

Bill C-420 transcript

Wednesday, March 9th, 2005

(1800)

Translation

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 44)

YEAS

Abbott
Ablonczy
Anderson (Cypress HillsGrasslands)
Andr
Angus
Asselin
Bachand
Bakopanos
Batters
Beaumier
Bellavance
Benoit
Benoit
Bergeron
Bezan
Bigras
Blaikie
Blais
Boire
Bonsant
Bouchard
Boulianne
Bourgeois
Breitkreuz
Broadbent
Brown (LeedsGrenville)
Brunelle
Cardin
Carrie
Carrier
Casey
Casson

Chong
Christopherson
Clavet
Cleary
Comartin
C t
Crte
Crowder
Cullen (SkeenaBulkley Valley)
Davies
Day
Demers
Deschamps
Desrochers
Devolin
Dhalla
Doyle
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Faille
Finley
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Forseth
Gagnon (Qubec)
Gagnon (Saint-MauriceChamplain)
Gagnon (JonquireAlma)
Gallant
Gaudet
Gauthier
Godin
Goodyear
Grewal (NewtonNorth Delta)
Grewal (FleetwoodPort Kells)
Guay
Guay
Guergis
Guimond
Harper
Harris
Harrison
Hearn
Hiebert
Hill
Hinton
Jaffer
Jean
Jennings
Julian
Kamp (Pitt MeadowsMaple RidgeMission)
Karygiannis
Keddy (South ShoreSt. Margaret's)
Kilgour
Komarnicki
Kotto
Kramp (Prince EdwardHastings)
Laframboise
Lalonde
Lapierre (LvisBellechasse)
Lauzon

Lavalle
Layton
Lemay
Lessard
Lvesque
Loubier
Lukiwski
Lunn
Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie
Malhi
Marceau
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Martin (Sault Ste. Marie)
Masse
McDonough
Mnard (Hochelaga)
Mnard (Marc-Aurle-Fortin)
Menzies
Miller
Mills
Moore (Port MoodyWestwoodPort Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Nicholson
O'Connor
Obhrai Oda
Paquette
Parrish
Parrish
Penson
Perron
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Poilievre
Poirier-Rivard
Prentice
Preston
Rajotte
Reid
Reynolds
Richardson
Ritz
Roy
Sauvageau
Scheer
Schellenberger
Schmidt (KelownaLake Country)
Siksay
Simard (Beauport Limoilou)
Skelton
Smith (Kildonan St. Paul)
Solberg
Sorenson
St-Hilaire
Steckle
Stoffer
Stronach
Telegdi

Thibault (Rimouski-NeigetteTmiscouataLes Basques)

Tilson

Toews

Tonks

Trost

Tweed Van Loan

Vellacott Vincent

Wappel Warawa

Wasylycia-Leis

Watson

Yelich

Total: -- 165

NAYS

Members

Adams

Alcock

Anders

Anderson (Victoria)

Bagnell

Bains

Barnes

Blanger

Bell

Bennett

Bevilacqua

Blondin-Andrew

Boivin

Bonin

Boshcoff

Boudria

Bradshaw

Brison

Brown (Oakville)

Bulte

Byrne

Carr

Carroll

Catterall

Chan

Coderre

Comuzzi

Cotler

Cullen (Etobicoke North)

Cuzner

D'Amours

Desjarlais

DeVillers

Dion

Dosanjh

Drouin

Dryden

Easter

Efford

Emerson

Eyking

Folco

Fontana
Frulla
Fry
Godbout
Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Guarnieri
Holland
Hubbard
Ianno
Kadis
Karetak-Lindell
Khan
Lapierre (Outremont)
Lastewka
LeBlanc
Longfield
Macklin
Maloney
Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle mard)
Matthews
McCallum
McGuinty
McGuire
McKay (Scarborough Guildwood)
McLellan
McTeague
Minna
Mitchell
Murphy
Neville
O'Brien
Owen
Pacetti
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Pettigrew
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham-Kent Essex)
Powers
Proulx
Ratansi
Redman
Regan
Robillard
Rodriguez
Rota
Saada
Savage
Savoy
Scarpaleggia
Scott
Sgro
Simard (Saint Boniface)
Simms
Smith (Pontiac)

St. Amand
St. Denis
Temelkovski
Thibault (West Nova)
Torsney
Ur
Valeri
Valley
Volpe
Wilfert

Total: -- 112

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Consequently the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration. (Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

English

The Speaker: It being 6 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

Private Members' Business

[Private Members' Business]

* * *

Translation

Food and Drugs Act

Page 8

The House resumed from November 29, 2004, consideration of the motion that Bill C-420, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (RosemontLa Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased today to speak on Bill C-420 to amend the Food and Drugs Act.

The aim of this bill, which was introduced and read the first time on October 21, 2004, is to ensure that natural health products are no longer

designated as drugs but rather as food.

I want to state right off that my party will vote in favour of the bill to amend the Food and Drugs Act, but on certain conditions. During the short time I have now, I will present the conditions for our support for this bill at second reading.

First, it is essential, in our opinion, to amend the current Food and Drugs Act. Why? So that these new concerns, these new types of uses of natural products, for example, can be included in the Canada Health Act and the Food and Drugs Act.

In recent years, we have seen a significant increase in the use of these natural health products by people in Quebec and Canada. According to a study by Health Canada in 1997, more than 56% of Canadians had taken a natural health product during the previous six months.

More and more, Quebecers and Canadians believe that we must take a complementary approach and not just limit ourselves to traditional medicine. We must, however, also ensure that the aspects of alternative medicine, complementary medicine, or holistic medicine can be integrated into our decision-making processes. If we observe that our fellow citizens are taking more natural health products, then legislation must be in place.

What has the government done in recent years with respect to natural health products? Instead of amending the Food and Drug Act as it should have done, and as the Standing Committee on Health recommended back in 1998, the government simply adopted or had adopted regulations on natural health products. This of course is a step in the right direction. It was time for the government to acknowledge, through regulation, that the Canadian public is using these products more and more.

However, what do the regulations that came into effect in January 2004 actually do? They cover definitions, licences for marketing, and good manufacturing practices. Still, even with regulations, natural health products will continue to be defined as drugs, or sometimes even as foods. So, depending on the product, these products will not necessarily be considered foods or drugs. There is ambiguity in the way these natural health products are categorized in the legislation.

That is a problem the bill does not solve. Should all natural health products be considered foods? Of course not. Is there not a characteristic, a value, specific to natural health products? Are natural health products necessarily foods or even drugs? The answer is no, not necessarily.