in Canada, would constitute an offence under an Act of Parliament punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of at least 10 years—

This amendment is a little complicated. It is an extension and it clarifies the original wording. A part of this amendment is just a housekeeping correction and the other deals with the length of term of conviction to justify the magnitude of criminality outside Canada.

This part is so serious and important, particularly in light of the recent reports that more than 200,000 people are staying in Canada illegally. About 15,000 people or more are under deportation warrants, according to the Auditor General of Canada. They are supposed to be deported, but they are still in Canada and they are missing. Also, I am—

The Speaker: I am reluctant to interrupt the hon. member, but he will have three minutes remaining in the time for his remarks at the conclusion of question period.

S. O. 31

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

WOMEN'S WORLD CUP CYCLING RACE

Ms. Carole-Marie Allard (Laval East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my great honour to inform this House of the recent successes of two Quebecers, Geneviève Jeanson, of Lachine, and Lyne Bessette, of Knowlton.

Geneviève Jeanson won the gold medal, Saturday, in the fifth leg of the women's world cup cycling road race in Montreal, and Lyne Bessette, the bronze medal. The race took place on Mount Royal and included the top world cup racing teams.

• (1400)

This is Geneviève's seventh victory this season, and Lyne won for the second time in her career the prestigious Tour de l'Aude less than a week ago.

Please join me in congratulating these two accomplished athletes and thanking them for bringing glory and honour to Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

RAIL SAFETY

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, this government has announced a \$700 million fund for improving rail safety. The minister has not indicated how much of this will be allocated for safety at unmarked rail crossings.

On Friday the parliamentary secretary implied that rail safety was not a concern to the people of Saskatchewan. I can assure the government that he is dead wrong.

Saskatchewan has 2,000 more rail crossings than the combined total of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, B.C. and Quebec. Since 1987, 70 people have died in Saskatchewan from accidents occurring at rail crossings. What is the government's response? More studies.

The Saskatchewan Safety Council along with the rail industry has proposed a cost effective solution. When will the government get out of the way and allow this initiative to proceed?

* * *

BRIGADIER GENERAL DENIS WHITAKER

Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has lost one of her true heroes. Brigadier General Denis Whitaker, one of the most distinguished and decorated soldiers Canada has ever produced, passed away last week.

S. O. 31

Brigadier General Whitaker took part in the ill-fated Dieppe raid and was awarded the Distinguished Service Order. He later commanded the Royal Hamilton Light Infantry during the north-west Europe campaign of 1944-45 in the liberation of France, Belgium and the Netherlands.

For his outstanding leadership and courage he was awarded a bar to his Distinguished Service Order. He went on to command the 3rd Infantry Brigade until his retirement in 1951.

General Whitaker was a member of the Order of Canada, a recipient of the Efficiency Decoration, the Canadian Forces Decoration as well as an Officer of the Legion D'Honneur (France) and a Commander of the Order of the Crown (Belgium).

The remarkable Denis Whitaker was also an all star quarterback for the Hamilton Tigers, a national squash and racquetball champion, a business executive and published military historian.

Men and women of the calibre of Brigadier General Whitaker are a rare and valuable treasure. He will be greatly missed.

* * *

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Tony Valeri (Stoney Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of attending, along with my colleague from Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant, the first ever joint meeting of NAFTA legislators to discuss North American steel issues.

As NAFTA legislators we agree that a global steel crisis whose roots lie outside North America has created an unprecedented situation of global steel overcapacity and market distortions. NAFTA governments must address these issues for effective and comprehensive steel policies.

That being said, in Canada and specifically in my city of Hamilton we have two very innovative and technologically advanced steel companies, Dofasco and Stelco, which are well positioned to reap economic awards in a fair trade environment.

As legislators we pledge to continue to work closely together. Our first meeting was a good start but we must continue to push for fair trade in steel.

We must ensure the effectiveness of trade laws and trade law enforcement in North America and we need to address world steel overcapacity and market distorting practices through the exploration of multilateral solutions.

Canada must continue to be a leader in these negotiations on the steel industry and vigorously defend the best interests of our domestic producers.

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was National Transportation Day, which marked the start of National Transportation Week.

On this special occasion, I think it important to pay tribute to Canadians working in the transportation field and helping to keep the network safe and efficient. They number nearly one million persons.

This is the thrust of the Government of Canada's initiative to create a policy framework to define a type of network for the next decade. It is time Canada had the best highway network in the world.

This framework would be based, among other things, on the work of the Canada Transportation Act Review Panel, the Transportation Climate Change Table and the discussions held at the Millennium Transportation Conference.

Our network must be safe, efficient, affordable, accessible and sustainable. The measures taken will help develop trade and stimulate competition, productivity and technological innovation.

* * *

● (1405)

[*English*]

TIANANMEN SQUARE

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today marks the 12th anniversary of the mass murder of students and freedom starved citizens in Tiananmen Square.

Twelve years ago today, to the shock and horror of the world, the order was given to reclaim the square at all costs. Tanks, armoured personnel carriers, machine guns and 40,000 storm troopers, that is what they were that day, crushed thousands of pro-democracy protesters. Hundreds and maybe thousands were killed. The exact numbers are not known because the government has never given a full account of the deaths and has blocked all attempts at an investigation.

Commemorations of the event are even forbidden in China and police routinely visit known dissidents and families of victims on the anniversary to warn them not to publicly mark the date.

As China slowly opens itself to the world, we must let it know that we will never forget its barbarism in the square 12 years ago today. We can never forget. We will never forget.

[Translation]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on May 21, the Canadian government announced the signing of an international social security agreement with the Slovak Republic.

This agreement will make it easier for Canadians who have lived and worked in the Slovak Republic, and for Slovaks who live in Canada, to qualify for old age, disability and survivor benefits.

This agreement is an important step toward strengthening the relationship and areas of co-operation between our two countries.

It should also be noted that international agreements such as this one are increasingly important, as global economics and greater international co-operation create increased labour mobility and movement between countries.

To date, Canada has signed social security agreements with 44 countries.

* * *

LE COURRIER-LAVAL

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the weekly *Le Courrier-Laval* was just awarded first prize by Quebec's weeklies association. Considering that there are over 140 weeklies in Quebec, this is quite the achievement.

Le Courrier-Laval was published for the first time on January 19, 1945 and is in its 56th year. With a circulation of close to 105,000 copies, this newspaper is read by practically every household in Laval.

This recognition of the journalistic value of *Le Courrier-Laval* is definitely not a coincidence. For the past three years, a new team has been working extremely hard to meet the challenge of excellence by diversifying the newspaper's content and by using more appealing graphics. *Le Courrier-Laval* achieved its objective with the support of 86 people. Without their involvement, the Laval weekly would never have won this prestigious award.

It is with pride that, on my behalf and on behalf of the residents of Laval, I congratulate *Le Courrier-Laval*. To publisher Serge Lemieux and news editor Jocelyn Bourassa, I say "Mission accomplished". Now they have no choice but to surpass themselves; because Laval believes in excellence.

S. O. 31

CANCER

Ms. Hélène Scherrer (Louis-Hébert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Sunday was National Cancer Survivors Day. This, the fourteenth annual edition, offered hope to a number of people affected by cancer.

Cancer is a terrible disease affecting far too many of us. Yet many Canadians who have a brush with cancer have strong chances of recovery. The latest figures show a drop in cancer death rates.

People who learn that they have cancer are no longer facing an automatic death sentence. Thanks to new screening techniques, the greater availability of information and state of the art treatments, they have hope of a full recovery and a return to a normal life.

Sunday's celebration provided all those who have recovered from cancer and those close to them with the opportunity to demonstrate that life after a cancer diagnosis can be a reality, thus sending a message of hope to all those who have this disease.

* * *

[English]

ROGER CYR

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today I am honoured to pay tribute to Roger Cyr, long time president of the Hong Kong Veterans' Association and a tireless and successful advocate for veterans' rights, who passed away on May 26.

Out of one of the most tragic events during World War II comes a story of heroism and determination. After Hong Kong fell to the Japanese, roughly 1,200 Canadian soldiers were forced into slave labour for almost four years. Roger Cyr made it his personal goal to see that every one of these soldiers was compensated for his unjust treatment and eventually the Canadian government did just that. It paid them an average of \$22,000 for their forced labour.

During Remembrance Day ceremonies in 1998, Mr. Cyr had the unprecedented honour of standing beside Governor General Roméo LeBlanc during the march past of veterans and took the salute. He deserved a salute from his comrades then, just as he deserves to be recognized and remembered by all Canadians today.

* * *

● (1410)

[Translation]

GENERAL MAURICE BARIL

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, June 28 will be a big day for the Canadian Armed

S. O. 31

Forces. General Maurice Baril, Chief of Defence Staff, is retiring after a 40 year military career which has brought him to the uppermost echelons of the Canadian military hierarchy.

There are so many highlights to his career that I could never list them all in my brief statement. I will limit myself to the pinnacle of his career, promotion to the position of Chief of Defence Staff, on September 17, 1997. That promotion was ample evidence of the value of Maurice Baril.

During my two years as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, I had the immense privilege of contact with this exceptional man, who became a friend. I was struck right from the start by his sense of organization and leadership, and particularly by his great human qualities. A humble and modest man, he inspired confidence in his troops.

General Baril, all members of this House join with me in extending our best wishes on your well-deserved retirement. We will miss you.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Health Canada continues to play catch up on critical safety issues associated with BSE or mad cow disease.

It took more than 10 years after Britain began measures to deal with the crisis for Health Canada to complete its first major assessment of the problem. It is now one year after that report was received and we still do not see wide scale livestock testing or an outright ban on animal protein in the feed of animals destined for human consumption. We still do not have a ban on food and confectionery products containing beef byproducts from countries where BSE has been detected. There is still no ban on the use of potentially infected deer and elk in rendering plants.

The government seems to be trying to do the absolute minimum needed to comply with the World Health Organization. The minimum will not do. Britain is dramatic proof of that. We urge the health minister to stop lagging behind and to make BSE prevention an urgent priority.

* * *

[Translation]

LA FÉDÉRATION DES FEMMES DU QUÉBEC

Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last weekend, members of the Fédération des femmes du Québec elected Vivian Barbot their new president.

Born in Haiti and a teacher at the Cegep in Victoriaville, Ms. Barbot was head of the Fédération des enseignantes et enseignants

de cégeps of the Centrale des syndicats du Québec, and has been a member of the intercultural relations committee of the Ligue des droits et libertés. She is also known for her public stands on the rights of immigrants and the defence of the French language.

She succeeds Françoise David, to whom we are indebted for the bread and roses march in 1995 and the World March of Women in October 2000.

The Bloc Québécois thanks Ms. David for her energetic defence of the interests of women in Quebec, and congratulates the new president, Ms. Barbot. We offer Ms. Barbot our co-operation and wish her a most productive mandate serving the interests of the women of Quebec.

* * *

SOFTWARE THEFT

Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Alliance against Software Theft has announced a 3% drop in software theft in Canada, but the figures show that software theft has cost Canada \$457 million in sales of business applications and software in 2000.

The cost of software theft is high: losses of jobs, wages and tax revenue in Canada.

We will inevitably have to become aware of the importance of adopting copyright protection policies.

We must encourage businesses to continue, through educational programs, legislative measures and enforcement, to raise the awareness of members of the public who use unauthorized copies of software.

* * *

[English]

GRANTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, the minister of heritage and culture, in an attempt to enhance her leadership bid, has been making funding announcements all across the country.

The minister of industry and trade, not to be outdone, is giving away public money like it is going out of style in order to enhance his chances at the leadership.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs uses CIDA and other corporations to deliver some of his goodies for appropriate credit, attention and hopefully support. Benefits from a lot of these expenditures are questionable. A large percentage of that money should go to the Department of Health where it is needed to help the underdog minister in his bid.

Oral Questions

• (1415)

The final player in the leadership race, the Minister of Finance, is so busy solidifying his lead that he does not know where the money is going. He did not bring in a budget. This is blatant pork barrelling. It is not good government

What price are we paying for power? Is the golf course not good enough any more?

* * *

EDUCATION

Ms. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to congratulate two constituents of York West, Albert Cheng of Weston Collegiate Institute and Sai Krishna Satyanarayana of le Collège français, on receiving a local excellence award from the millennium scholarship foundation.

Both students have demonstrated outstanding achievements in academic life, significant contributions to the community and leadership in innovation, all qualities that have helped to enrich the quality and community of life in York West.

The millennium scholarships foundation originates from a Government of Canada initiative that represents a significant investment in the future of young Canadians and an original way of celebrating the new millennium.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD*[Translation]***JUSTICE**

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is this government's lack of pragmatism that explains why our children will not be effectively protected against sexual predators using the Internet to find their victims.

Will the minister acknowledge publicly that she has learned from her mistakes and will, finally, introduce new legislation to protect our children?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member should be well aware, we have legislation before the House that deals with the protection of children in relation to Internet luring and other aspects of child pornography as they relate to technology.

Unfortunately the hon. member's party and others play politics in this regard. It is part and parcel of legislation, all of which deals with amendments to the criminal code. If people were interested in protecting our children instead of playing politics, I expect they would work with us to practise legislation in—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Macleod.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister put the portion of legislation that would have protected children from Internet criminals into a big bill that has other controversial issues in it. She knows that. That is the reason we are not supporting it.

Will the minister bring in standalone legislation that will protect our children from Internet sexual predators? Yes or no.

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the provisions to which the hon. member refers are amendments to the criminal code.

Bill C-15 which is before the House is legislation, all of which deals with amendments to the criminal code, many of which were before the House before the last election. There is absolutely no excuse for any hon. member of the House not to have informed himself or herself in relation to the legislation and be prepared to move forward.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, let us give another example. Western premiers decided that they could not wait for the minister. They are to set up a sex offender registry on their own. Ontario has also decided that CPIC is not suitable for this issue.

When will the minister set up a national sex offender registry to protect our children from sexual predators?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague is well aware that we have one of the best registries in the world, CPIC, which is the envy of all police forces around the world. We have indicated to the provinces and the people that any corrections which need to be made with CPIC will be made.

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the RCMP disagrees with the minister. Canadians are very disappointed with the justice minister's refusal to co-operate with the opposition to pass long needed laws dealing with child predators on the Internet.

The minister is now prepared to delay the legislation. This is unacceptable to Canadians. Why will the Minister of Justice not put politics aside and ensure that the provisions in Bill C-15 dealing with child predators are passed as quickly as possible?

• (1420)

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I challenge Alliance members to put politics aside and let the legislation come to a vote now. If they will not do that they are the ones playing politics with the safety of our children.

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that answer is unacceptable to Canadians. Protecting our children from sexual predators is a priority of Canadians. Everyone knows

Oral Questions

that the government is playing political games by lumping animals and children together in the same bill.

Given the unanimous consent of past child protection provisions, will the Deputy Prime Minister stop playing games with Canadian children, stop playing American style politics and pass—

The Speaker: The hon. Deputy Prime Minister.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the polls out today show that the Alliance is unacceptable to Canadians.

The message to the Alliance is not to stand in the way of Bill C-15 and good legislation like it if it wants to protect children. It should join with us in protecting our children and let the legislation come to a vote, or it will go even further down in the polls. That is the message of Canadians to the Alliance.

* * *

[Translation]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, under the Access to Information Act, the Bloc Québécois has obtained a copy of a communication strategy, which serves as a sort of guide for the federal government in its dealings with the government of Quebec. This document tells ministers and members how to behave toward the government of Quebec.

My question is for the minister of public works. How can the federal government justify adopting a belligerent marketing approach and identifying the enemy as the government of Quebec? Does this not confirm what we had always known, that the federal government had decided to make war?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have never seen this document.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the fact that the minister who pays hundreds of thousands of dollars to have studies done has not seen the document indicates a problem somewhere.

On page 13 of the document—I will refresh the minister's memory—we see, and I quote “The first concern of perceptual positioning here is not service as such, but moulding the mind of the consumer”.

Is not the role of a modern democratic government to serve its citizens, rather than try to brainwash them?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member,

who previously sat in the national assembly, should perhaps look at his own documents.

I can assure the House that yes, there are a number of people working for the government across the country and a number could write documents and could express thoughts. However, the government has never commented.

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this same document says, and I quote “Transfer payments to the provinces reduce the scope of the federal involvement in the provinces”.

Is this not the reason why the first federal cuts to reduce the deficit were made to transfers to the provinces, because these transfers do not contribute to the federal government's propaganda?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's information is inaccurate. The government cut a lot more in direct spending than in transfers to the provinces.

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government's strategy is increasingly clear. It consists in making taxpayers pay for its mad obsession with propaganda.

Is this not also why, in spite of huge surpluses, the federal government does not want to increase transfers for health and education and is much more interested in investing in propaganda?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that, as soon as it had restored fiscal balance, the Government of Canada's priority was to strengthen transfers to the provinces, the Canada social transfer and equalization payments.

* * *

● (1425)

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister says that economic indicators sometimes cause him to lose sleep. I would like to ask the minister about environmental indicators that should be causing him nightmares.

First, Canada has the second worst environmental record among OECD nations. Second, Canada's greenhouse gases are on track to rise 44% above Kyoto targets. Third, Environment Canada under the finance minister is the worst funded of all departments.

With those environmental indicators how could the finance minister ever sleep at night?

Oral Questions

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member gives no indication of where these assertions come from. There is no truth whatsoever to the reference to the figures with respect to greenhouse gases.

I do not know where she gets her statements. She has consistently asked questions of this nature before, which really have no answer unless we have some factual information rather than her wild surmises.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is incredible. The facts are out there. The government keeps ignoring the facts. Now they are trying to dangle \$145 million as if it were some kind of serious response to Canada's environmental deficit.

The finance minister knows that \$145 million is 1% of what is needed to deal with our water quality crisis. Instead of preening as Mr. Green, why does the finance minister not muster the courage, the resolve and the resources for the robust environmental strategy that he used to champion when he was on the opposition side a decade ago?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister made available in the last period since the budget \$1.1 billion for climate change alone, plus other substantial amounts.

I do not know where the hon. member gets the figure of \$145 million. She has plucked that out of a hat somewhere. All I can say is once again it is the NDP saying that a figure of \$145 million is insignificant. It may be very significant and deal with the problem to which it will be applied.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Deputy Prime Minister is about the helicopter scandal. The Prime Minister stated last week that the government wanted, and I quote—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. The Chair wants to hear about this as well. The right hon. member for Calgary Centre has the floor.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: The Prime Minister said last week that the government wanted:

—to have a helicopter at the best possible price that can do the job.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: They applaud the scandal. When did the Prime Minister learn that splitting the contract would add \$400 million to the price tag? Why did the government go ahead with a split contract that adds an unnecessary \$400 million?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is absolutely wrong. He talks about a possible

contingency which is not an absolute decision that this would cost \$400 million more.

When he got to his feet and asked about the helicopter scandal, I thought he was talking about the EH-101 deal he was associated with along with Mr. Mulroney.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, there will be time to debate that. My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Would he tell the House whether there was written advice to the Prime Minister and to the government to split the helicopter procurement project? If there was that written advice, will the government table in the House the written advice on which that decision was taken?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the decision to have two contracts in schedule 1 is a government decision. With one contract we had three bidders. With two contracts we have a possible thirteen bidders. That means more competition, more transparency, more Canadian companies getting involved, more Canadian technology and more Canadian jobs.

* * *

• (1430)

FISHERIES

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, for months now the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has been refusing to provide or to make public his department's legal opinion on the Marshall decision in the Supreme Court of Canada.

We now know why he has refused. Department of Justice lawyers in the federal court have taken a position on the Marshall decision contrary to the stated public position of the minister.

Would the minister confirm that justice department lawyers acting on his behalf in the federal court in Nova Scotia have denied that natives have a treaty right to harvest lobster?

Hon. Herb Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as usual, the hon. member does not have his facts correct. I did provide an answer to his question to me. Legal advice is provided by the Ministry of Justice. I have to consult with all the members to make sure we can provide that advice.

In the Marshall decision the supreme court ruling clearly said there was a right to a commercial fishery. We are following the Marshall decision in the supreme court.

Unfortunately the hon. member and his party speak about helping aboriginal people but whenever we want to do something for the aboriginal communities, they are against it every time in the House.

Oral Questions

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister has spent hundreds of millions of dollars buying lobster boats, licences and gear because he said that the Marshall decision recognized a treaty right to harvest lobster.

The Department of Justice lawyers, in federal court, disagree with the minister. They deny that natives have a constitutionally protected right to harvest lobster.

Which is it? Who is speaking for the government on treaty rights to harvest lobster? Is it the minister of fisheries or is it the Department of Justice? Who is speaking for the government?

Hon. Herb Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government speaks with one voice. We have said it from day one that the supreme court clearly said there is a right to a commercial fishery.

I have also said it is not an absolute right but a regulated right. Yes, we are spending money to make sure that—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: It is very hard to hear one voice when there are 10 or 20 others yelling. The Chair has to be able to hear the person speaking. The hon. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has the floor.

Hon. Herb Dhaliwal: Mr. Speaker, we hear the Alliance Party members say they want to help aboriginal people but when it comes to helping them with government programs, they stand in the House and say they are against it every time.

Why do you not make up your minds on whether you are interested or—

The Speaker: It would be helpful if members would address the Chair as well.

* * *

[Translation]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

Ms. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the federal government's propaganda document, transfer payments are hurting its visibility, so it took a different tack with Quebec.

My question is for the President of the Privy Council. Is this not the real reason for the drop in federal government transfer payments for education, and the explanation for its stubborn insistence on a millennium scholarships program that nobody wanted?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have had occasion to point out, transfer payments have increased. They have never been as high as they are today, if one takes into account the increase in the value of tax points.

If the Bloc Québécois is so intent on scandal, why does it not ask its head office to release the infamous Plan O, which would

have squandered over \$16 billion of Quebecers' savings in the vain hope of calming the markets after a yes in the referendum?

Ms. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is the smallest investment in education in 30 years.

Does this document not also make it clear why, in September 1999, contrary to all expectations, the federal government terminated its agreement with Communication Québec and set up its own communications program, 1-800-O-Canada?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her question, because it gives me an opportunity to point out that 1-800-O-Canada is one of the rare telephone services to have a human voice at the other end of the line, and it is a great success.

The reason we ended this contract with Quebec and with Manitoba as well is because, with a central telephone system for the entire country, we must naturally be able to answer in both official languages.

* * *

● (1435)

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Alberta government has officially declared the province a drought disaster area. Almost 90% of the provincial agricultural area does not have enough soil moisture for annual cropping this year.

In my riding conditions are reminiscent of the dust bowl of the 1930s with precipitation at 20% of the last 50 year average. Farmers are crippled by this drought and it could get worse. Forage crops in many areas have already been lost and forest fire conditions have been extreme in northern central Alberta for some weeks.

What is the government prepared to do to help farmers deal with these extreme drought conditions?

Mr. Larry McCormick (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, certainly it is very unfortunate about the conditions our western neighbours are putting up with in regard to the pastures, but this year for the first time in history two million acres of pasture can be insured under crop insurance. That is a federal-provincial program. I certainly encourage all the ranchers to enlist in the program.

Also, the order in council on Friday approved a transfer to the Alberta treasury of its balance of the \$500 million. This \$126 million is available today.

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Alberta provincial government has offered \$73 mil-

lion in emergency drought relief to the province's livestock and honey producers. The PFRA, supposedly existing to help farmers with water supply, ran out of money four days after the renewal of this year's budget.

Again, what will the government do to help farmers with this crisis of drought conditions?

Mr. Larry McCormick (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me the chance to remind him that this money that is coming from the federal government to Alberta will be available today, but first the Alberta government has to sign the contract.

Alberta is one of the provinces that has not signed yet. As soon as the member encourages his premier to sign, this \$126 million will be available.

* * *

[Translation]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government's philosophy is abundantly clear: avoid transfer payments because they take away from the visibility of the federal government.

Does this not explain the federal government's refusal to negotiate with Quebec a true parental leave program that would cover all families?

Is it not because agreeing to negotiate would deprive Ottawa of its visibility, so families are left to bear the brunt of its refusal?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is guided by but one concern, providing Canadians with the best services and the best policies.

If Canadians find these services and policies to be good ones, it is certainly not the result of brainwashing; it is because they are being given good government.

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there has been \$500 million worth of propaganda since 1995. Page 12 of the document identifies the three problems the federal government has in Quebec: transfer payments, provincial autonomy and Canada-Quebec agreements.

Does this description of the federal government's problems in Quebec not explain the rigid federal attitude when it comes to having to negotiate with Quebec?

Does it not explain certain behaviours seen on the other side of this House when the time comes to discuss Quebec and its needs?

Oral Questions

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would not be difficult to demonstrate that ours is the most flexible federation possible. Every time the Bloc Québécois tries to come up with a foreign model, we can prove to them that Canada is more flexible than other federations. For almost any example they can come up with, we can prove—as for example once again recently with the Young Offenders Act—that the practice in Quebec finds support and assistance within the Canadian federation.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there is yet another internal military document that contradicts the minister's statements in the House. This report clearly states that the end of the cold war did not eliminate the threat of foreign submarines in our waters. Rather, it compounded the threat. We now need better protection against rogue nations and modern day aggressor submarines than we ever did.

Why do so many internal military documents call for increased protection when the minister politically calls for cuts in capability?

• (1440)

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has the situation all wrong. The helicopter that has been proposed to us by the military, and that we have accepted the statement of requirements for, will have a vigorous and robust anti-submarine capacity, but it will have that robust capacity to deal with the current threat by submarines and will not live in the past like my hon. colleague.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, cold war requirements should be minimum standards, not maximum standards.

It is well known to all that the threat to Canada's maritime territory is largely subsurface, by many more nations' submarines than in the 1960s.

Submarines with missile capability are in place or can be available to rogue nations worldwide. Why would Canada ever consider decreasing its NATO anti-submarine capability by politically decreasing the fly time and range capabilities of the helicopters that hunt them?

Mr. John O'Reilly (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I draw to the attention of the member the committee meeting of last week in which Vice Admiral Maddison indicated to the member that all written requirements were written by him, written by the military to

Oral Questions

do a job in today's world, not in the cold war era in which the member seems to live.

These submarines, these helicopters, everything that the Canadian forces have re-equipped with, are on military specifications, and they meet the demands of Canada's national defence.

[Translation]

Ms. Yolande Thibeault (Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the community of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu has a long military history dating back to the 18th century. This tradition is being maintained with the presence of the Canadian forces in the region.

[English]

The Minister of National Defence recently made an important announcement in St-Jean, Quebec. Could the parliamentary secretary inform the House about this announcement?

Mr. John O'Reilly (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Minister of National Defence announced a five year, \$45 million support contract with the Fort Saint-Jean campus for use of the site facilities. Four programs will be located there, bringing in 400 students annually: the military training assistance program for the partnership for peace countries; the Canadian forces management development school; the regular officer training plan year; and summer second language training.

The Fort Saint-Jean campus is a wonderful site and we are pleased to continue our relationship with it.

* * *

TRANSPORTATION

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Canada is the only industrial country in the world where the national government has not made a serious financial contribution to public transit. Under its transportation equity act in the United States, the federal government there is now contributing some \$10 billion Canadian per year to public transit.

Will the Minister of Finance now follow the lead in the United States and make a substantial contribution to public transit in this country? He has had seven long years to show some leadership. Will he show leadership on this issue now?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have news for the hon. member. The Minister of Finance showed leadership last year by announcing a \$2 billion infrastructure program to be matched by the municipalities and by the provinces, and much of that money can and will be spent on public transit.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if someone has stolen the Minister of Finance's tongue today. He is not responding to questions.

I will ask him again. Every year the Minister of Finance collects some \$5 billion on excise taxes and GST from gasoline and diesel fuel and yet puts very little of it back into public transit in Canada, which reduces smog and is good for the environment.

Will the Minister of Finance now initiate a tax credit or tax exemption on public transit passes, which would be great for the environment? Why does he not show that leadership and show it now?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows the Canadian government, as do other governments, receives its sources of funding from a series of taxes. Those taxes are then spent in terms of the Canadian priorities.

Those priorities are very clear. The Minister of Transport has just outlined what is a very aggressive and a very imaginative program of the Canadian government, working with the provinces and with the municipalities to do so, in the same area as the Minister of the Environment has demonstrated.

We are doing it in a wide range of areas, working with the municipalities in terms of the environment and in terms of climate change as the Minister of Energy has outlined. The fact is we do receive money—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Fundy—Royal.

* * *

• (1445)

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, since the tragedy of Walkerton, Canadians have been demanding national drinking water standards. The least Canadians expect from the government is for it to invest in drinking water and sewage infrastructure.

Why is the environment minister failing to fight? Why is he so reluctant to promote green infrastructure to properly treat sewage and to ensure Canadians have safe drinking water?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure program just referred to, of which the entire opposition appears totally unaware, makes \$2 billion available for infrastructure projects. Green infrastructure is the theme. In my province the figure is 75% must go to water, sewage and solid waste projects and 25% to other projects.

There is a major program which the Conservative Party never brought in when it was in power, and of which it is still unaware. I suggest the member look at the figures. He will find it is an important contribution to improving the infrastructure in municipalities.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, we know that the infrastructure focus should be on water. We also know that the regional minister from Manitoba is seriously sup-

porting a \$12 million gift from the infrastructure program to a proposed privately owned arena in the city of Winnipeg.

Would the minister responsible for infrastructure please tell the House if she would prefer to have the dollars for infrastructure go to water projects or to arenas?

Hon. Ronald Duhamel (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Franco-phonie), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have never heard so much nonsense from a member in the House of Commons.

We made announcements with respect to flood litigation. We made announcements with respect to Haywood, Cormorant and a number of other communities for safe water. We have a number of others being requested. In the whole of western Canada there are roughly 2,000 applications, of which roughly 50% are water related.

We are spending and spending wisely. The member does not get it.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the level of violence in the Middle East seems to be about to escalate. Canada has a very good reputation in the world in general, specifically with both parties in the Middle East.

What specific steps has the government taken toward the Palestinian authority to secure a ceasefire before the violence escalates?

Mr. Denis Paradis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to offer our condolences to the families of the victims this weekend.

On Saturday the Minister of Foreign Affairs spoke with the foreign minister, Shimon Peres, to convey Canada's condolences. We also spoke with the Palestinian minister, Dr. Nabil Shaath, to express the concerns of the Canadian people that terrorism and violence must end.

We urge everyone to go back to the table and implement the Mitchell report.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that is laudable. It is good to urge them to go back to the table, but Canada recently handed over \$5 billion through CIDA to the Palestinian authority. The foreign affairs minister met with Yasser Arafat.

Has the government considered and will it start putting restrictions on aid that goes to the Palestinian authority, contingent upon the authority controlling violence in the Middle East?

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Paradis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that endless war has been dragging on for too long.

As indicated in the Mitchell report, it is important that the two sides go back to the negotiating table as soon as possible. It is important to end this endless war and to have everyone back at the negotiating table.

Canada will make every effort to help the two sides sit down and negotiate.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in its attempt to hastily rectify the employment insurance system, just before the election call, the federal government failed to meet the needs of the unemployed.

Today, the government has an opportunity to do a lot more for them. We concur in the unanimous report by the standing committee on human resources development, and if it wants to pass legislation in this regard before the recess, it will have the support of the Bloc.

This is a basic issue for the unemployed. Can the Minister of Human Resources Development tell us when the government will reveal its political will and act?

• (1450)

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member rightly states that the government recently passed Bill C-2, where we repealed the intensity rule, where we made changes to the clawback initiative, and where we made it easier for parents to get benefits upon re-entry into the workplace.

Where were they? They were blocking that act. From my point of view I think members of the Bloc have a lot to respond to in their own constituencies.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the committee recognized unanimously that this was not enough and hence the Bloc Québécois' opposition.

The federal government has everything it needs to act. It has the support of the opposition and, if it so wishes, we will approve its bill by Friday. In fact, it has a unanimous report by the standing committee on human resources development in which all of the parties call on it to act. The needs are there, they are desperate.

On what pretexts can the government still justify its inaction?

Oral Questions

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the track record on this side of the House is very clear. We made significant changes to the Employment Insurance Act, not the least of which was the doubling of parental benefits and, as I pointed out, the changes under Bill C-2.

As we were trying to pass Bill C-2, it was the Bloc that actually voted for the House to close down. Where is its interest when it comes to employment insurance?

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance refuses to acknowledge that a lower Canadian dollar means a higher cost of living for many Canadians, particularly those on fixed incomes, many of whom are seniors.

Will the Minister of Finance admit that his government's policy is directly responsible for a higher cost of living, particularly as it affects seniors?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I will certainly admit is that according to the most recent numbers real personal disposable incomes grew by 5.4% and are now at a record high.

At the same time I will admit that the real gross domestic product in Canada grew at an annualized rate of 2.5%. That is twice the rate of growth in the United States, and that benefits all Canadians including our seniors.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there is at least one Canadian senior who is expecting a 42% increase in the next little while. What about the rest?

The average increase in the cost of living of Canadian seniors has skyrocketed. Fuel costs to heat their homes have gone up. Weekly grocery costs have gone up. Gas prices have gone up. Medication costs have gone up.

When will the minister stop forcing Canadian seniors and those on fixed incomes to bear the major burden for the lower Canadian dollar?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we look at what was done in budget 2000, after a long delay brought in by the previous government we reindexed all the benefits in the Canadian benefit system. The prime beneficiaries of that are Canadian seniors and those who are on fixed incomes. The question is: Why did the Alliance vote against that?

[Translation]

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mr. Claude Duplain (Portneuf, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn that the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council has awarded \$53 million in funding for basic research. Such research is essential to develop the knowledge base on which to build the knowledge based economy.

Can the Secretary of State explain how the SSHRC awards its funding and what proportion goes to Quebec?

Hon. Gilbert Normand (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I recently had the pleasure of announcing that the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council is going to provide \$56.5 million in funding over three years for 737 research projects in such areas as economics, culture, business and the environment, as well as \$3.5 million for 100 post-doctoral scholars. I want to congratulate the recipients.

Quebec's share of this is 31% as far as the number of researchers is concerned, and 27% of the total funds.

* * *

[English]

HIGHWAYS

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the United States returns over 90% of its federal fuel tax revenues back to each state for highway improvement. The Canadian federal government returns only 4% to the provinces.

Maybe the Minister of Transport does not realize that Canada's highways are in deplorable condition and as a result we are losing more and more transportation business to the U.S.

● (1455)

If the minister is only returning 4% of the fuel tax revenues to the provinces, what is he doing with the other 96%?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, we receive funding from a number of sources and we invest it. More than likely the answer to the hon. member's question is that we put it into health care.

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will let that one go. It will cost an estimated \$17 billion to upgrade Canada's highways. My province of British Columbia alone needs almost \$3 billion.

Oral Questions

That is five times more than the \$600 million Ottawa has offered to fix the entire Canadian highway system.

Western premiers want Ottawa to set up a national highway program that will return the fuel tax money it takes from the provinces. When will the Minister of Transport return a significant share of fuel taxes back to the provinces?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that under the government we have now embarked upon our third infrastructure program. Under the leadership of the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Transport we are investing very heavily, and will continue to do so, in our highway transportation system.

* * *

[Translation]

GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, recently, Unibroue thought it had federal government certification that its products were GMO free.

Now we learn that the government is refusing to give Unibroue this certification, which it needs to export to Europe, because no GMO labelling policy exists in Canada.

Will the government not admit, in the light of this example, that businesses need a labelling policy, because Europeans, just like Quebecers, want to know what they are eating and drinking?

[English]

Mr. Larry McCormick (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency does not certify food products as GM free. Companies can label their products, but they do not get this support from the CFIA. Unibroue has misinterpreted this and we have asked it to take the decertification off its website.

In Canada companies are free to do this but, as the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food has often said, labelling must be meaningful to consumers, enforceable and credible under all circumstances.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Shawn Murphy (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. Recently we have been reading more and more articles in the media concerning high levels of sulphur in fuels, air pollution and health problems that result from these high levels.

On this issue could the minister tell the House what actions are being taken to deal with the issue of high sulphur levels in fuels in Canada?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the announcement I made earlier this year covers gasoline, diesel and fuel oils outside road fuels. It will reduce the amount of sulphur in gasoline from its average now of 360 parts per million to 30 parts per million. In on road diesel, the figure will go from 500 parts per million to 15. The dates for this are the end of 2004 for gasoline and June 1, 2006, for diesel.

* * *

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the justice minister has not been able to convince her cabinet colleagues that Bill C-15 needs to be passed before the summer recess. Consequently she will now be forced to proclaim yet another amnesty for the owners of more than half a million legally owned and registered handguns that the government banned six years ago with Bill C-68. This is the fourth amnesty since December 1998.

Her own actions and the Bill C-15 amendments prove that these firearms are not dangerous at all when in the hands of law abiding, responsible owners. Instead of proclaiming amnesty after amnesty why does she not admit they were wrong to ban these registered firearms in the first place?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have only two things to say. First, in relation to Bill C-15, why does the opposition not stop playing politics and pass the amendments to the criminal code?

Second, I would ask the hon. member why he does not join the vast majority of Canadians and support our gun control regulations.

* * *

[Translation]

FREE TRADE AREA OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, over three months ago, the Minister for International Trade told this House that he hoped the basic texts used in the negotiations on the free trade area of the Americas would be made public.

Upon his return from Buenos Aires, close to two months ago, he announced triumphantly that he had obtained the authorization of the other ministers to release the texts. We are still waiting for the basic texts to be made public.

Routine Proceedings

• (1500)

My question to the Minister for International Trade is simple: When will the texts be made public? The minister must realize that we want these texts before the deadline for negotiations.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Joliette for giving us another opportunity to stress the extraordinary contribution of Canadian diplomacy to promote transparency in the process on the free trade area of the Americas. Indeed, this was a major success for Canada.

We must now have the texts in the four languages. Canada has provided the French version of these documents. The Portuguese version should be ready. We should have the texts in the next few days, or relatively soon.

This is a major success for Canadian diplomacy and for transparency in international trade negotiations.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, by splitting Bill C-15 and removing the very controversial animal cruelty and firearms provisions much good would flow. Children would be given greater protection from demented Internet stalkers. We could have some tough new provisions introduced through the criminal code.

Why has the justice minister dug in her heels and refused to allow quick passage of very positive criminal code amendments? Clearly Canadians know who is playing politics here. It is the very stubborn minister of justice.

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is right. Canadians do know who is playing politics, and that is all the opposition parties over there.

We have made it absolutely plain that Bill C-15 deals with nothing more than amendments to the criminal code. Many of these amendments to the criminal code were in fact introduced before the last election.

There is no excuse for all those learned men and women on that side of the House not to work with us to move the bill forward quickly.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

[English]

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-28, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and the Salaries Act.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-368, an act to amend the Criminal Code.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this enactment is to allow municipalities that wish to do so to license establishments of places of business where prostitutes may legally perform their trade.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

• (1505)

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-369, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (donations to food banks).

He said: Mr. Speaker, this enactment would permit a donation to food banks of food to be treated as a charitable gift, notwithstanding that the value of the food has already been deducted as a business expense of the donor.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

CANADIAN CHILD RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-370, an act respecting the rights of children.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this enactment is to recognize in law the basic rights of the child enumerated in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child that are not already covered by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

CANADIAN BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-371, an act to amend the Canadian Bill of Rights (right to housing).

He said: Mr. Speaker, this enactment would amend the Canadian Bill of Rights to include the right to proper housing at a reasonable cost and free of unreasonable barriers.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS ACT

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-372, an act to provide for the harmonization of environmental standards throughout Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this enactment is to establish a process of consultation with the provinces to establish uniformity in the environmental standards applied in Canada and in every province.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since each member is very lucky to have one bill ever drawn, is there not some rule that prevents this member from having 400 private members' bills, all which will never see the light of day?

The Speaker: I do not know anything about the light of day or the light of the night, but I tell the hon. member that there is no limit on the number of bills that an hon. member can introduce in the House.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to seek unanimous consent to propose the following motion:

That the bill entitled, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and the Salaries Act, shall be disposed of as follows:

Business of the House

1. The House shall proceed for the second reading stage of the said bill immediately after oral questions on Tuesday, June 5, and, during this stage, no member shall speak for more than 10 minutes, and that no later than 15 minutes prior to the conclusion of government orders on that day all questions necessary for the disposal of the second reading stage shall be put and any division necessary to dispose of the reading shall be taken forthwith;

2. That immediately after routine proceedings on Wednesday, June 6, the bill shall be referred to a committee of the whole House, provided that, (a) any member may table an amendment which, if in order, the Chair shall put at the appropriate time, (b) after no more than one hour of consideration by the said committee on clause 1, the committee shall proceed to subsequent clauses, which shall be subject to debate and amendment, (c) any divisions requested in the committee shall be deferred until the end of the committee's consideration of the bill and (d) no later than 15 minutes prior to the ordinary time of adjournment, all necessary questions to dispose of the committee stage and the report stage of the bill shall be put and any division necessary be taken forthwith; and

3. That after oral questions on Thursday, June 7, the House shall immediately proceed to third reading stage of the said bill, during which no member shall speak for more than 10 minutes, and that no later than 15 minutes prior to the conclusion of government orders on that day all questions necessary for the disposal of the third reading stage shall be put and any division necessary to dispose of the reading shall be taken forthwith.

● (1510)

In other words, the vote shall be taken Thursday afternoon at the end of government orders.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 56.1(1)(a), I move:

That the bill entitled, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and the Salaries Act, shall be disposed of as follows:

1. The House shall proceed to the second reading stage of the said bill immediately after oral questions on Tuesday, June 5, and, during this stage, no member shall speak for more than 10 minutes, and that no later than 15 minutes prior to the conclusion of government orders on that day all questions necessary for the disposal of the second reading stage shall be put and any division necessary to dispose of the reading shall be taken forthwith;

2. That immediately after routine proceedings on Wednesday, June 6, the bill shall be referred to a committee of the whole House, provided that, (a) any Member may table

Routine Proceedings

an amendment which, if in order, the Chair shall put at the appropriate time, (b) after no more than one hour of consideration by the said committee on clause 1, the committee shall proceed to subsequent clauses, which shall be subject to debate and amendment, (c) any divisions requested in the committee shall be deferred until the end of the committee's consideration of the bill and (d) no later than 15 minutes prior to the ordinary time of adjournment, all necessary questions to dispose of the committee stage and the report stage of the bill shall be put and any divisions necessary be taken forthwith; and

3. That after oral questions on Thursday, June 7, the House shall immediately proceed to third reading stage of the said bill, during which no member shall speak for more than 10 minutes, and that no later than 15 minutes prior to the conclusion of government orders on that day all questions necessary for the disposal of the third reading stage shall be put and any division necessary to dispose of the reading shall be taken forthwith.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Will those members who object to the motion please rise in their places?

And fewer than 25 members having risen:

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

● (1515)

PETITIONS

VIA RAIL

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present another petition from people in the Peterborough area who would like to see VIA Rail service re-established between Peterborough and Toronto.

The petition aims at improving the environment by reducing greenhouse emissions and accidents on the highways. It is hoped to strengthen Peterborough as a business, educational and tourism centre. It has support all along the route in federal ridings like Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Durham, Whitby—Ajax, Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, Markham, Scarborough—Rouge River, Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington.

I am pleased to say that the petition has already resulted in a constructive meeting between the Minister of Transport and citizens of the Peterborough area.

IRAQ

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition from citizens in Peterborough who are concerned about the continuation of sanctions in Iraq. This is an issue of great interest in Peterborough. It has resulted in a weekly vigil at my office among people including people who are of Iraqi origin, now Canadians, and people who visited Iraq. They are concerned about the condition of poor people in Iraq, particularly the children.

The petitioners call upon parliament to accept the recommendation of the foreign affairs committee for the lifting of sanctions and the establishment of a diplomatic presence in Baghdad. They call for serious peace negotiations and they urge that Canada persuade the UN committee to quickly approve funds for the rebuilding of water, electric power and all production infrastructure. They ask that the compensation fund taken from the oil for food program be suspended.

CANADIAN COAST GUARD

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition from residents in my riding and elsewhere who draw to the attention of the House their displeasure with the government for disbanding the coast guard dive team which operated out of Richmond, British Columbia.

The removal of the dive team causes the public to be put at risk. The fact that the coast guard dive team was disbanded may have contributed to the death of Paul Sandhu. The petitioners believe that more lives could be lost if the dive team remains disbanded. They call on the government to reinstate the dive team.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am presenting a petition signed by approximately 200 residents of my riding. They know that approximately 3,500 to 4,000 Canadians die each year by suicide and they are calling on parliament to pass legislation that would create a national suicide prevention strategy.

HEALTH CARE

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present yet another petition from Canadians concerned about the state of our health care system, the inaction of the government to stop the trend and the move toward two tier health care.

The citizens who have signed the petition are concerned about the shortage of nurses, the backlog in emergency rooms and the lack of access to necessary medical treatment. They call on the government to take immediate action to save public health care in Canada and to stop two tier American style health care from coming to Canada.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the following petition to the House of Commons.

The petitioners draw the attention of the House to the fact that Great Gulf Homes Inc. is in the process of destroying a priceless wetland habitat on the Mimico marsh in Brampton, thus endangering birds, trees and wetland species.

The petitioners call upon parliament to lead the provincial and municipal governments in the preservation and restoration of the wetland site by co-ordinating public and social processes to turn over the lands to the public trust.

• (1520)

POISON CONTROL

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions on behalf of the constituents of Battlefords—Lloydminster.

The first one calls for a reinstatement of the strychnine levels of poisoning that we used to use on our gophers. It is an epidemic this year, with the drought as well. They are growing faster than we can control them. With the new stuff they are giving us we actually think it makes them a little more virile rather than causing them any sort of problem.

ABORTION

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in my second petition hundreds of my constituents are calling for a defunding of public spending on abortions.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-11, an act respecting immigration to Canada and the granting of refugee protection to persons who are displaced, persecuted or in danger, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 3.

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, before question period I was debating the three important motions in Group No. 3 at report stage of Bill C-11.

The situation with respect to immigration in Canada is very serious. About 200,000 people, according to different reports, are illegally staying in Canada. According to the auditor general,

Government Orders

15,000 people are named in deportation warrants and they are missing. Also, 60% of visitors who apply for refugee status in Canada arrive at Canadian ports without any kind of documentation.

Canadian borders are like sieves. We do not have exit control. CIC cannot track those who are missing or are staying illegally in Canada. The situation is very serious.

Since this is the last group of motions in amendment at report stage of Bill C-11 we are missing the opportunity to debate many worthwhile amendments, many of which were put forward by the chief critic for the Canadian Alliance, the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River. The amendments related to consultation by CIC with the provinces, municipalities and other NGOs. They were related to family reunification and one dealt with once in a lifetime sponsorship by a Canadian citizen of related family members.

There were also amendments related to foreign academic degrees, to refugees, the discriminatory head tax, the appeal process and various aspects of the refugee process. The whole appeal process is just like the layers of an onion. We can keep on peeling it. We need to streamline the appeal process. Since the government has not been particularly interested in stressing the appeal process it could only be done through amendment, and the amendments were not accepted.

Other amendments would have fixed the outdated 40 year old health standards in Canada. The standards are so old and incomprehensible that we need to fix them. Those amendments were not accepted.

There were amendments related to improving communication among CIC, CSIS, RCMP, the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Department of International Trade and various NGOs involved in immigration work. There is no communication. The minister believes that she knows better or more than expert advisers from various organizations like CSIS. That is probably the reason the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Cooperation attended the Tamil tiger fundraising.

• (1525)

In a nutshell the amendments were related to training and staffing requirements, security risks, human smuggling, organized crime, fraud, bribes, the operations of overseas officers and patronage appointments. All these amendments—

The Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but he has had a generous allotment of time. I know the Chair has been quite lenient. I am afraid his time has expired.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is an important group of amendments at report stage of Bill C-11. They pertain specifically to the parts of the bill dealing with refugees and refugee sponsorships.

Government Orders

We spent a considerable amount of time on this section in committee. We heard from many Canadians who work directly in the field of refugee sponsorship and helping displaced persons. They ensure that Canada, as has been the case in the past, is a place of refuge, a place of safety for people confronted with political, economic or social persecution and conditions that are unacceptable from the point of view of any notion of being a civilized society.

Our main focus in this section was to try to ensure that Canada continued to be a place of refuge and respectful of our humanitarian and compassionate consideration of such cases around the globe. There was some progress. The bill took into account some of the concerns of organizations involved in refugee sponsorship and moved from Bill C-31 to Bill C-11 with some significant changes.

I also know that during the course of committee hearings the government heard further concerns and made a few changes. However there are some significant areas of concern that remain and need to be addressed.

The amendments before the House today attempt to do that. We tried to do our part at committee with dozens of amendments pertaining to refugee sponsorship and refugee protection that were not adopted by the government and regretfully were disregarded.

Our fundamental concern is that Canada should use this opportunity to ensure that we are fully in compliance with international conventions pertaining to refugees and torture.

The committee heard from numerous groups that are very expert and knowledgeable in this field. They told us that Canada through the bill is still not fully compliant with our international obligations.

It is a terrible shame that in 2001, at this opportune moment when we have a window to overhaul our immigration and refugee act, we are not taking advantage of this opportunity. Something with which we will have to deal over the next number of years and will remain a challenge is how we convince the government of the day to actually take these obligations seriously and act on them.

It was clearly stated to us by numerous organizations that Canada is not doing its part. The chair of the committee rose in the House today to speak about Canada's work on the international front and our role in terms of refugee protection and suggested that Canada was one of four countries that is outstanding in this regard.

First, I want to say that is not enough. Second, that account of the situation does not fully consider the advice and information we received from many groups. We were told quite clearly that we remain negligent in our duties as the Parliament of Canada and have not fully acted on the requirements.

We made some suggestions that we addressed this morning and afternoon such as the right of a refugee to make a second claim regardless of whether there were new circumstances or new information.

• (1530)

Despite what we have heard today, the amendments we proposed to allow second claims were not adopted and the advice was not considered. That continues to constitute a serious burden on some refugees and has a disproportionate impact on women in particular.

On that point, we were successful in convincing the government to agree with our amendment to conduct a gender analysis of the bill within two years of the proclamation of the act. That offers us some consolation and sense of fulfilment to know that at some point the government will do what it ought to have done leading up to the introduction of this bill, and that is a gender analysis. It is something the government promised would be done with respect to every bill introduced in the House. It promised there would always be a gender analysis and that it would always take into account the disproportionate impact of any law, program or policy on women.

It is clear from the advice we received during the hearings that the government did not do a thorough gender analysis of Bill C-11. Women continue to face a disproportionate impact as a result of many provisions of the bill.

One of those provisions has to do with the ability to make another claim after being turned down, regardless of whether there are new circumstances. Women are often not in a position to tell their whole story. The trauma they have experienced cannot necessarily be communicated to their families for risk of losing the family. They often cannot tell their whole story for cultural reasons. They must sometimes live in silence after a terrible and traumatic incident, with no recourse and no way of getting the attention of officials to ensure that their situation and the status of their family is recognized and that they are able to find refuge in Canada.

It was clear to us from the outset that, especially in the case of women, there had to be an opportunity to make a second claim. There had to be a way for women to tell their stories when it was appropriate and when provisions were made for keeping their stories as private as possible. We have not addressed that situation.

The government says it has made changes that make it a bit better. Yes, there are a few things that make it a bit better. However by and large we have not allowed for a genuine process whereby refugees who cannot tell their whole story or who must relive an ordeal are able to seek the attention of officials and get refugee status in Canada.

To help refugees make their stay in Canada a productive one, it is clear to us that the government must do more in terms of

Government Orders

sponsoring and assisting groups that care for and nurture refugee families who come to Canada. There is an enormous number of groups here which give all their volunteer time, energies and resources to sponsoring refugees and refugee families from all over the world.

In my constituency one that comes to mind is the North End Sponsorship Team, otherwise known as NEST, a group that has devoted the last 15 years to sponsoring some 60 refugees and refugee families from four different continents. This organization, made up of the Lutheran and United churches, is prepared to take on high risk cases and refugees with large families. It is prepared to do the work that other groups are not always prepared to do, and its efforts need to be recognized and supported.

In a province like Manitoba, were it not for the work of the church community, private sponsorships and the provincial nominee program of the provincial government, there would be no increase in immigrants and refugees coming to our province.

• (1535)

That indicates the failure of federal government policy and this legislation to ensure we are able to continually attract newcomers to every part of the country and to compete internationally in attracting immigrants.

If we begin by addressing the fundamental issues of refugee status, the right to make a second claim, adequate documents and compliance with international covenants and agreements on refugees and torture, we will have done a great service. Unfortunately that is not the case as the bill stands.

I plead with members on all sides of the House, but mainly with government members who have failed to get the message, to act as soon as possible to address these concerns.

[*Translation*]

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Winnipeg Centre, who is the NDP immigration critic.

Now it is my turn to give my party's position at report stage of Bill C-11, on Group No. 3, which includes Motions Nos. 9, 10 and 12.

[*English*]

It is a point of fact that the country is not a big Lethbridge, a big Baie-Comeau, a big Hampton, New Brunswick, or even a big Winnipeg. It is a multicultural, pluralistic society that we have been able to build together and garner collectively as one of the most fabulous places to live. The country we have been able to build reflects values that all Canadians share quite dearly.

We are a country that relies heavily on immigration, values human rights and is one of four principal countries that receives convention refugees. The bill does not reflect the objectives or values that Canadians share with respect to immigration.

We have heard Liberal government members give testimony before Canadians across the country about alterations that were required with respect to this flawed bill. However when it came to the clause by clause stage we were only able to garner modest augmentations to the bill instead of making it a pioneering piece of legislation of which we could be proud.

As a lawyer I know that the House has probably heard that the Canadian Bar Association has difficulty with a number of issues with respect to the legislation. It is not only the Canadian Bar Association. Liberal colleagues, along with all four opposition parties, have a problem with the bill as well.

The party of Pearson, Trudeau and Wilfrid Laurier now seems to be the most reticent to protect the rights of refugees and immigrants. I will quote from the immigration committee chair, the hon. member for London North Centre, when he stated "It is lucky that I do not have to vote". Referring to the opposition, he said "When they start sounding more Liberal than we do, I get concerned".

The chair had a very open approach at the committee level. He was very encouraging with respect to opposition members and we were able to earn some improvements. However it is not a pioneering bill. That is why it is being panned in urban Canada in particular, which for the most part has been the great reservoir for new Canadians. That is a fact. That is what we must live with when we pass a bill that is not pioneering.

• (1540)

I will speak to a couple of the amendments before us that would augment that aspect. The Progressive Conservative Party will support the Bloc motion de mon cher collègue de Laval Centre which reads:

The Minister shall assume the social and medical costs of refugee claimants at the ninetieth day after the day of the claim and until a decision is made in respect of that claim.

The motion says that refugee claimants whose claims have not been processed would have social and medical coverage while they await a decision.

Essentially the amendment by the hon. member for Laval Centre advocates that we not let these people live in limbo in perpetuity. We must address the issue, particularly when there are children and vulnerable populations involved or if someone is sick and a potential refugee. It is a very noble gesture that my colleague in the Bloc has put forward.

I will skip to the 12th motion, also put forward by the Bloc. By adding the word maximum, the motion would clarify the imprison-

Government Orders

ment threshold for the potential removal of a permanent resident. Some may call this a housekeeping issue but it would give us an opportunity to raise the fact that the government is stripping the appeal rights of permanent residents which, as I said before, is un-Liberal, un-Canadian and draconian. Other individuals have used that terminology before I did as a member of the Progressive Conservative Party.

There are two other motions in this group to which I will refer, in particular Motion No. 10. I thank my friend and colleague from Winnipeg, the NDP critic on immigration. I also pay tribute to the member for Winnipeg South Centre who was the catalyst for us to improve the second appeal issue.

Members know as I do that the protection of refugee rights is the protection of human rights. If we get it wrong people could die. If we get it wrong people could be persecuted or face injury. That is why it is imperative that we get it right.

Approximately 25% of appeals granted to refugees are approved. That is because we do not get it right the first time. There is a massive envelope that we miss the first time around. Although different, it is the same issue. We want to add an amendment which members on both sides of the House supported. We got almost a semi-compromise amendment from the member for Winnipeg South Centre who helped the NDP critic, the Bloc critic and myself. I am quite sure the critic for the Canadian Alliance was on board for the motion as well.

We are not saying that we would have a new claim for all refugees on a second appeal. It would only be if the relevant circumstances of the claimant had changed since the previous determination or if specific circumstances had prevented part of the evidence from being presented during a previous determination.

That is the issue. Let us suppose a person comes to Canada and is granted refugee status because his or her country of origin is at war. The person goes home and, a few years later, because of the country's volatility, the situation changes. Under existing legislation that person would not have the right to a second claim in his or her lifetime. That is a fact. That is what is wrong and that is what we are trying to fix.

• (1545)

I will try to dovetail the remarks of my NDP colleague who had the advantage of going before me. This amendment is very anti-woman as well. In this circumstance it could be possible that there would be reasons for women who had been persecuted or sexually assaulted not wanting to bring forth that evidence on their first appeal. Only later would that information come to fruition. That is an example where the evidence was not deduced at that time. That person should have the right to a second appeal as well.

Bill C-11 could have been a good bill. It is framework legislation that we got wrong. We are not protecting refugees from persecution and possible death and injury. That is why the Progressive

Conservative Party will not be supporting it, however, I ask all members to support that motion in particular.

Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am happy to see the government is doing broad based consultations on various immigrant issues. I invite the federal government in the course of these consultations to discuss with the provinces the issue of expansion of family class to include brothers and sisters.

Second, with regard to the recognition and accreditation of an immigrant's professional degree, this issue falls under provincial jurisdiction. This is why I encourage the provinces to come together and create a national standard, making the degree recognition standard across the country. Only with a national standard on degree accreditation can skilled and hardworking immigrants be attracted to Canada and succeed.

Finally, in regard to sponsorship relationships that fall apart as a result of divorce, there are many cases and circumstances when a couple's marriage ends in divorce because of abuse of false immigration conditions. I encourage the government to ensure that Bill C-11 has conditions to protect the vulnerable, and encourage those individuals who find themselves in this type of situation to automatically report the matter to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration so that a proper investigation can be launched immediately.

The government eliminated the landing fee on refugees. I ask the government to consider eliminating the landing fee on all new immigrants.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am glad to add our remarks to this set of amendments regarding Bill C-11. I understand that these amendments deal specifically with refugee issues.

I am happy to take part in this debate for the simple reason that my riding of Winnipeg Centre is the part of Winnipeg where most people who are deemed as refugees or most newcomers seem to settle. The core area or downtown area of Winnipeg seems to be the place where they can find affordable housing and access to reasonable settlement services that help them get their start in Canada.

I am proud Canada plays an active role around the world in providing safe refuge to those who seek sanctuary, whether they have to flee religious persecution, political persecution or whatever their reason may be. There is a certain spirit of generosity I believe that most Canadians share in reaching out to those who need the safe sanctuary of Canada. Other speakers have mentioned groups that are playing a particularly active role which enables these people to leave their troubled homelands and to come to Canada.

● (1550)

Certainly there are church groups within my riding that work day and night to try to sponsor refugees and refugee families. They do fundraising, but their activism does not stop in terms of financial contributions. They also do a lot of follow through. They actually stay with the refugee or refugee family to help them to break into mainstream Canadian culture, to get them over the hurdles and barriers which exist when newcomers come to Canada, to help them find work and get fully integrated. Some of the church groups in Winnipeg do a wonderful job.

I want to make special mention of an organization. It is the Manitoba Interfaith Immigration Council found on Edmonton Street in my riding. I work closely with this organization because it is charged with the responsibility of administering the settlement services that are offered to refugees in Winnipeg. I cannot say enough about the dedication of these individuals. The people there work in conditions that we would all find very taxing. It is an under-resourced organization. I believe it does an awful lot with very little. Its budget has been cut back in recent years in terms of stable core funding, of which we have been very critical.

We believe that we are getting incredibly good value for our dollar by adequate funding to organizations like this because they do so much to alleviate the load from the department officials who would otherwise have to deliver and administer these settlement services. I would speak very forcefully of the restoration of levels of funding to organizations like the Manitoba Interfaith Immigration Council.

They were very vocal and active through Bill C-31 and Bill C-11 in pointing out some of the shortcomings of those bills or putting forth very solid recommendations on how these bills could be improved, not just in the refugee area, but also in areas of family sponsorship.

Even though I know we are on the subject of refugees right now, I want to make a point that I did not get a chance to make under earlier motions. Using the low income cutoff for family sponsorship is fundamentally wrong. It is a flawed way of putting a line in the sand. It does not do the city of Winnipeg any service because large cities like it are lumped into the same category. In other words, if people want to sponsor one of their family members, they have to be at a certain level of family income to undertake that sponsorship.

The family income arrived at is the same in Winnipeg as it is in Toronto, Vancouver or other major cities. I could demonstrate quite easily that the cost of living is a great deal lower in the city of Winnipeg. The cost of housing is about one-quarter of what it is in the city of Toronto. We should not be held to the same standard when it comes to the reunification of families or the sponsorship of families.

Government Orders

Some might think that failed sponsorships put some sort of burden on municipalities in terms of social welfare costs. I can provide some figures from the Manitoba Immigration Interfaith Council. Out of 13,700 welfare claimants in the city of Winnipeg, only 11 of those were actually the result of failed family sponsorships in immigrations. Eleven out of 13,000 is not an undue burden on our city. Those who think that could come about are simply not working with the actual facts.

Another group that has been very active in the advocacy for refugees is of course the Canadian Council for Refugees. They came before the committee for Bill C-31 and again for Bill C-11 with some very thoughtful recommendations on how the bill could be more fair in its treatment of the refugee determination and admissibility of permanent residents. I would encourage government to revisit the brief from the Canadian Council for Refugees. I do not think there is a single organization in this country that is as authoritative on this issue or has worked as diligently to try and develop standards for managing the refugee influx into this country.

● (1555)

It was one of the council's recommendations that brought in the whole subject of gender analysis and how necessary it was that we use that screen for any legislation introduced by parliament. I am very glad the member for Winnipeg North Centre managed to convince the committee that we needed to undertake a comprehensive gender analysis in legislation of this type.

An example which was pointed out was the need to allow women a second hearing in terms of being turned down as a refugee. Sometimes the circumstances that qualify them as a refugee are not easy for them to make public. In the initial application some information may be held back for any number of cultural reasons or personal safety reasons. If this information needs to be heard or needs to be introduced, it would have to be introduced at a second refugee hearing. That is being contemplated now through the hard work of those of the committee.

I want to thank the Canadian Council for Refugees for being the one to really push that issue and the members of the committee for seeing fit to make that one of the priorities.

Another gender issue I would like to point out also has to do with the family reunification. As we do this comprehensive gender analysis I hope this comes forward. In terms of sponsoring other family members women are disadvantaged in that regard as well. Given that there is this income threshold by virtue of which a person is allowed to sponsor or not sponsor another family member, given that women earn only 66% of what men do on average across the country, women or households led by women are less able to sponsor family members than households where the male is the bread winner.

Government Orders

I would suggest this is another amendment that needs to be introduced in the interests of fairness. In the interest of people's chartered rights, this issue needs to be addressed. I would hope the gender analysis that is undertaken is sensitive to that issue now that we have put it on the record.

Another organization that has been influential in advocating on behalf of refugees is the Maytree Foundation in Toronto. The organization has put forward some of the best prepared material on the subject. It was satisfied that there was some recognition of the issues it raised.

The foundation advises that that Bill C-11 includes some positive, but also some negative measures relating to refugee protection in Canada. It speaks to the issue of identity documents. There are times when personal documentation is extremely difficult to access when people flee their homeland under persecution, often in the dead of night. There are places in the world that if refugees need the documents we demand they have to make application for those documents. Then they become flight suspects. When prospective refugees make application to get their marriage licence or birth certificate from the city hall or agency, the spotlight shines on them and they may in fact not be able to get them.

I am honoured to raise the names of the organizations of the Manitoba Interfaith Immigration Council in Winnipeg, the Maytree Foundation, the Canadian Council for Refugees, and the contributions they have made.

An hon. member: Here comes trouble.

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): There is not trouble, Madam Speaker, contrary to what the opposition might think.

An hon. member: There is going to be, though.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: There might be. One never knows.

I want to address the issue around refugees, which my hon. friend recently talked about.

One change to Bill C-11 that is really important from the standpoint of refugees is the one year window of opportunity that they will have to sponsor family once they have been accepted as a convention refugee.

• (1600)

That opportunity has not existed in the past. This is contrary to some of the media articles, notably the one by Diane Francis, whom my colleague from Scarborough East greatly admires, in which she stated that all the people who come here as refugees cheat the system and go on welfare, which is what my friend from Winnipeg was saying. The article creates the image that these people are a burden on the taxpayer, whether it be at the municipal

or federal levels. I agree that statistics will be available to show that is simply not true. It is an image put forward by some of the more extreme right wingers, both in political circles and in the media, which is most unfortunate.

The fact is that the vast majority of people who come here and apply for refugee status are people who have some stress in their lives. They are either fleeing persecution, torture or possible death. Many of them come from very unstable countries with a military presence.

There will of course be people who try to abuse the system and that is one of the things we are trying to address with the changes in Bill C-11. However for people to suggest that all refugees are in that category is profoundly unfair and it creates a stereotype that is not true.

I have travelled with the immigration minister to our ports overseas to visit with immigration staff and to go to refugee camps. Unfortunately the member from the official opposition has declined to attend, for whatever reason. It is an educational experience to see the situations in Africa, Moscow and other parts of the world where there are terrible economic problems.

One example that will probably stay with me the rest of my life is when I was in Nairobi, Kenya. I sat in on interviews with people who were applying to come to Canada. Through a translator, one woman told a story of how she and her husband were dragged out of their bed in the middle of the night to the front yard where her husband was shot and killed. Her teenage son ran to help his father and he was also shot and killed. A third boy came out and he was put in the back of a truck. She was thrown into the truck and then put in prison for two months where she was gang raped every day by seven guards. To this day she has yet to see the son who was taken away. She does not know if he is alive or dead, being tortured, in a work camp or perhaps sold into slavery. She has no way of finding out what happened to him. While this woman was being tortured and raped in prison for two months, her three children, who were under the age of 10, were left to fend for themselves.

This is a reality that many of these people are facing. As Canadians, we need to understand the terrible suffering and brutality that is going on in the world. As Canadians, we need to find a way to open our doors to these people so we can help them.

This woman was applying for refugee status in Canada. I will never forget the moment when the immigration officer asked the woman's 11 year old daughter what she wanted to be when she grew up. Through an interpreter, she said that she wanted to be an airline pilot. The closest these people would be to an airplane would be 10,000 feet as it passed over them while they were wandering in the desert.

• (1605)

If that young 11 year old girl could arrive in Canada, go to school and have the opportunity for a life, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that she may one day be flying MPs between Toronto and Ottawa on a regular basis. Who knows? It is not beyond the realm of possibility because this is Canada and that is what the bill is about.

The bill is about opening up our doors to people throughout the world who need the compassion, the opportunity, the caring and the help that we as Canadians can provide.

My old friend, Johnny Barker of the United Steelworkers in Sault Ste. Marie, used to say "Don't let your bleeding heart run away with your bloody head". The point of that is, of course we have these terrible problems throughout the world but does that mean that we should just let our hearts bleed or should we put in place some realistic, achievable goals for trying to help the world's refugee population? If we can once and for all close the back door to the illegals who do abuse our system and our generosity, then we will be able to open the door to people like the lady I met in Nairobi and her daughters.

What I find particularly troubling is that so much of the focus of the debate around Bill C-11, not from the speaker just before me but from the critics for the other parties, is why we are taking away appeal rights for convicted criminals. It is difficult to understand why we are worried about people who have been convicted of a crime that comes with a 10 year sentence and who receive at least two years of actual sentence time as a result of that conviction. They have a right to appeal that through the criminal justice system, to have that appeal turned down, to spend two years in jail and then we have the opportunity as a country to deport these people. There was anguish in committee. Members opposite said that it was awful to treat people like that?

We are not talking about refugees. We are talking about people who are landed immigrants in this country, not Canadian citizens, who commit a serious crime.

Madam Speaker, as a lawyer you would know that to get a two year sentence in this country one has to do something pretty serious in the criminal justice system. We are not talking about minor felons here, we are talking about serious problems.

Why the opposition continues to foster the idea that somehow we should provide greater rights and protection for convicted criminals or potential terrorists in this country is truly mind-boggling. It has been an enormous exercise in frustration to listen to the members opposite put forward that kind of argument. I can only think that they do it because they are opposing for the sake of opposing instead of realizing that the aims in Bill C-11 and the aims of the minister are to deal strongly and forcefully with people

Government Orders

who would abuse our system, commit crimes and do things against our society. We can deport them and once and for all not allow them to re-offend.

The bill would bring integrity to the immigration and refugee system in the country. I hope members opposite will see fit to support it.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to the group of motions which would amend the refugee portion of the new immigration bill.

• (1610)

I have to say that I agree a lot with what the member from the governing party said earlier. However one thing I have found is that what the government says and what is in its legislation is often completely different, and that is the case with the legislation today.

I think everyone would agree that what Canada wants to do with our immigration and refugee system is to make the immigration system work better than it does now for people who we want to attract to this country. Our system has failed miserably in that regard and the changes in the legislation will not fix that up.

I think most Canadians would agree that, when it comes to the refugee system, changes need to be made that would not only allow genuine refugees to be accepted in this country but that we would be able to offer refuge to genuine refugees in other parts of the world living in camps, sometimes for years and years, and those who are identified by the United Nations as genuine refugees.

The system we have now will not do that and the new legislation will not fix it. A very high percentage of people who have been accepted as refugees right now are not in fact refugees by the United Nations' definition or by this government's own definition which is broader than the United Nations' definition.

Canadians also want a much faster process in terms of reuniting families. When someone has been accepted to this country as a refugee or through the independent immigrant stream and they have dependants, a spouse, parents or grandparents, when they want to reunite their families our system fails miserably in a number of cases. Every member of parliament knows about that because we have cases in our offices.

In the case of a family reunification, which one would think would take less than a year certainly, sometimes it is three to four years later and the accepted refugee is still trying to be reunited with family members. That is not what Canadians want. I suggest that there are not many in the House who would support anything much different. I think that is widely supported by members from all political parties.

Here we are today at report stage of Bill C-11 talking about the changes to the refugee system. What is in the bill now before these

Government Orders

amendments certainly will make our refugee system work better in terms of accepting genuine refugees and keeping out those who are not genuine refugees. The system that is meant to work for those who are not genuine refugees is in the other part of the bill dealing with immigration.

The amendments, quite frankly, will not improve the bill enough to make it good legislation, although some would certainly help in that regard. It is pretty sad, after talking about this new bill, that it is the government's second or third attempt at it. It has been years now since the government brought forth its first effort to reform the Immigration Act. The legislation, which I will speak to tomorrow in a more general way, or whenever it comes back to the House for third reading, will not fix the immigration system.

I would like to say as well that the auditor general made something very clear in his last report and in the report 10 years ago when he said that even if the legislation were fixed to make it a good act that it would not solve the problems this government has in immigration. It would not fix it because many of the problems are in administration and this act would not change that administration.

• (1615)

That is the other thing I think Canadians should not forget. Even if this were a good piece of legislation that would bring forth a brand new act, even if that were the case, which it is not for the reasons I have outlined already, it still would not fix the problems in our immigration and refugee system because administration is a big part of the problem and this would do nothing to help improve administration.

Here we are after all these years, about four years since the government first brought forth the legislation, and the government's own member, the speaker before me, is standing and explaining what he wants from the piece of legislation. He knows in his heart that the bill clearly does not give what he wants in a new immigration act.

Here we are, all these years later, facing a situation where, if this legislation is to pass, which I hope it does not, we will be stuck with an immigration act that will not work for Canadians. It will not work for genuine refugees. It will not work for people who we desperately need in this country and who come through the independent categories. It will not work for family reunification in cases where we are genuinely talking about family reunification.

What has this four years done? What good has it brought? What would the new act do to help Canadians? In certain narrow areas it would make things better. In a broad way it would make things worse. While some of the amendments in this grouping would help if they were passed, we know that the government will pass only what it wants. We know that because that is the way things work around here. Should it pass—it has failed before—we will end up

with a bill, after all of this, that just simply will not do what it is intended to do.

I would encourage Canadians to listen to members of the governing party when they are talking about what they want from an immigration system and to compare that to what the new act would deliver should this legislation pass. They will find the two just do not match whatsoever. What that means is that government members themselves know that this piece of legislation will not deliver what the government says it should deliver. It certainly will not deliver what the opposition says it should deliver.

I know my time is almost up so I will just leave my comments at that. I look forward to speaking on third reading whenever that may come up. I would not be at all disappointed if it never comes up.

Ms. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak very briefly on the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Fundy—Royal, Motion No. 10. I first want to thank him for his kind words about my role in committee. I also would like to recognize his tenacity in putting forward an amendment that did not pass through committee and which he feels very strongly about.

I do not think there were any members of the committee who sat through the 154 presentations from Canadians across the country who were not gripped by the stories of many who have worked and fought hard to come to this country and bring their families and their relatives to this country. I do not think there were many of us there who were not overwhelmed with admiration for the commitment, the nobility, in a sense, and the energy of those Canadians who worked on their behalf. It was admirable. It was what one would hope of one's citizens and one's neighbours as active participants in the activities of the country.

I would like to speak to the issue of Motion No. 10 in particular. The member put forward this motion in committee. The intent of the government's position is simply to prevent abuse of the system by persons who use the refugee determination system as a means of gaining access to Canada.

• (1620)

As we listened to the many who came before the committee, I do not think there was a member of the committee who was not touched by the stories, particularly of women who, when they appeared before their refugee hearings, either misinformed those present or held back information about their circumstances and their claim for refugee protection because of shame, cultural differences, historic issues or concern in terms of what it would do within their own families.

Government Orders

Accordingly the committee, in its wisdom, put forward a recommendation and an attempt to deal with this matter through the pre-removal risk assessment, in clause 113 of the bill, whereby people in these circumstances can come forward a second time to the PRRA to bring forward information that they withheld for whatever reason earlier in their refugee hearing, have it considered. It could allow them to gain access as a refugee to the country.

Therefore I think it is important to acknowledge that the issue the member is trying to address in Motion No. 10 has been addressed. He would like to bring it forward in a broader way, but to do so would simply take us back to the revolving door aspect that we dealt with regarding refugees prior to the bill coming into effect.

Before I resume my seat I would like to acknowledge that the member for Winnipeg Centre quite rightly identified his area as having large numbers of immigrants and refugees. My riding of Winnipeg South Centre has large numbers as well, perhaps not to the same extent as his riding but large numbers nonetheless. In his acknowledgement of the activities of associations in Manitoba, I did not hear the member acknowledge the activities of the Citizenship Council of Manitoba, an organization that has historically taken the lead in Manitoba and has expanded its services over the years to meet the needs of an evolving community. Without an acknowledgement of that organization, we would be shortchanging the many men and women in that community.

Again on the issue of Motion No. 10, I think the matters that the member is trying to address in this motion have in fact been addressed in clause 113. People should not be denied access to Canada as refugees because they are afraid to tell their stories.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Madam Speaker, it is once again a pleasure to rise on the grouping of three of the amendments that have been put forward on Bill C-11. I would like to again congratulate the member for Fundy—Royal, who has put his heart and soul into this piece of legislation, Bill C-11, and who has in Group No. 3 one of the amendments we are talking about today.

When the member for Mississauga West talked about his particular issues on Bill C-11, he did not quite focus on the amendments in Group No. 3. He talked about other benefits of the legislation. However, he should have been here when we talked about the first and second groupings of the amendments. He probably could have talked more passionately and certainly more knowledgeably to those amendments instead of just talking to the bill in general.

However, on Group No. 3 the member for Fundy—Royal has put forward Motion No. 10. I believe it was the member for Mississauga West who tried to get across to members of the House the importance and the urgency of being able to deal with the status of a refugee who is coming to our shores.

• (1625)

We Canadians too often take for granted what it is that we have in this great country of ours. Sometimes we do not think of the challenges this globe presents to the majority of people away from our own country. It was mentioned that in refugee camps all around this globe there are people who legitimately have fear and concern for their own safety and the safety of their children, their spouses and their families. It is those people we are focusing on in this grouping of amendments.

When people make application as refugees in this country, there are some who do so illegitimately and there are systems in place to ferret out those applications, to certainly not allow in those who are not persecuted and do not have fear for their own lives and the lives of their families in their country of origin. In some cases mistakes are made and some get through the process.

For the most part, as was mentioned by the member for Winnipeg Centre, the people who do come to our shores and apply as refugees do so legitimately. As was mentioned, there are some examples, but very few examples, of those who try to circumvent the system. That is what we are talking about here: legitimate refugees coming forward to this country, not only to attempt to get refugee status, landed status, but ultimately to get citizenship status in our country.

We talked earlier about how the majority of the refugees who come to our shores and to this country do, through the process, become contributing members to this society. These refugees do contribute, not only to our social systems but to our economic systems. In fact, we as a country depend not only on the immigration side of this piece of legislation but also on the refugee side for the people who come into this country and become Canadian citizens and exist thus far.

I would read a quote to the House. It simply says “A truly humanitarian country is judged not by how it treats the most privileged, but rather on how it protects the disadvantaged. Immigrants and refugees are among the most marginalized and the least powerful by virtue of their status and the circumstances upon which they arrived in this country”. Truer words could not be spoken.

They are the people for whom we in the House must put together a piece of legislation that will protect them. We must protect not only the immigrants who apply but also the refugees.

There are three amendments in this grouping, two from the Bloc. The first one from the Bloc, Motion No. 9, would add new clause 95.1 after clause 95, which deals with the conferral of refugee protection. This new clause states:

The Minister shall assume the social and medical costs of refugee claimants as of the ninetieth day after the day of the claim and until a decision is made in respect of that claim.

Government Orders

I said earlier that there are refugees leaving their country in circumstances that unfortunately we as Canadians cannot even relate to. They are being persecuted and their families are being persecuted. It could be a matter of life and death, so when they come to our country they do not necessarily have all the necessary papers. They do not necessarily have all the identification. They do not have all the paper trail that Canadians would normally take for granted. They do not have the birth certificate, the driver's licence, the medical insurance card. They are coming to our country with nothing except themselves and their families, looking for a place that they can call home and that they can contribute to.

When they come here, as the Bloc has identified, when they do not have all of these documents, they sometimes find themselves in limbo. It is hard to be able to find out who they are in this big, wonderful world of ours and where they are coming from. We have to see whether they have legitimate refugee status.

• (1630)

In the meantime, the Bloc has suggested that after the 90th day the department should be responsible for the social and medical needs of a refugee. That is laudable and certainly can be supported by our party. Given the opportunity to think about this logically, it would also mean that the government could say that there is now some urgency to work toward a better timeline and timeframe to ensure that these applications are dealt with in a timely fashion. Our party will be supporting Motion No. 9.

Motion No. 12, as I understand it, is a technical motion. It simply adds the word "maximum" to the clause. We will be supporting Motion No. 12.

In Group No. 3, the motion that speaks to the bill is Motion No. 10, which was put forward by the member for Fundy—Royal. There were a couple of issues with respect to Motion No. 10. The amendment would refer a claim to the refugee protection division. It would not necessarily be done in all cases but where there was a new determination.

However, there are two caveats: First, where the relevant circumstances of the claimant have changed since a previous determination, and that is very important, the claim could then be referred to the refugee protection division for a new determination; and second, where specific circumstances prevented part of the evidence from being presented during a previous determination. We have talked briefly about that.

Let us put ourselves in the position of a refugee claimant who might experience problems with language, education not quite at acceptable levels, or a fear of cultural differences, authority and bureaucrats. I do not believe there is anyone here who does not fear bureaucrats but when we put ourselves in the position of a refugee

claimant this is all very difficult to comprehend. There are a number of things that could happen. There could simply be an omission of fact from the claimant because of the circumstance itself and how he or she deals with that kind of stress and pressure.

There is also the cultural issue, especially when a husband, wife and family make an application. There may be information that any one family member may not wish to bring out and put forward to an adjudicator for any number of reasons. It could have been a circumstance that happened previously that the wife may not want the husband to know about. These things do happen. In those cases it is necessary to allow for a new determination.

The last issue which the amendment deals and which I find is only logical is the fact that right now the law says there can only be one refugee claim per lifetime. If people come to our country and are granted refugee status, we believe they should have the opportunity to go back to their own country at some point in time. If they do so and find that the circumstances have exacerbated the problems, they cannot come back to this country and make a second claim. The amendment would stop that.

I congratulate the member for Fundy—Royal for all his work on this particular file. I know we will have an opportunity to speak to that at third reading.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Madam Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to speak to this group of amendments and, in particular, to recognize the contributions, both in committee and in the House, made to advancing the support for defending the interests of refugees in Canada.

• (1635)

These individuals have escaped great strife, faced personal risk, tremendous loss, and in many cases bloodshed and some of the worst atrocities imaginable to those of us in our very safe environment in Canada. They seek refuge and the safety of a place where they can regroup, protect their families, work to develop futures in Canada or potentially at some point to return to their homelands.

I need not remind anyone in the House that what they return to is sometimes devastating. If we look at the former Yugoslavia, over half the homes were destroyed as a result of efforts at ethnic cleansing. Effectively all records such as birth records and property deeds, some of which had been held by the same families for generations, were gone. For all intents and purposes many of the refugees who come here have no other choice because they have been forced out of their homelands. They actually lose every sense of attachment to their heritage, birthplace and home country.

We need to consider some of the hardships many of these individuals endured prior to coming here when we design legisla-

tion and to ensure that we are vigilant in defending what has been a principle of Canadian immigration policy for some time: protection of legitimate refugees, recognition of their rights and support for them during such difficult times.

That is what the PC amendment proposed by my colleague from Fundy—Royal seeks to do. I find it wrong headed that a government that is so soft on many groups in society, that is so soft on crime and criminals, that balks at strengthening or proposing more effective approaches to young offenders, that refuses to pursue issues of law and order more aggressively, is also a government that seems to be disproportionately hard on legitimate refugees. It is inconsistent with the principles that have guided Canadian refugee and immigration policies for so long.

I understand why members of the House on all sides, including some members on the government's side, have significant reservations about the government's direction in this regard. We must avoid public policy reinforcing some of the stereotypes which to such a degree impede the progress and security of refugees in Canada.

It is very easy in this place when we create two tiers of rights for people to feed what would be a self-fulfilling prophecy by further hurting people who have been hurt so badly by circumstances that they did not bring upon themselves. Hands were dealt to them which have been unimaginatively bad. With some of the circumstances people have had to deal with in their home countries, to come to Canada and not have every level of protection, security and equality is offensive.

• (1640)

When we consider that many of these people are escaping some of the most egregious examples of inequality, prejudice, bloodshed and ethnic cleansing, it sets a very bad example for the government to fail to provide every level of protection, support and security in Canada. We are a country that has been largely built by people who have chosen this place as their home. In some cases this was by choice and in other cases it was in situations of duress and great struggle for freedom and security for themselves and their families.

I hope government members will be supportive of some of our amendments in this group. Some of the Bloc amendments also deserve consideration in the same regard.

I commend the hon. member for Fundy—Royal who because of his erudite discourse in the House is frequently confused with me. However I commend him once again for bringing a great level of commitment to good public policy and of vigilance on behalf of the huddled masses, or refugees who seek to become Canadians, to ensure that their interests are protected when the government fails to do so in the legislation.

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

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The question is on Motion No. 9. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The recorded division on Motion No. 9 stands deferred.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The recorded division on Motion No. 10 stands deferred.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): I declare Motion No. 12 carried.

Supply

• (1645)

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

[English]

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is there agreement in the House to defer the vote until later this day?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY WATERS TREATY ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-6, an act to amend the International Boundary Waters Treaty Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (for the Minister of Foreign Affairs) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

* * *

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT

The House resumed from May 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

• (1650)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): I declare the motion carried. Accordingly the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. Joe Jordan: Madam Speaker, I ask that we suspend the sitting to the call of the Chair.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is it the wish of the House to suspend the sitting until the call of the Chair?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 4.51 p.m.)

• (1830)

[Translation]

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 6.30 p.m.

* * *

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—TAX ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

The House resumed from May 31 consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Pursuant to order passed Thursday, May 31, 2001, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment pertaining to the opposition motion.

Call in the members.

• (1900)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 107)

YEAS

Members

Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Borotsik
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Brien	Brison
Burton	Cadman
Cardin	Chatters
Clark	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Doyle
Dubé	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Goldring
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Herron
Hill (MacLeod)	Hinton
Jaffer	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laframboise	Lebel
Loubier	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Marceau
Mark	Mayfield
Merrifield	Moore
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Peschisolido	Picard (Drummond)
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Toews
Venne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)—72

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Carrroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Collenette	Comartin
Comuzzi	Copp
Cullen	Cuzner
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Duplain	Easter
Eyking	Farrar
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis

Supply

Keyes	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Longfield	MacAulay
Macklin	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mathews	McCallum
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan	McTeague
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Myers	Nault
Neville	Normand
Nystrom	O'Reilly
Owen	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed (Halton)
Regan	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi	Tobin
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—160

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beaumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serré	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

● (1905)

The next question is on the main motion.

*Supply**[English]*

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent from all parties that the vote on the previous motion be applied to the motion now before the House.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 108)***YEAS**

Members

Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Borotsik
Bourgeois	Breitkreuz
Brien	Brisson
Burton	Cadman
Cardin	Chatters
Clark	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Doyle
Dubé	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Goldring
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Herron
Hill (MacLeod)	Hinton
Jaffer	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Laframboise	Lebel
Loubier	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Marceau
Mark	Mayfield
Merrifield	Moore
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Peschisolido	Picard (Drummond)
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Reynolds	Ritz
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Toews
Venne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)—72

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden

Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Collenette	Comartin
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cuzner
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Duplain	Easter
Eyking	Farrah
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Knudson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Longfield	MacAulay
Macklin	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Marcil	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews	McCallum
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan	McTeague
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Myers	Nault
Neville	Normand
Nystrom	O'Reilly
Owen	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proulx	Provenzano
Redman	Reed (Halton)
Regan	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi	Tobin
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—160

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beaumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serré	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

* * *

[*English*]

PATENT ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the concurrence motion on Bill S-17.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent in the House that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on this motion, with Liberals voting yea.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yes to the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members support this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP who are present are opposed to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote yes to the motion.

Mr. Dan McTeague: Mr. Speaker, I wish not to have my vote recorded on this particular motion.

Mrs. Betty Hinton: Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote no to the motion.

Mr. Joseph Volpe: Mr. Speaker, I wish to have my name stricken from the list of those who voted in favour of the motion.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 109*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Binet	Blondin-Andrew

Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bourgeois	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz	Brien
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Burton	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cardin
Carroll	Castonguay
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Charbonneau
Chatters	Clark
Collette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	Cuzner
Dalphond-Guiral	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé
Duhamel	Duplain
Easter	Epp
Eyking	Farrah
Finlay	Fitzpatrick
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Golding
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hill (MacLeod)	Hinton
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Keys
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laframboise	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lebel
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Longfield
Loubier	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Macklin	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Marceau	Marcil
Mark	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Matthews
Mayfield	McCallum
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
Merrifield	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Moore	Murphy
Myers	Nault
Neville	Normand
O'Reilly	Obhrai
Owen	Pagtakhan
Pallister	Paquette
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peschisolido
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proulx	Provenzano
Rajotte	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Sada
Scherrer	Schmidt
Scott	Sgro
Shepherd	Solberg
Sorenson	Speller

Government Orders

Spencer	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tirabassi	Tobin
Toews	Tonks
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Wilfert
Wood—217	

NAYS

Members

Blaikie	Comartin
Davies	Desjarlais
Godin	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Nystrom
Proctor	Robinson
Skelton	Stoffer
Wasylcia-Leis —13	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serré	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

PROCEEDS OF CRIME (MONEY LAUNDERING) ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the concurrence motion on Bill S-16.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yes to the motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members support this motion.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present vote yes to the motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote yes on this motion.

[English]

Mr. Dan McTeague: Mr. Speaker, for greater clarity I want to ensure that I was recorded as voting with the government on this bill, as well as subsequent bills.

• (1910)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 110)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Binet	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bourgeois
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz
Brien	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Burton
Byrne	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cardin	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clark	Collenette
Comartin	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	Cuzner
Dalphon-Guiral	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé
Duhamel	Duplain

Easter
 Eyking
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Gagliano
 Gallant
 Gauthier
 Godfrey
 Goldring
 Graham
 Grewal
 Grose
 Guay
 Harvard
 Herron
 Hinton
 Ianno
 Jaffer
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Keys
 Kraft Sloan
 Laliberte
 Lebel
 Lee
 Longfield
 Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marcil
 Marleau
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 Mayfield
 McCormick
 McGuire
 McLellan
 Merrifield
 Minna
 Moore
 Myers
 Neville
 Nystrom
 Obhrai
 Pagtakhan
 Paquette
 Parrish
 Penon
 Peschisolido
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Price
 Proulx
 Rajotte
 Reed (Halton)
 Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
 Richardson
 Robillard
 Rocheleau
 Saada
 Schmidt
 Sgro
 Skelton
 Sorenson
 Spencer
 St-Hilaire
 St-Julien
 Stewart
 Stoffer
 Szabo
 Thibault (West Nova)
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Tobin
 Tonks
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Volpe
 Whelan
 Wilfert

Epp
 Farrah
 Fitzpatrick
 Fry
 Gagnon (Québec)
 Gallaway
 Girard-Bujold
 Godin
 Goodale
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Grey (Edmonton North)
 Guarnieri
 Harb
 Harvey
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hubbard
 Jackson
 Jennings
 Karetak-Lindell
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Knutson
 Laframboise
 Lastewka
 LeBlanc
 Leung
 Loubier
 MacAulay
 Macklin
 Malhi
 Marceau
 Mark
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Matthews
 McCallum
 McDonough
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
 Mitchell
 Murphy
 Nault
 Normand
 O'Reilly
 Owen
 Pallister
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peric
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Pratt
 Proctor
 Provenzano
 Redman
 Regan
 Reynolds
 Ritz
 Robinson
 Rock
 Scherrer
 Scott
 Shepherd
 Solberg
 Speller
 St. Denis
 St-Jacques
 Steckle
 Stinson
 Strahl
 Telegdi
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Tirabassi
 Toews
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Venne
 Wasylycia-Leis
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)
 Wood —232

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

*Nil/aucun

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beaumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serré	Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-11, an act respecting immigration to Canada and the granting of refugee protection to persons who are displaced, persecuted or in danger, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the report stage of Bill C-11. The question is on Motion No. 1.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent in the House that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting on this motion, with the Liberal members voting yes, with the exception of the member for Trinity—Spadina who I understand has left the Chamber.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yes to the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members vote yes on this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote yes on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Mr. Speaker, members of the PC Party vote yes to the motion.

Government Orders

Mr. Tony Ianno: Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting in the Chamber enjoying your words of wisdom. I would like to be noted as having voted with the government on all the previous motions.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. III)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Binet	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bourgeois
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz
Brien	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Burton
Byrne	Caccia
Cadman	Calder
Cardin	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Chatters
Clark	Collenette
Comartin	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Cummins	Cuzner
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé
Duhamel	Duplain
Easter	Epp
Eyking	Farrah
Finlay	Fitzpatrick
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin
Goldring	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hinton	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laframboise
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lebel	LeBlanc
Lee	Leung
Longfield	Loubier
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Macklin

Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Marceau
Marcel	Mark
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
Mayfield	McCallum
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan	McTeague
Merrifield	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Moore	Murphy
Myers	Nault
Neville	Normand
Nystrom	O'Reilly
Obhrai	Owen
Pagtakhan	Pallister
Paquette	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peschisolido	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proulx	Provenzano
Rajotte	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Richardson	Ritz
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Scherrer
Schmidt	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Speller
Spencer	St. Denis
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Steckle
Stewart	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibault (West Nova)	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tirabassi
Tobin	Toews
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanelief	Venne
Volpe	Wasylcia-Leis
Whelan	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wilfert	Wood —232

NAYS

Members

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beaumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serré	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

[Translation]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that those members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[English]

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, Alliance members present will vote yes to all the motions.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members support this motion.

[English]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP vote yes to the motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mr. Andrew Telegdi: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting yes to the motion.

• (1915)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 112)

YEAS

Members

Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Brien
Brisson	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Chatters	Clark
Comartin	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dubé	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin
Goldring	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hinton	Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lebel	Loubier
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Mark

Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	Merrifield
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Peschisolido	Picard (Drummond)
Proctor	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Telegdi	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Toews
Venne	Wasylycia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —85	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Duplain	Easter
Eyking	Farrah
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gallaway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Marcil
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCallum
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
McTeague	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Myers
Nault	Neville
Normand	O'Reilly
Owen	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman

Government Orders

Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Rock
Scherrer
Sgro
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—147

Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scott
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart
Thibault (West Nova)
Tobin
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

Hinton
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lebel
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Peschisolido
Proctor
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Rocheleau
Skelton
Sorenson
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —85

Jaffer
Laframboise
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark
Mayfield
Merrifield
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Stinson
Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Wasylcyia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock
Caplan
Crête
Duceppe
Fournier
Guimond
Lalonde
Lincoln
Ménard
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Serré
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)

Beaumier
Carignan
Desrochers
Eggleton
Gagnon (Champlain)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lancôt
Manley
O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron
Roy
Savoy
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 3

[*English*]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent in the House that the vote just taken on Motion No. 2 be applied to the following: Motions Nos. 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 113*)

YEAS

Members

Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Borotsik
Breitkreuz
Brison
Cadman
Chatters
Comartin
Dalphond-Guiral
Desjarlais
Dubé
Fitzpatrick
Gallant
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Herron

Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Bourgeois
Brien
Burton
Cardin
Clark
Cummins
Davies
Doyle
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Godin
Grewal
Guay
Hill (Macleod)

Adams
Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian
Bagnell
Bakopanos
Belanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Castonguay
Cauchon
Charbonneau
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Drouin
Duplain
Eyking
Finlay
Fry
Gallaway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Knutson
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
Matthews
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Normand
Owen
Paradis
Patry

NAYS

Members

Allard
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Copp
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Farrah
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McGuire
McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Myers
Neville
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric

Government Orders

Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Rock
Scherrer
Sgro
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—147

Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scott
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart
Thibault (West Nova)
Tobin
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Rocheleau
Skelton
Sorenson
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —85

Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Stinson
Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Wasylcia-Leis

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock
Caplan
Crête
Duceppe
Fournier
Guimond
Lalonde
Lincoln
Ménard
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Serré
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)

Beaumier
Carignan
Desrochers
Eggleton
Gagnon (Champlain)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lancôt
Manley
O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron
Roy
Savoy
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Wappel

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 114)

YEAS

Members

Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Borotsik
Breitkreuz
Brisson
Cadman
Chatters
Comartin
Dalphond-Guiral
Desjarlais
Dubé
Fitzpatrick
Gallant
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Herron
Hinton
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lebel
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Peschisolido
Proctor

Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Bourgeois
Brien
Burton
Cardin
Clark
Cummins
Davies
Doyle
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Godin
Grewal
Guay
Hill (Macleod)
Jaffer
Laframboise
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark
Mayfield
Merrifield
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Rajotte

Adams
Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian
Bagnell
Bakopanos
Belanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Castonguay
Cauchon
Charbonneau
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Drouin
Duplain
Eyking
Finlay
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Knutson
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
Matthews
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Normand
Owen
Paradis
Petry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Rock
Scherrer
Sgro
Speller
St-Jacques
Steckle

NAYS

Members

Allard
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collenette
Coppes
Cuzner
Dhalliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Farrah
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Marcil
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McGuire
McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Myers
Neville
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scott
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart

Government Orders

Szabo	Thibault (West Nova)	Sorenson	Spencer
Tirabassi	Tobin	St-Hilaire	Stinson
Tonks	Torsney	Stoffer	Strahl
Ur	Valeri	Telegdi	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vanclief	Volpe	Thompson (Wild Rose)	Toews
Whelan	Willfert	Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
Wood—147		White (Langley—Abbotsford) —85	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beaumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serré	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 116)

YEAS

Members

Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Brien
Brison	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Chatters	Clark
Comartin	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dubé	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin
Goldring	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hinton	Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lebel	Loubier
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	Merrifield
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Peschisolido	Picard (Drummond)
Proctor	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Duplain	Easter
Eyking	Farrah
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Marcil
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCallum
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
McTeague	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Myers
Nault	Neville
Normand	O'Reilly
Owen	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi	Tobin
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—147	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beaumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serré	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 117)

YEAS

Members

Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Brien
Brison	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Chatters	Clark
Comartin	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dubé	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin
Goldring	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hinton	Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lebel	Loubier
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	Merrifield
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Peschisolido	Picard (Drummond)
Proctor	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Telegdi	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Toews
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —85	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Belanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Duplain	Easter
Eyking	Farrah
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Marcil
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCallum
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
McTeague	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Myers
Nault	Neville
Normand	O'Reilly
Owen	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Sada
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi	Tobin
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—147	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beaumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serré	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 118)

YEAS

Members

Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Brien
Brison	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Chatters	Clark
Comartin	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dubé	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin
Goldring	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hinton	Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lebel	Loubier
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	Merrifield
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Peschisolido	Picard (Drummond)
Proctor	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Telegdi	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Toews
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —85	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Belanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Duplain	Easter
Eyking	Farrah
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Marcil
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCallum
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
McTeague	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Myers
Nault	Neville
Normand	O'Reilly
Owen	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Sada
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi	Tobin
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—147	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beaumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serré	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 119)

YEAS

Members

Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Bourgeois
Breitkreuz	Brien
Brison	Burton
Cadman	Cardin
Chatters	Clark
Comartin	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dubé	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallant	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin
Goldring	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hinton	Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laframboise
Lebel	Loubier
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	Merrifield
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Paquette	Penson
Peschisolido	Picard (Drummond)
Proctor	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Skelton	Solberg
Sorenson	Spencer
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Telegdi	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Toews
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —85	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bagnell	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Belanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Binet
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cuzner
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Duplain	Easter
Eyking	Farrah
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Longfield
MacAulay	Macklin
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Marcil
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews	McCallum
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan
McTeague	Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Myers
Nault	Neville
Normand	O'Reilly
Owen	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Price	Proulx
Provenzano	Redman
Reed (Halton)	Regan
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Sada
Scherrer	Scott
Sgro	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Steckle	Stewart
Szabo	Thibault (West Nova)
Tirabassi	Tobin
Tonks	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—147	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Beaumier
Caplan	Carignan
Crête	Desrochers
Duceppe	Eggleton
Fournier	Gagnon (Champlain)
Guimond	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lalonde	Lancôt
Lincoln	Manley
Ménard	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	Perron
Plamondon	Roy
Sauvageau	Savoy
Serre	Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent in the House that those who voted on the previous motions be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House with the Liberal members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, the Alliance members present will vote yes to the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are opposed to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP are voting yes to the motion.

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Mr. Speaker, the PC members will vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi: I am voting in favour of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

(The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 115)

YEAS

Members

Anders	Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bailey	Benoit
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz	Brison
Burton	Cadman
Chatters	Clark
Comartin	Cummins
Davies	Desjarlais
Doyle	Epp
Fitzpatrick	Gallant
Godin	Goldring

Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hinton	Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	Merrifield
Moore	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pallister
Penson	Peschisolido
Proctor	Rajotte
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)	Reynolds
Ritz	Robinson
Schmidt	Skelton
Solberg	Sorenson
Spencer	Stinson
Stoffer	Strahl
Telegdi	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Toews
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)—62

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allard
Anderson (Victoria)	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bagnell	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Belanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Binet	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bourgeois
Bradshaw	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Cardin	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Charbonneau	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cuzner
Dalphond-Guiral	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Dromiskiy	Drouin
Dubé	Duhamel
Duplain	Easter
Eyking	Farrah
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)	Galloway
Gauthier	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keyes
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laframboise	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lebel
LeBlanc	Lee
Leung	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
Macklin	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Marceau	Marcil
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)

Government Orders

Matthews
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Normand
Owen
Paquette
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Jacques
Steckle
Szabo
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wilfert

McCallum
McGuire
McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Myers
Neville
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Rock
Scherrer
Sgro
Speller
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Stewart
Thibault (West Nova)
Tobin
Torsney
Valeri
Venne
Whelan
Wood—170

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock
Caplan
Crête
Duceppe
Fournier
Guimond
Lalonde
Lincoln
Ménard
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Serré
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)

Beaumier
Carignan
Desrochers
Eggleton
Gagnon (Champlain)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lancôt
Manley
O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron
Roy
Savoy
Thibeault (Saint-Lambert)
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 lost.

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent in the House that the members recorded as voting on the previous motion be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House with the Liberal members voting yes, with the exception of the member for Kitchener—Waterloo voting no.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, the Alliance members present will vote no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members will be voting against this motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, NDP members present will be voting against this motion.

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party vote against the motion.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 120*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian
Bagnell
Bakopanos
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Castonguay
Cauchon
Charbonneau
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Drouin
Duplain
Eyking
Finlay
Fry
Gallaway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Knutson
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marleau
Matthews
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Normand
Owen
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Reed (Halton)
Richardson
Rock
Scherrer
Sgro
Speller
St-Jacques

Allard
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bertrand
Binet
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Collette
Coppes
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Farrah
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Ianno
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Longfield
Macklin
Malhi
Maril
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCallum
McGuire
McLellan
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Myers
Neville
O'Reilly
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Saada
Scott
Shepherd
St. Denis
St-Julien

Government Orders

Steckle
Szabo
Tirabassi
Tonks
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—147

Stewart
Thibault (West Nova)
Tobin
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

• (1920)

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY WATERS TREATY ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the concurrence motion on Bill C-6.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, the House would give its consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members being recorded as voting yea.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, Canadian Alliance members present vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois oppose this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present will vote no to the motion.

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Mr. Speaker, members of the Progressive Conservative Party will be voting yes to the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: I just wish to point out that our colleague for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel has had to be absent for this vote and the one before it.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 121*)

YEAS**Members**

Adams
Anders
Anderson (Victoria)
Assadourian
Bagnell
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Benoit
Bevilacqua

Allard
Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopoulos
Bélanger
Bennett
Bertrand
Binet

NAYS**Members**

Anders
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bigras
Borotsik
Breitkreuz
Brisson
Cadman
Chatters
Comartin
Dalphond-Guiral
Desjarlais
Dubé
Fitzpatrick
Gallant
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Grey (Edmonton North)
Herron
Hinton
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark
Mayfield
Merrifield
Nystrom
Pallister
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Rajotte
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
Spencer
Stinson
Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Toews
Wasylcia-Leis

Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Bourgeois
Brien
Burton
Cardin
Clark
Cummins
Davies
Doyle
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Godin
Grewal
Guay
Hill (Macleod)
Jaffer
Lebel
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Marceau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Moore
Obhrai
Paquette
Peschisolido
Proctor
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz
Rocheleau
Skelton
Sorenson
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Telegdi
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —84

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock
Caplan
Crête
Duceppe
Fournier
Guimond
Lalonde
Lincoln
Ménard
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Plamondon
Sauvageau
Serré
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)

Beaumier
Carignan
Desrochers
Eggleton
Gagnon (Champlain)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lancôt
Manley
O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron
Roy
Savoy
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz
Brown
Bulte
Byrne
Cadman
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chatters
Collenette
Copp
Cummins
DeVillers
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Easter
Eyking
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Goldring
Graham
Grewal
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hubbard
Jackson
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Knutson
Laliberte
LeBlanc
Leung
Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni)
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney
Maloney
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mills (Toronto—Danforth)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
Normand
Obhrai
Pagtakhan
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Regan
Reynolds
Ritz
Rock
Scherrer
Scott
Shepherd
Solberg
Speller

Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brisson
Bryden
Burton
Caccia
Calder
Castonguay
Cauchon
Charbonneau
Clark
Comuzzi
Cullen
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Doyle
Drouin
Duplain
Epp
Farrah
Fitzpatrick
Fry
Gallant
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Herron
Hinton
Ianno
Jaffer
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keys
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Longfield
MacAulay
Macklin
Malhi
Marcil
Marleau
Matthews
McCallum
McGuire
McLellan
Merrifield
Minna
Moore
Myers
Neville
O'Reilly
Owen
Pallister
Parrish
Penson
Peschisolido
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Proulx
Rajotte
Reed (Halton)
Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Richardson
Robillard
Saada
Schmidt
Sgro
Skelton
Sorenson
Spencer

St. Denis
St-Julien
Stewart
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tirabassi
Toews
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wood—197

St-Jacques
Steckle
Stinson
Szabo
Thibault (West Nova)
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tobin
Tonks
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wilfert

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bigras
Bourgeois
Cardin
Dalphond-Guiral
Desjarlais
Gagnon (Québec)
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Loubier
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)
Robinson
St-Hilaire
Venne

Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Blaikie
Brien
Comartin
Davies
Dubé
Gauthier
Godin
Lebel
Marceau
McDonough
Paquette
Proctor
Rocheleau
Stoffer
Wasylcia-Leis —34

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock
Caplan
Crête
Duceppe
Fournier
Guimond
Lalonde
Lincoln
Ménard
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Plamondon
Owen
Sauvageau
Serré
Tremblay (Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis)

Beaumier
Carignan
Desrochers
Eggleton
Gagnon (Champlain)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Lanctôt
Manley
O'Brien (Labrador)
Perron
Roy
Savoy
Thibault (Saint-Lambert)
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[English]

It being 7.23 p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.23 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, June 4, 2001

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

The Act of Incorporation of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada

Mr. Alcock	4557
Motion	4557
(Motion agreed to)	4557
Second Reading	
Bill S-25	4557
Mr. Alcock	4557
Mr. Toews	4557
Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	4557
Mr. Borotsik	4558
Mr. Epp	4558
Mr. Cannis	4559
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	4560
Mr. Nystrom	4561
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed)	4561
Mr. Jordan	4561

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Patent Act

Bill S-17. Report stage	4561
Motion for concurrence	4562
Mr. Gagliano	4562
Division on motion deferred	4562

Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act

Bill S-16. Report stage	4562
Motion for concurrence	4562
Mr. Gagliano	4562
Division on motion deferred	4562

Immigration and Refugee Protection Act

Bill C-11. Report stage	4562
Mr. Obhrai	4562
Mr. Nystrom	4563
Mr. Herron	4565
Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	4565
Mr. Mahoney	4566
Mr. Laframboise	4568
Mr. Paquette	4569
Mr. Hearn	4570
Mr. Borotsik	4571
Mr. Fontana	4572
Mr. Keddy	4573
Mr. Fontana	4574
Mr. Keddy	4574
Mr. Mills (Toronto—Danforth)	4574
Division on Motion No. 5 deferred	4575
Division on Motion No. 6 deferred	4576
Division on Motion No. 7 deferred	4576
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	4576
Motion No. 9	4576
Mr. Herron	4576
Motion No. 10	4576
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	4576

Motion No. 12	4576
Mr. Fontana	4577
Mr. Grewal	4578

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Women's World Cup Cycling Race

Ms. Allard	4579
------------------	------

Rail Safety

Mr. Fitzpatrick	4579
-----------------------	------

Brigadier General Denis Whitaker

Mr. Keyes	4579
-----------------	------

North American Free Trade Agreement

Mr. Valeri	4580
------------------	------

Transportation

Mr. Proulx	4580
------------------	------

Tiananmen Square

Mr. Moore	4580
-----------------	------

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Paradis	4581
-------------------	------

Le Courrier-Laval

Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	4581
---------------------------	------

Cancer

Ms. Scherrer	4581
--------------------	------

Roger Cyr

Mr. Bailey	4581
------------------	------

General Maurice Baril

Mr. Bertrand	4581
--------------------	------

Health

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	4582
--------------------------	------

La Fédération des femmes du Québec

Ms. Bourgeois	4582
---------------------	------

Software Theft

Mr. LeBlanc	4582
-------------------	------

Grants and Contributions

Mr. Hearn	4582
-----------------	------

Education

Ms. Sgro	4583
----------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Justice

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	4583
Ms. McLellan	4583
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	4583
Ms. McLellan	4583
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	4583
Mr. MacAulay	4583
Mr. Toews	4583
Mr. Gray	4583
Mr. Toews	4583
Mr. Gray	4584

Federal-Provincial Relations

Mr. Gauthier	4584
Mr. Gagliano	4584
Mr. Gauthier	4584
Mr. Gagliano	4584
Ms. Picard	4584
Mr. Dion	4584
Ms. Picard	4584
Mr. Dion	4584

The Environment

Ms. McDonough	4584
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	4585
Ms. McDonough	4585
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	4585

National Defence

Mr. Clark	4585
Mr. Gray	4585
Mr. Clark	4585
Mr. Gagliano	4585

Fisheries

Mr. Cummins	4585
Mr. Dhaliwal	4585
Mr. Cummins	4586
Mr. Dhaliwal	4586
Mr. Dhaliwal	4586

Federal-Provincial Relations

Ms. Gagnon	4586
Mr. Dion	4586
Ms. Gagnon	4586
Mr. Gagliano	4586

Agriculture

Mr. Chatters	4586
Mr. McCormick	4586
Mr. Chatters	4586
Mr. McCormick	4587

Federal-Provincial Relations

Mr. Marceau	4587
Mr. Dion	4587
Mr. Marceau	4587
Mr. Dion	4587

National Defence

Mr. Goldring	4587
Mr. Gray	4587
Mr. Goldring	4587
Mr. O'Reilly	4587
Ms. Thibeault	4588
Mr. O'Reilly	4588

Transportation

Mr. Nystrom	4588
Mr. Collenette	4588
Mr. Nystrom	4588
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4588

Infrastructure

Mr. Herron	4588
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	4588
Mr. Borotsik	4588
Mr. Duhamel	4589

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Solberg	4589
Mr. Paradis	4589
Mr. Solberg	4589
Mr. Paradis	4589

Employment Insurance

Mr. Bergeron	4589
Mrs. Stewart	4589
Mr. Bergeron	4589
Mrs. Stewart	4590

The Economy

Mr. Schmidt	4590
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4590
Mr. Schmidt	4590
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4590

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

Mr. Duplain	4590
Mr. Normand	4590

Highways

Mrs. Hinton	4590
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4590
Mrs. Hinton	4590
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4591

Genetically Modified Organisms

Mr. Bigras	4591
Mr. McCormick	4591

The Environment

Mr. Murphy	4591
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	4591

Gun Control

Mr. Breitreuz	4591
Ms. McLellan	4591

Free Trade Area of the Americas

Mr. Paquette	4591
Mr. Pettigrew	4592

Justice

Mr. MacKay	4592
Ms. McLellan	4592

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**Government Response To Petitions**

Mr. Lee	4592
---------------	------

Parliament of Canada Act

Bill C-28. Introduction and first reading	4592
Mr. Boudria	4592
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	4592

Criminal Code

Bill C-368. Introduction and first reading	4592
Mr. Harb	4592
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	4592

Income Tax Act

Bill C-369. Introduction and first reading	4592
Mr. Harb	4592
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	4592

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Bill C-370. Introduction and first reading	4593
--	------

Motion for concurrence	4621
Ms. Caplan	4621
Ms. Catterall	4621
Mr. Breitkreuz	4621
Mr. Bergeron	4621
Mr. Godin	4621
Mr. Borotsik	4621
Motion agreed to	4622
(Motion agreed to)	4622

International Boundary Waters Treaty Act

Bill C-6. Motion for concurrence	4622
Ms. Catterall	4622
Mr. Breitkreuz	4622
Mr. Bergeron	4622
Mr. Godin	4622
Mr. Borotsik	4622
Mr. Bergeron	4622
Motion agreed to	4623

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 : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9