



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 040 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, December 6, 2002

—
Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, December 6, 2002

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

AN ACT TO AMEND THE CRIMINAL CODE (CRUELTY TO ANIMALS AND FIREARMS) AND FIREARMS ACT

Hon. Bill Graham (for the Minister of Justice) moved:

That, in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-10, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals and firearms) and the Firearms Act, this House concur with the Senate's division of the bill into two parts, namely, Bill C-10A, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (firearms) and the Firearms Act, and Bill C-10B, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals), but

that the House, while disapproving any infringement of its rights and privileges by the other House, waives its rights and privileges in this case, with the understanding that this waiver cannot be construed as a precedent; and that a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours therewith.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House today to address the issue before us. Clearly we have to look at the purpose of the process we are going through and the goals we are trying to achieve.

Bill C-10A contains administrative amendments to the Canadian firearms program. The goal is to streamline the program and reduce the costs while improving client service and continuing to meet our public safety objectives.

This program approaches gun safety in a practical and common sense manner. It already is helping to keep firearms away from people who should not have them. It is encouraging safe and responsible gun use by legitimate owners.

There is no doubt that the Canadian firearms program is an outstanding example of a preventative approach to public safety. Just last week, the Canadian Police Association appeared before the Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs in the other place to reiterate its support for this program. In the Canadian Police Association's view, licensing and registration are important measures to reduce misuse and the illegal trade in firearms.

Over the past decade, poll after poll has shown that an overwhelming majority of Canadians support gun control and

support the important public safety framework of the Firearms Act. Thanks to the implementation of a number of initiatives to simplify the administration and make the program more user friendly for firearms owners, Canadians are complying with the law. The licensing phase of the program has achieved over 90% compliance, and over 70% of the firearms owners have registered their firearms.

The program is already achieving higher levels of public safety for all Canadians. Since December 1, 1998, over 7,000 licences have been refused or revoked by the public safety authorities. The number of revocations is over 50 times higher than the total in the last five years under the previous program.

The amendments to the firearms act included in Bill C-10A will help to ensure that key public safety goals of the Firearms Act are met. At the same time, they will ensure that the administration of the program is more efficient, effective and client friendly. These administrative changes will simplify processes and requirements for firearms owners by producing a more streamlined system. For example, they will simplify the firearms licence renewals and registration process. They will also make the border process more efficient by introducing pre-processing for visitors bringing guns into Canada.

Much has been made about the costs of the program, but we have to put things in perspective. This is a sound investment in the long term safety of Canadians. We now have the opportunity to adopt amendments that will go a long way to achieving a more efficient and cost effective program.

One of these measures is the proposal to stagger firearms licence renewals, which is intended to help avoid a surge of applications in five year cycles. Evening out the workload in such a manner would result in more efficient processing and significant cost savings.

Streamlining the transfer process of non-restricted firearms would also allow CFOs to focus their efforts and resources on their many other public safety functions. Moreover, consolidating the administrative authority for all operations under the Canadian firearms commissioner would ensure more direct accountability to the justice minister, who would remain responsible to Parliament for the program. This in turn would enhance financial accountability.

We should keep in mind that this is not the time for delay. It will cost more to operate the system the longer we delay. This bill is needed to move forward with the cost savings measures that will lead to a more efficient program for Canadians.

Government Orders

This is a public safety program that is supported by a vast majority of Canadians and the policing community. It is a program that is already achieving concrete results in terms of public safety.

• (1010)

The bill presents an opportunity to build on the achievements in a way that is even more responsive to the firearms community and will reduce costs.

I urge the House to accept the bill that has been put before us and to go forward with this legislation forthwith.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we are here today in regard to the other place splitting the bill dealing with cruelty to animals and with the Firearms Act, which we passed here in the House of Commons.

The question of the operation of this place has already been dealt with by the Chair, so I will not go into that in too great a depth other than to say it seems that the other place is having a greater influence on the House of Commons than it should. Of course the problem with this is that the members of the other place do not have to go back to their constituents in the provinces, have a vote and in fact get a reaffirmation that the positions they are taking are right.

On the issue of this firearms legislation, what needs to be made clear right off the bat is that before Bill C-68 was put forward in 1995, Canada had very good firearms legislation. It had good control over firearms and the people who used firearms. There was good protection for society in general, both in the cities and in the country.

Members might ask how I can make this statement. They might ask if the gun legislation that came through in 1995 is not the best legislation, probably, and if it did not fill a big vacuum.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, you know me, as you are all-knowing about members of Parliament. I was in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for 30 years. I am darn proud of my service there.

I dealt with a lot of the social ills in this country, including abuse and assaults between individual people, some on a social basis in unfortunate family situations and some in a criminal context. Before this billion dollar boondoggle of Bill C-68, how did police manage to handle the use of firearms if crimes were being committed? How did they check out somebody who wanted to have a firearm, or somebody who not only wanted but needed to have a firearm, as in the case of farmers and ranchers in particular, or trappers and people working in the resource industry in remote areas of the country where there are wild animals that actually will attack and kill humans? We did not need the new law. We needed to retain those we had.

Here is what we had before. We had a firearms acquisition certificate. Anybody who wanted to acquire firearms had to have a FAC, as it was called. People got that by going down to the local police station where local officers would do the computer checks through the Canadian Police Information Centre. They would do checks on people's background and character. They would know whether or not people were recorded as having any mental illness and/or criminal record. That was already in place. We did not have registration of every rifle and shotgun, but we did have the

registering of handguns. That had been done since the 1930s. There was control of the handguns for the simple reason that handguns are easy to conceal inside a jacket or under a coat. That is legitimate firearms control and that is what we had.

Let us say that a firearm owner had his or her gun stolen. The RCMP would get the firearm owner to give us the serial number of his or her firearm and we would enter that into a computer. If that firearm had ever been used in a crime or if it was recovered, we would be able to immediately find it. However, that did not cost \$1 billion. It probably cost a few million dollars to keep that system going. Those FACs are renewed every five years.

• (1015)

What about the situation where someone believes that maybe a person will use a firearm for an unlawful purpose or to hurt himself or herself or someone else? I know from practical experience that police can go to a court of law to obtain an order to seize those firearms and/or to remove the person who might commit the crime against his or her family or whomever.

We had good laws that worked, that were economical and that prevented those crimes which could be prevented. The problem with this legislation is that the Canadian public is given the impression that by registering every rifle and shotgun crime will be cut down. That is not the truth. Criminals cut down rifles and shotguns which make them illegal firearms, according to the Criminal Code. They become concealable weapons with which criminals commit the crimes.

Handguns are already registered. If the registration system is so good and prevents crime, why does the City of Toronto have gangs and criminals shooting each other and innocent bystanders on a regular weekly basis? The registration system cannot and will not prevent criminal activities or criminals from acquiring firearms.

What should we do? Do we take this \$1 billion and fight crime or do we take the \$1 billion, like the government has, and spend it on a registration system and harass law-abiding citizens? I and the Canadian Alliance say quite clearly that if we had given that \$1 billion to the RCMP back in 1995, it would have improved its computers and it would have had an excellent system with regard to handguns. It would have used a lot of that \$1 billion to go after real criminals. The money should have gone there.

The report of the Auditor General was recently presented to the House recently. It needs to be stated again in the House that is a scathing report. The Auditor General has used words to the effect that never in the history of Canada has there been such a large cost overrun on a program, a cost overrun that even the Auditor General could not establish from the books.

The Auditor General originally took the position of the government at the time that this would be a \$2 million system. As she worked through it, she realized that the cost was around \$1 billion and expected that it was likely much higher. However the records of the government were so bad that she could not determine how much money had been wasted on the system. There had been no accountability.

Government Orders

That brings us to the simple conclusion that throwing more money at this will not help. The system is still the way it is. It is still broken. It is still run down. It still cannot be made to work. I think the arguments of the backbench members of the government seem to have finally reached the frontbench and that is, further money should not be spent on the system.

The other day the Minister of Justice asked that \$72 million be taken out of the supplementary estimates for the gun registry. The members have not said it, but I think they realize that throwing good money after bad will not do the job.

● (1020)

What would be wrong with not passing the motion and not sending it back to the other place? Let us keep this firearm legislation here. Let us make legislation that is effective in controlling crime, that makes wise use of resources and that is based on common sense and not some phoney Liberal value. That is what we need.

I have described the sensible legislation which the Canadian Alliance would put in place. We would still make fully automatic firearms prohibited. People would not be allowed to carry around handguns willy-nilly. However people could take their handguns to the local shooting range. If people did not want to use them at the shooting range for a whole year, for instance, that would be fine. They are their personal property.

However, with this legislation, the government is saying to people that if they have not used their firearms for year, because they have not signed in and out of the shooting club, then they no longer need them and they will be taken away. That is explicitly what it is saying it will do.

That is what is wrong with this legislation. It is a deception that the government and the Department of Justice have used right from the start to achieve its real goal, which cannot be crime prevention because obviously it does not prevent crime. Its real goal is to harass Canadians who have firearms either because they need them or for plain recreational purposes. The government wants to remove as many firearms as is possible.

The ideal goal as put forward by the lobby group, which is a very small number of people who want the federal government to put this legislation in, is that no Canadians have a firearms. The government understands that free society is not made up that way. A free society is made up of honest, decent citizens making a better country. Just because people own guns does not mean that they are not decent, normal citizen.

The government planned that the registry system would protect Canadians. Who is paying for that? The gun owners. Every blasted penny is being paid by people who own firearms. That further goes to show that the goal of the system is to harass gun owners and take away their firearms through the use of onerous laws made up of a whole bunch of little rules. The costs for that are borne by firearm owners.

The governments plan went a little bit awry when it tried to unload the costs onto the provinces. At that time the provinces said that the system would not work. They said that it was the most foolish plan

they had ever seen and that would not participate or help the federal government.

Then we saw the initial court cases in Edmonton, Alberta. I recall very clearly the statistics the Department of Justice used. Because it did not have a good argument as to why the gun registry would help fight crime, it misstated and misused the figures, supplied by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, in court. Subsequently, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police said publicly that the statistics were not correct and that they had been misrepresented in court. As a result, that deception continued.

Then the Auditor General found another deception. The Parliament of Canada was not being properly informed of the costs of the registry. That is highly suspect. The ministers are even saying to this day things that I think are questionable. That is the best way that I can put it.

● (1025)

The Minister of Justice said that the province of Ontario, at the time Premier Harris, and the province of Alberta, Premier Klein, were against effective gun control. I hate to quote from newspapers but that is what the minister said. That is patently untrue. It is as untrue as the statistics in the court case. The premiers of the provinces want effective gun control and wise use of resources, as I described at the start of my speech. I laid out how effective the system was before Bill C-68 and that is the system that I still purport we should use today.

That is why I would vote against the motion to send the bill back to the Senate for approval. The creation of a bureaucracy with a new commissioner of firearms reporting to the Minister of Justice instead of the RCMP will be a mammoth cost also and it will do absolutely nothing other than to drive the costs up. The minister will not answer our questions as to how much it will cost to finish registering of firearms and how much the system will cost every year thereafter.

I know that Canadians, both gun owners and non-gun owners, have not given up the battle to have this legislation repealed.

The former justice minister who brought this legislation forward quite clearly stated that the war had been lost by the Canadian Alliance in 1995 and as result it should be ended. The Canadian Alliance is not the only one fighting this. All provinces, firearm owners and people who are angry about the waste of their tax dollars are fighting it. This battle is not over by a long shot; it will continue.

I have a motion that I wish to put before the House, but before I do that I wish to speak to the other part of the motion which concerns the cruelty to animals legislation.

With regard to the cruelty to animals legislation, I only hope that, if the government sends it back to the Senate, that the Senate will retain the harsh penalties for cruelty to animals. I and my party are in favour that anybody who is cruel to animals should be hit with hard penalties. Animals are relatively defenceless when they are dealing with humans and as a result need that protection.

Government Orders

The stated goal here again is different than what the animal rights movement really wants. It does not want animals to be used either for food consumption or in any way other than their natural environment. I guess it would not even let us ride horses if it had its way because that is not totally natural to the animal.

● (1030)

I was talking about opposition to legislation. The Canadian Cattlemen's Association, every farmer lobby group association and the university medical research people are against the legislation. Millions of Canadians are against the legislation because parts of the bill do not protect farmers in the legitimate use of animals.

Once again, why would we not keep the bill in the House and fix it here, rather than send it back to the other place? I guess that is to be dealt with by the House as a whole and I suspect it will go back. Hopefully the Senate will do what we did not have the backbone to do in the House and that is make the cruelty to animal the best possible legislation. I wish the other place well in that regard.

I have made my points that both legislations are drastically flawed and that the opportunity to do the right thing in the House is available to us once again.

If the government sends bills back to the other place to be dealt with, it is abdicating its responsibility to do what is in the interest of all Canadians by the government and that is a sorry state of affairs. I wish to make an amendment in regard to this motion. I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

"in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-10, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals and firearms) and the Firearms Act, this House does not concur with the Senate's division of the Bill into two parts, namely, Bill C-10A, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (firearms) and the Firearms Act, and Bill C-10B, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals), since it is the view of this House that such alteration to Bill C-10 by the Senate is an infringement of the rights and privileges of the House of Commons;" and

That this House asks the Senate to consider C-10 in an undivided form; and

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours therewith.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair is satisfied that the amendment is in order. The debate is on the amendment.

● (1035)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, good morning. We are in favour of the amendment. I have been sitting in this House for nine years, since 1993. I always thought that a distinction should be made between the work done here in the House of Commons and the work done in the other House.

I would have never thought that the government, particularly the government House leader, would be so—I must say the word, hoping that it is parliamentary language—spineless as to ask us to collectively forgo our privileges as members of the House of Commons. What is happening here is quite significant.

I hope that people in the gallery understand that we, as the elected representatives of the people, the 301 members of the House of Commons, are legislators. We have been elected here to represent the people. We are the ones with democratic legitimacy. We know our constitutional history.

The Senate, and I will have the opportunity to come back to this, is not there to defy this House. The Senate is there to review the bills that are proposed to it by the House of Commons, but the House of Commons is the real decision-making centre in our democracy.

We had already chosen to divide the bill earlier. We went through the whole legislative process we had to go through and we were at third reading stage. It may be useful to remind those who are listening to us what this legislative work is.

A bill is introduced, which is the first reading, and everyone knows that this is something automatic; there is no debate at this stage. Then, there is second reading, where the principles of the bill are debated. At the end of the second reading stage, the bill is referred to a committee, one of the House's several standing committees of the House. Finally, there is the third reading stage, where we comment on the principles, once the bill has gone through clause by clause consideration in committee.

The bill we are asked us to split, to divide into two bills, had gone through most of the legislative process. It was at third reading stage.

What right does the Senate—which is made up of people who are not elected but appointed, as we know, through a partisan system, therefore people who for all intents and purposes do what the Prime Minister tells them to, because they do not represent anyone—have to do this? The Senate is not there to defy the House. The Senate could not bring the government down. The other place cannot hold a vote of non-confidence. Not only are senators not elected, but they cannot pass bills that would lead to increased government expenditures. And now, they want us to suspend the democratic will of members of the House of Commons. This is unacceptable. We shall never accept this kind of process.

What is worse, the government is demonstrating complacency beyond what we thought possible. We have seen that this government is servile. We have seen that this government is being complacent. Nor is this the first time that the government is being spineless. We have seen how the government is unable to hold its own when important issues are raised. However, for the government to ask us to forgo our privileges by asking us to agree that this not be a precedent, that is beyond comprehension.

How can the government be so servile? How can the government cave in so shamelessly when it comes to our work at legislators? We know that we are not dealing with a courageous government. We are not dealing with a very active government. We are having problems getting legislation to look at.

● (1040)

Not only is the government not active, not interventionist, but when the time comes for us to do our job, it is prepared to abdicate the privileges we have in this House. This is unacceptable.

Government Orders

I know that at such times we can rely on the Chair. The Speaker is the guardian of our freedoms. I do not know if Canadians and Quebecers are aware of this, but if there were a world conflict and if Parliament were unable to sit, the Speaker would have an important role to play. In an emergency situation, such as an apprehended insurrection or any other calamity that would prevent Parliament from sitting, should we have to contact the British authorities, the only person empowered to do so would be the Speaker.

This is why the Speaker is the guardian of our freedoms. When we see the Speaker and the Sergeant-at-Arms process in front of us with the mace, which is the symbol of our authority, we understand that we are invited to sit, that we are plenipotentiaries who can do what they were elected to do, which is to pass laws.

I will never accept that the other chamber would ask us, at a stage as late as third reading, to start the whole legislative process all over. This shows how anachronistic that institution is. Why, after three mandates, has this government still not deemed it appropriate to examine on the role of senators? Is it acceptable to have people who have no democratic legitimacy making decisions for their peers?

In this House, there is a convention. We accept dissent, we accept diverging views, we accept the fact that we may not all agree on something, but there is a common base, in that all members are elected. All members have received the same democratic stamp of approval. All members who rise in this House do so on behalf of their fellow citizens. But the other place wants to interfere with our authority, with our legitimacy.

I will never, no matter how long I live, forgive the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for the kind complacency, if not servility, that makes him so totally spineless when the time comes to defend our parliamentary privileges. He has the nerve to present this motion, even in its amended form. If there had not been an amendment, the government would have been perfectly willing to allow one of our privileges to be breached.

There is no greater privilege for members of this House than to organize how they operate as they see fit. We agree that the executive, the government, has a role, which is to initiate bills. Once again, however, that is not the issue today.

Today, we are saying that we acknowledge the fact that the other chamber has interfered with how we operate, trampled our authority, shown disdain for the work done by parliamentarians. Yet the government is asking us to say “This time we will accept it, but not as a precedent that will work against us later on”. This is not possible. We will not cooperate in such a ploy.

We do not necessarily have anything against the bill. The firearms issue does, of course, stir up a lot of passions. We are familiar with the debate here, even within our own caucus.

• (1045)

I am a Montreal MP, and of course have not received any representations about the firearms issue. The only animals in my riding are in the Biodome, and they are pretty well contained.

I do, however, readily acknowledge that some members have received many representations, particularly those whose ridings are in isolated regions, such as my friend, the member for Frontenac—

Mégantic, where the firearms issue is viewed in different terms than in Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, which is close to the inner city.

We agreed that the right to bear arms is not in our constitution. The right our citizens have under the constitution is to live in peace, free of violence and illegal search and seizure. They have the right to be protected from physical violence and to have their physical well-being respected. No one in this House, no constitutional expert, could argue that the right to bear arms is a right under the constitution.

It seemed reasonable to us—

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Réal Ménard: —because every person is entitled to eat properly, and every person is entitled to the right to express himself on a full stomach, and I feel that my rights in this regard are being violated at this very moment.

All this to say that gun ownership is not a constitutional right. It seemed reasonable to us to put registration mechanisms in place.

Of course, when it was being debated in the House, many members raised legitimate questions regarding the cost of registration. We were told \$15 or \$20 million, but it has risen to a billion dollars.

I watched the news carefully and I was extremely pleased to see that government members are exercising their right to dissent, given that one member questioned the current Minister of Industry's competence. This was the sad spectacle of a kind of intellectual sparring match between two members of the Liberal majority.

There are certainly many members of the House who think that there is some truth to what the Liberal member said about the Minister of Industry. However, these are all considerations that can be debated in public.

We agreed to recognize in 1995, 1996 and 1997, that owning a firearm is not a constitutional right, because of the fact that we live in a society sheltered from violence. The debate took place, the parties had their say, and we voted.

As for the bill on cruelty to animals, we also had some reservations. I am sure members will recall, with joy and nostalgia no doubt, the excellent work done by the member for Berthier—Montcalm at the time.

Incidentally, as everyone knows, we will soon have the pleasure, I hope, of welcoming another member for Berthier—Montcalm, who will join the Bloc Québécois caucus. I am taking this opportunity to invite all our fellow citizens from Berthier—Montcalm to go and vote on Monday. Let us not forget that there is nothing more precious in a democracy than to exercise one's right to vote. I remain fully confident that the voters of Berthier—Montcalm will put their trust in the Bloc Québécois candidate.

Having said this, let us go back to the essence of the motion before us. As parliamentarians, how could we accept that our rights as legislators not be respected?

Government Orders

Even though our parliament is a bicameral institution, which means that it is made up of two chambers, namely the House of Commons and the other place, we cannot accept that a bill that was introduced in this House, that was debated at second reading, at which time members from all parties had an opportunity to speak, a bill that received serious consideration in committee and that made it to third reading, should be amended.

As parliamentarians, we know that a member of Parliament shows his true worth in committee. Indeed, it is in committee that the real work of parliamentarians is done, because an expertise is developed, the process is less partisan, and we can of course work in the true spirit of cooperation and friendship that all parties should have.

• (1050)

The bill came back for third reading. All the parties represented in the House expressed their opinions. We sent it to the other place. The Senate, with a shocking disregard for our prerogative as members of Parliament, is asking us to review the bill's structure and to split it again. This is unacceptable. This would create a precedent.

This proves to us in the Bloc Québécois that it is high time we abolished this antiquated, backward, outdated, antidemocratic, obsolete institution, which has absolutely no place in a democratic system. When it comes time to look back on the Liberal Party's record and history, we will see how devoid of moral fibre and courage this party has been in refusing to modernize our political institutions.

The other place should have been abolished long ago. Anyone making decisions for their peers should be democratically and legitimately elected.

That is not what we are being proposed. They are proposing to ride roughshod over our prerogative. The Bloc Québécois will never permit the other place to come here and tell us to do our work differently, as if the debate had never taken place, as if we were not elected representatives and as if we were not democratically elected. When I rise in this House, I can speak legitimately on behalf of the people of Hochelaga—Maisonneuve.

Do parliamentarians know who the senators represent? What is the role of the Senate, in terms of democratic legitimacy? In truth, it does not have any.

Of course, historically, people will say that when the founding fathers designed the federal system, they wanted to give the senators, in that other place, a responsibility to protect minorities. You could tell me this, but this responsibility to protect minorities has nothing to do with the democratic legitimacy of the members of this House.

I must say it again, it is almost as if the Senate wanted to hold us hostage, to strangle us with a bear hug and prevent us from breathing democratically. This is out of the question.

A number of institutions, such as the Senate and the position of Governor General, need to be rethought. They are not especially democratic. Granted, there have been some representatives of the Queen whose descendants have graced this House. This is perhaps the most useful thing they ever did for society.

However, let us agree that the Senate, the Governor General and anyone who is not democratically elected, are no longer legitimate in the 21st century. I am thankful that the Canadian Alliance has moved an amendment that invites us to take a firm stand. If by some misfortune this amendment were adopted, I hope that all government members and the hon. members of this House will understand the precedent that would be set. Imagine how vulnerable we would be. What happened once could happen again and again.

If ever the Senate were so ill-advised as to not approve bills referred to it or to refuse again to split a bill, the other place could claim a precedent and could say, "We did it for the bill on cruelty to animals and gun control; we could do it for any other bill".

I am asking all those who believe in democracy, in our role as parliamentarians and in democratic legitimacy, to stop this trend towards disrespect for parliamentarians and to vote against the motion. I am asking the hon. members to approve the Canadian Alliance's amendment, so that if the Senate ever wants to claim a precedent, we can say no.

• (1055)

We will have been vigilant and have exercised our prerogative as representatives of the people. We are going to send the same message and stand together as one in telling the Senate, "We do not accept the Senate's cavalier attitude toward the House of Commons". That is what the Canadian Senate is up to.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from the Bloc for his comments, especially his point that no matter whom people vote for on Monday, it is important for the people of that riding in Quebec to get out in full force and vote for the candidate of their choice.

I want to give the member an opportunity to speak a little more on the Bloc's idea of what should take place in Senate reform.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, as you know, there are five ways of amending the Constitution. Sometimes this requires the consent of all provinces, sometimes the 7-50 formula, consent of seven provinces representing 50% of the population. Sometimes it needs the consent of the federal government and the province concerned, as was the case when we changed the language-based school boards. Sometimes it requires not just the consent of the federal government but also that of the province concerned and the adjacent province, when boundaries are being changed.

To abolish the Senate of Canada would of course require a round of constitutional negotiations. The Senate is, in our opinion, an outmoded institution, one that has outlived its usefulness, an anachronism, with no justification for its existence. The Senate should be abolished, and steps taken to ensure that all those who make decisions for their peers, all those who represent the public, are elected representatives.

S. O. 31

[English]

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like the member to compare what I am about to say with bringing many things into one bill. I remember when we had autograph books, one of the little verses was:

Roses are red,
Violets are blue,
I've got a horse,
Can you swim?

It did not mean anything. Would the member not agree that putting things together of a different nature in one bill means the same thing, particularly when it comes from that side of the House?

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, our colleague could not have been more eloquent. I would encourage this House to realize that a romantic poet lurks inside our colleague, which adds greatly to his charm.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

QUEEN'S JUBILEE MEDAL

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge 20 deserving citizens of Surrey North who have been selected to receive the Queen's Golden Jubilee Medal for their outstanding service to the community.

They are: Chuck Bailey, Raghbir Singh Bains, Doreen Biener, Bill Brand, Al Cleaver, Dale Denney, Brenda Dudfield, Elizabeth Gilbert, Carol Girardi, Eileen Gratland, Daniel Igali, Wady Lehmann, Betty McClurg, Gerry Morden, Pritam Muker, Jean Munday, Peter Nichols, Dr. John O'Brien-Bell, Ole Olson and Catherine Schoen.

I would also like to pay tribute to the many others who were nominated. I invite the House to congratulate these individuals who have given so freely of themselves to the benefit of their community.

* * *

HALIFAX HARBOUR

Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 85 years ago today, just after 9 a.m., the beautiful, bustling harbour front of Halifax was reduced to a pile of smouldering rubble.

The Halifax explosion, at the time the largest man-made explosion ever, killed between 1,600 and 2,500 people and displaced thousands more, leaving them homeless and missing family and friends.

A centre for naval activity and ocean going commerce since its founding in 1949, Halifax is no stranger to nautical disasters. However, the scope of the collision between the Belgian relief ship *Imo* and French munitions vessel *Mont Blanc* and the ensuing destruction is beyond the understanding of contemporaries and historians alike.

I ask all members to join with me in remembering this solemn occasion with the respect it deserves.

● (1100)

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1989, the lives of 14 young women were tragically cut short at L'École Polytechnique in Montreal. They were killed because of their gender.

In 1991 the Parliament of Canada established the National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women to commemorate the loss of these young women and to reflect on the reality of violence against women in our society. This day has become a day to reflect, not only upon the losses but also to turn a thought to the many Canadian women and girls who live daily with the threat of violence.

It is equally important to remember that December 6 represents a day for communities to find concrete actions each Canadian can act upon in their own lives to prevent and eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls.

We must commemorate, reflect and take action in our own personal way. We must help to put an end to the violence against women because it can and does affect all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

LAC-SAINT-JEAN—SAGUENAY BYELECTION

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, something interesting is happening in the riding of Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay: the Bloc Québécois's popularity is declining.

Militant separatists, such as Bernard Pilote, admit "People place less trust in our party's candidate than in the other party's candidate". Jacques Brassard has almost conceded victory in the byelection to the Liberal candidate. He says "They could win".

The Bloc has accomplished surprisingly little. They have been representing the riding for more than ten years, yet they have nothing to show for it. One chair is all the Bloc brought back to Lac-Saint-Jean from Ottawa. One chair does not create jobs nor ensure regional development.

It is obvious, Liberal candidate Gilbert Tremblay can make a difference in the region. Next Monday, the Bloc will get the message. The riding of Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay will be a winner.

* * *

QUEBEC BYELECTIONS

Mr. Georges Farrah (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the byelections underway in Quebec raise a very important question: the relevance of the Bloc Québécois.

The public, sovereignists, journalists and regional stakeholders are seriously wondering. Let me quote a few.

S. O. 31

First, Marc Beausoleil, a militant sovereignist, said “I wonder if it is still appropriate for the Bloc Québécois to be in Ottawa”. ●(1105)

Jacques Brassard, a former PQ minister, said, speaking of the Bloc “This is a party that was born to die. Perhaps its time has come”. [Translation]

In Berthier—Montcalm and Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay, we do not want the opposition anymore. It is time to stop blocking issues, and start focussing on the development of these ridings.

Next Monday, vote for your Liberal candidate. Vote in your own interest.

* * *

[English]

MEMBER FOR LASALLE—ÉMARD

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Karl Marx once noted that history's great events happen twice, first as a tragedy, then a farce.

A modern case in point is the second leadership run by the former Liberal finance minister, the member for LaSalle—Émard.

Why a farce? Once he was opposed to free trade, then he flipped and not only supported free trade but expanded it. Once he was going to abolish GST. Not only was it not abolished when he was finance minister, but it was further entrenched by the creation of the HST. At first he said that Kyoto did not go far enough, then he said that it was a bad plan, then he said that we should consult the provinces and now he is going to vote for ratification by Christmas.

While campaigning he said that we needed to invest in our armed forces but he was the guy who gutted our armed forces for almost a decade. He says that we need to eliminate the democratic deficit but he does not even allow the free sale of memberships within his own party. The last time he ran for the leadership he said that he supported an elected Senate. Now he says that he is opposed.

He says that the accounting scandals of Enron must be noticed and that we must have truth in accounting. Where is the truth in accounting for EI?

About corporate responsibility, perhaps the former finance minister could tell Canadians why his company, Canada Steamship Lines, does not have its ships registered to pay taxes in Canada.

There is a credibility gap and this man should not be trusted.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while many of us were affected by the tragedy at École Polytechnique in Montreal 13 years ago, the real pain was and always will be felt by the families and the friends of the victims.

Violence against women touches every Canadian community. It takes away their dignity, breaks the strength of our communities and fosters unacceptable social attitudes and behaviours toward women.

I call upon all my colleagues and all Canadians to join in National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women to end the cycle of violence against women.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, 14 young women from l'École Polytechnique in Montreal were tragically killed because of their gender. Fourteen young women shot in cold blood, hundreds of lives shattered, and everyone in Quebec shaken.

On this Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women, the Bloc Québécois is joining all the organizations dedicated to the advocacy and support of battered women in taking concrete, visible action against violence against women.

We also want to pay tribute to all the victims of such unacceptable violence and urge men to mobilize in support of women's action to eliminate violence against women and girls.

We in the Bloc Québécois hope that the federal government will respond to the World March of Women demands and make the necessary money available, so that the many obstacles in the lives of women can be removed.

* * *

[English]

NUNAVUT

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Nunavut Association of Municipalities held its annual general meeting in Ottawa in April. Many of my colleagues met the mayors of Nunavut and participated in the fundraising auction.

Today Mayor Keith Peterson of Cambridge Bay presented a donation cheque on behalf of NAM to Tungasuvvingat Inuit, a local Inuit organization that works hard to help Inuit here in Ottawa.

Earlier this week I presented a wall hanging to the National Press Club made by the students of Kiilnik High School, thanking the National Press Club for the very generous and successful book drive it held for its community of Cambridge Bay, Nunavut.

I thank all the generous people who have taken the time and effort to lend a helping hand, and I wish every one season's greetings.

AQUACULTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the aquaculture industry contributes over a billion dollars to the Canadian economy through its production and sale of nearly 120,000 metric tonnes of farmed salmon and other products yearly. It has the ability to harvest the product and sell it as fresh 365 days a year.

In my riding of Skeena there is much interest in expanding the number of aquaculture sites as a means of sustainable employment for remote coastal communities. This interest is also growing among some aboriginal groups.

I have always advocated for more development on the north coast of B.C., be it offshore oil and gas, grain shipments through the port of Prince Rupert or aquaculture. Development must be done in an environmentally sustainable manner, following clearly defined government regulations, and must benefit the local economy.

This is something myself and the Canadian Alliance have always supported.

* * *

RELIGIOUS CELEBRATIONS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Muslims all over the world began the celebration to mark the end of the month long fast of Ramadan. On the same day, Jews all over the world are celebrating the last day of Hanukkah. It is a time to focus especially on families, on sharing, on values and on community building. It is a time to work toward peace and harmony. What a powerful symbol for these two religions.

I would like to offer my best wishes to Canadian Jews on the end of Hanukkah and my best wishes to Canadian Muslims on Eid Mubbarak.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on this day, December 6, we mark and remember the anniversary of the 14 young women who were brutally murdered at Montreal's École Polytechnique.

I want to recognize the leadership of Dawn Black, former NDP member of Parliament, who brought forward this day as a National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women. Thirteen years later we remember the horror of what took place and the ongoing suffering and grief of the families.

The case of the 66 missing women in Vancouver's downtown east side, 15 of whom are known to be murdered, is also evidence that violence against women, particularly poor and aboriginal women, is increasing.

Governments have failed to act on every level. The federal government must bear responsibility as women suffer ongoing cutbacks in services. The government must demonstrate that ending violence against women is truly a priority. It must be reflected in the laws, programs, services and community supports so that women can live without the fear and abuse of violence. Nothing less will do.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday this week, I went to Quyon, a small municipality in Pontiac County, to deliver a cheque for \$1,000 to Linda Gagné, coordinator of The Angel Tree, a charitable organization that distributes Christmas presents to underprivileged children in the region.

The money came from the Quebec association of federal Liberal assistants, who started a program a few years ago to make donations to various charities in Quebec recommended to them by their members. This year, four charitable organizations in Quebec received \$1,000 each to support their charitable activities.

On behalf of my constituents and everyone who has benefited from the great generosity of the Quebec Liberal assistants, I would sincerely like to congratulate them and thank them for their generous donations to organizations helping the less fortunate.

We can only hope that the commendable efforts of the Quebec association of Liberal assistants will inspire other organizations in the community to follow suit.

* * *

● (1110)

QUEBEC BYELECTIONS

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the theme of the Liberal candidates in Berthier—Montcalm and in Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay is that they can get money for their region because they will become government members. According to them, constituents must vote the right way.

What does this really mean? The riding represented by the most powerful person in Ottawa for the past 10 years, the Prime Minister of Canada and member for the riding of Saint-Maurice, continues to have one of the highest unemployment rates in Quebec.

By contrast, the riding of Sherbrooke, which is proudly represented by a Bloc Québécois member, can take pride in the fact that it has one of the highest employment rates in Quebec.

This should come as no surprise, since we know that it is for their friends that Liberal members are really good at getting money.

While Liberal members from Quebec are working for western Canada's oil industry, Bloc Québécois members are fighting for softwood lumber workers, farmers, the unemployed, the most disadvantaged of our seniors, young families, the sick and local businesses. In short, they are working for Quebeckers, and they are proud to do so.

Oral Questions

[English]

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago a lone gunman walked into a classroom in Montreal's École Polytechnique and viciously murdered 14 young women. The victims were chosen, not because of something they had said or done, but simply because of who they were and what they aspired to become.

Today we mourn the passing of those 14 young women who were taken away from their loved ones at a tragically young age. However our reflections must go beyond the brutal acts that took place in that classroom.

Today we mourn all the women who have suffered in silence at the hands of a stranger, a father, a brother, a husband or a boyfriend.

The unthinkable act of December 6, 1989, must serve as a cold reminder of the countless acts of violence against women that occur every day. As individuals and as members of this House we have a duty to do everything we can to put an end to that violence.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today has been marked as a day of remembrance, not just in memory of the horrific murder of 14 young women at École Polytechnique, but to remind us of our collective responsibility to protect the innocent and vulnerable.

Violence against women also devastates the lives of those who loved them: their partners, mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, grandparents, friends and neighbours. The circle of sadness and grief is infinitely wide.

The ugly echos of violence against women sound in the lives of far too many children. Violence against women is violence against us all because members of a society are interdependent.

On this day of special remembrance, I urge parliamentarians and all Canadians to renew their resolve to make the protection and safety of every member of our society a matter of utmost importance.

* * *

[Translation]

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, December 6, is the National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women. Surely, there is no need to demonstrate that violence against women is unacceptable.

However, the various types of violence of which women are victims are specific manifestations of a broader social issue that requires unique attention and solutions. Violence can stand in the way of full equality for women in our society, and it remains a problem in Canada.

It is important that all Canadian men and women recognize that violence is unacceptable, regardless of whom it is directed against.

This recognition should also not end when the sun sets today. It should be apparent every day of the year.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: I invite members to rise for a minute of silence.

[Editor's Note: The House stood in silence]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

● (1115)

[English]

FIREARMS REGISTRY

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the government was asked over and over how much it would cost to complete the firearms registry and how much to maintain it. Either unwilling or unable to answer that question, it has had 24 hours to go through its advisers and strategists, so I will ask the question again.

How much will it cost Canadian taxpayers who are paying the bill to complete the firearms registry and how much to maintain it?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice dealt with these questions yesterday. He has taken very firm action in response to the Auditor General's report.

At his request, less than 24 hours ago, all parties of the House agreed to withdraw the supplementary estimates of \$72 million. The minister has frozen discretionary spending. He has asked a private firm to audit the program and report in January. Once this happens, we will be able to come forward with more details.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the answer still is not forthcoming. I did ask two questions but I will make it easier for the minister answering for the government.

How much is it going to cost to complete the firearms registry? Just one question this time.

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has acknowledged the criticisms in the Auditor General's report and has agreed to accept the recommendations.

What we cannot forget is the real end game here of the Canadian Alliance. The real end game of the Canadian Alliance is to undermine a law that is supported by 80% of Canadians, which went through this House and the Senate, and is working.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Canadians will still support the law when they realize that we were promised it would cost \$2 million and it ended up costing \$1 billion.

Let me ask the second part of the question since the minister is either unwilling or unable to answer the first part. How much will the annual cost be to maintain the registry when it is completed? That one is easier.

Oral Questions

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is interesting to note is in the last 24 hours other people from the law enforcement community have come forward to support this law and how effective it has been at reducing crime with weapons. In fact, the commissioner of the RCMP said that the wider community in the country supports not only the law, but the gun registry.

The gun registry will continue. Any problems we have had with the administration of it will be dealt with and they will be dealt with very quickly.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the minister is not answering that question.

In fact, the minister yesterday stated that all major spending for this program had been frozen, yet he said the registry will remain operational. How is that going to work? The money has to come from somewhere.

Can the minister guarantee to the House that he will not be taking money away from front line police officers to pay for this gun registry of his?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we looked back at some quotes over the last few years we would see a systematic attempt by the reform party, now the Canadian Alliance, to undermine the law passed by Parliament.

The former member for Crowfoot, remember him? He was another great member of the reform party. He released details about a loophole that would have allowed people to avoid the registry by leasing guns instead of buying them.

Another former reform member from Cypress Hills—Grasslands, remember him? He said, “There will be many thousands of people who will resist this law, even with the jail sentence staring them in the face. I will be in there and if I have to do a year, fine”.

That is what is really motivating the Canadian—

• (1120)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that does not address the issue of the Minister of Justice of the day saying it would cost \$2 million and it is now running to over \$1 billion. That is incompetence.

If the minister is determined to keep this program running, it is obvious it will have to be financed. Will the Minister of Justice tell the House what justice department program he intends to pilfer to pay for this latest billion dollar boondoggle?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the Canadian Alliance has been taking its lead on this issue from the National Rifle Association in the United States. The Alliance should know that Charlton Heston is not really Moses, he just played him in a movie.

Unlike the Alliance, we do not believe that Canada with guns on the street is the way to the promised land.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Agriculture attended the Union des producteurs agricoles conference, he got a pretty chilly reception for his presentation of the main funding thrusts for the new federal agricultural policy. This confirms farmers' fears, because the minister plans to have Ottawa make the decisions regarding Quebec's agricultural development.

Does the minister understand that he would do far better if he demonstrated some real flexibility and transferred the federal funds to the Financière agricole?

[*English*]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I assume that the issue the hon. member is raising is the distribution of the \$600 million transition money that the government put forward to support our industry. The government made the decision, as the government should make the decision, that farmers in Canada would all be treated equitably. The money was distributed in such a way that they are treated equitably whether they live in Saskatchewan, Ontario, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, or Quebec. We will maintain that approach.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Quebec fear that they will be hard hit by the federal government's unfair policies, and by one more fight started by Ottawa because of its inflexibility.

When is the minister going to understand that the agricultural reality of Quebec requires tailor-made policies and that these policies must be administered within Quebec using tools developed by the farmers of Quebec that reflect their reality and their needs?

[*English*]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in June 2001 at the summer and annual meeting of the ministers of agriculture from the provinces, the territories and the federal government, all ministers, including the minister of agriculture from Quebec, agreed that we needed to move forward in an equitable way with national standards so that all farmers in Canada would be treated the same, including those in Quebec. That is the approach we will continue to take as a national government.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the president of the Quebec Farmers' Association, Cindy Duncan McMillan, summarized the position of Quebec farmers rather well: “Our counterparts in other provinces are envious of our programs, our union and our industry. If you want equity, allow us to show the rest of Canada how it is done. Show trust in us and in the Financière agricole”.

This message could not be any clearer. Did the minister get Mrs. Duncan McMillan's message?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the federal dollars will be distributed on an equitable basis to farmers across Canada. A grain farmer in Quebec is treated the same as a grain farmer in Saskatchewan. There is equitability in that way, for example.

There is absolutely nothing prohibiting the provinces, there never has been and there is not now, from doing other things and more things, as the province of Quebec has done in the past for the Quebec farmers with the money from the province of Quebec. Provincial programs are available to be put in place by the provincial governments.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a motion has been adopted unanimously by the Quebec National Assembly, and the general congress of the UPA was also unanimous in calling for the federal funds to be transferred to the Financière agricole.

What more does the Minister of Agriculture want?

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what this minister wants and what the government insists on and will continue to insist on is that all farmers in Canada, when it comes to the use of federal money, will be treated in exactly the same way.

As we have in other provinces, the actual administration of the distribution of those dollars can be handed over to the provinces, but not how they are distributed because we are going to ensure that producers are treated in exactly the same way across the country.

* * *

● (1125)

FIREARMS REGISTRY

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, we know that yesterday the government was forced to back down from the \$72 million increase for the firearms registry. This issue is not about guns. It is about unacceptable waste by the government.

On at least five occasions the government secretly shifted money to the firearms registry through the Treasury Board contingency fund and then repaid that money to the fund. Will the government give a commitment now that the Treasury Board contingency funds will not be used to fund the firearms registry? What we want is a guarantee that the government—

The Deputy Speaker: I regret, but the time is up. The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it was evident in the reply yesterday from the Minister of Justice that all appropriate measures necessary to deal with this unfortunate situation will be taken by the government. I think the minister should be taken at good faith.

* * *

TERRORISM

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, when the Solicitor General made his announcement on November 27 that the

federal government was adding six groups to the list of suspected terrorist groups, he noted that he was considering adding others.

Yesterday the Minister of Foreign Affairs said, “The last statement of the leader of Hezbollah is clearly an indication his party is advocating a form of conduct that we do not approve of and that would be contributing to global terrorism”.

In that light, could the government confirm whether Hezbollah is one of those groups? Has the Minister of Foreign Affairs made such a request to the Solicitor General and if not, why not?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, facts continue to be compiled in terms of quite a number of entities, actually. It is under my mandate as the Solicitor General that I have to look at the facts based on criminal and security intelligence information and that is in fact what I will do. The hon. member can be assured that we will be bringing forward entities in the not too distant future.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on this national day of remembrance and action on violence against women, we remember the horror of the 14 young women who were so brutally murdered.

That tragedy compelled action, including the need to register guns to prevent violence against women.

Now we are faced with the staggering financial mismanagement of the registry, while at the same time services and programs to women have been cut.

I would like to ask the minister, will the government end this disgraceful record of mismanagement and restore front line services for women who are facing poverty and violence?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member recognizes the fact that the country has a gun control law that works and is effective, and no greater rationale for it is, of course, the ceremony that we have marked earlier, with the tragic deaths of women in Montreal and the ones that have occurred in Vancouver.

I have to underscore the fact that the gun control law is there. It will stay, as will the registry.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister is full of wishful thinking on what he would like to hear. I think I very clearly suggested and put forward that the registry had been completely mismanaged. Let us remember it was set up to prevent violence against women, while at the same time the homicide rate for young women separated from their spouses is double that for other women.

Again I ask the minister, how does the government plan to deal with the mismanagement and also prevent the murders of more women?

Oral Questions

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned about the issues that the hon. member raises. The reality is that we take many measures on this side of the House to look at prevention. We work very hard at trying to find new ways of prevention. The gun control legislation is simply one method that we have used. We will keep looking for other ways and means of preventing those situations that occur and that the hon. member is concerned about.

* * *

TERRORISM

Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, for two decades now Hezbollah's chief, Nasrallah, has called for war on the western world. Hezbollah has struck in South America. It has struck in Europe. It has killed in the Middle East. It has killed hundreds of Americans and it has promised more killings worldwide. Suddenly yesterday the foreign affairs minister had this revelation. He said, "Hezbollah...does not intend to be governed by the rules of civilized conduct". As my five year old granddaughter would say, "Hello?"

What out of body experience did the foreign affairs minister have to suddenly wake him up and stop his year-long defence of Hezbollah? What happened?

• (1130)

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Solicitor General has told the House, it is his responsibility and it is the government's responsibility to ensure the safety of Canadians and we will continue to do that.

It is my job to advise the Solicitor General of foreign policy issues, which include guaranteeing peace where possible but suppressing terrorism through our international conduct. The statements made by the sheik yesterday made it very clear that we have to factor that into our decision and we will do that.

I am confident that the Solicitor General and the cabinet will deal with this matter in the interests of security for Canadians, our allies and the development of peace around the world.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, rather than blaming the Solicitor General, I am asking the foreign affairs minister this. After months of Canadian Alliance pressure on this, after dozens of questions on this, after a record of killing and murder by this Hezbollah group, after announcements time and again on its Internet, an Internet which a high school student in Canada can tap into and see that it is dangerous, what was it that caused the flip-flop? If this has caused the flip-flop and he believes it is dangerous, why is he not putting it on the list of banned groups today?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member is having an out of body experience. The fact of the matter is that he is talking about the latest headlines that he reads in the papers. We have heard those latest headlines before.

We have a responsibility as a government to base the listing of entities on criminal and security intelligence information. We will do

that. We will not be pushed to do it hastily. We will do it in the proper fashion in the proper order and we will do it timely and soon.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ÉCOLE DE MÉDECINE VÉTÉRAIRE DE SAINT-HYACINTHE

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food was at the UPA congress but said nothing about any progress in connection with the École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe. With three days left until its deadline to report to the American association, Ottawa has all but abandoned the school and Quebec will no longer be able to train accredited veterinarians in French.

Will the federal government stop treating Quebec with contempt and immediately free up the necessary money to allow the only French language school of veterinary medicine in North America to regain its full accreditation?

[*English*]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking questions on a daily basis on this issue, but I can tell you that he is not working anywhere near as hard as the member for Shefford on this side, as the backbenchers and all of the government who approached this. They have been leading the way.

I also want to make one thing very clear. December 9 is a date that has been set by some people in Quebec, but it is not the final date. December 9 is the date on which the board and the university are starting to prepare their presentation to the accreditation body, which they must provide to that accreditation body by the end of December this year.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is not just a date set by some people. It is a date set by the American association, and the dean must present a final report and say that the federal government is not giving one red cent to the school of veterinary medicine to modernize its equipment and to keep its accreditation.

The countdown is starting, you might say. It sends a signal to students who are thinking of enrolling in the school of veterinary sciences in Saint-Hyacinthe in the near future not to go, because the school may very well lose its accreditation in the end.

I am asking the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food to stop the waffling and party politics and to make a commitment today to support the modernization of the school's equipment so that it can continue—

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

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member that we are fully aware of the situation approaching as far as the review of the accreditation of the college at Saint-Hyacinthe, and there are three other university colleges that are approaching similar reviews across this country and—

• (1135)

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Loubier: No, it's the only one. Liar.

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief: —I can repeat again that the government is working very hard and we will continue to work very hard in order to do all that we can to ensure that no veterinary college, whether it be in Saint-Hyacinthe—

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Loubier: Liar. You are a liar.

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief: —whether it be in Prince Edward Island, whether it be in Ontario or Saskatchewan, loses its accreditation.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has a dark cloud of scandal hanging over him. It is alleged that when he was junior minister for amateur sport he interceded on behalf of his friends at Groupe Everest to ensure that they were awarded a half million dollar contract.

The minister denies his involvement, but his former executive director, Roger Farley, confirms it.

Could we get the ethics counsellor to investigate this immediately and to clear the air by making the report public?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, before the November break, this matter was debated in the House in question period.

The ethics counsellor said that he was looking into the matter and that he would make that report public at the appropriate time.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): That is right, Mr. Speaker, and a month ago, as requested by the Deputy Prime Minister, I wrote to the government's so-called ethics counsellor, Howard Wilson, regarding this very issue. To date he has not replied.

When I tried to raise this issue with Mr. Wilson yesterday in the procedure and House affairs committee, the Liberal chairman would not allow my questions.

What good is an ethics counsellor if he does not even reply to requests to investigate? Why do the Liberals' ethics not require them to get to the truth?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we are dealing with accusations of this magnitude

and when we are dealing with people's reputations, we have to be extremely careful.

I note that Mr. Wilson is quoted today in the newspaper as saying that he wants his officials to make sure that the hon. member's complaint "is not vexatious and frivolous...". He is doing his job to protect everyone's reputations.

* * *

*[Translation]***HEALTH**

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this week the Auditor General brought out into the open the administrative fiasco of the firearm registry program. At the same time, we had the government indicating its intention to meddle in the administration of the health care system. There is a bit of a paradox here.

Should the government not use today's meeting of ministers of health to show its concern for the well-being of patients by announcing the immediate and unconditional transfer of the funds to Quebec?

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to inform the House that the provincial health ministers are meeting today in Toronto with the federal Minister of Health.

In a spirit of collaboration and cooperation, they will be examining ways to develop and improve a health care system that will meet the needs of Canadians and reflect the contents of the very significant reports available to us, namely the Romanow, Kirby and Clair reports—

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

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure control over the funding it provides to the first nations, the government requires 168 reports of them, and nothing is done with them. Yet the government insists on enforcing a reporting process for health expenditures, when the public knows very well that it is the one that has the last word on this.

Does the minister not agree that the only real accountability is when governments go to the people?

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our reception of the Auditor General report was highly positive. It is always a pleasure to receive her reports. It is, in the end, this information that will enable us to work together to improve the situation of all Canadians.

We are well aware of the point my colleague is raising. We are equally aware of the fact that there is room for improvement when it comes to the reporting required of these people. This is why we wish to sit down with representatives of the various departments in order to ensure—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam.

[English]

FINANCE

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, an illegal Russian immigrant is charged with using three privately owned automatic teller machines to steal more than \$1.2 million, but there is a twist. He did not steal the money from the machines. He owned the machines.

He used the ATMs to gather bank information and PIN numbers from unsuspecting customers and robbed their accounts later. These machines were authorized by the federal Competition Tribunal but because they are not operated by a chartered bank, they are unregulated.

When will the government act to protect both consumers and legitimate owners of private ATMs?

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if someone is defrauding the banks' customers from ATM machines, he or she is subject to prosecution by the law. Obviously they will go to court and they will be dealt with.

Now if there is in fact a widespread problem in this particular industry, it will be reviewed by the government and appropriate actions would be taken.

• (1140)

Mr. Richard Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the problem is that no one really regulates these white label ATMs and as a result consumers are not protected from fraud artists. The federal laws that govern the same operations of ATMs of the financial institutions do not apply to white label ATMs.

We have to ask the question, why is the government making it so easy for ATM fraud artists to operate in Canada?

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we are not making it easy. First, it is a Criminal Code offence and it will be dealt with. If someone steals something, whether it is from a bank or a store, the same principle applies under the Criminal Code.

Sometimes in the House props might be useful, in this case to draw the member a picture: Criminal Code, people steal, they get prosecuted and go to court, and we will deal with it.

* * *

JOB CREATION

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the employment figure for the month of November has just been released. It is not 4,000, it is not 14,000, it is not 40,000, but 42,300 new jobs.

Could the Minister of Finance give us any new information on the employment front for the year 2002?

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first let me point out that the unemployment rate for this month is down to 7.5%. Most of the 42,000 new jobs are in the manufacturing sector.

Oral Questions

The total for the year, and I will say this very slowly, is 502,000 new jobs, of which almost 100,000 were created among young Canadians. What is important is that this shows that the prudent policies of the government have created the economic climate for this type of job growth.

* * *

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government likes to pat itself on the back on the improvement of jobs situation.

The fact is persons with disabilities have a 50% unemployment rate in this country and the government is about to let expire a very important disability support and wage subsidy program for vulnerable Canadians. The employment assistance for persons with disabilities program is said to expire in March. The current recipients need to know if the program will be renewed.

Will the government let that \$193 million per year program continue into 2003-04 or should these groups—

The Deputy Speaker: I have tried to be very generous, but the hon. Minister of Human Resources Development.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a very timely question and I thank the hon. member for her interest in this file.

Indeed last week I met with the ministers of social services and we talked about expediting the new replacement program for employment assistance for people with disabilities.

I can tell the hon. member that I was most optimistic coming out of that meeting. Ministers right across the country want to work with the Government of Canada to ensure that these moneys, \$193 million today, will continue to flow for the benefit of Canadians with disabilities.

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's comments.

The government has promised a labour market strategy for the one in six Canadians with a disability in the last two throne speeches. It still has not happened and we still see the largest employment support program getting ready to expire.

I appreciate the minister's sentiment but I need to know as well as the groups that are working in this area, when will it happen? Will it happen before March, does the anxiety continue forever, or will we know ASAP?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that provincial ministers and myself have agreed on a framework of action that deals with the question of employability, supply and demand. We want to ensure that EAPD moneys are reflected against that framework and can be leveraged with existing provincial moneys.

Oral Questions

The hon. member can rest assured that the government is committed to ensuring that Canadians with disabilities can exercise their full rights as citizens in this country.

* * *

• (1145)

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, we know that the ratification of the Kyoto protocol will adversely affect agriculture. All agriculture stakeholders have said emphatically that carbon sink credits must be given to the owner of the property. The federal government has been somewhat reluctant to agree to that.

Will the Minister of Agriculture stand today and tell us that agricultural carbon sink credits will go to agricultural landowners?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the first correction needed is in the first words of the hon. member's preamble to his question.

The fact is if we do not act on climate change agriculture in Canada will be dramatically and negatively impacted. We will see large areas, particularly areas that depend upon the eastern slope of the Rockies for their water supplies, literally disappearing as agricultural sectors for the Canadian economy.

That is why it is so important for the agricultural community, and in particular the agricultural community in Alberta, to understand that we must have measures to reduce the impact of climate change on the agricultural industry.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGROPUR PLANT IN CHAMBORD

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, last week, the Secretary of State responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec confirmed in this House that he had met with stakeholders in the matter of the Agropur plant in Chambord. He assured them that the federal government would provide financial support for the local consortium that wants to reopen the plant.

What is the nature and amount of the federal assistance, and when can the consortium expect to receive a cheque?

Hon. Claude Drouin (Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I met with the people from the plant in Chambord last Monday, along with our candidate, Gilbert Tremblay, who is doing an excellent job in supporting people, we indicated that we were prepared to work together with them on a feasibility study.

However, the hon. member should understand that we need to see the plans before we can determine how much money will be granted.

We assured them we would work in cooperation with them, and that is what we will do.

[*English*]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government is blindly stampeding the Canadian economy over a financial cliff to sure disaster if it ratifies the Kyoto agreement. On Tuesday, the agriculture department's assistant deputy minister for research said that his bureau still has not done a cost benefit analysis of the impact Kyoto will have on agriculture.

Why has this research not been done?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have done extensive research on the major sectors of the Canadian economy.

The issue for the hon. member who comes from Alberta is why he is not recognizing the importance of dealing with a long term problem which will literally eliminate the type of agriculture we now have on the areas of the prairies dependent upon the eastern slope of the Rockies for the flow of water, particularly the flows in the summer times.

It is really incredible that this party has not understood the impact that climate change could have on prairie agriculture.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the member who asked the question is from Manitoba, and agriculture was not one of the sectors studied. In fact the government's modelling was so bad that we were told that one of its main assumptions was that petroleum producers could not even pass their costs onto farmers.

In 1998 a study conducted by our largest trading partner, the U.S., determined that implementing Kyoto would increase farm expenses by 32%, diminish agricultural exports, and put farmers out of business. They called the Kyoto protocol "the single biggest public policy threat to the agricultural community today".

Is it not true that the reason the government has hidden its results from farmers is because its conclusions confirm the results of the U.S. study?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think what is true is that this party, as it always has been on so many issues, is behind the times.

The hon. member said himself that it was a 1998 study, one which many other studies and all other studies have said was not done well and in fact is not relevant to the situation today.

The specific question that the head of research in Agriculture Canada was asked the other day was if there were specific projects in research in Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, and the individual said no. However the policy and the overall review has been done and I will be informing—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Terrebonne—Blainville.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that 21% of federal public servants in general report that they have been subjected to harassment. The situation is comparable in the prisons.

Can the Solicitor General inform us of what efforts have been made by his department to ensure effective application of the policy on harassment policy by Correctional Services?

• (1150)

[English]

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that the RCMP and other agencies under the department of the Solicitor General do take these matters seriously. We ensure that the guidelines, as established for the Government of Canada and the Human Rights Commission, are in fact followed, and if they are not, there would be penalties.

[Translation]

Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that the government is currently investing considerable sums to determine the extent of the problem, but there was a report back in 1999 that pointed out that there was much still to be done to eliminate harassment from federal workplaces.

How many reports does the Solicitor General need before actually implementing the harassment policy in his department's facilities?

[English]

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we always welcome reports that outline if there is a problem in any area. The Treasury Board minister yesterday mentioned that progress was not made to the extent that had been fully hoped, but what these reports do for us is give us an analysis of areas where there should be improvement.

I can assure the House that the Government of Canada is working on improvements because harassment should not take place in the workplace.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in 1993 the Liberal red book promised to establish an independent claims commission to resolve certain types of disputes between the government and first nations. In 1998 a joint task force report from the government and first nations also concluded that a claims commission should be independent and not controlled by the government, but in Bill C-6 the government has broken its promise to have a truly independent claims commission. In committee, the government rejected all amendments that would have brought independence to the commission.

Why is the Indian affairs minister no longer committed to an independent claims commission?

Mr. John Finlay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. There are three parties

involved in specific claims: the first nations, Canada, and the provincial governments. This commission is being changed in order that decisions can be made more quickly and more satisfactorily so that first nations can get on with the matter of controlling their own land.

* * *

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the disastrous national energy program costs hundreds of businesses thousands of jobs and leaves families in turmoil due to failed Liberal Ouija board economic planning. We all want a clean environment. The Kyoto costs are not explained and not detailed. Provinces and businesses have not had their say. The members for Edmonton West and Edmonton Southeast must stand up with Albertans and say no to Kyoto.

How could the government have the audacity to ask Canadians to buy into the unexplained Liberal, shoot from the lip, Kyoto plan? How?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the problem that the opposition has is denying that there is a plan, denying that there is this document in existence, and therefore it cannot get around to reading what is in it.

However, if the hon. member would like to, this weekend, off the record, perhaps behind closed doors, sneak out a copy and look to page 31 he will get the figures that he is asking for. It is all in the book. All he has to do is recognize the book exists and read it.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Canadian Heritage has a remarkable commitment to francophone minorities in Canada. In fact, she is in Moncton delivering the goods yet again.

Could the parliamentary secretary to the minister tell us what good news the government has for francophone minorities in New Brunswick.

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that today the Minister of Canadian Heritage along with Premier Lord in New Brunswick are announcing \$2 million to assist in the implementation of New Brunswick's new Official Languages Act.

We are proud to be partners with New Brunswick as it assists its local municipalities to comply with the act, the purpose of which is to create an awareness and to promote the use of French and English in the administration of that province.

Oral Questions

● (1155)

[Translation]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting with Quebec softwood lumber workers, the Minister for International Trade stated his intention to extend the financial assistance for laid-off workers.

The Canadian Alliance has continually called for a targeted income support program for softwood lumber workers who have been laid off.

When is the government finally going to provide some help to workers who have been laid off as a result of this government's poor handling of the softwood lumber issue?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are already taking action because we are concerned about the impact and the potential impact of this trade dispute on Canadian workers in the softwood lumber industry.

I would remind the hon. member that each year on average \$450 million is provided through employment insurance benefits to workers in the forestry industry. We recently identified \$246 million in specific new targeted measures specifically for workers in the softwood lumber industry. In Quebec alone, \$600 million is transferred every year for active measures through the employment insurance fund, as well as additional money specifically for older workers.

* * *

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Ontario has already had a blind date with Kyoto. The federal government signed a treaty capping sulphur dioxide emissions in 1988 and imposed those limits only in Ontario. It has cost Ontario consumers an arm and a leg when it comes to paying electricity bills. The Kyoto agreement will drive hydro bills even higher when it caps greenhouse gas emissions.

Why will the government not heed the lesson learned in Ontario and save us all from Kyoto ugly?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely astonished that an Ontario member would get up in the House and reject the concept of reducing acid rain, which has had such a dramatic impact on the streams and lakes of Ontario.

I would further suggest that it is extraordinary that she would get up here and talk about the program to reduce acid rain and SO₂, and fail to point out that, when we finally came to do it, it cost industry in Ontario one-fifth of the amount that it had calculated at the beginning.

Ingenuity takes over and people reduce costs when they are required to do it. That is why ratification of Kyoto is so important next week.

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following the cancellation in 1993 of the EH-101 contract, which cost taxpayers over \$500 million, and following the government's attempt to split the contract into two parts to let the Prime Minister save face, the government has decided to change its mind yet again and is now proposing a single tender to replace the old Sea Kings.

Since our national defence policy still has not been defined, why did the Minister of National Defence wait so long before starting all over, delaying the replacement of helicopters that put their crews' lives in danger, and whose service life has completely expired.

[English]

Mr. John O'Reilly (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister has said many times that he wants to get the right aircraft for the Canadian Forces as soon as possible. He moved yesterday to announce that he is doing just that. These aircraft will be on stream quicker on a single source contract and they will be fully equipped to replace the Sea Kings.

This approach accelerates the process, has less risk and reduces the cost to Canadians. It is expected that the winning bid will be announced some time in 2004.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the human resources minister.

There is another group of people in this country who could really use some good news and those are caregivers who deliver care to thousands of families across the country, and most of those caregivers are women.

Two throne speeches, a Romanow recommendation and a private member's bill delivered by the NDP and to be debated on Thursday, deal with that specific issue.

Will the human resources minister at least announce a program before Christmas that will help these people in the financial stress that they undergo and alleviate the pain that they are going through?

● (1200)

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, supporting Canadians balance workplace-family challenges is a priority for the government. We recently doubled parental benefits so Canadian parents have the choice of staying home with their new children for up to a year.

In the Speech from the Throne, as the hon. member mentioned, we also recognized that there is a role to be played in reducing the moral dilemma of working and caring for gravely ill children or dying parents.

The Romanow commission has recommended that we act on this, and, with the support of the hon. member and the House, I hope we will do so very soon.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, following the fishery moratorium in 1992, the government offered a number of licence buyouts to fishermen in order to reduce the numbers involved in the fishery.

Some of those who sold back their licences to the government were given a lump sum tax free payment. Some were taxed on 75% of the amount, some were taxed on 50% of the amount and some were taxed on 25% of the amount. Why the discrepancy in such a program?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to receive that question as notice. It does require that the Income Tax Act be followed. I would be happy to see that the member opposite receives a detailed analysis so that he will understand the differences.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, a year ago when I pointed out that employment insurance payments were taking six to eight weeks to reach laid off workers in eastern Ontario, the minister promised that her department would soon meet its four week promise of performance.

A year later things are worse, not better. Laid off workers have to wait as much as eight weeks. A local weekly reports that one young woman has been forced to survive on social assistance payments of \$50 a month while waiting for benefits to which she is legally entitled.

The Liberal government has never been shy about extracting EI premiums from eastern Ontario. Why will the government not devote the manpower needed to pay out timely EI benefits?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a priority for us to ensure that benefits that are in place are in the hands of recipients. We have continued to focus on the challenges before us.

The hon. member can rest assured that the department is following these requirements on a weekly basis and doing its very best to make sure that these important benefits are in the hands of individuals.

If he has an individual case he would like me to look at I would be pleased to do that on his behalf.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of September 11, the Minister of Transport approved the introduction of an \$24 airport security tax. This tax was included in the most recent budget, tabled in December 2001.

Point of Order

He stated at the time that he would review his decision to keep this tax, based on its relevancy. Since then, the airline industry has said unanimously that this tax is a burden that is causing them considerable damage.

Will the Minister of Transport yield to the demands of the industry, which is asking loud and clear for him to honour his word and withdraw the airport security tax—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance.

[*English*]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister is listening to the industry. In fact, the minister has indicated that until the end of this month he is taking representations on this particular issue. He will report back at an appropriate time. We are looking at all of the information.

It is a concern, particularly to the members on this side of the House. We have addressed the issue in the past. We have said that we will make sure that it is in the best interests of Canadians.

First and foremost, however, public security while travelling on aircraft is very important to the government.

* * *

[*Translation*]

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during oral question period, the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot called the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food a liar out loud several times. This language is unparliamentary.

Thanks to the very firm stance taken by the member for Shefford and the entire Quebec caucus on this issue, the minister is making every effort to solve the problem of the École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe. The member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot may or may not agree on how things are happening, but that does not give him the right to make this type of unfounded and unparliamentary accusation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room in this House for insults. I would kindly ask him to withdraw his comments immediately.

● (1205)

The Deputy Speaker: I must say that even with the great din, I very clearly heard the comments attributed to the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot by the government deputy House leader.

I am sure the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot is well aware of my respect for him. We must all demonstrate this same collective respect for our parliamentary institution.

In the spirit of cooperation, I would ask the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot to withdraw the word liar.

[*English*]

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Routine Proceedings

The Deputy Speaker: No, I am dealing with the matter raised by the deputy whip of the government. I have asked the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot to respond to what has been raised and to what I heard clearly. In the best spirit of the House, in the spirit of cooperation and respect for our institution, I ask the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot to withdraw the word “menteur”.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will not allow lies to justify sabotage. When it comes to the interests of Quebec, of the Francophonie and of Saint-Hyacinthe, I will not keep quiet in the House when faced with bald-faced lies that have lasted for several months, in the case of the École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe.

The Deputy Speaker: It is not the role of the Chair to rule on the passion, devotion or enthusiasm a member may display on an issue that affects his riding a great deal. Unfortunately, that has nothing to do with the situation.

Clearly, in the context of what occurred during oral question period, the word liar is unparliamentary.

I ask the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot to reconsider and to withdraw the word liar.

Mr. Yvan Loubier: Mr. Speaker, on Monday, one of Quebec's and the Francophonie's most important institutions will begin to lose credibility because of the inertia of the federal government, which has given preferential treatment to three other schools of veterinary medicine in Canada and tarnished the reputation of the École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe. Starting Monday, the government will be sending out the signal that the École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe has no future, and I find this unacceptable. The members opposite have been fibbing for months now—

* * *

NAMING OF MEMBER

The Deputy Speaker: Mr. Loubier, I must name you for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Pursuant to the powers vested in me under Standing Order 11, I order you to withdraw from the House for the remainder of today's sitting.

[*Editor's note: And Mr. Loubier having withdrawn*]

• (1210)

[*English*]

Mr. Stockwell Day: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would request unanimous approval from the House to agree with a motion that states: That in the opinion of this House, the terrorist group known as Hezbollah has committed untold horror on the lives of innocent people; That this group represents a security threat to Canada and its allies; That the Foreign Affairs Minister acknowledged yesterday that Hezbollah is not governed by civilized conduct; And that the Solicitor General of Canada should therefore recommend to the Governor in Council that Hezbollah, including

all of its various factions, be added to the list established under section 83.05 of the Criminal Code—

The Deputy Speaker: That is certainly not a point of order, with the greatest of respect. I will go so far as to ask if there would be unanimous consent to propose such a motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With the greatest of respect, I ask the Speaker to consider whether recent practices in the House might lead the Chair to look again at language which has historically been deemed to be unparliamentary.

I raise it because of the incident on which the Speaker has just issued a judgment. I heard the language. I also heard the response by the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food. To state it very clearly, the issue not about—

The Deputy Speaker: I must conclude that the right hon. member is engaging in debate. Sometimes the Chair, maybe because of the noise level or whatever, might have greater doubt. In the instance earlier today, there was no doubt that I heard clearly the words from the member, who has been asked to leave the chamber. This matter on that point of order and on that decision is over.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: On my point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Deputy Speaker: I would remind the member that while the Chair is standing, no one else will have the floor. The matter that was raised earlier has been dealt with and the matter is closed.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, my request is very specific and it is that the Chair undertake a review of language that is deemed to be unparliamentary. I heard all the words that were exchanged. There is no doubt that Mr. Speaker is correct that the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot used the language which he did not withdraw.

It is also the case that the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food made a statement that is not true and—

The Deputy Speaker: Again clearly we are getting into debate. If there is to be review of any rules regarding parliamentary language or other matters, I would simply and respectfully submit to the House and the right hon. member for Calgary Centre that they be dealt with in the Standing Committee of Procedure and House Affairs. That is where that matter will rest.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the 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 20 petitions.

Routine Proceedings

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

[Translation]

FEDERAL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to section 21 of the act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, to lay upon the table a certified copy of the report of the federal electoral boundaries commission for Newfoundland and Labrador.

The report is deemed permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

* * *

● (1215)

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources on Bill C-6, an act to establish the Canadian Centre for the Independent Resolution of First Nations Specific Claims to provide for the filing, negotiation and resolution of specific claims and to make related amendments to other acts, with amendments.

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the third report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources, pursuant to its order of reference dated Tuesday, October 22. Your committee considered Bill C-2, an act to establish a process for assessing the environmental and socio-economic effects of certain activities in Yukon, and reports the bill, with amendments.

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADA POST

Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House of Commons a petition signed by a number of constituents of the riding of Beauséjour—Petitcodiac. It concerns rural route mail couriers. I met with these people on a number of occasions and they have a valid point.

They are petitioning the House of Commons and Parliament to repeal section 13(5) of the Canada Post Corporation Act, which would allow them to have collective bargaining rights.

JUSTICE

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have two groups of petitions to present here. The first group of petition ask that no bail be allowed for accused murders who are caught by eye witnesses in the act of committing crimes and that only maximum sentences be given under those circumstances.

This group of petitions was spawn from the death of Dana Fair in Lloydminster a couple of years ago.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the other group of petitions is on behalf of petitioners in my constituency. The petitioners call on Parliament to protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Ottawa—Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by residents of my riding of Ottawa—Orléans, requesting that the House of Commons legislate in favour of stem cell research to find cures and therapies necessary to treat the illnesses and diseases of suffering Canadians.

The petitioners also state that non-embryonic stem cells, which are also known as adult stem cells, have shown significant research progress without the immune rejection or ethical problems associated with embryonic stem cells.

MARRIAGE

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions. The first petition is on the defence of marriage. The petitioners from across Canada, including from my own riding of Mississauga South, would like to bring to the attention of Parliament that social policies should be decided by elected members of Parliament and not the unelected judiciary, and also that the majority of Canadians do support the current legal definition of marriage.

The petitioners therefore call upon Parliament to use all possible legislative and administrative measures, including invoking the notwithstanding clause, section 33 of the charter, to preserve and protect the current definition of marriage of one man and one woman, to the exclusion of all others.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition has to do with the issue of stem cell research. The petitioners who believe, as I do, that life begins at conception support stem cell research. The issue for them is from where they come. from. They point out that adult stem cells have shown great promise, without the immune rejection or ethical problems associated with embryonic stem cells.

Therefore, they call upon Parliament to focus its legislative support on adult stem cell research to find the cures and therapies necessary for Canadians.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the petitioners of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke are petitioning the government to make good on its promise to renovate the Arnprior College for Emergency Preparedness. They recognize that the training for emergency situations is of national importance, especially in our heightened state of alert on terrorism at this point in time.

Routine Proceedings

●(1220)

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by several hundred petitioners who draw attention to the fact that thousands of Canadians suffer from various debilitating diseases and that Canadians do support ethical stem cell research. The petitioners point out that non-embryonic stem cells which are also known as adult stem cells have shown significant research progress without the immune rejection or ethical problems associated with embryonic stem cells.

They call upon Parliament to focus its legislative support and dollars on adult stem cell research to find the cures and therapies necessary to treat the illnesses and diseases of Canadians.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to present today in respect of child pornography.

The petitioners draw attention to the fact that the creation and use of child pornography is condemned by the clear majority of Canadians and that the courts have not applied the current child pornography law in a way which makes it clear that such exploitation will always be met with swift punishment.

They call upon Parliament to protect our children by taking the necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, my third petition is signed by residents of Canada who draw the attention of the House to the fact that modern science has unequivocally and irrefutably established that a human being begins to exist at the moment of conception.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to bring in legislation defining a human fetus or embryo from the moment of conception whether in the womb of the mother or not, and whether conceived naturally or otherwise, as a human being and to make any and all consequential amendments to all Canadian laws as required.

Ms. Libby Davies: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if I might ask the indulgence of the House to go back to the item on the agenda which deals with the introduction of private member's bills. I seek the unanimous consent of the House to do that so I may introduce my bill. I would appreciate that.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Vancouver East have the consent of the House to revert back to the introduction of private member's bills?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-329, an act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (student loan).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank members of the House for giving their consent so I can present my bill.

I am honoured to present this bill in the House today. Its purpose is to reverse and stop discrimination facing students who are now required to wait ten years before they can declare bankruptcy. The new ten year rule means that unlike other consumers who wait two years to declare bankruptcy, students must face additional hardship and discrimination.

The overwhelming majority of students do everything they can to repay their student loans but when bankruptcy becomes the only option, the bill I am presenting today would ensure that students would get a fair deal and would not be discriminated against.

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

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: No. 39.

[Text]

Question No. 39—**Mr. Keith Martin:**

With respect to the Air Travellers Security Charge announced in the December 2001 Budget that took affect on May 1, 2002, and subsequent announcements by the Ministers of Finance and Transport that the tax would be adjusted downward if the government collected more revenue than necessary to improve air security: (a) what are the revenues from the tax; (b) how much of the revenue collected since May 1, 2002 has gone into (i) the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority, and (ii) general revenue; (c) if monies have gone into general revenue, how has this money been spent to improve air security; and (d) when will the Minister of Finance announce an adjustment to the tax?

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Revenue from the charge is reported monthly in *The Fiscal Monitor* published by the Department of Finance. Revenue for the first four months of operation, April through July 2002, totals roughly \$122 million, composed of monthly remittances of \$20 million, \$28 million, \$34 million and \$36 million, plus an estimated \$1 million per month from the GST/HST. Based on collections to date, ongoing full year revenue from the charge, including applicable GST, is estimated to be in the range of \$400 million to \$420 million per year.

The total cost of the enhanced air travel security system is expected to be \$2.2 billion through 2006-07. Budget 2001 provided that revenue from the charge would be maintained in line with expected expenditures on the enhanced air travel security system through 2006-07. The government is committed to reviewing the charge over time to ensure that revenue remains in line with the costs of enhanced security.

The government has begun the process of reviewing the charge. The government has indicated that if revenue is projected to exceed planned expenditures through 2006-07, the charge will be reduced.

Routine Proceedings

Under the government's current five year forecast, which is based on ATSC collections and air traffic data observed to date, revenue from the charge is not expected to exceed the cost of enhanced air security as set out in budget 2001. As such, there is little scope for reducing the charge at the present time. However, the government's change to accrual accounting, possibly as early as budget 2003, could provide an opportunity for reducing the charge. Under accrual accounting, the costs to be recovered from the charge through 2006-07 may be lower than those set out in budget 2001.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 26, 30, 31, 32 and 33 could be made orders for return, the returns would be tabled immediately.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 26—Mr. John Cummins:

With regard to the risk management of the antimalarial drug mefloquine by Health Canada and the Department of National Defence: (a) what deployments since 1990 involved administration of the drug to members of the Canadian Forces; (b) did Health Canada receive from the Canadian Forces adverse drug event reports for each such deployment either during or immediately following deployment; (c) how many Canadians received the drug under Health Canada's Lariam Safety Monitoring Study; (d) how many patients were the subject of monitoring reports received by Health Canada directly or indirectly from Roche under the Lariam Safety Monitoring Study; (e) what types of adverse events were identified by the Lariam Safety Monitoring Study up to the time the drug was licensed in 1993; (f) what is the total number of adverse events reported to Health Canada since the commencement of marketing in 1993; (g) how many adverse events were reported to Health Canada since the commencement of the marketing of the drug in 1993 involving each of the following reactions - hallucinations, panic reaction, hyper alertness, extreme excitability, convulsions, aggressive reaction, marked restlessness, suicide, suicidal tendency, suicide attempt, thoughts of self harm, abnormal dreams, emotional disorder, irritability, nightmares, abnormal thinking, anxiety, depressed state, aggravated depression, light-headedness, anxiety attack, mood swings, abnormal crying, psychosis, delusion, speech disorder, concentration impaired, fear, euphoria, hysteria, paranoid psychosis, memory impairment, emotional disorder, murder; (h) what measures have been taken by Health Canada to ensure that it receives notice of such adverse drug events from doctors administering the drug; (i) what changes to the product monograph have been approved by Health Canada since licensing of the drug in 1993; (j) how many Canadian Forces members deployed on special missions abroad since 1990 have committed suicide (i) during the mission, (ii) following the mission, (iii) of these how many had been required to take mefloquine; and (k) what action has been undertaken to investigate the nature and extent of combined mefloquine exposure and post traumatic stress disorder in current and former members of the Canadian Forces members both regular and reserve who have at one time been deployed on special missions abroad?

Return tabled.

Question No. 30—Mr. Jim Pankiw:

With respect to the years 1971, 1976, 1981, 1986, 1991, 1996, and 2001, what has the government through Treasury Board determined to be: (a) the number of federal civil service jobs located in Quebec, excluding the National Capital Region (NCR), expressed as a percentage of all federal civil service jobs in Canada; (b) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs within Quebec, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (c) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Management" within Quebec, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (d) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Administrative Support" within Quebec, excluding the NCR, held by

i) anglophones ii) francophones; (e) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Administrative and Foreign Service" within Quebec, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (f) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Scientific and Professional" within Quebec, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (g) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Technical" within Quebec, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; and (h) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Operational" within Quebec, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones?

Return tabled.

Question No. 31—Mr. Jim Pankiw:

With respect to the years 1971, 1976, 1981, 1986, 1991, 1996, and 2001, what has the government through Treasury Board determined to be: (a) the number of federal civil service jobs located in Ontario, excluding the National Capital Region (NCR), expressed as a percentage of all federal civil service jobs in Canada; (b) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs within Ontario, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (c) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Management" within Ontario, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (d) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Administrative Support" within Ontario, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (e) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Administrative and Foreign Service" within Ontario, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (f) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Scientific and Professional" within Ontario, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (g) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Technical" within Ontario, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; and (h) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Operational" within Ontario, excluding the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones?

Return tabled.

Question No. 32—Mr. Jim Pankiw:

With respect to census information compiled by Statistics Canada for the years 1971, 1976, 1981, 1986, 1991, 1996, and 2001, what has the government determined to be the number of persons—expressed as a percentage of the overall population within each of the regions requested—in: (a) the National Capital Region (NCR), who were listed by mother tongue as i) English ii) French; (b) Ontario, excluding the NCR, who were listed by mother tongue as i) English ii) French; (c) Quebec, excluding the NCR, who were listed by mother tongue as i) English ii) French; and (d) the rest of Canada, excluding Ontario, Quebec and the NCR, who were listed by mother tongue as i) English ii) French?

Return tabled.

Question No. 33—Mr. Jim Pankiw:

With respect to the years 1971, 1976, 1981, 1986, 1991, 1996, and 2001, what has the government through Treasury Board determined to be: (a) the number of federal civil service jobs located in National Capital Region (NCR) expressed as a percentage of all federal civil service jobs in Canada; (b) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs within the NCR held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (c) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Management" within the NCR held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (d) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Administrative Support" within the NCR held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (e) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Administrative and Foreign Service" within the NCR held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (f) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Scientific and Professional" within the NCR, held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; (g) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Technical" within the NCR held by i) anglophones ii) francophones; and (h) the percentage of all federal civil service jobs designated as "Operational" within the NCR held by i) anglophones ii) francophones?

Return tabled.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Geoff Regan: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

NUCLEAR SAFETY AND CONTROL ACT

The House resumed from December 4 consideration of the motion that Bill C-4, an act to amend the Nuclear Safety and Control Act, be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among members about the vote that will eventually happen on Bill C-4. To permit as many members as possible to participate on this, I would like to move the following motion. I move:

That, when no member rises to speak during consideration of Bill C-4, the question shall be put and a division thereon deemed to have been requested and deferred until Tuesday, December 10 at 3:00 p.m.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1225)

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on third reading of Bill C-4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division is deemed requested and deferred until Tuesday, December 10 at 3 p.m.

* * *

KYOTO PROTOCOL

The House resumed from December 3 consideration of the motion, and of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties in the House. I believe you would find unanimous consent for the following. I move

That, during consideration of Government Order, Government Business No. 9 this day, the Chair shall not receive any dilatory motion, quorum call or request for unanimous consent to propose any motion, and, when no member rises to speak, or

2:30 p.m., whichever occurs first, the Chair shall adjourn the House to the next sitting day.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give its consent to the government House leader to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Does the House give its consent to the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

NOTICE OF CLOSURE MOTION

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether this motion is required, but out of an abundance of caution, I wish to renew the notice I gave yesterday with respect to Government Order, Government Business No. 9, namely, that, at the next sitting of the House a minister of the Crown shall propose, pursuant to Standing Order 57, that the debate be not further adjourned

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to conclude my speech on this very important matter.

This week we have heard from government members who have stood in this place during debate and question period preaching doom and gloom if we do not ratify the Kyoto accord. The minister and other government members have acted as if they were the only people who cared about the earth or as if they were the only ones with children or who were worried about the future. That is simply not true.

Like the Minister of the Environment, I am a trained lawyer. I emphasize that I am not a scientist but neither is the minister. Unlike him, I do not pretend to know exactly what effect human CO₂ emissions have on climate. I do not know. However, as recently as last week 27 climate specialists stated, "Delaying ratification for a short period so as to allow proper scientific consultations to take place will do absolutely no damage to Canada or the environment and is unquestionably the prudent and responsible course of action at this time".

Included in this group are presenters and reviewers of the 2001 IPCC report. The truth is there are thousands and thousands of scientists on both sides of this debate and no amount of wishing by the Minister of the Environment can make it otherwise.

The Kyoto protocol is not based on science; it is based on politics, on a desperate desire for a legacy by the Prime Minister, an expired prime minister. It is driven by fear and an environmental industry that is every bit as self-interested as anyone else. It is certainly not based on a strong fiscal plan.

Government Orders

Kyoto will be a body blow to the Canadian economy, its cost ranging as high as \$40 billion and 450,000 jobs lost. The Minister of the Environment tells us in the House day after day, "Trust us. Trust me. We will develop the plan. We will work on the Canadian solution. Trust us. Ratify this accord and we will make it work. You have got to believe us".

Let us look at some of the facts. The government just took \$1 billion and poof, out into the wind it went on the firearms registry. The firearms registry is bad enough. The government absolutely wasted \$1 billion.

In British Columbia the provincial government used \$450 million to build three fast ferries and the people threw out that government. That party is now down to two seats.

The Liberals took \$1 billion to create a database. It is appalling. It is sickening. Now those guys are telling us to trust them, trust them on the database. I heard someone from the government talking in question period today on the Sea King helicopter procurement and I just about choked. He said, "We are accelerating the contract". Two years ago they split the contract in two and now they are bringing it back together and saying, "We are accelerating the contract, it will be quicker", after completely bungling the issue for the last 10 years.

Now the Liberals say, "Trust us on the Kyoto accord" when the scientific community is split on it, when the entire Canadian industry has concerns about it, and when we are the only country in the western hemisphere to buy into it. Our largest trading partners are not buying into it. Why? Because they know it is not the right way to go.

Yes, we should clean up our environment. Yes, we want to ensure that our environment is there for our children. Do we want to clean up our air? Absolutely. Do we want to try to reduce smog? Absolutely. Is that what the Kyoto protocol is all about? Absolutely not.

The government charades are an absolute disgrace. After their record, the Liberals are trying to pull the wool over the Canadian people's eyes. Since being elected in 1997, we have seen the \$1 billion boondoggle and Groupaction contracts. The way the Liberals blow money out of this place one would think they had a printing press out in the lobby. It is absolutely incomprehensible to spend \$1 billion on a database.

• (1230)

They blow it off saying that they will fix the problem. The Liberals have been around here since 1993 and they have screwed up just about every single thing they have touched. It is time to throw those guys out.

On October 22 the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development released her audit on the government's environmental record. It was a long list of failed environmental commitments. The government says to trust it on the Kyoto accord. Its past record on the environment is dismal. The government was reminded of its failure to reduce toxic chemicals, harmful airborne particulates, its failure to clean up contaminated sites on federal lands, and the list goes on. This is from the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development.

Then the government says, "Trust us, believe in us. Just ratify the Kyoto accord and in the next year we will try to come up with a plan". Even its own numbers do not add up. It is absolutely incomprehensible. The government wants Canadians to trust it after having one dismal failure after another from the government.

The commissioner also found that strategies and plans for some issues were missing or incomplete, and that objectives, targets and timetables were fuzzy or missing, and in some of its strategies, plans that did not exist. Does this sound familiar? Sure it does.

The Minister of the Environment stands up in question period day after day and waves his little green book and tries to cast insults on everyone saying that he is the only one that has any knowledge on this issue and that the rest of us have none. We have read the minister's little green book. There is one single number in that little green book of \$1.6 billion. The government has already spent that.

There are no numbers. There are absolutely no assessments. The government has not done its homework, and the government says, "Trust us". There was \$1 billion in the HRDC scandal. I am going to keep repeating this next one until I am blue in the face. This week it was \$1 billion for a database. That is bad enough. It is absolutely astonishing, but there is something that is even worse. The Auditor General pointed out to Canadians that the government had purposely hid it from Parliament.

How could anyone trust the government after one screw up after another? The minute these revelations come to light the government goes into full damage control mode, full defence mode. It is not okay. We are here as the caretakers of the public purse. We are supposed to have some sense of accountability in this place for how money is spent. The government blows \$1 billion as if it were nothing. It is unbelievable that the government members can look Canadians in the eye and say, "Trust us".

The truth is the Kyoto accord will not clean up the air. It will not plant a tree. It will not clean a stream. The truth is the government has no idea, not a clue on how much it will cost Canadians. The scientific community has been telling us it could cost \$40 billion or \$50 billion. They have been telling us it could be 450,000 jobs. The government does not have a clue.

The government knows about as much about how much Kyoto will cost as how much it will cost to fulfill the firearms registry. The government does not know how much the annual costs are. We have been witnessing this in question period for the last two days. The government does not have a clue. The government cannot tell Canadians. It has armies of people over there and it is in damage control mode. They blew away \$1 billion. The government wants to get through next week so that when the House of Commons adjourns for two months, this issue will go away.

This time it will not go away. It is not only about the firearms registry, although that is bad enough. We in the Canadian Alliance believe we should be putting police officers on the street. We should be putting those resources into our police agencies to reduce crime. Then there would be greater safety. Then we would not have the tragedies such as that which we witnessed years ago in Montreal, and today is the anniversary. We could reduce such tragedies as occurred in Vancouver.

Government Orders

•(1235)

We believe we should be putting those resources into policing across the country, not into an ill-fated gun registry and blowing away \$1 billion. We have to pound the message home that it is not okay.

The government wants us to trust that it will get Kyoto right and that it will come up with a plan. The truth is that it does not have a clue. The Minister of the Environment has no idea what this will cost. He wants us to trust him. He has put all his eggs in one basket, Kyoto. He has ignored environmental legislation. He has ignored cleaning up toxic waste sites. The list goes on and on, but he wants us to trust him.

How can anybody trust the government after its dismal accountability for the Canadian purse? I note that the former finance minister was the holder of the chequebook through all of this and kept writing the cheques. They kept having to go back to Treasury Board to quietly take more money out of different programs so they could fund another billion dollar boondoggle.

The only legacy the Prime Minister will be left with will be billion dollar boondoggles, and this one tops the list: a billion dollars for a database. It is enough to make anybody just about choke. Then it hides it from us. It is a disaster. Not one person in this country should trust the government.

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, with our neighbours and NAFTA partners to the south not signing the Kyoto protocol, with the huge border we share with the United States, and with so much of our industry and development concentrated along the 49th parallel, I wonder if the hon. member shares my concerns.

In British Columbia we have just seen a mill close in Fort Langley and move across the 49th, just south of the border, taking with it 56 jobs. In that community of only 780 people south of the border, they are building a huge electrical generating plant, and I understand there are more on the drawing board.

Does the hon. member share my concern that Kyoto is a great plan for the development of the northern United States at Canada's expense? I wonder if he shares my concern or would care to comment on that.

•(1240)

Mr. Gary Lunn: Mr. Speaker, the truth is that in the Americas, Canada is the only industrialized country to sign on to the Kyoto protocol, or is about to ratify it.

As most members in the House know, or should know, some 85% of our trade—the figure is debatable, plus or minus a per cent or two—is with our neighbours to the south. Billions of dollars a day go across the border in two way trade with the United States. We cannot seem to get it through the Liberals' thick skulls that this will have a huge, disastrous impact on our economy.

Other industrialized countries, such as Australia, negotiated the Kyoto protocol at more than 8% of 1990 levels. Our negotiators' only mandate was to try to one up the Americans and they did not even do that. They negotiated 6% below 1990 levels. The worse thing is that it will not clean up the environment. It will create an

economic disaster with our largest trading partner and it will cost Canadians in the magnitude of half a billion jobs.

The member is absolutely right. The alarm bells should be going off for businesses in British Columbia and elsewhere in Canada. They should be panicking to throw the government as far as they can.

We have a Prime Minister who is more interested in demonstrating to the world that he is Mr. Green than any single worker in this country. We have a Minister of the Environment who is trying to get this Kyoto ratification through at any cost. He wants us to trust that his government will be able to do it. The last thing we should do is trust them.

Canadians should fire the government as far as they can. Taking \$1 billion and blowing it into the wind like it has a printing press back there is unacceptable. How can the government talk about trust when it hides this from Parliament? It is bloody disgrace.

Hon. Stephen Owen (Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully and with interest to the statements by my colleague opposite on the Kyoto accord.

I would like to ask him a very specific question. How does he possibly think Canada will succeed economically if we do not develop the environmental technologies to meet the ever increasing standards that we all realize around the world need to be met for our health and to reduce energy consumption and therefore energy costs?

For the last 10 years California has been increasingly raising its emission standards and building the environmental technologies to meet its own standards, which it then will sell to the rest of the world. However, as we move into the future and try to meet California's standards we will have to buy its technology. When we raised our pulp emission standards in the early 1990s we bought Scandinavian equipment because we did not have the technology ourselves. We did the same thing with the Japanese automobile industry in the 1970s and 1980s when the first oil crisis occurred.

How on earth does the member think we will become a competitive trading country into the future if we are going to be totally dependent on foreign technologies, largely American?

The member talks about Kyoto not being accepted and ratified by the United States. The American states are raising their environmental standards and developing the technology to meet them, which we will then have to buy from them.

Let us look to the future and not just look to the past in terms of this very backward thinking.

Government Orders

•(1245)

Mr. Gary Lunn: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect for the member, as he pointed out, the people in the United States have this great technology but they do not have Kyoto. My whole point is exactly what he is saying. He made my argument for me. We do not need the Minister of the Environment's little green book, for which he does not know the cost of developing the technologies.

Should we be reducing smog? Absolutely. Should we be trying to clean up the environment? Absolutely, 100%. Every single member over here will support that.

The hon. member said himself that if we do not ratify Kyoto we will have to buy the technology from the Americans. They are not ratifying Kyoto but they will continue to develop their technologies. We have some of the brightest minds here in Canada. We can do it here. However we need a government that will provide the economic policies so that this country can flourish and our economies will not lag behind. We need a government that will put resources into developing these technologies, not blow the money into the wind, into a firearm registry that has zero accountability.

The Liberals want us to trust them. We have seen billion dollar boondoggles. We have watched hundreds of millions of dollars in advertising contracts going to their friends who donate to the Liberal Party. Why should Canadians trust the government? There is not one reason.

With all due respect, the member made my argument for me. The minister's little green book will not develop these technologies. However we can develop those technologies if we have a strong, economic platform. Yes, we can. We do not need Kyoto. Kyoto will be another fatal disaster. If the government ratifies this we will be back in the House a few years from now saying, "Oh well, we just threw another billion dollars up against the wall and we haven't reached our CO₂ emissions".

The facts speak for themselves. We only have to look at the record. Do not blame me. Look at the government's record of mismanagement and hiding. It is an abuse of power and it blows it off like it does not even care. It is in full defence, full damage control mode.

The member who just spoke, and who I have the greatest respect for, is from British Columbia. He witnessed firsthand what happened when the provincial government out there blew \$450 million on fast ferries. The public was outraged, as it rightly should have been, and it threw those members out of government. So far that party is down to two seats.

The same thing deserves to happen to the government. It has no respect for the Canadian hardworking people who send taxpayer money to this institution.

I keep emphasizing that it is not about a gun registry, although, yes, we believe that money should be going into policing, it is about a government that can blow away a billion dollars and have complete disregard for the taxpayer. It could not care less about it. It tries to sweep it under the rug. It is wrong.

The worst thing is how did that billion dollars ever get in there if it hid it from Parliament? How did that happen? Did one of the

ministers secretly go off and try to pull money from other departments? Will we finally get to the bottom of the truth in this matter? For the government to take a billion dollars to create a database and hide it from Parliament, that is borderline criminal.

It is time we throw the government out. It is time Canadians show the government what it deserves. When it stands up and says that we should trust it, how could anyone, even its own members, trust the government?

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every time I hear from the members of the flat earth society I despair.

Before my hon. colleague throws out the government, does he know which party he will be in then? Which world does he belong to? Does he agree that we are part of an international community, that treaties are signed, not just by Canada but by a lot of countries? In this case, over 93 countries have signed, including all our allies: Japan and all the countries of Europe. He cites Australia. I could cite Japan, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Germany and France.

Does he not think that we have a duty to other countries of the world that are polluted by us, including our own fellow citizens from the Arctic region, including my colleague from Nunavut who has spoken very eloquently many times about the changes in the Arctic? Does he not think that we should do something for others for a change, instead of always looking inwardly to ourselves, as his party does in its silly little cocoon and cannot see beyond Alberta and B.C.? Does he not think that we have a responsibility toward the other people of the world as well and that is what Kyoto is about?

•(1250)

Mr. Gary Lunn: Mr. Speaker, I am still perplexed by these questions. The government wants to sign Kyoto because other countries have signed it. Canada negotiated a bad deal. Europe will trade emission credits within the EU and it knows the shutdown of the industry in eastern Europe will make it much easier for it to achieve its targets.

Yes, we should clean up our environment. Nobody is disputing that but this ill-fated Kyoto accord would not do that. I do not know what it will take for the government to understand that. The Kyoto accord is about reducing CO₂ gases of which 95% are not man made, they are natural.

Canada does its fair share but it could do a lot more by ensuring we have a strong economy. We have a very different country. We have a large country with transportation issues. Our trading partners are not signing onto this. It is a bad deal and for the member to paint the Canadian Alliance as people who do not care is simply false.

We will protect the best interests of the country and ensure there is a strong economy for Canadians. We will do our part but we will not continue on the government's record of blowing money out into the wind as if it had its own printing presses. It is time for Canadians to look at the record and give what the government justly deserves and that is to toss it as far as they can.

Government Orders

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on the Kyoto protocol and represent the people of Nunavut on this important issue, I want to move the debate back to the topic at hand by putting a human face on the matter. I want to talk about what climate change is doing to a way of life and culture.

Inuit and northerners, people of the Arctic, live hand in hand with the environment and they are feeling the effects of climate change in their lives. Their lives are changing constantly because of the different factors that are happening in the world. They are not immune to it. They are experiencing it, just like every other group of people in the world.

The northerners and the people of my riding have been consistently supporting the government's intention to ratify the Kyoto protocol. I am sure we have all seen the first ministers' conference where the Premier of Nunavut took a strong position and urged the Government of Canada to ratify the Kyoto protocol.

One of the main reasons that people in the north are supporting ratification is that we are already experiencing the impact of climate change. We are living the changes every day. We all talk about the effect climate change would have on the people of tomorrow, but I want to stress to the people of Canada that the changes are happening now and we are feeling the changes today as I speak.

It has been documented by our people. We have heard from different sources like the hunters who go out every day and see the changes. My father is one of those people. He has lived in harmony with the land. He is 72 years old and has seen tremendous changes in our lives, not only affected by climate but also other factors. This is someone who I admire greatly and whose knowledge I trust. I would put my life in his hands because of his knowledge of the land, the climate and the weather.

He and other hunters are telling us today that they cannot predict what the weather would be like day to day because all the traditional knowledge that they have, that they use to rely on to determine their survival, is not consistent today with what they know and expect of the weather because nothing is reliable as far as the weather is concerned. The changes are so drastic that their knowledge is undermined by what is happening today.

We talk about melting permafrost. We live in an area where we do not have any basements for the houses because in some areas of the north we have permafrost only six feet below the ground. All our houses are built on this permafrost that is threatening to melt, as some people in Grise Fjord have noted.

The government of Nunavut is doing a study on its own on the different changes that people are talking about. It is documenting these changes. One piece of information received was that the glaciers were melting and this can be noticeably seen as the landscape changes before our very eyes.

The other area that we are hearing about is the way that travel is changing in our part of the country. I can attest to that myself because the ice is melting so soon in the spring and freezing very late in the fall. That affects how people go out and travel in our part of the north, especially with the lakes or sea ice freezing so late. This in turn affects the animals, mammals and fish and whether we can even

count on the species being where we normally expect them to be at certain times of the year.

• (1255)

In many of my interventions and speeches I always talk about how the people of the north are so adaptable, but I can say right now that these changes are happening so fast that we are caught in a time where we are finding it difficult to adapt. One can imagine what effect this is having on other living things in the north.

When the summit was taking place in Johannesburg we had people from the Arctic as part of the Canadian delegation. They were honoured to be there and that Canada recognized that the Arctic was one of the main indicators of climate change. We were pleased to have that recognition because that is where most of the changes are being felt today.

The changes that are happening today are very much a threat to our culture and way of life. We talk a lot about living in harmony with the environment. If the environment were to change, then our lives would change. We are a group of people that have undergone many changes. We feel that this is a direct threat to Inuit culture because of all the changes that are happening.

We are put in actual physical danger because of the changes to the weather and ice conditions. This is undermining traditional knowledge that has been passed down for generations. If the climate keeps changing at this accelerated rate we fear great changes would happen to our way of life, the lives of animals and the Inuit way of life overall.

We are concerned with the carbon dioxide emissions and how the temperatures might rise over the next while, even by 5°C in the summer, which may not seem like a lot, but to us it is.

With regard to health factors, we have the highest cancer rates and we have other detrimental health effects that people are experiencing in our part of the world. We have had many studies done where contaminants were reaching our people. These contaminants were coming from other parts of the world. We talk about pollution from different factories around the world and those contaminants were reaching the Arctic where the fragile ecosystem is greatly affected by these contaminants.

We have different researchers telling the people of the north that they must keep eating their traditional foods even though they are contaminated today because the harmful health effects of not eating them are greater than eating the contaminated food. That is the reality we have in the Arctic. We are being told to continue with the lesser of two evils. Even though we see contaminants from different sources from around the world entering the food cycle, it is still better for people to continue eating the traditional foods that we have always relied on for our survival.

Different research has proven that there were harmful effects of contaminants entering the breast milk of Inuit women. That is disturbing for us to hear. Again people are telling us that it is healthier to continue to use breast milk even though they know there are harmful contaminants in the mother's breast milk. Those are the realities that we are living with today.

Government Orders

•(1300)

So for the north, we very strongly urge the ratification of the Kyoto protocol because the expense of not doing something to improve the lives and the health of people is greater, and as a country we have to take the initiative to deal with the harmful effects in the environment and to help with the survival of a group of people and their culture.

As I said at the beginning of my intervention, I want to put a human face on this debate. We very strongly support the ratification of the Kyoto protocol because we feel that our very culture and our way of life is at stake, on the top of the human life that will be affected if we do not do anything.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in her speech the member talked about contaminants that are affecting the health of people from her constituency. I think that is something that the government certainly should be dealing with.

It is ironic, I think, that this member would talk about the importance of dealing with the problem of contaminants affecting the health of her constituents and at the same time support the Kyoto agreement, because the Kyoto protocol has nothing to do with the contaminants she is talking about. It has zero to do with that.

Kyoto also has nothing to do with acid rain, nothing to do with the smog over Toronto or any of our Canadian cities, and nothing to do with any types of pollutants that are in our water, our soil and our air. It has only to do with carbon dioxide and the other small amounts of greenhouse gases which combine with water vapour. Water is the single largest greenhouse gas. The theory is that is causing global warming. It is unproven. She is supporting an agreement that deals with this unproven science about increasing temperature and yet in her speech she was talking about contaminants, which are absolutely not included in the Kyoto agreement. They have nothing to do with it.

Why does this member not support the position taken by the official opposition and others, which is to put government resources into dealing with real pollution problems like acid rain, pollution over our cities, smog and the types of pollution she is talking about, if it is in fact man-made? Why is she not encouraging the government to put money into those resources, deal with those very real environmental problems and forget about for now, at least until the science is clear, something that is so uncertain as whether man is causing global warming?

I would like to ask the member why she does not support that.

•(1305)

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: Mr. Speaker, I support taking a position today. That was the whole basis of my argument: that we have to do something today.

While we are debating whose angle is better, people's health is affected. As a country we have taken a position to do something, and I feel that while everyone is trying to decide how we should deal with climate change, we are losing people to cancer and we are losing people's good health. I am talking about taking a move as a nation to deal with a very serious issue. By ratifying the Kyoto protocol, I would say that we are on the move to creating solutions

and getting people involved in the debate on how to deal with the other issues affecting us today.

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I also listened to the member's speech with interest. We of course have a lot of respect for the member and the community she represents.

She mentioned that hunters cannot rely on their traditional knowledge because of changes in climate. We certainly appreciate that. Climate change is affecting everybody.

The question really is about the fact of Kyoto dealing with CO₂ when only 5% of it is man-made and 95% is natural. The contaminants that the member mentioned, like the POPs that arrive in cold communities, come down in the snowpack all over the world. In the Alps, in the Arctic and in the Rocky Mountains, we are seeing that contaminants come from hundreds of miles away. Sadly, Kyoto is not going to address these issues.

The member surely should be aware, more than anybody, that Canada has a large land mass. We have a very cold country. We have heating costs for our homes. We are an underdeveloped country. We expect to see our population grow. How can we realistically expect to go back to levels below 1990's when we have huge transportation costs and huge heating costs for our homes?

Really, the question is this: Is this Kyoto agreement going to help us with the objectives we are trying to achieve?

The member who spoke previously mentioned that there are 33 million people in California and they have low transportation costs. There are as many people jammed into California as we have in the whole country. They can afford to have lower transportation costs and shared transportation costs, like public transit. That is very difficult to achieve in Canada with our numbers so spread out.

Is this effort actually going to achieve the objectives that we all want to see? We want to see a reduction. Surely it should be a made in Canada approach that does not bind us into buying credits in other countries and sending money out of the country in order to achieve unrealistic objectives. Would that not be a more reasoned approach for Canadians, to find our own plan and deal with this in a responsible way?

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of Canada having taken the initiative in ratifying the Kyoto accord.

As a person of the Arctic who had to live with Chernobyl, as actually everyone else in the world did, we know that it did not happen in our country but it affected the whole world.

We have to do this internationally because we cannot do it by ourselves.

The people in the Arctic circumpolar world have taken a position through the Inuit Circumpolar Conference that everyone has to come up with an international solution. I am very proud of Canada for being one of those countries that has taken on this challenge and has moved forward.

Government Orders

We have seen a decline in Arctic research. I feel that with the Kyoto protocol there will be more push for different kinds of research to be done internationally. As much as we know that we have to deal with it in our own country, this is very much an international effort that all countries hopefully will recognize to come up with an international solution.

• (1310)

Mr. Andy Savoy (Tobique—Mactaquac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her very informative speech.

With regard to CO₂ emissions, a question was asked previously about how the contaminants that the member spoke of were not dealt with specifically because Kyoto is focused on CO₂. I would like to remind the member of this point and ask her opinion. While we are making CO₂ emissions reductions, we are also making NO and NO₂ emissions reductions, we are making SO and SO₂ reductions and we are making particulate reductions, because we cannot isolate CO₂ and say we are only acting on CO₂. When we talk about emissions we do not separate them out. They all come together in a package. What we see from a smokestack is not strictly CO₂. It is all of these in combination, so we are actually dealing with that specific issue of the contaminants being put into our atmosphere. By reducing CO₂ emissions and emissions generally, we are reducing all of those noxious chemicals.

I would like to hear the member's comments on that.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has taken this opportunity to bring some very interesting facts to the debate.

I know, from other initiatives we have taken, that it is never a single avenue. There are always ripple effects. I think that is a reason for the whole debate. As much we say that the Kyoto protocol is to reduce the carbon dioxide emissions there will be other areas within which research will be done and there will be other opportunities to deal with other pollution factors in the world.

We can never single-handedly deal with one single issue because they all intertwine with each other. I look at the Kyoto protocol as a starting point from which other great initiatives can be taken.

Again, I am proud that as a country we have decided to ratify this protocol and I look forward to the ratification before the end of the year.

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time today with the member for Surrey Central.

It is a pleasure to rise today to address the issue of Kyoto. This issue is of great concern to Canadians. What concerns Canadians is the unknown. They have no idea what the plan will cost, no idea what costs will be put on them in the future, and no idea what the plan in fact is supposed to do.

The government says to trust it with the many unknowns of Kyoto and all will be fine. This is a government that has become, over the past 10 years, a government of distrust, and now it demands that the Canadian public place full trust in it with the Kyoto plan.

Ten years ago, the Liberals promised Canadians they would solve the problem of the GST. They promised they would solve the problem of ethics in government. They promised they would solve

the declining morale in the military. Ten years later, we know that fraud in the goods and service tax is running rampant. Ten years of Liberals at the helm have set new standards in ethics far more ethically challenged than those of any government it preceded. Ten years of spending less and less on the military have left Canadian soldiers feeling vulnerable and discouraged. Now there is a \$1 billion gun registry boondoggle. What next?

Broken promises have become a staple of the government. The Prime Minister is desperate for a lasting legacy. I suggest that the legacy of the Prime Minister will be based primarily on the promises he broke rather than the promises he attempted to keep.

Now we have the promise of Kyoto. The government has promised the provinces that they will not bear an unreasonable share of the burden. It has also promised Canadian businesses that they will remain competitive. However, the government states in its documentation that it is impossible to be precise in forecasting the estimated economic impact over 8 to 10 years. It obviously has no clue as to the effect.

Every day Canadians are learning more about Kyoto and every day Canadians are asking more and more questions. Clearly, Canadians are growing more concerned about the unknowns.

I want to address a few things that have been outlined in the Kyoto package sent to my office by government. One pamphlet is entitled "Challenge for Canadians". This is what it states:

On average, each Canadian generates just over five tonnes of greenhouse gases per year by driving vehicles, heating and cooling homes, washing and drying clothes and using other appliances. By making choices that reduce our GHG emissions, we are doing our part to address climate change.

In its draft plan, the Government of Canada asks that every Canadian set the goal of cutting personal greenhouse gas emissions by one tonne. It states:

Together, we can reduce our GHG emissions, just from small actions that we take at home, at work, or on the road.

Perhaps we should talk a bit about the need to make choices. When members of Parliament walk from their Parliament Hill offices to the centre block each day, we walk past the limousines of cabinet. It does not matter whether it is 30° below or 30° above: Those limousines are sitting there running. In the cold winter months they are running so that when the minister is ready to go, the car is all nice and warm.

An hon. member: Even the environment minister.

Mr. Andy Burton: Of course.

During Ottawa's hot, muggy summers it is much the same. The limousines are running with the air conditioning on full blast.

The government, and in particular the Minister of Natural Resources, says it is all about choices. The Minister of Natural Resources is telling Canadians to make better choices to reduce greenhouse gases. I ask the minister, is it his choice to keep his limousine idling outside the House just so he can have a warm seat when he leaves?

The government plan states:

Government Orders

If every Canadian motorist avoided idling their vehicles for just five minutes a day, all year, more than 1.6 million tonnes of carbon dioxide, along with other toxic substances, would not enter the air.

Ministerial limousines are running for hours at a time, for hours, not minutes, as the government is asking Canadians to do. Each Tuesday the cabinet usually meets for three hours. On a typical Tuesday, that would amount to a total of more than 90 hours of idling time each week just for cabinet members. Interestingly enough, the plan states:

Every litre of gasoline you use in your car produces almost 2.5 kilograms of CO₂ as well as other pollutants.

One can only imagine how many kilograms of CO₂ are being emitted by those idling limousines sitting mere metres from where I am standing right now.

It gets better. A major campaign put on by the Department of Natural Resources is entitled "The Idle-Free Zone". The premise of this campaign is to help Canadians stop unnecessary engine idling. I wonder if the minister even knows about his own department's initiative. One can only wonder how the members of the cabinet are able to sleep at night knowing the absurd levels of hypocrisy they are emitting each day.

Why does the government expect Canadians to do their part when the federal cabinet is not prepared to follow suit?

• (1315)

The department says that there is never a good time to waste fuel and generate greenhouse gas emissions by idling our vehicles. How is it possible for the natural resources minister to say one thing, yet completely do the opposite? Canadians will have a great deal of difficulty accepting this line of reasoning.

What has become standard practice over the last 10 years from this administration is to ram one set of rules and regulations down the throats of Canadians only to live by a completely different set of rules. The choices being made by this cabinet today completely contradict the choices expected from Canadians.

Canadians expect and they demand leadership by example. Perhaps the Minister of Natural Resources should follow the words of Paul Graham, the Sudbury municipal project adviser whose words, ironically, are posted on the department's website:

Get your own house in order. You can't do anything with the public without getting your own house in order. The municipality must take the lead on issues like idling.

Leadership starts at home. Hopefully, the Minister of Natural Resources has heard this.

There is no need for the Ministers of the Environment and Natural Resources to travel across this country looking for ways to reduce greenhouse gases. What they need to do is look at themselves and look at their colleagues around the cabinet table. The government is telling Canadians that if they really care about the environment, then they will need to exercise restraint, to become more energy efficient.

The natural resources minister is part of another departmental campaign entitled, "Idling gets you nowhere". In the literature it says "unnecessary idling is expensive and causes environmental damage". It also says "Don't count on public support if you idle unnecessarily".

The Canadian Alliance position is solid. Kyoto will not change a thing. The Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Natural Resources should come clean and admit this to Canadians. They are telling Canadians to conserve and reduce. Why should Canadians be expected to change their habits when the cabinet can simply ignore any responsibility? This is not responsible government.

The Canadian Alliance is speaking for millions of Canadians who are concerned with Kyoto. Perrin Beatty, who represents Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters, is one of those. The membership of his organization accounts for 75% of Canada's industrial output and 90% of its exports. When the government claims that Kyoto will not harm Canada's competitiveness, obviously it did not consult with the primary stakeholders.

I want to read into the record what the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters had to say when the government released its plan:

The document acknowledges some of the concerns that have been raised by industry and by the provinces, but provides little more detail than the framework released previously. Canadians deserve a detailed plan that spells out the costs and necessary actions on the part of industry and individual citizens for Canada to achieve its target. There is still no clear indication of how Ottawa will address the remaining 60 megatonne shortfall. Nor is there a detailed outline of how much the incentives and programs will cost and where the funds will come from. The document says the plan 'must be a made-in-Canada approach that is based on collaboration, partnerships and respect for jurisdiction.' The acid test of whether the government means what it says is whether it will set aside its rush to ratify and give Canadians a chance to be heard first. It is far more important to get the plan right than to rush it through before Christmas.

When an organization that represents a majority of Canada's manufacturers expresses caution, asking for the government to get the plan right instead of rushing it through, why will the government not listen? What benefit is it to government to ignore the interests of those who create jobs? Obviously Canadian manufacturers want and need more information. They need to know concrete statistics on the impact of Kyoto.

I suggest that the Kyoto plan is simply an exercise by the Liberals for appearance purposes only. It is about saying one thing and doing another. It is about speaking out of both sides of the mouth. The government wants individual Canadians to do their part in achieving climate change objectives. The minister uses phrases such as "we expect, we hope and we intend". These are not words of confidence. These are the words of a minister making up policy on the fly.

It is unacceptable to the Canadian Alliance. It is unacceptable to ordinary Canadians. The sheer hypocrisy of the Minister of Natural Resources alone will convince Canadians that the Kyoto plan is a scam. Leadership is living by example.

Government Orders

• (1320)

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, what are the costs? First, we do not have figures as to what it will cost the country as a whole. However it has been estimated that the government wants us to go to R-2000 homes, insulate our homes more. It wants us to go to smaller cars. It wants us to abandon clothes dryer and go back to the clothesline.

The accord is almost certainly to bring us increased costs for energy and for gasoline. The estimate is that it will cost an average of \$2,700 per Canadian family. I have had questions from people in my riding about how much it will cost them.

I had a contractor ask me recently what it would cost him for the cost of building a home and how it would cut in to his ability to survive and keep his income and livelihood. In fact we have heard that up to 450,000 jobs are potentially in jeopardy.

This is an ideological debate. With so much of our industry concentrated along the border with so little potential gain to the environment, as industry moves south of the border to take advantage of economic energy opportunity there, really will we have achieved the goals that we want in reducing pollution or will we have just moved it a little a bit south of the 49th where it will continue to blow into Canada and continue to cause problems for us? Is it not better to pursue our own energy efficient policies, wind power, energy alternatives like hydrogen and expand our hydro electric capacity?

Could my colleague comment on that?

Mr. Andy Burton: Mr. Speaker, obviously there are huge concerns about the potential costs of Kyoto. The government obviously does not know. It is like the gun registry. How much will cost? What is the total cost? Nobody knows.

That is not acceptable. There is no question that there will be huge costs on the Canadian economy. The right direction for Canada to go is to have a made in Canada plan, develop new technology, research and spend Canadian dollars. It makes no sense whatsoever to send billions of dollars overseas to third world countries to buy clean air credits. Let us keep those dollars in Canada. Let us create jobs in Canada working on new research and technology such as wind power, clean gas power and cleaner coal power. There are all kinds of options out there.

We have huge resources in Canada. We need to create jobs in Canada, not lose jobs. Kyoto will cost Canada jobs. That is absolutely counterproductive. It is not acceptable. I do not think Canadians will accept it. We have to work toward creating jobs in Canada, based certainly on working toward cleaning up the atmosphere and greenhouse gases.

It needs to be made very clear that 95% of greenhouse gases are natural and 5% of the world's greenhouse gases are man made. Of that 5%, 2% are Canadian and that is something like one-tenth of one percent.

I will not belittle the need for working on change and making things better but we have to look at the cost benefit analysis. I do not think the government has a clue about where we are heading with

this. It is a terrible shame and a damned poor Christmas present for Canadians.

• (1325)

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the possibility of creating new jobs and new technologies as a result of the need to meet this challenge of the environment, surely having a target is precisely what we want to have to stimulate this kind of activity. To not have a target, I would suggest, would not give the kind of incentive to developing these new technologies that we know on which Canada is capable of leading the world.

Mr. Andy Burton: Mr. Speaker, that is all very well said but targets without any idea of what it will cost to hit them is totally counterproductive. We have to know where we are going with this. We have to know what the cost will be in terms of dollars, jobs and of lost opportunity.

To simply say that we will do it and let the jobs move across the border to the lower 48th does not make any sense whatsoever. It is not good for Canadians. It just will not work. We need to keep the dollars in Canada, develop technology and deal with the problem in Canada with Canadian labour and people.

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the constituents of Surrey Central to participate in the debate on the motion to ratify the Kyoto protocol.

What does protecting the environment mean? It means clean air to breathe, clean water to drink, clean food to eat, clean surroundings to live in. It means pollution or contamination free, pesticide or chemical free surroundings, no smog, no acid rain. It means protecting our forests, endangered species and natural resources.

The Kyoto accord will not do any of these things. Carbon dioxide is a naturally occurring substance that is essential to plants and animals. Kyoto restricts carbon dioxide emissions, not the air pollution that causes smog or acid rain, et cetera. The Kyoto accord does not deal with environmental contamination or controlling air pollution.

Greenhouse gasses, which include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide and sulphur dioxide, et cetera, comprise less than 1% of the air. Water vapour, comprising 99% of greenhouses gases in the atmosphere, provides most of the greenhouse gas effect.

So far science on the causes of global warming is not conclusive. Global warming is a natural phenomenon that has been happening for millions of years. There are other factors at play that account for global warming and need to be addressed.

The Kyoto accord does not require Canada to actually make carbon dioxide reductions. Therefore, being opposed to Kyoto is not the equivalent of being opposed to all efforts to curb climate change. It is opposing a wrong political decision with a wrong approach to dealing with a serious problem without properly consulting and evaluating the repercussions and impact on Canadians and on the environment.

Government Orders

Funding Kyoto would drain billions of dollars, and some from developing countries, away from worthwhile environmental concerns. The Kyoto accord will not cover countries producing two-thirds of man-made carbon dioxide emissions.

More than 160 countries are signatories to the protocol but imposes emission limits on just 38 countries. Countries such as India, China and Indonesia have signed on but they do not have to talk about reducing emissions until after 2012. Of the 38 countries, 13 have been deemed economies in transition and are essentially exempted from any deadlines for meeting targets.

The fifteen countries that are members of the European community are likely to meet their targets through creative accounting. Six nations are extremely small and have equally tiny targets. That leaves just four countries; the United States, Australia, Japan and Canada.

However, the United States and Australia have already decided not to ratify. China and India each spew as much carbon dioxide into the atmosphere every day as does Canada in an entire year.

The Kyoto accord cannot come into force unless 55 countries that collectively produce 55% of the developed world's carbon dioxide emissions ratify it. The U.S. abandonment of the treaty makes the backing of other signatories critical to the agreement's survival.

Countries that have refused to ratify are not required to reduce emissions in phase 1 of the Kyoto protocol.

The vast majority, 95% of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, is naturally occurring. Of the 5% that is man made, two-thirds is produced in countries not ratifying Kyoto or are exempt from its targets. There are no real penalties for those countries in the Kyoto treaty. Countries that do not meet their targets have their overruns added to the next target like the interest on credit cards.

Canada accounts for only 2% of global greenhouse gases. It will be the only country in the western hemisphere required to make significant reductions under the protocol to meet 1990 emission levels. Taxpayer dollars should be used for something worthwhile and for an effective cause, not for something ineffective or doomed to be a failure.

• (1330)

Both the Liberal cabinet and the caucus are divided on whether or not the government should ratify the Kyoto protocol. Ministers of Natural Resources, Industry and Finance have varying and contradicting opinions about Kyoto. Some have indicated their reluctance to see the government ratify it at this time. Other Liberals have been sitting on the fence and watching their wet finger figuring out which way the wind is blowing.

The former finance minister and the Liberal leader in waiting could have shown some leadership. How can he oppose the plan and then promise to vote in favour of it? I do not understand that. The Liberal record on protecting the environment and endangered species or dealing with pesticides, contaminations and pollutants is dismal. The Liberals have repeatedly broken their red book promises.

The provinces have no confidence in the federal Liberal government. The provinces have not been provided with a plan,

even though they must find money to meet the targets. Conferences with the premiers have been postponed many times. British Columbia, for example, has invested heavily in the past decades in clean, renewable hydroelectricity, which supplies 90% of the province's energy needs. British Columbia's per capita greenhouse gas emissions are the third lowest in Canada. Yet under the government's implementation plan B.C. would suffer the worst job and economic impacts.

The federal government has spent millions of dollars on so-called consultations. Despite this Canadians are generally poorly informed on the Kyoto accord. Some think the Kyoto accord is a model of a Japanese car like the Honda Accord, while others visualize images of huge plants and factories billowing great mushroom clouds of poisonous smog. Most people believe that the protocol would affect only big businesses. It is not a joke, but rather a very serious matter.

The federal government, because of the lack of a clear approach and plan, has been unable and unsuccessful in educating and informing Canadians about this most expensive initiative ever. There is no legislation in the pipeline, so how can we believe the government? To meet the 240 megatonne made in Japan commitment, the government acknowledges there is still a 60 megatonne gap and it has been unable to close the gap. The plan has a few flaws. The figures do not add up and the government does not have a plan. Just like Humpty Dumpty, the Liberals think Kyoto can mean whatever they want it to mean. This is a recipe for abuse, fraud and corruption. Kyoto is an inadequate public relations scam and fraud.

Kyoto has never been about science; it has only been about politics. The only climate it would change would be the economic climate. Implementing the treaty would result in massive losses in jobs, productivity and wealth, unfairly affecting some regions of the country far more than others and devastating communities in the process. Job losses would be massive, about half a million. Domestic emission reductions alone could cost as high as \$45 billion.

The Kyoto protocol is unfair to Canadian industry and would put us at a competitive disadvantage internationally, particularly with the U.S. Businesses may simply move across the border to avoid the costs of Kyoto. With no public benefits or even global ones, we would all lose. It is a lose-lose proposition. In B.C. pulp mills could ship wood chips to the United States for processing rather than run mills in B.C. Consideration should be given to the Dutch example. A strong economy would result in better environmental protection.

We must continue to conduct the necessary research to properly understand this complex issue. Clearly, today's climate change science does not provide a sufficiently robust foundation on which to base a significant and costly international treaty.

Government Orders

We should reduce real pollution as well as greenhouse gases which might be contributing to climate change by promoting: energy and resources conservation; transitional fuels such as propane, natural gas, ethanol and other biofuels; wind, solar and other alternative energy sources; and a society wide conversion to clean hydrogen fuel. We should not leave the minister's car running and thus setting a bad example. We should also work on adapting to climate change, whether natural or man made.

● (1335)

The Canadian Alliance opposes ratification of the protocol, but supports policies that would lead to both a healthier environment and a growing economy. The Kyoto environmental accord is a deeply flawed international deal. We should find scientific reasons and invest in technology so we could make significant contributions for generations to come.

Mr. Andy Savoy (Tobique—Mactaquac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in the House on such an important issue to the future of Canadians. I will be sharing my time with the member for Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot.

I would like to describe the issue as people across Canada see it and as I see it. About 90% of scientists agree that greenhouse gases contribute to global warming. There are about 10% who do not agree and have alternative theories. An intergovernmental panel of 1,800 scientists has recommended a 60% reduction in CO₂ emissions. We are looking at 6%. This is a serious problem.

Let us look at the evidence. The boreal forest out west is in recession. In the last five years Nova Scotia has had some serious storms. Manitoba had four or five serious floods in the nineties. There is also the unprecedented melting of polar ice caps.

This is a problem which we can try to ignore. There are some members who claim we should do nothing about greenhouse gas emissions because they say they are not a problem. The argument that greenhouse gas emissions do not contribute to global warming is absolutely false. Let us recognize at least among us here that this is an issue.

Some members look at this issue as a problem, and preach doom and gloom. I and many members of our government believe this is not a problem, but rather an opportunity for Canadians and for Canadian industry as well. Opposition members should get down off their soap boxes and stop preaching doom and gloom for the Canadian economy. Let us look at this as an opportunity and progress as opposed to doom and gloom.

In 1973 the head of Ford said that the company and the industry were forced to install catalytic converters in cars to reduce air pollution. This would cause Ford to shut down and reduce gross national production by \$17 billion, increase unemployment to 800,000 and decrease tax receipts of \$5 billion at all levels of government. This would result in some local governments becoming insolvent. Some years later that same leader in the American industry said his company was continuously faced with great opportunities, brilliantly disguised as insoluble problems. That amazing and accomplished leader of industry was Mr. Lee Iacocca. This was an example of how people who preached doom and gloom at the beginning, but through time and actuality realized it offered

solutions and opportunity for industry, private citizens and governments.

It has been predicted that 60,000 jobs would be lost as a result of the Kyoto implementation.

An hon. member: It is 450, 000.

Mr. Andy Savoy: Mr. Speaker, various people have predicted 60,000 jobs, others 450,000, depending on whose estimates we look at.

Let me talk about the cost of inaction. Let us talk about quantifying those costs of inaction in terms of health costs and costs to various industries such as the insurance industry. Let us talk about the opportunities such as helping new industry evolve in Canada and becoming a centre for environmental technologies geared toward greenhouse gas emission reduction. Those opportunities have not been quantified. In fact, if we look at the cost, often the cost of inaction is not mentioned whatsoever.

● (1340)

There would definitely be health impacts by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. We are not only talking about CO₂ emissions. When we reduce emissions, we are reducing all emissions and CO₂ is certainly the target. However, we are looking at and dealing with NO and NO₂, and SO and SO₂ in particular. They all have levels of chemical loading in our atmosphere that are serious. It is not only CO₂ emissions, there are many other types of noxious chemicals as well.

We can agree there is a problem. Most members would say greenhouse gas emissions and global warming are issues that must be dealt with. If members talk to their constituents they would also say that yes, we understand there are issues around global warming. Where should we go from here because we know there is a problem?

The intergovernmental panel consisted of 1,800 scientists. It talked about a 60% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. We are talking about 6%, which is modest. The question is, where do we go from here? How do we implement this? How do we work with industry, governments, and various stakeholders to bring in an implementation plan that would be as user friendly and built on consensus as possible?

I had a round table in my riding specifically on Kyoto. Some of the recommendations that came from industry, government, and individual citizens were heartening to see. They came up with a number of recommendations and thoughts on this issue. One gentleman, for instance, said that he had solar panels installed in his summer cottage to heat his water, operate his lights and heat his home in general. He said the payback on that looked like it would be about six years. It is heartening for me to see people looking at those opportunities, coming up with their own solutions, and in fact working with renewable energy technologies like solar power.

Government Orders

There are other renewable energies that we could look at: geothermal technology, ethanol and biofuels. Coming from an agricultural riding I am happy to see that biofuels offer an opportunity. Farming is very difficult and farmers are going through rough times. We know they face international market conditions that are difficult. Farm profits are decreasing. We have seen problems with smaller farms as well. There is a reduction in the numbers of smaller farms.

Biofuels would offer farmers an alternative revenue source because they do have the input or the natural resource to put into a biofuel process. That is something that we can explore and that is good news for the agriculture sector.

Another example is wind energy. California has made great strides with wind energy. Prince Edward Island has 11 wind turbines that are working very well. They are feeding into the provincial grid system and doing a great job of it.

One other example that was mentioned at this round table was how hot water heaters are some of the least efficient appliances in our homes. Why is that so? It had not been significantly questioned before. Issues like this were brought forward by citizens who were concerned and I thought that was commendable.

Habitat protection for species at risk was mentioned. I had a hard time equating that with Kyoto. However, people said that we could look at our forests and reforestation to help rebuild habitats.

I would like to voice my support for Kyoto. We should look at creating an implementation plan where we look, on a regional basis, to come up with regional solutions involving the consultative process. We should bring all sectors, industry, municipalities, provincial governments, the energy sector, the resource sector, the citizens coalitions and non-governmental organizations around a table, to develop a regional approach that would address the regional issues and challenge this group to come up with solutions in conjunction with the federal government.

● (1345)

This cannot be a top down process. The implementation plan must be a "community up" process in my mind, where we build consensus among all the stakeholders around the table, bring them to Ottawa and hash out a plan.

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his intervention. We do get a little enthusiastic about some of our discussions around here and there is quite an ideological debate going on about how we should proceed to address some very important issues.

The hon. member mentioned that jobs would be created to offset the losses in industry. Jobs would be created by innovation and by advancing energy alternatives. Is the member implying that the only way to achieve these job gains in energy alternatives is by signing on to the Kyoto accord, which is outside of Canada?

He mentioned alternatives, and some good ideas came forward, such as wind, hydro, hydrogen, solar energy, geothermal, ethanol and bio-fuels. He mentioned someone in his own riding who used solar panels to greatly increase the efficiency of his home. But that was done, might I suggest, without Kyoto. It has been done already.

We have talked about what happened in California, where great strides are being made in this area toward energy alternatives, but that was done without Kyoto.

There are great penalties associated with Kyoto if Canada does not reach these unachievable or unrealistic targets. They are very difficult targets. We do not know how we are going to get out there without a plan. If we do not reach them, there are very severe penalties to our economy and that will require emissions trading abroad and transfers of great sums of money from our country to other countries. Therefore, would it not be better to spend that money by investing in this country, advancing the concerns and alternatives that we are all interested in?

● (1350)

Mr. Andy Savoy: Mr. Speaker, one aspect I would like to address immediately is U.S. support for Kyoto. In fact, the Attorneys General of 11 major states, including California, New York and Massachusetts, wrote to President Bush deploring his current policy as failing to mandate reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. They stated:

To fill this regulatory void, states and others are being forced to rely on their available legal mechanisms...[which] will necessarily lessen regulatory certainty and increase the ultimate costs of addressing climate change, thereby making the purported goals of the Administration's current policy illusory.

I think there is widespread support for addressing climate change, but I think the process is what we should be focusing on. I feel that the goals, at 6% below 1990 levels, are very modest, and I understand that there have been issues around consultation.

What I would like to focus on now in going forward is setting a target and trying to achieve that target in consultation, with industry, provinces, municipal governments, provincial governments, NGOs and citizens' coalitions around the table, so that we can all work together to look at a solution that is implementable.

This has to be done on a regional basis to make sure that regional interests and concerns are addressed. Certainly in the case of Alberta, for example, which has a large oil and gas sector, we must take that into account in looking at job creation and opportunities for corporate growth in the oil sector.

I think that the issue here is not about the ratification, but more so about the implementation, in a consensus building fashion.

Government Orders

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned the United States in his response. In Sumas, Washington, there is a plant being built, just across the 49th. We already have one plant pulling out of B.C. to move to this new location just south of the 49th. A little community with 780 people will get 56 jobs from a formerly Canadian plant. It will get all the hundreds of construction jobs. There is a 600 megawatt power plant going in there, just south of the 49th, to serve this little community. Presumably that power is destined for Seattle and California, but it is not legal for them to build the plant near Seattle or in California because of the pollution concerns there. Yet it is being built just south of the 49th.

Does the hon. member really not think that with our dependence on the U.S. for our exports and our energy products a lot of our industry will just go south of the 49th? Canada will still receive as much emissions or more and it will be at the expense of the Canadian economy and Canadian jobs.

Mr. Andy Savoy: Mr. Speaker, again I thank the hon. member for his question.

If what he has stated, that lesser degrees of environmental compliance or regulations are the basis for companies to move to some constituencies from others, California would be bankrupt. California is one of the most progressive environmental communities in the world, certainly in North America. We have seen California put forward a number of environmental issues and it was one state that said to the president that the developed countries should take the lead in combating climate change. Developed countries should also commit to voluntarily stabilizing their emissions—

An hon. member: It has as many people as we do in all of Canada.

Mr. Andy Savoy: I understand, but just in closing, if we are trying to say that because of a different level of environmental regulations the exodus of companies from one jurisdiction to another will happen, then California should be an example because it has been this way for 20 years and California has seen wonderful growth.

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the definition of leadership is to be willing to lead when the way ahead is unsure. Anyone can go forward when the future is full of certainty, but few are prepared to go forward to show true leadership when the future is uncertain. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is the case with the Kyoto accord.

As with countries, as with prime ministers, as with heads of corporations and businesses and as with ordinary people, when the time comes to lead, it has to be when one realizes it is necessary, one is called upon to lead, and the way ahead is unsure.

I have been following the debate on Kyoto. I actually have on my desk a very thick file of all the speeches in *Hansard*. There is no doubt that there is a lot of uncertainty surrounding what we are proposing to do about ratifying the Kyoto accord.

There is no doubt in my mind that there is a huge political element in the lead-up to the Kyoto accord, that indeed there are some countries in the world that hope to see countries like Canada and the United States indeed sign on to the commitments involved in Kyoto to make them less competitive, so that these countries in the third

world, or even in the second world, if we will, in Europe, can compete better with the products that are produced especially in North America.

There also is no doubt that there is dispute on the scientific evidence. It is true that finally, after many years of debate, the consensus among scientists is that the climate is changing. But there is not consensus that the climate is changing because of world contributions of greenhouse gas emissions. That is not proven. However, what is known, what is established, is that the world is under threat of pollution caused by human activity and that populations around the world are growing. What is happening, and we saw it so well with the former east bloc countries, is that when the desire is to produce, to manufacture at any cost, there is a tremendous cost to the environment, an unacceptable price paid on the loss of environmental integrity.

All we have to do is to go to today's East Germany or Taiwan, for example, or many of the cities in the countries in the Far East and eastern Europe and see the effects of unregulated pollution, where the rivers are poisoned and the air is poisoned. Visitors from Taiwan will comment when they have been here in Ottawa for 24 hours or 48 hours that they do not have to change their shirts because they do not have a black ring around the neck. The air pollution in Singapore, Mexico City and so many places around the world is very severe.

I would suggest that the Kyoto accord is not really about carbon dioxide, because again we acknowledge that carbon dioxide is something that plants use and it is a non-poisonous gas that is part of the natural environment. But the reason why one focuses on the question of carbon dioxide is that it is an indicator of other human-produced pollutants.

The reason why it is so important, in my view, that despite the uncertainty Canada stands up at the plate on Kyoto is that the leading developed nations have to lead on this, because the third world looks to us with great envy and sees us as the ones who have it all our way. They want to catch up and they want to compete with us in any way they can, and if that any way involves contributing to world pollution then that any way is what they will do. So the developed nations have to lead the way on air pollution control is what it really amounts to, on cutting back on the pollutants in the atmosphere.

● (1355)

There is no doubt that whatever we do here in Canada is not going to account for that much difference in climate change. If we want to see where the real problems in air pollution are coming from, all we have to do is get on the Internet and get into those satellites that are looking down into the Middle East or Africa and see those natural gas flares that are blowing into the air in Saudi Arabia or Nigeria, or see the plumes of smoke from the forest fires and the clear-cutting in western Africa, in the Amazon and in Malaysia. This is serious pollution. The only way that the western world, the developed countries, can get any kind of moral authority to persuade these other countries not to do this is to lead the way in cutting back on the emissions that we ourselves create.

Government Orders

It is important to lead. One of my great disappointments in this whole Kyoto process is the fact that the United States did not take the lead. I believe that there is a tremendous will in the United States to lead in this particular way because Americans and Canadians, North Americans, are renowned worldwide for the ability to innovate. If there were any two countries in the entire world that could face this challenge and employ high technology and creativity to develop new strategies to control pollution, be it carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, or any of these things, it is Americans and Canadians.

It is sad that the American leadership has decided not to go down this avenue that the rest of the world is calling upon it to do. Therefore Canada has to take the lead. We are the only G-7 nation that is prepared to take this kind of leadership.

I really believe that when we made this commitment, and we are going into a world of uncertainty, I think we will show that we can meet the challenges. I would suggest that within a few years of going down that road, that road of uncertainty, I believe that the Americans will follow the Canadians.

● (1400)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I listened to what the member had to say. I would simply reflect back to him what I have said to others when I have engaged in the comments on these debates and that is, it is based on huge assumptions on all facets.

First, on the environmental facet, one must recognize that carbon dioxide, which is the main element of the Kyoto accord, is the fourth element in our atmosphere. As a matter of fact, nitrogen and oxygen comprise 99%, actually it is 99.03%, of our total atmosphere. Everything else is less than 1%. The next one is argon and following that is carbon dioxide at .033% by volume. Therefore, when one says that carbon dioxide emissions will greatly affect our atmosphere, our weather, our global temperature, I think it is a huge leap of assumption.

Furthermore, Canada emits about 2% of man-made carbon dioxide. The man-made portion of carbon dioxide production in the world is an infinitesimal amount of the total if we think of things like volcanoes and forest fires. Every swamp that is rotting away produces carbon dioxide. It is not reasonable to assume that the small proportion of carbon dioxide that is emitted by mankind worldwide can really have a sizable affect on the total amount of carbon dioxide in the world. It is the same as saying that the oceans are too high so we had better take a couple of cups of water out of them. Numerically that would reduce the volume of water in the oceans, but it would be an infinitesimal amount. That is the first assumption.

Then the big assumption is that by actually reducing our production of carbon dioxide, even by the percentage proclaimed here, it would have any affect at all. I think that is a huge leap.

I am a mathematician, a math physics major. I did a little chemistry but probably only enough to be dangerous. I think we need to be very careful with what we are doing.

The question is are we ready to risk such huge economic repercussions for something that may not make any difference at all?

● (1405)

Mr. John Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the member for Elk Island really has demonstrated that he does not have a grasp of chemistry beyond early high school. None of those arguments have any bearing on what I said.

The point is simply that we have to lead the way in struggling to create environmental technologies that combat all forms of air pollution. There is no doubt. If he had listened to my speech I would have acknowledged that carbon dioxide is not the ultimate problem. It is the problem of leadership. We have to get out there and show the undeveloped world that the developed world is willing to lead the way in reducing air pollution of every kind. It is a matter of the future of the world, the future of the planet, not a matter of a chemistry lesson that obviously the member opposite did not learn very well.

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand today and speak to the Kyoto protocol, which will be rammed through this place. Closure has been tabled so we know that Monday will be our last day to work with this. I will be splitting my time with my colleague from Lakeland.

A lot of folks out there have the mistaken idea that Kyoto will somehow limit the smog days and will magically cure asthma for their kids, and so on. That is far from the truth. Kyoto has very little to do with what we know as pollution. The target is 240 megatonnes, that is 240 million tonnes of CO₂ less than what we are producing now. There is a lot of speculation out there as to what that will do and what that will cost us as an economic country.

It all came about based upon the Rio summit in 1992 and moving on to the 1997 meeting in Kyoto, Japan, hence the name. Before that meeting in Japan, the federal government, in its wisdom, did not consult with the provincial governments nor the people of this country. It was going to sign on to an international agreement but we did not know what it was buying into. We did not know what we were committing ourselves to over the next 20, 30 or 40 years. No one really knew.

The provincial ministers had a meeting in Regina, Saskatchewan, my home province. They came up with what they felt they could handle and they presented that to the federal government. The problem was that when the federal group changed planes in Vancouver I guess they left it in the airport, because they did not honour the agreement that the premiers had put forward in Regina. They went over to Japan and proceeded to outbid the Americans. Their attitude was that whatever the Americans could do, we could do better.

The government has us in a situation where it has signed us on to a reduction from 1990 levels, that is 12 years ago, of 6% below what we were producing at that point. That will make a change of about 30% of what we are at today.

In the big argument of whether that is valid or not, the problem is, is there an agreement that CO₂ is really the culprit? Is that what we need to go after? Is there really a greenhouse situation happening around the world? There are scientists on both sides of that argument and both sides have valid points, so we do not have sound consensus that this is really going on.

Government Orders

One of the major players in the environmental movement, a fellow named Bjorn Lomborg from Denmark, has switched sides. He is saying that there is no conclusive evidence. As an economist he cannot rationalize why a country like Canada would commit to this sort of an anchor to drag along against the rest of the industrialized countries that are our trading partners.

The Americans, the Australians and over 100 countries went to the meeting in Kyoto. It came down to Canada and Russia having to sign on to get the prerequisite 55 to make this thing fly. The Russians are waiting to see if Canada signs on, and then they will because they know we have to send them huge gobs of cash in order to make our commitments. It makes no sense at all to me that we can literally pass the buck. It is a get out of jail free card. We will send money to Russia because its emissions are down. Because it closed a lot of factories as the Russian economy hit the skids, it says that it has already met its requirements. It negotiated on that. Now the British are saying that they have changed all their factories from coal to gas so they have met their requirements.

The Australians went to the Kyoto meeting and negotiated an 8% increase, not a decrease. Since then they have backed off because their scientists are saying that this is a hoax. They are saying that the 1.4° variance that we have seen cured the ozone problem that we had. It was actually the extra heat that dissipated that hole and turned it into a myriad of little holes that are not a problem any more. They are saying that this is not the right way to go.

Canada produces 2% of the global emissions. That is within the margin of error so we may not be promoting that problem at all. There is just no sound science for us to do this. It is all about the Prime Minister making commitments in Kyoto and again in South Africa a few months ago, saying that he would ram this through by the end of the year.

We have dragged our feet for five years. If there really is a problem here and a culprit that we need to go after, why did we wait five years? In that five years the government has not discussed it with anybody.

The minister stood here today and said, "We have this little book. Read it. Understand it. The numbers are all in there". The only numbers I can find are the page numbers. There is nothing in here that tells us what this will cost. They have some wish lists here. They are talking about disposable income per household and they have it pegged at \$68,000.

• (1410)

I represent a lot of farmers who do not make 10% of that amount and this will really hit them hard.

No studies have been done on the industrial impacts. The federal chamber of commerce has come out against this. It can see the downside of this but nobody has softened its fears that it will hurt the business community. We know it will, and especially in my area of western Canada. We drill for and pump out the natural gas that goes to the United States to make it greener, which is good for us and good for it, but we do not get credit for doing that in the Kyoto agreement because the United States is not a Kyoto signatory.

We also in Saskatchewan mine some of the highest grade uranium which is turned into fuel rods so that France can make its Kyoto

targets with its nuclear energy. We get hit with the cost of the mining and the environmental damage that goes with it but we do not get credit for helping France meet its targets. Those are the negotiations that should have gone on. Where are the credits for what we actually do to help the global community do a better job?

The last member talked about the third world countries looking for leadership. Certainly they are, but they are more concerned about having a full belly at night than they are about the flare on that natural gas well. Let us get our priorities straight. Certainly we have to look after the environment, but their priority is eating and surviving to the next day as much as it is worrying about environmental pollution. That is unfortunate.

Certainly there is a leadership role for Canada to play, but not at any cost, which is what we are seeing here.

The government talks about the 2,000 UN scientists who promoted this and said that it was great. They did some good work. They came up with a variance in temperature of 1.4°C. That has happened over the last million years. We can trace it up and down.

The political spin was not good enough so the bureaucrats and the politicians said that it had to be higher than that or people would not take notice. What does the number in the book say? It says that it could be as high as 5.8°C. It could be but there is no science that supports that assertion, none at all.

Since that time we have had 19,000 worldwide scientific community members sign on to what is called the Oregon petition, which is what turned the United States around from signing on. It said that there was no sound science, that there was nothing to say that this was for real, and that this has not gone on and on.

There are just too many things that drive us in the opposition to say that we had better have a look at this. If we buy into this it will hurt the third world. If Canada's economy takes the hit that we think it will take or even half the hits that the industry groups, the chamber of commerce, the CFIB and the manufacturers' association are talking about, we can no longer afford the half billion dollar Africa plan that the Prime Minister wants. We will not be economically sustainable any more. We will be scratching to feed our own folks, let alone help out the third world. This could be a detriment if we were to really think about it in that vein.

The government talks about building all our homes to R-2000 value. In my former life in agriculture I did a lot of construction to pay for that farming habit. We built to R-2000 standards in 1980. We have gone way beyond that. R-2000 calls for R-12 insulation and double glazed windows. We left that behind two decades ago. That is what is in this book. That is how out of date this is.

Government Orders

The government talks about a CO₂ pipeline. From where to where? What are we going to do with it? Alberta is already capturing CO₂ at wellheads, pumping it back into coal beds to extract the methane to get a good clean burning fuel. Alberta is already doing that.

I just visited southern Ontario. Greenhouses there have a cylinder of CO₂ when they are getting their seedlings started and they crack it because it is fertilizer for plants.

North America already is the largest CO₂ filter in the world. If we look at the slip stream coming in west to east and measure the CO₂ amounts on the west coast and measure them as they go out the east coast, we have been a significant filter because of our agricultural productions and our reforestation. We are already doing our part.

It just boggles my mind that we would forge ahead with this when no impact assessments have been done. Just in the last couple of days we have seen with the firearms registry what happens when there is not consultation with the provinces and the affected groups. We get money thrown out the window trying to bury a problem. Kyoto is another example along that line of what will to happen. There is no plan, only we are talking tens of billions of dollars, not just one billion.

In wrapping up, there is no way that we can pass the buck on this. Certainly Canada has a leadership role to play, but when we are the only industrialized nation in the western hemisphere to sign on to this, it is doomed to fail.

The former natural resources minister, the member for Wascana, said, "If our American trading partners do not sign on to this, we shouldn't either because we are under the same umbrella of air". What happened to that logic? That is the first thing I have heard from that side that made any sense and it has now been forgotten.

• (1415)

This argument is going to go on. It is all about a legacy for the Prime Minister but I put it before members today that it is more about lunacy in our actions here.

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would just observe, it is not about legacy for the Prime Minister. It is about legacy for future generations on the planet. The member opposite made reference to the flares and that people could tolerate the flares in the third world, that is the flares burning off natural gas into the atmosphere, in those countries where these flares occur because this is a way of keeping food on the table.

I would point out to the member opposite that these flares are the result of international oil consortiums drilling for oil and burning the gas off with the agreement of the countries in whose territories they are operating. These are governments that have made these decisions, the government of Saudi Arabia and the government of Nigeria. These are the countries that somehow the developed world has to persuade to find that they would take other solutions that gain less for them in the short run and provide more for all of us in the long run. In other words, this is really not about carbon dioxide.

I could concede many of the things the speaker opposite says but the reality is that this is all about Canada showing the leadership

because our ally to the south, who should have been in this place on this issue, has not showed the leadership.

Mr. Gerry Ritz: Mr. Speaker, I guess it comes down to what can we enforce on other countries if it is government to government? Certainly we can show leadership. The Americans have not backed away from the thrust of what Kyoto is all about. They have set their own targets. They are doing a made in U.S.A. plan that targets 18%, virtually what they had agree to in Kyoto. We could do the same thing, and I do not disagree with that, but let us have something that is Canada friendly, that is taxpayer friendly and that at the end of the day we have results we can measure.

The problem with Kyoto is that we have six billion people living on the planet. One billion out of six billion are under the Kyoto protocol. It is doomed to fail. I talked about us being the only industrialized country in the western hemisphere that is hamstrung with a deal that will limit us. We will have jobs and industry leave to Kyoto friendly climates. Rightly or wrongly they are going to do that. They will take the path of least resistance.

I watched a documentary the other night. There are 100 manufacturing companies in southern Ontario that are now setting up businesses, counterparts, in China. There are several reasons they are doing that. There is a large, cheap workforce. They need the products they develop right there so they get close to the market but it is also not covered by Kyoto. They can do what they need to do to make a buck at the end of the day and create those jobs.

In my mind Kyoto is totally the wrong target. We spend all of the time, energy and money chasing the rainbow of CO₂, the nasty thing it is, and we forget about the 1,200 toxic sites that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency has outlined for us. It catalogued them, including the Sydney tar ponds. We spent \$60 million studying that green guck out there and have not come up with a solution.

We are targeting Kyoto. We have a straw man who we are chasing, just like gun control. We are chasing guns instead of the bad guys. Here we are chasing CO₂ instead of the really noxious stuff that we need to so that we have a healthy climate and so that we have an economy that can afford to do some handouts for the third world and show some leadership in whatever area they want us to lead.

• (1420)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the other night just for my recreational relaxed reading before I went to bed, I was looking over the Kyoto accord to see what it actually said.

One thing rather amazed me, and I am surprised that the Liberals have not glommed onto it. There is an international committee that is set up and it is in its sole discretion going to determine whether a country has been meeting its targets. That means an international organization has the right to tax us. We totally lose our Canadian sovereignty in that particular case. Does the member have a comment on that aspect of Kyoto?

Mr. Gerry Ritz: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent point. We rail in this place about our sovereignty and how we need to be in charge of our own destiny, yet we sign it away in a situation like this where we cannot begin to maintain it.

Government Orders

I know the Deputy Prime Minister said that we would ratify it and just never do it but that damages the leadership capability of the country in the rest of the world. We would be a welsher. We cannot do that. If we decide we are going to go on something like this we had better damned well be there. We cannot turn our back on it, make this thing happen, foist it on other countries and then not implement it. God help us if we do.

The biggest problem we will have is ratifying it. The penalties include another 30% in emissions tacked on and no more emissions trading credits. Again we are hamstrung.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak on the Kyoto accord today. The ratification of Kyoto is an extremely important issue. However in listening to the speeches over the past few days, a lot of what has been said has really nothing to do with the Kyoto protocol.

Many members referred to saving the planet. Any of us who have seen an environmental problem which is a threat to the planet obviously would do anything at any cost to save the planet. However, that is not what this is about. Today in the 10 minutes that I have I will to try to explain what Kyoto is about, what it would do in dealing with any real pollution problems and briefly what the economic impacts could be. I think those are the things Canadians want to know about.

First, Kyoto targets only carbon dioxide and to a much lesser extent methane and nitrous oxide. Combining these with water vapour creates the greenhouse gases that help control the temperature to some extent on the earth's surface. Kyoto is talking about those are the greenhouse gases.

Second, clearly carbon dioxide is not a pollutant. Plants depend on carbon dioxide to grow. If we wish to grow plants for food, they need carbon dioxide. To raise our animals we need plants that use carbon dioxide to grow. Clearly CO₂ is not a pollutant and it should not be referred to as that.

Some government members have said that by controlling CO₂ we are also controlling some real pollutants. These members acknowledge that CO₂ is not a pollutant. They say that if we are controlling CO₂ because of the basket of pollutants that is released, CO₂ being part of other substances being released and are real pollutants, then the Kyoto protocol, if implemented, would help deal with real pollutants.

If those real pollutants are what the government is concerned about, then why do we not put in place a policy that deals with them directly and not just as some ancillary or auxiliary part of an agreement? This has nothing to do with the Kyoto protocol. Why not focus on real pollution.

I will argue and make the point that if Kyoto is implemented, it will lead to greater pollution of the planet.

First, with the U.S. out of the agreement, pollution in greenhouse gas emissions would actually rise if Canada were to implement the treaty. Many energy intensive operations in the United States use a far higher percentage of electricity generated from relatively high polluting, coal fired stations than is the case here in Canada.

Second, if we are to ratify Kyoto, when the United States has said it will not, we will be exporting industry and jobs to the United States, where the U.S. will be using coal which will pollute our atmosphere in a very real way. Therefore Kyoto will actually lead to an increase in pollution.

What is worse, many industries will move their operations away from Canada to developing countries which have little or no control over serious pollutants which threaten human health and the national environment. Countries such as China, India, Brazil are exempt from emissions controls. In fact, nations exempt from Kyoto's provisions or are not ratifying it produce 80% of the emissions of greenhouse gases and a much higher portion of actual pollutants as well. If we are to export industry from Canada to these developing nations, we are in fact leading to the pollution of this planet, not the opposite.

Third, there is a real concern that the actions necessary to implement radical carbon dioxide reductions would result in technological switching to emissions with higher pollution. Therefore, if we were to implement this agreement, we are in fact increasing the pollution of the planet.

Fourth, economists say that Kyoto could lead to a recession in Canada and, as with every recession in any developed country, this recession would lead to a reduction in existing environmental programs. Clearly the money would not there in the economy to pay the taxes which would be used on dealing with genuine environmental problems.

• (1425)

The implementation of Kyoto in Canada will lead to higher pollution of the planet. The debate I have heard on this issue ignores these clearly fundamental points which have to be made.

All of this is being talked about because of what I would call bad science. There is only a small fraction of climate scientists who are prepared to commit themselves to the idea that humans are causing significant climate change. Many eminent scientists, including meteorologists who study weather patterns, claim that any warming we are experiencing falls well within cyclical norms. This is something the government does not often talk about, but it is a reality.

From looking at glacial ice cores they have found that what is happening right now with CO₂ levels falls within norms that have been reached over the past few hundred thousand years. They have also found that the CO₂ levels now are not as high as they have been at times over the past few hundred thousand years.

To my knowledge, unless there was a human race before us that I do not know about, man was not involved in raising those CO₂ levels a few hundred thousand years ago, yet the CO₂ levels were higher then than they are now.

This whole debate on the Kyoto issue is taking place due to bad science. There are a lot of other examples and quotes from people such as Dr. Madhav Khandekar, a former Environment Canada scientist, who has said the same type of thing. The environment minister, the Prime Minister and other people who claim that the blizzards, droughts and all those things somehow come from an increase in greenhouse gases, I believe, are being fundamentally dishonest with Canadians.

Scientists argue that is not the case. I do not think it is healthy for debate when people in the government make radical, extreme statements like that because factually speaking, it is simply not the truth. How can ministers, people who are supposed to be responsible, make those kinds of claims? I would argue they cannot, in good judgment.

I stress that if implemented, Kyoto will damage our environment further and that this whole thing is based on bad science. I want to take a couple of minutes to talk about what the fallout of implementation of Kyoto could mean.

Many people back home say Kyoto is just another national energy program, which damaged Alberta in a way that very few Canadians understand. My brother lost a rapidly developing business directly as a result of the national energy program. Family members lost jobs as a result of the implementation of the national energy program. It hurt Alberta, and Saskatchewan to some extent, in a way that is hard for anyone else to understand.

Government Orders

Is Kyoto like the national energy program? No, it is different. Although it will hurt Alberta more than any other province, it will hurt every single Canadian across the country. That is what makes it different from the national energy program.

We can look at how it will hurt. According to experts, the cost of the average home may increase by \$30,000. That is the figure being used. Every individual, including those on fixed incomes, may see their electricity bill increase 100%. The cost of fuel at the pumps over the next few years probably will double according to many of the experts. Other costs that people have every single day just to survive will increase dramatically due to the implementation of Kyoto.

All that, combined with the reality that Kyoto will make pollution worse and not better, and that it is based on very doubtful science at the best, should lead us to not support the government when it pushes ratification of Kyoto through next week.

● (1430)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 2:30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.30 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. PIERRE BRIEN

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

HON. DON BOUDRIA

MR. LOYOLA HEARN

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	CA
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CA
Benoit, Leon	Lakeland	CA
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	CA
Chatters, David	Athabasca	CA
Clark, Right Hon. Joe	Calgary Centre	PC
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	CA
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton Centre-East	CA
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	CA
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	CA
Harper, Stephen, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	CA
Hill, Grant	Macleod	CA
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	CA
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	CA
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	CA
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Health	Edmonton West	Lib.
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	CA
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	CA
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	CA
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	CA
Rajotte, James	Edmonton Southwest	CA
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	CA
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	CA
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	CA
Williams, John	St. Albert	CA
BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay—Columbia	CA
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	Lib.
Burton, Andy	Skeena	CA
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	CA
Cummins, John	Delta—South Richmond	CA
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Day, Stockwell	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CA
Dhaliwal, Hon. Herb, Minister of Natural Resources	Vancouver South—Burnaby	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	CA
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	CA
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby	CA
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan	CA
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	CA
Harris, Richard	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	CA
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	CA

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (4)		
Barnes, Rex	Gander—Grand Falls	PC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Efford, R. John	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	PC
Matthews, Bill, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Burin—St. George's	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Cuzner, Rodger	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Lib.
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	West Nova	Lib.
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
ONTARIO (101)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Hon. Jean, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald, The Acting Speaker	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bryden, John	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of National Revenue	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—St. Clair	NDP
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Hon. Paul, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Art	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CA
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Hon. Bill, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Lib.
Jordan, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, The Deputy Speaker	Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Hon. Gar, Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Macklin, Paul Harold, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Northumberland	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour	Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	NDP
McCallum, Hon. John, Minister of National Defence	Markham	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
McCormick, Larry, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Hon. Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis	Toronto—Danforth	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Beaches—East York	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Myers, Lynn, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada	Waterloo—Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade	London—Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Haliburton—Victoria—Brock	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Peric, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham—Kent Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean—Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Carleton	CA
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Industry	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Lib.
Tirabassi, Tony	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Hon. Susan, Minister for International Cooperation	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
Easter, Hon. Wayne, Solicitor General of Canada	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
McGuire, Joe.....	Egmont	Lib.
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough.....	Lib.
QUEBEC (71)		
Allard, Carole-Marie	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André.....	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude.....	Saint-Jean.....	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bergeron, Stéphane.....	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie.....	BQ
Binet, Gérard.....	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Brien, Pierre.....	Témiscamingue.....	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy.....	Québec East	Lib. Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada.....	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon.....	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies.....	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.....	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre.....	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable.....	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville.....	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick.....	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles.....	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf.....	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans ..	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Frulla, Liza.....	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec.....	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel.....	Champlain	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de- Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	BQ
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Ind.
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	BQ
Marcil, Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Lib.
Martin, Hon. Paul	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister for International Trade	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Anderson, David	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CA
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CA
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Wascana	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Lib.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Ind.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CA

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Skelton, Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	CA
Spencer, Larry	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	CA
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	CA
Yelich, Lynne	Blackstrap	CA
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Larry	Yukon	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of December 6, 2002 — 2nd Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:	Raymond Bonin	Vice-Chairs:	Nancy Karetak-Lindell Maurice Vellacott	
Gérard Binet	John Finlay	Inky Mark	Brian Pallister	(16)
Serge Cardin	John Godfrey	Pat Martin	Benôit Serré	
David Chatters	Yvan Loubier	Anita Neville	Brent St. Denis	
R. John Efford				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Cummins	Jay Hill	Gilles-A. Perron
Diane Ablonczy	Stockwell Day	Howard Hilstrom	James Rajotte
Rob Anders	Bev Desjarlais	Betty Hinton	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Norman Doyle	Rahim Jaffer	John Reynolds
Gérard Asselin	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Jean-Yves Roy
Claude Bachand	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Robert Lanctôt	Carol Skelton
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Ghislain Fournier	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Stéphane Bergeron	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Larry Spencer
Bernard Bigras	Yvon Godin	Richard Marceau	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitkreuz	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Elsie Wayne
Bill Casey	Stephen Harper	Bob Mills	Randy White
Rick Casson	Richard Harris	James Moore	Ted White
Joe Clark	Loyola Hearn	Lorne Nystrom	John Williams
Joe Comartin	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Lynne Yelich
Paul Crête	Grant Hill	Charlie Penson	

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD**Chair:**

Charles Hubbard

Vice-Chairs:Murray Calder
Howard HilstromDavid Anderson
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitreuz
Claude DuplainMark Eyking
Marcel Gagnon
Rick LaliberteLarry McCormick
Louis Plamondon
Dick ProctorBob Speller
Paul Steckle
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
Paul Crête
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman DoyleJohn Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald KeddyJason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Robert Lanctôt
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
James RajotteScott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Jean-Yves Roy
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairs:

Jim Abbott
Paul Bonwick

Sarmite Bulte
Rodger Cuzner
Claude Duplain
Liza Frulla

Christiane Gagnon
John Harvard
Loyola Hearn

Betty Hinton
Wendy Lill
Dennis Mills

Caroline St-Hilaire
Chuck Strahl
Tony Tirabassi

(16)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins

Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Rahim Jaffer

Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Dick Proctor
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs:

Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Jerry Pickard

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Assad
Yvon Charbonneau
Antoine Dubé

John Godfrey
Steve Mahoney
Inky Mark

Grant McNally
Anita Neville
Joe Peschisolido

David Price
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Bill Blaikie
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins

Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill

Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams

FINANCE**Chair:**

Sue Barnes

Vice-Chairs:Nick Discepola
Richard HarrisScott Brison
Rick Casson
Roy Cullen
Albina GuarnieriRahim Jaffer
Sophia Leung
Maria Minna
Shawn MurphyLorne Nystrom
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Pauline PicardGary Pillitteri
Tony Valeri
Bryon Wilfert

(18)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman DoyleAntoine Dubé
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty HintonDale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Gilles-A. Perron
Joe PeschisolidoJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Judy Sgro
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Bob Wood
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Tom Wappel

Vice-Chairs: Rodger Cuzner
Peter Stoffer

Sarkis Assadourian
Andy Burton
John Cummins
R. John Efford

Reed Elley
Georges Farrah
Loyola Hearn

Dominic LeBlanc
Bill Matthews
Joe Peschisolido

Yves Rocheleau
Jean-Yves Roy
Paul Steckle

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
G rard Asselin
Andr  Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan

Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Ghislain Fournier
Marcel Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer

Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds

Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:	Bernard Patry	Vice-Chairs:	Stockwell Day Diane Marleau	
Sarkis Assadourian	Irwin Cotler	John Harvard	Pat O'Brien	(18)
Stéphane Bergeron	John Duncan	Marlene Jennings	Deepak Obhrai	
Aileen Carroll	Art Eggleton	Francine Lalonde	Svend Robinson	
Bill Casey	Mark Eyking	Keith Martin		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Reed Elley	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds
Diane Ablonczy	Ken Epp	Yvan Loubier	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn	Yves Rocheleau
David Anderson	Raymonde Folco	James Lunney	Benoît Sauvageau
André Bachand	Paul Forseth	Peter MacKay	Werner Schmidt
Claude Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Peter Goldring	Pat Martin	Monte Solberg
Sue Barnes	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Kevin Sorenson
Colleen Beaumier	Gurmant Grewal	Alexa McDonough	Bob Speller
Leon Benoit	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Bernard Bigras	Art Hanger	Val Meredith	Darrel Stinson
Bill Blaikie	Mac Harb	Rob Merrifield	Chuck Strahl
Rick Borotsik	Stephen Harper	Bob Mills	Greg Thompson
Garry Breitkreuz	Richard Harris	James Moore	Myron Thompson
Scott Brison	Loyola Hearn	Shawn Murphy	Vic Toews
Andy Burton	John Herron	Lorne Nystrom	Tony Valeri
Chuck Cadman	Grant Hill	Brian Pallister	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Pierre Paquette	Joseph Volpe
David Chatters	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Betty Hinton	Beth Phinney	Ted White
Paul Crête	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte	John Williams
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Scott Reid	Lynne Yelich
Norman Doyle	Gerald Keddy		

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair:	Mac Harb	Vice-Chairs:	Stéphane Bergeron Mark Eyking	
Bill Casey	Pat O'Brien	Bob Speller	Tony Valeri	(9)
Rick Casson	Svend Robinson			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Sarkis Assadourian	Irwin Cotler	Marlene Jennings	Beth Phinney	(9)
Colleen Beaumier	Antoine Dubé	Deepak Obhrai	Svend Robinson	
Bill Casey				

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:	Reg Alcock	Vice-Chairs:	Paul Forseth Tony Valeri	
Carolyn Bennett	Liza Frulla	Pat Martin	Andy Scott	(16)
Scott Brison	Robert Lanctôt	Gilles-A. Perron	Alex Shepherd	
Roy Cullen	Steve Mahoney	Gerry Ritz	Paul Szabo	
Ken Epp				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Betty Hinton	Charlie Penson
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte
Rob Anders	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dale Johnston	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Christiane Gagnon	Gerald Keddy	John Reynolds
André Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Jason Kenney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Gary Lunn	Carol Skelton
Rex Barnes	Yvon Godin	James Lunney	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Peter MacKay	Kevin Sorenson
Rick Borotsik	Jim Gouk	Inky Mark	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitkreuz	Gurmant Grewal	Keith Martin	Darrel Stinson
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Chuck Strahl
Chuck Cadman	Monique Guay	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Bill Casey	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Rick Casson	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
David Chatters	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
Joe Clark	Loyola Hearn	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Paul Crête	John Herron	James Moore	Randy White
John Cummins	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Ted White
Stockwell Day	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	John Williams
Odina Desrochers	Howard Hilstrom	Pierre Paquette	Lynne Yelich
Norman Doyle			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES PROCESS

Chairs:	Gerry Ritz Tony Valeri	Vice-Chair:		(2)
----------------	---------------------------	--------------------	--	-----

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE RENEWAL

Chairs:	Roy Cullen Paul Forseth	Vice-Chair:		(4)
Liza Frulla	Pat Martin			

HEALTH**Chair:** Bonnie Brown**Vice-Chairs:** Stan Dromisky
Réal MénardCarolyn Bennett
Diane Bourgeois
Jeannot Castonguay
Brenda ChamberlainHedy Fry
James Lunney
Rob MerrifieldHélène Scherrer
Judy Sgro
Carol SkeltonYolande Thibeault
Greg Thompson
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(16)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Madeleine Dalphond-GuiralLibby Davies
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant HillJay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian PallisterCharlie Penson
Pauline Picard
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Judi Longfield	Vice-Chairs:	Eugène Bellemare Monte Solberg	
Libby Davies	Peter Goldring	Gurbax Malhi	Diane St-Jacques	(18)
Norman Doyle	Jim Gouk	Serge Marcil	Alan Tonks	
R. John Efford	Monique Guay	Raymond Simard	Suzanne Tremblay	
Raymonde Folco	Tony Ianno	Larry Spencer		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Antoine Dubé	Rahim Jaffer	Brian Pallister
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	Charlie Penson
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Robert Lanctôt	Gerry Ritz
Rex Barnes	Christiane Gagnon	Wendy Lill	Jean-Yves Roy
Mauril Bélanger	Marcel Gagnon	Yvan Loubier	Werner Schmidt
Carolyn Bennett	Cheryl Gallant	Gary Lunn	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Rick Borotsik	John Godfrey	Peter MacKay	Darrel Stinson
Diane Bourgeois	Yvon Godin	Inky Mark	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitzkreuz	Gurmant Grewal	Keith Martin	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Deborah Grey	Pat Martin	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Art Hanger	Philip Mayfield	Tony Tirabassi
Chuck Cadman	Stephen Harper	Grant McNally	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Réal Ménard	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	Val Meredith	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
David Chatters	John Herron	Rob Merrifield	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Grant Hill	Bob Mills	Randy White
Paul Crête	Jay Hill	James Moore	Ted White
John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	Anita Neville	John Williams
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Betty Hinton	Deepak Obhrai	Lynne Yelich
Stockwell Day			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Carolyn Bennett	Vice-Chair:		
Mauril Bélanger	Norman Doyle	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Anita Neville	(9)
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Reed Elley	Wendy Lill	Tony Tirabassi	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

Chair:	John Godfrey	Vice-Chair:		
Libby Davies	Loyola Hearn	Larry Spencer	Tony Tirabassi	(9)
Monique Guay	Anita Neville	Diane St-Jacques	Alan Tonks	

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:

Walt Lastewka

Vice-Chairs:

Dan McTeague

James Rajotte

André Bachand
Larry Bagnell
Paul Crête
Nick Discepola

Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold

Serge Marcil
Brian Masse
Andy Savoy

Brent St. Denis
Paddy Torsney
Joseph Volpe

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Eugène Bellemare
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Gérard Binet
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day

Bev Desjarlais
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton

Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Joe McGuire
Grant McNally
Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister

Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Dick Proctor
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Andy Scott	Vice-Chairs:	Chuck Cadman John McKay	
Carole-Marie Allard	Hedy Fry	Paul Harold Macklin	Kevin Sorenson	(18)
Bill Blaikie	Ivan Grose	John Maloney	Vic Toews	
Garry Breitkreuz	Derek Lee	Richard Marceau	Pierrette Venne	
Irwin Cotler	Peter MacKay	Lynn Myers		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Bev Desjarlais	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Norman Doyle	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
David Anderson	John Duncan	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Reed Elley	Jason Kenney	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Robert Lanctôt	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	Yvan Loubier	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Gary Lunn	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Peter Goldring	James Lunney	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Jim Gouk	Inky Mark	Darrel Stinson
Diane Bourgeois	Gurmant Grewal	Keith Martin	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Greg Thompson
Andy Burton	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Stephen Harper	Réal Ménard	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Richard Harris	Val Meredith	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
David Chatters	Loyola Hearn	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	John Herron	James Moore	Randy White
Joe Comartin	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Ted White
John Cummins	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	John Williams
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:	Derek Lee	Vice-Chairs:	Marlene Jennings Kevin Sorenson	
Bill Blaikie	John McKay	David Pratt	Vic Toews	(11)
Peter MacKay	Lynn Myers	Geoff Regan	Pierrette Venne	

LIAISON

Chair:	Walt Lastewka	Vice-Chair:	Judi Longfield	
Peter Adams	Bonnie Brown	Gurmant Grewal	David Pratt	(19)
Reg Alcock	Charles Caccia	Charles Hubbard	Andy Scott	
Sue Barnes	Joe Comuzzi	Clifford Lincoln	Tom Wappel	
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Bernard Patry	John Williams	
Raymond Bonin				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Paul Forseth	Derek Lee	David Price
Eugène Bellemare	Yvon Godin	Diane Marleau	Marcel Proulx
Paul Bonwick	Mac Harb	John McKay	James Rajotte
Chuck Cadman	Richard Harris	Dan McTeague	Monte Solberg
Murray Calder	John Herron	Réal Ménard	Peter Stoffer
Rodger Cuzner	Howard Hilstrom	James Moore	Yolande Thibeault
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Dale Johnston	Carolyn Parrish	Tony Valeri
Stockwell Day	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Beth Phinney	Maurice Vellacott
Nick Discepolo	Karen Kraft Sloan	Jerry Pickard	Elsie Wayne
Stan Dromisky			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Peter Adams	Gurmant Grewal	Judi Longfield	John Williams	(6)
Mauril Bélanger	Walt Lastewka			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Reg Alcock	Bonnie Brown	Walt Lastewka	Tom Wappel	(8)
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Andy Scott	John Williams	

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:

David Pratt

Vice-Chairs:
David Price
Elsie Wayne

Rob Anders
Claude Bachand
Colleen Beaumier
Leon Benoit

Robert Bertrand
Cheryl Gallant
Joe McGuire

John O'Reilly
Janko Peric
Louis Plamondon

Carmen Provenzano
Peter Stoffer
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
Stan Dromisky
John Duncan

Reed Elley
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
Wendy Lill
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Dan McTeague
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:	Mauril Bélanger	Vice-Chairs:	Yvon Godin Yolande Thibeault	
Eugène Bellemare Gérard Binet Sarmite Bulte Jeannot Castonguay	Christiane Gagnon John Herron Rahim Jaffer	Jason Kenney Dan McTeague Massimo Pacetti	Scott Reid Benoît Sauvageau Raymond Simard	(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson André Bachand Roy Bailey Rex Barnes Leon Benoit Stéphane Bergeron Rick Borotsik Garry Breitzkreuz Scott Brison Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters Joe Clark Joe Comartin John Cummins	Stockwell Day Norman Doyle John Duncan Reed Elley Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Paul Forseth Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Stephen Harper Richard Harris Loyola Hearn Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton	Dale Johnston Gerald Keddy Yvan Loubier Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Keith Martin Philip Mayfield Grant McNally Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Lorne Nystrom Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Charlie Penson Louis Plamondon James Rajotte John Reynolds	Gerry Ritz Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Guy St-Julien Darrel Stinson Chuck Strahl Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Vic Toews Suzanne Tremblay Maurice Vellacott Elsie Wayne Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich
--	---	--	---

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Peter Adams	Vice-Chairs:	Dale Johnston Carolyn Parrish	
Rick Borotsik	Yvon Godin	Geoff Regan	Werner Schmidt	(16)
Pierre Brien	Michel Guimond	John Reynolds	Guy St-Julien	
Marlene Catterall	Joe Jordan	Jacques Saada	Tony Tirabassi	
Wayne Easter				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson
Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	Betty Hinton	Marcel Proulx
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
André Bachand	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	Gerry Ritz
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn	Carol Skelton
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	James Lunney	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Kevin Sorenson
Stéphane Bergeron	John Godfrey	Inky Mark	Larry Spencer
Bill Blaikie	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Caroline St-Hilaire
Garry Breitzkreuz	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Darrel Stinson
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Larry McCormick	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	John Harvard	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Randy White
John Cummins	John Herron	Lorne Nystrom	Ted White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	John Williams
Libby Davies	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Marcel Proulx	Vice-Chair:		
Rick Borotsik	Michel Guimond	Chuck Strahl	Tony Tirabassi	(6)
Yvon Godin				

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

John Williams

Vice-Chairs:Mac Harb
Beth PhinneyRobert Bertrand
John Bryden
Odina Desrochers
John FinlayPaul Forseth
Gerald Keddy
Sophia Leung
Pat MartinPhilip Mayfield
Val Meredith
Shawn MurphyGilles-A. Perron
Joe Peschisolido
Alex Shepherd

(17)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell DayBev Desjarlais
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard HilstromBetty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Grant McNally
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott ReidJohn Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
Lynne Yelich

TRANSPORT

Chair:	Joe Comuzzi	Vice-Chairs:	James Moore Marcel Proulx	
Rex Barnes	Jim Gouk	Stan Keyes	Alex Shepherd	(16)
John Cannis	André Harvey	Mario Laframboise	Raymond Simard	
Bev Desjarlais	Ovid Jackson	Robert Lanctôt	Lynne Yelich	
Roger Gallaway				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Howard Hilstrom	Dick Proctor
Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
G�rard Asselin	Ken Epp	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
Andr� Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Jason Kenney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Yvan Loubier	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Ghislain Fournier	Gary Lunn	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Christiane Gagnon	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Paul Bonwick	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Inky Mark	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitkreuz	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Peter Stoffer
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Philip Mayfield	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	R�al M�nard	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Loyola Hearn	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Paul Cr�te	Grant Hill	Brian Pallister	Ted White
John Cummins	Jay Hill	Charlie Penson	John Williams

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Chair:	Paddy Torsney	Vice-Chairs:	Carole-Marie Allard Randy White	
Bernard Bigras	Mac Harb	R�al M�nard	Kevin Sorenson	(13)
Libby Davies	Dominic LeBlanc	Jacques Saada	Greg Thompson	
Hedy Fry	Derek Lee			

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROCEDURES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Chair:	Bob Kilger	Vice-Chairs:	Don Boudria John Reynolds	
Bill Blaikie	Michel Gauthier	Loyola Hearn	Dick Proctor	(11)
Norman Doyle	Monique Guay	Stan Keyes	Werner Schmidt	

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chair:

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Michael J. Forrestall
Jean Lapointe

Yves Morin
Vivienne Poy

Mauril Bélanger
Carolyn Bennett
Robert Bertrand
Rick Borotsik
Marlene Catterall
Marcel Gagnon
Deborah Grey
Grant Hill

Jim Karygiannis
Wendy Lill
Jerry Pickard
Louis Plamondon
Jacques Saada
Guy St-Julien
Darrel Stinson
Andrew Telegdi

(21)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Libby Davies
Stockwell Day

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer

Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Gurmant Grewal
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair: Derek Lee

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron
Elizabeth Hubley
James Kelleher

Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin
Gérard Phalen

Paul Bonwick
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Liza Frulla
Michel Guimond
Paul Harold Macklin
John Maloney
Pat Martin

John McKay
Lynn Myers
Caroline St-Hilaire
Greg Thompson
Maurice Vellacott
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(24)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Pierre Brien
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Stockwell Day

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton

Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister

Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILL C-17, PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

Chair: Bob Kilger

Vice-Chair:

Diane Ablonczy
Sarkis Assadourian
Claude Bachand
Rex Barnes

Robert Bertrand
Bev Desjarlais
Mario Laframboise
Derek Lee

Steve Mahoney
James Moore
Lynn Myers
Anita Neville

John O'Reilly
Andy Savoy
Vic Toews

(16)

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panel of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
Hon. David Collenette	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. John Manley	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance
Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Health
Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Industry
Hon. Wayne Easter	Solicitor General of Canada
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
Hon. Don Boudria	Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
Hon. Robert Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Denis Coderre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Robert Thibault	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
Hon. Bill Graham	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Susan Whelan	Minister for International Cooperation
Hon. Gerry Byrne	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. John McCallum	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
Hon. Paul DeVillers	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Gar Knutson	Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)
Hon. Denis Paradis	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)
Hon. Claude Drouin	Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Stephen Owen	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)
Hon. Jean Augustine	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Joe Jordan	to the Prime Minister
Mr. André Harvey	to the Minister of Transport
Mr. Steve Mahoney	to the Minister of Transport
Mrs. Karen Redman	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Paul Szabo	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Ms. Sarmite Bulte	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Bryon Wilfert	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Lynn Myers	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Alex Shepherd	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Paul Harold Macklin	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Ms. Raymonde Folco	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Bill Matthews	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Pat O'Brien	to the Minister for International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Larry McCormick	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Mr. Benoît Serré	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. John Finlay	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Ms. Sophia Leung	to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Mark Assad	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Carmen Provenzano	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Minister for International Cooperation
Mr. John O'Reilly	to the Minister of National Defence

CONTENTS

Friday, December 6, 2002

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

An Act to Amend the Criminal Code (Cruelty to Animals and Firearms) and Firearms Act

Bill C-10. Motion for concurrence in Senate amendments	2361
Mr. Macklin	2361
Mr. Hilstrom	2362
Amendment	2364
Mr. Ménard	2364
Mr. Stoffer	2366
Mr. Bailey	2367

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Queen's Jubilee Medal

Mr. Cadman	2367
------------------	------

Halifax Harbour

Mr. Regan	2367
-----------------	------

Violence Against Women

Ms. Bulte	2367
-----------------	------

Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay Byelection

Mr. Proulx	2367
------------------	------

Quebec Byelections

Mr. Farrah	2367
------------------	------

Member for LaSalle—Émard

Mr. Moore	2368
-----------------	------

Violence Against Women

Mr. Malhi	2368
-----------------	------

Violence Against Women

Ms. Picard	2368
------------------	------

Nunavut

Ms. Karetak-Lindell	2368
---------------------------	------

Aquaculture Industry

Mr. Burton	2369
------------------	------

Religious Celebrations

Mr. Harb	2369
----------------	------

Violence Against Women

Ms. Davies	2369
------------------	------

Charitable Organizations

Mr. Bertrand	2369
--------------------	------

Quebec Byelections

Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	2369
---------------------------	------

Violence Against Women

Mr. Borotsik	2370
--------------------	------

Violence Against Women

Mrs. Ablonczy	2370
---------------------	------

Violence Against Women

Ms. Folco	2370
-----------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Firearms Registry

Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	2370
Mr. Collenette	2370
Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	2370
Mr. Collenette	2370
Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	2370
Mr. Collenette	2371
Mr. Penson	2371
Mr. Collenette	2371
Mr. Penson	2371
Mr. Collenette	2371

Agriculture

Mr. Brien	2371
Mr. Vanclief	2371
Mr. Brien	2371
Mr. Vanclief	2371
Ms. Guay	2371
Mr. Vanclief	2372
Ms. Guay	2372
Mr. Vanclief	2372

Firearms Registry

Mr. Clark	2372
Mr. Collenette	2372

Terrorism

Mr. Herron	2372
Mr. Easter	2372

Violence Against Women

Ms. Davies	2372
Mr. Collenette	2372
Ms. Davies	2372
Mr. Macklin	2373

Terrorism

Mr. Day	2373
Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale)	2373
Mr. Day	2373
Mr. Easter	2373

École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe

Mr. Loubier	2373
Mr. Vanclief	2373
Mr. Loubier	2373
Mr. Vanclief	2374

Government Contracts

Mr. Epp	2374
Mr. Collenette	2374
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	2374
Mr. Collenette	2374

Health

Mr. Ménard	2374
------------------	------

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Regan 2383

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Nuclear Safety and Control Act

Bill C-4. Third reading 2384
Mr. Boudria 2384
Motion 2384
(Motion agreed to) 2384
Division on motion deemed demanded and deferred 2384

Kyoto Protocol

Mr. Boudria 2384
Motion 2384
(Motion agreed to) 2384

Notice of Closure Motion

Mr. Boudria 2384
Mr. Lunn 2384
Mr. Lunney 2386
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra) 2386

Mr. Lincoln 2387
Ms. Karetak-Lindell 2388
Mr. Benoit 2389
Mr. Lunney 2389
Mr. Savoy 2390
Mr. Burton 2390
Mr. Lunney 2392
Mr. Bryden 2392
Mr. Grewal 2392
Mr. Savoy 2394
Mr. Lunney 2395
Mr. Bryden 2396
Mr. Epp 2397
Mr. Ritz 2397
Mr. Bryden 2399
Mr. Epp 2399
Mr. Benoit 2400

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :

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

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Communication Canada - Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9**