



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 030 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, November 22, 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, November 22, 2002

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[English]

TAX CONVENTIONS IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2002

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-2, an act to implement an agreement, conventions and protocols concluded between Canada and Kuwait, Mongolia, the United Arab Emirates, Moldova, Norway, Belgium and Italy for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion and to amend the enacted text of three tax treaties, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Hon. Don Boudria (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Monday, November 25 at the conclusion of government orders.

* * *

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

The House resumed from November 21 consideration of the motion.

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this morning to speak on this very important agenda item that the very capable House leader has put before the House.

In fact, it goes back to March 2001, when the House affairs committee met at the time and considered a number of recommendations in order to address the whole issue of modernization. It reported in June 2001 and made a number of recommendations. There was a wide range of recommendations: the ratification of appointments of parliamentary officers by the House; a new format for emergency debates to take place in committee of the whole; more take note debates; allowing votes to be deferred to 3 p.m., after question period, therefore freeing the House and members to do other important things.

It also addressed the notions of permitting the Leader of the Opposition to refer two sets of estimates to the committee of the whole for debate for up to five hours each before the May break, as well as a 30 minute debate with the responsible ministers on motions, time allocation and closure. As well, it addressed the notions of tightening the sanction for questions on the order paper that are not answered on time, increasing advance notice of the text of opposition day motions and permanently equipping a second room for televised committee hearings. The report also looked at programming of government bills when referred to standing committees and increasing the use of ministerial statements.

I cannot state how important these issues are, for many reasons. Many of my colleagues have faced a lot of frustration in the process in the House and in how we have been dealing with issues that come before committee.

The House leader has gone to great lengths in order to consult with and bring on board members of the opposition parties in the House so that we can address this once and for all. It is timely. Why? Everything is changing around us and our citizens are demanding of us more transparency, more efficiency and value for money. You will recall that in the House not long ago, Mr. Speaker, we spent up to five days, 24 hours a day, voting in the House of Commons on issues, some of which were valid and others which were not so valid. I would say that it is high time for us to come together on a non-partisan basis and address those issues. This submission by the House leader does just that. I want to commend him on his commitment to the House for many years and his commitment to the renewal process, which began quite some time ago and continues to take place.

Government Orders

A number of initiatives have been passed so far in 2002. As a result of the minister responding to members and some of their queries, a change to royal assent was passed, allowing royal assent to be given to legislation through a written procedure. A new Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates has been established. Its members have been identified and it is already operational.

As well, the House of Commons has done something that I believe is extraordinary, which is to address the bilingual nature of our country and to reflect that in the House of Commons proceedings. As a result, we have established the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

Also, the House adopted the procedure committee's report making private members' business votable. As well, the House agreed to require the election of committee chairs by secret ballot, although I am not in favour of that.

• (1010)

If we stand up to vote in the House, our constituents have a chance to see us voting. I do not understand why they should not also be allowed to see us voting in the committees. Why it has to be secret is beyond me. Nonetheless, it is water under the bridge. It has gone through.

Also, the modernization committee has taken a number of other initiatives. The House leader has agreed to propose to the House that there be a second phase of modernization to consider further changes to the rules of the House.

I would say that along with what has been done, which have been very positive steps, I believe there are other things the committee could consider. One is to see what other jurisdictions are doing, whether it is in the parliamentary system in the United Kingdom or that of Australia or other commonwealth countries, to see whether or not we can share some best practices.

One of the issues we would need to address, for example, is the whole notion of the handling of question period, such as the timing and how many times it would take place in a week. Perhaps we could look at themes that come from different departments and so on. Also, we should look at what the committee could do in terms of examining bills at report stage and how we can make that system a little more efficient.

There are other procedural issues that House leaders have talked about in the past and have brought to a debate in the House. One, for example, is how we handle private members' bills after the prorogation of the House. Speaking of private members' bills, I am one of those guilty people who has approximately 60 private members' bills. Every time the House prorogues I have to come back to my seat with a pile of private members' bills after they have been reviewed by the legislative counsel. Quite often I have asked the House for its consent so I can introduce them all at once without debate.

Nonetheless, as everyone will recall, on a number of occasions some of my colleagues in the House have denied me the opportunity to introduce all 60 at once. As a result of that, I had to stand up, along with you, Mr. Speaker, 60 times. There has to be some sort of a mechanism so that we do not have to do that. While we have tried so far to move forward on bills that come from the government, I would suggest that perhaps it is high time for us to do the same thing when it comes to private members' bills.

Again speaking of private members' bills, I think we have a huge opportunity to make a difference in the House by eliminating some of the frustrations that exist in our community, whereby, if for whatever reason one of our colleagues has an idea that is worthwhile considering, the individual MP does not have to wait until his or her name is drawn and then decide which one of the bills or motions will be introduced to the House. I think what has taken place is very positive. In fact each one of us will be given an opportunity to choose legislation that the House will debate and the committee will consider it and report back to the House. I think that is a very positive thing.

Also, I think we have other things we can address and deal with, such as the use of modern technologies. I know that electronic voting is a pretty ticklish issue with some of the members in the House. I do not think it is a good idea for us to continue using the old system, which is for each member of the House to stand up individually. By the time two or three votes take place we have spent approximately an hour to an hour and a half of House time. Our translators have to be in place, the camera people have to be in place, *Hansard* people have to be in place, all of the clerks and yourself, Mr. Speaker, as well as many other support staff, have to be in place.

• (1015)

I would suggest that if we were to eliminate that alone the savings to the House on an annual basis would be tremendous. Somebody told me, and the House leaders can correct me, that the cost per hour for every hour we sit is over \$30,000. If we multiply that times the number of days the House sits, the number of votes that take place and the number of hours, I would suggest there would be a substantial savings as well, not to mention more efficiency and transparency, which would be very important.

Regarding the use of technologies by members of Parliament, I am a telecommunications engineer but frankly I am embarrassed to say that I am not using the modern technology that is available efficiently. In fact, there was study done which found that only about 58% of MPs have websites. I do not have a website yet, which is terrible because I should have one, and I will undertake to have one.

Nonetheless, if we were to encourage our colleagues to use modern technology, I would suggest that our constituents would be a lot more pleased with us than otherwise, and at the same time we would have an opportunity to access information a lot easier, save staff time and improve efficiencies.

Government Orders

Speaking of modern technologies, and I am not getting off the subject here, but it is really frustrating for members of Parliament nowadays when we have, on an average daily basis, approximately 100 e-mails coming to us from all over the world. In some cases we do not know whether Sam or Sue is asking us about an issue involving a constituency matter, asking us to buy one item or another, or asking us to pass on propaganda of one form or another. It is a challenge for us because our staff time has been extensively overused in this particular area. I hope someone in the field will figure out a way where we could do some sort of a filtering in order to remove the junk mail that comes through the computer system so we can respond more efficiently to our constituents. Technology is not all good. Some elements of it are pretty good and other elements, I would say, need to be changed.

Other improvements have taken place. For example, the member for St. Paul's, who chairs the Subcommittee on the Status of Persons with Disabilities, is making great use of modern technology. Therefore, I think we could work a little more on that particular element. We could make our websites more interactive and use plain language, in a sense.

I would suggest and I would hope that when the time comes for phase two that we will work a little more aggressively in order to move forward with some of the issues that the House leader has been speaking about and consulting with the opposition leaders on. I also hope that we always keep in mind the interests of our constituents. To that extent, perhaps we need to do things on a non-partisan basis and move forward with them on a non-partisan basis.

I had the pleasure of sitting in for a colleague on one of the standing committees. During the half-hour I was sitting in the committee, the committee was taken up by one member who spoke about one issue. In my view, while the comments were exceptionally valid, I felt that the time allotted to individual members to speak on one item of legislation needed to be tightened up somewhat so that committees would not become somewhat inefficient and cumbersome.

As a result of my experience, I think it would be a good idea to have a standard system for all committees of the House so that, like the House here, every member of Parliament would have to play by the same rules. I would also suggest that we have standard rules for all committees to follow. As a result, we would not have one committee dealing with procedures in one way and another committee dealing with procedures differently.

● (1020)

We also have to figure out a mechanism whereby it will be a lot easier for our respective caucuses, as well as the government and the leadership within the parties, from time to time when members of Parliament come up with good ideas to bring them forward. I do not see why we do not approach the specific cabinet ministers with those ideas to see whether or not the cabinet minister is willing to adopt the private member's bill, whether from this side of the House or the other side of the House, and make it an initiative of the House of Commons and move with it as such. We would remove the element of where the bill is coming from and we would focus mainly on the substance of the bill and what the bill will do: is it really beneficial for our constituency, is it beneficial to the country as a whole. We

should do that assessment and move forward with it. I would say that would prove to be exceptionally helpful.

Another thing is the way committees do their reporting to the House. I suggest that it is working but it could work a lot better. In some committees, without getting specific, some reports linger around in those committees for close to eight months and in some cases up to a year. There is nothing really in the system to ensure that once an item is referred to a specific committee that it has to report within a specific time to the House, in particular when it comes to studies.

The public accounts committee is a case in point where we are still sitting on a report that goes back to 2001 as well as early 2002. We are almost moving on to 2003. Something should be in the procedures of committees, such as that the committee has to carry on with the work once priorities are established, that it cannot move out of the priorities and decide along the way that it wants to debate other issues that may or may not have anything to do with the mandate of the committee.

It is exceptionally important to look at some of the nitty-gritties of procedures, not only when it comes to the House of Commons but also to committees themselves.

I sometimes sense, and I am not the only person, many of my colleagues have the same feeling, that when the House is in session it seems as though we run through corridors almost like chickens without heads. We do not seem to be able to control the flow of information that comes from every angle.

What the House leaders are proposing will improve efficiency so that we do not have to take away valuable time from our constituents and from our work as legislators, and to spend that time on useless votes and, in some cases, on fictitious motions and ridiculous amendments to legislation when the main objective is not to allow legislation to go through and delay legislation for pure partisan objectives. This does not improve on the efficiency of how government runs its business.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend you for the leadership you have taken because you have done a marvellous job in trying to make Parliament run more smoothly and more efficiently.

The member for Peterborough also played a leadership role. He chaired the same committee, the House affairs committee, where a lot of those changes that came to Parliament actually passed through that specific committee. With your previous leadership, Mr. Speaker, and the leadership of the member for Peterborough, whose constituents are very fortunate to have him as their MP, you both have done a marvellous job in bringing forward reports that respond to the aspirations of members of Parliament, to the needs of Parliament and to the overall hopes and aspirations of Canadians.

I am delighted that the House leaders have moved forward with this wonderful initiative. I am also delighted that discussions between all the House leaders on the very important issues that affect the House and the operation of the House are continuing to take place.

Government Orders

● (1025)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the member a question on one of the items that he spoke about. I found interest in a number of things that he said.

The item I am talking about is the one about members of Parliament actually choosing the chairs of the committees. If I heard him right, he said that he did not agree with secret ballots for the election of the chairs. I would remind him that the reason for the secret ballots was simply that instead of government members having to toe the line, as told by their party whip or the Prime Minister, on who to select as the chair, they could use their own judgment and choose the person who is best qualified for the position.

There would be nothing wrong with having public votes on this provided there was no coercion from the parties on their members. This is a way of freeing up the members from that coercion so they can use their own best judgment.

I need the member to explain to me why he is opposed to a secret ballot because it gives him the freedom to use his judgment which must, invariably, on occasion, be better than the judgment of others who would decide for him.

Mr. Mac Harb: Mr. Speaker, it is a very interesting question and here is where I am coming from. We have a country that is huge, with different regions, some remote and some urban. We have representation in the House by males and females who represent their constituents, and this election of chair of a committee is not as straightforward as my colleague would think.

We need to have a balance, like the balance we have with the selection of members of cabinet, secretaries of state and parliamentary secretaries. From time to time the government parties will have to establish a balance. How many women chairs do we want? How many male chairs? What regions do we want to have represented on that specific committee?

I am sure my colleagues go through the same exercise when they want to select people to sit on committees. It may not be all the time, but any member of any party in the House, including mine, who chooses a committee to sit on, does not always end up on that committee. I have selected committees in the past that I wanted to sit on and I was not given that opportunity.

The most important point I want to tell my colleague is that we are over the age of 18, most of us in terms of age as well as mental capacity. I am sure the member does not mean to generate insult here insinuating that some of my colleagues are afraid to speak their minds on committees. That is far from it. We already vote on the committees by a raise of hand or by roll call. However I also want to let him know that if we do not have a secret ballot in the House why should we have a secret ballot at the committee level?

I also want to tell him that when it comes to cabinet proceedings, even though they are confidential and after 30 years are rendered public, is he suggesting that committees should use the same procedures to release the voting patterns of members? I do not know. I would say that it is gone, we have voted on it but, nonetheless, I would suggest it was the wrong thing to do.

● (1030)

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague. We are engaged in a very important debate which has to do with thinking about how this place runs. The way we run it, both the standing orders and the customs, have evolved over generations and are very important. We should constantly look at them and change them with care.

He mentioned that he has many private member's bills tabled and that he makes a practice of doing that. One of the things we are engaged in very directly at the moment is a change in the way we deal with private member's bills. Part of the objective is to make more of them votable.

However, I found it very useful to have private member's bills, to use them to publicize issues and I did once have one drawn. I was disappointed that it was not votable but we had a debate about it in the House of Commons. I found that very useful. I have used that debate since to press different corporations and various groups on the issue that was raised in my private member's bill. Although I would have liked it to have been votable, I found it very useful to have private member's bills, and I have used them to the limit of my capacity.

I wonder if my colleague could give us some idea of why it is that he continually reintroduces and introduces new private member's bills, knowing that many of them will not become votable?

Mr. Mac Harb: Mr. Speaker, it is an excellent point. Out of the 54 bills I have introduced, I am happy to report to the House that through the administration of government I was successful in having about seven or eight of them adopted, nearly all of them dealing with the UN convention on the rights of the child.

Treasury Board, for example, adopted my private member's bills when Mr. Masse was the minister. On the issue of the definition of a child, the justice department adopted my propositions. The former justice minister, who is now the Minister of Industry, adopted two of my private member's bills dealing with certain aspects of the Criminal Code. The industry minister adopted two of my bills, one dealing with whistleblower legislation, as part of the Competitions Act.

Introducing private member's bills gives me an opportunity to put them on the record and from there on to approach the specific ministers to see if there is a possibility for my bills to be adopted as part of a government initiative. Whenever a bill from the government is introduced which has something to do with my private member's bill, I approach the ministers to see if I can get their support.

On private members' bills, the government and the Prime Minister have allowed more free votes in Parliament than ever before in the history of Parliament and far more than the opposition has ever allowed on bills as well as on motions. This Prime Minister has allowed more freedom for members of Parliament than any other prime minister ever in the history of Canada, not only to speak their minds within caucus, but outside of caucus as well as in the House. This Prime Minister has taken more initiative to bring about changes to Parliament than any other prime minister in the history of Canada. This Prime Minister has done more for Canada on the economic front as well as on the political front than any other prime minister in the history of Canada.

Government Orders

It is a privilege to serve with members of the House with the leadership we have in the Prime Minister, specifically on the notion of free votes, of reform to the parliamentary system and of leadership, both economically and politically.

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, to further follow up on our previous interchange, the member has the audacity to say that what member in the Liberal Party would not go against directions given from the party.

I was part of the finance committee when the whip signed herself in to get the correct number of people in committee to implement the Prime Minister's choice.

Furthermore, I cannot believe that the member thinks that only the Prime Minister can compute who are the best people for the job and whether they are the right gender or whether they represent the right region. As there will be secret ballot elections in the committee now, those facts will become known and they should then influence the voting decision of the member of Parliament, unless he has a brain the size of an asp.

•(1035)

Mr. Mac Harb: Mr. Speaker, *Hansard* is here to stay. The member can review *Hansard*. Historically, since we came to government, it is his party as well as other parties in opposition that have voted more en bloc than this party has done. Consistently on important issues we have had the freedom to choose and to vote.

Unlike what he said has taken place, the hon. member can review *Hansard*. They always vote on a blockbuster type of arrangement.

Mr. Ken Epp: But not because we were forced to. That is the difference.

Mr. Mac Harb: Mr. Speaker, I will not use words that are not parliamentary, but sometimes it is tempting.

The opposition parties move in droves in voting against government initiatives and government policies, unlike what happens on this side. There is a lot more freedom on this side than there is on the other side, because this side is a liberal side.

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join in the debate. I have chaired the senior committee of the House which has particular responsibility for the Standing Orders. If we read the annotated version of the Standing Orders, each of the subsections of the Standing Orders has a history. If we read that with care, those histories together are really a history of this place. The Standing Orders are very special. Therefore, although I know many of the people watching on television know relatively little about the Standing Orders, this debate is very important.

As a member, I believe it is extremely important from time to time to think about the Standing Orders and consider modernizing them. If we read those annotations since confederation, in fact some of the annotations go back before confederation, it shows that whenever we engage in this exercise we should proceed thoughtfully and with care. Every Standing Order in this place has evolved over a long period of time and has had the input of many members of Parliament like ourselves. We should respect those opinions, not to the point of doing nothing but of proceeding with care.

I would like to talk a bit about being careful, when we engage in this exercise, of not throwing the baby out with the bathwater. In other words, we must think very carefully about the place as a whole, not condemn it when we are concerned about one facet or another of these very important Standing Orders.

I would like to share some of my experience with the Ontario legislature at Queen's Park, where I was for three years. Like all the legislatures in Canada, it is a remarkably open place. However, I stress that in comparison to the openness that we have here, it is still very much a closed place.

I want to draw back a bit on some of the discussion of private members' business, the nature of question period, how committees operate and so on. I will give one example of that.

The Ontario legislature operates on a calendar which is determined by the premier of the province of Ontario, in other words by the leader of the government party. The legislature is called at the whim of the premier and is closed and prorogued at the whim of the premier. People might say so what. However think of the fundamental freedom and influence of members of Parliament. If our Prime Minister could close the House down now or could say that we would not meet for the next six months, or sometimes in the case of Ontario eight months, that would be control.

I am sure viewers have little idea of this, but we operate on a two year rolling calendar. The House of Commons functions in 10 months of the year. On working days, we work for nine or ten hours a day, including meal times. The House of Commons rolls on, but in a predetermined fashion. Our Prime Minister, I and my colleagues know that next April we will be here on certain days. We have a reasonable idea of the flow of business. Throughout the year we know what we will be doing, and our Prime Minister cannot stop that.

I would urge members to remember that, in a very real sense, the House of Commons controls its own calendar. Every year the two year rolling calendar is changed, I assume through discussion among the House leaders. In principle the forum throughout the year is controlled by the House itself. That is a very important power. Whether our legislature can be closed down by the Prime Minister is where members of Parliament have limited power.

I want to give another example from Queen's Park. We have what we call S.O. 31s. These are statements by members and we have 60 seconds. I do not know how it works among the opposition parties but on this side it is like a lottery. When a member has something he wants to say, perhaps it is about your constituency or about a political point, the statement is submitted and it is drawn out of a hat. Then there are 60 seconds in which the member can say whatever he or she likes.

Government Orders

•(1040)

Sixty seconds may not sound like very much to people watching this. However, when I was at Queen's Park I was supporting the idea that the Olympic games should be in southern Ontario and not in Greece. This is a pretty obscure thing. I am interested in sports and in southern Ontario, so I submitted what we would call an S. O. 31, a private member's statement, about this. Private members' statements are vetted at Queen's Park. In my statement was a line which I thought was a joke, and I am sure the House will think it is a joke. I said that if the people of Greece had really been interested in having the Olympic games, they would not have given them up 2000 years ago. Because of that sentence, my private member's statement was pulled from the list. To members opposite, and I do not know how theirs are chosen, that sort of thing does not happen here.

I also want to talk about the Standing Orders with respect to this debate. When we have debates, there is discussion among the House leaders and it is determined how long speeches will be and whether there will be questions and answers, and there usually are questions and answers. Typically in this case, if I manage to speak for 20 minutes, the Speaker will allow 10 minutes of questions and answers. If I speak for 10 minutes, typically members from all sides are allowed five minutes of questions and answers.

On my very first day in the House of Commons, when I was first elected in 1993, I came in and we went through the opening of the House and then we went on immediately to the predetermined calendar. I was on duty on this side. I had to be here. As a new member, I sat in my seat throughout.

I was in awe of being in this place. Gradually the light changed, the sun went down and the stained glass windows changed their hue, and I was impressed. It was my first day and I was not on the speaking list. Nor had not tried to be on the speaking list. However I noticed that when a member stopped speaking other members got up and asked them questions. When I was at Queen's Park that never happened.

After I have finished speaking here, members can get up and they will have either five or 10 minutes, depending on how long I speak, to ask questions.

However later that night, at seven or eight o'clock, I got up and made a comment. I asked one of the speakers a question just so that I could test the waters. As a result of that, the following day I received a phone call from a lady in Vancouver, who happened to have seen it, and she had a comment on what I had to say.

Those question and answer periods are in our Standing Orders, which they do not have at Queen's Park. People say that this is a whipped and highly controlled House of Commons. If a member can come in here and he or she has five minutes to get up make a comment and ask a question, how can the whips control that?

I know the member for Elk Island takes an extraordinary interest in this debate and in other debates. Let us say that he has come here today and he is seething with some problem in agriculture or something of that type. Even though this debate is on modernization, we all know that, if he wishes he can get up and speak for two or three minutes on the record about agriculture today, whether his whip wants him to or not. That is the sort of freedom we have in the

House. That is what I mean about not throwing the baby away with the bathwater. We have to think of the strengths of the House of Commons as well as its weaknesses.

I mentioned question period. Question period is different in all the parliaments around the world. We often have had the Westminster model quoted to us during this debate from the other side of the House. In the Westminster model the members of parliament give notice of their questions. They say that they will ask this person or that person a specific question about health care.

In our House of Commons no notice is given. The Prime Minister and our ministers come in here and the members opposite can ask them anything they like. Not only that, the official opposition gets a question and then two supplementary questions on the first few rounds. The rules are not in the Standing Orders exactly, but I know the Speaker has developed them.

•(1045)

In addition to not having any notice, the Prime Minister answers a question and the official opposition can ask him another question on the same topic. It can probe through the question and two supplementaries. In many other parliaments this does not exist. That is a good example of the way the official opposition party, in this case the Canadian Alliance, is protected by our standing orders. It is given very special privileges in question period which it would not have in other parliaments.

Modernization is very important but we should proceed thoughtfully and carefully. I mentioned the official opposition. I am not demeaning other legislatures because they also have their particular strengths, but in every other parliament around the world which is modeled on Westminster, the standing orders are geared to nurture the official opposition party.

The idea is that if the official opposition, as members may recall was the case in New Brunswick recently, is reduced to one or as happened previously is reduced to zero, it has to think of some way of generating opposition at the same time. Even if the opposition party is reduced to one or two members, those members should be given all the strength possible.

We believe that through the standing orders the official opposition should be nurtured. It holds the government accountable and it trains future governments. That brings me to the comments made by the member for Elk Island regarding the secret ballot.

As I have mentioned, I am chair of the procedure committee which tabled the report on the secret vote. I function as chair of that committee as well as I can. I have to say to the hon. member that it is not the secrecy of the ballot itself or anything of that sort that concerns me, but I believe that change which was cobbled together very quickly is flawed. It is flawed in that it has weakened not only the present official opposition, but future official oppositions. One of the special roles of the standing orders is not to nurture the government because it does not need any nurturing, but it is to nurture the people in the opposition party.

Government Orders

The official opposition has already lost five vice-chairs of standing committees. We could conceive of that party losing all of them. If I were debating in a partisan way, I would say good, the Canadian Alliance has lost five vice-chairs. However as chair of the committee which is responsible for the standing orders, and as someone who is very conscious, when I am not engaged in partisan debate, of the preservation of the intrinsic strengths of this place, I hope there can be some modification in the future of the secret ballot so that the official opposition, not the opposition in general, but the official opposition and future official oppositions are not weakened by that change.

Those are my general baby in bath water comments. There are some things I am interested in that do not require changes to the standing orders but which I have promoted for a long time and wish to promote again. They are simple changes in the way committees operate which could be done by consensus by members here in this chamber.

One of these changes is the televising of committees. I have worked very hard not just as chair of the procedure and House affairs committee, but before that to see to it that committee work is televised whenever possible. People say that is just vanity and members just want to be on television and there is some truth to that statement. I believe that when committees are televised, people can see members working and they know what their members of Parliament are doing. Televising committees changes the way members operate. Members think very seriously and speak differently when they are on television.

•(1050)

There is a pilot project in the House whereby any committee can be televised. It will go until the end of the year and then the committee will look at it again. There are two official television rooms. If a commercial television station gives the chair of the committee notice, for example the night before, that it will be putting a camera in the committee room the following day, the camera can be put there and the event can be televised. There are some rules associated with that.

That exists but it has not been widely used by committees, and committee members could do something about that. It has not been widely used by the television companies either. I hope they start to use it. I think by that simple change, by more frequently getting committees on television, individual members of Parliament would be strengthened.

The other one is in the same vein. It is the matter of committee travel. When committees travel, it empowers the individual members of Parliament on the committees. They go to different parts of the country and come back here to report on what they heard. People listen to them more carefully as a result of their travel.

At the moment in theory all the committees can travel. However it is expensive when 16 or 18 people travel. We might have enough confidence, which is within the standing orders, to send seven or eight members of a committee rather than the whole lot. Again, the committee could decide on that itself and it could have a quorum for receiving witnesses which is in the standing orders. Then it would be easier for the committee to travel.

More significantly, in order to travel, the committee has to agree that it wants to travel. It has to submit a budget, which is as it should be. It has to come to the House to get unanimous consent to travel. An individual member in here can stop a committee from travelling and it happens.

Speaking here particularly about the two smallest parties which have 12 or 13 members, I know it is difficult for them to release one of their members to travel for three days to the west coast, to Nunavut and to the Maritimes. I would urge that individual members think seriously before stopping committees from travelling.

Individual members can say no, and a committee will not travel. A good example is the Standing Committee on Official Languages which has tried to travel numerous times and has never been able to travel to my knowledge, simply because of a voice that was heard in this place.

That would not be a change in the standing orders. It would be a change in attitude in the House of Commons and among the parties.

I will conclude on that point. Like my colleague previously, I compliment you, Mr. Speaker, on allowing us to conduct this very important debate on modernizing the House of Commons.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, since I was mentioned in the member's speech, I feel privileged to respond to him.

I begin by saying that of all of the members I have seen chair committees, that particular member has to be one of the best. He is fair, very efficient and I have always enjoyed serving on the committees when he has been chairing. I have not done that too much, but from time to time I have been involved in committees that he is on.

I would like to talk about the issue of free votes. He mentioned that we vote as a block more often than the Liberals do. I do not really think that is true. I would have to check the actual records to see how many dissenting votes there were from the Liberals.

The member may have been referring to private members' business and in that case, it is true. We all have the freedom to vote as we wish on private members' bills and as far as I know that is true for all parties in the House. On those occasions, yes, because there are some 170 members of the Liberal Party, a greater number of them would be voting on one side or the other.

With respect to government bills and whipped votes, I do not think we would find that to be true at all. Of course, in our party not only do we have the privilege of representing our constituents first and foremost instead of taking our voting orders from the party hierarchy, but we have an obligation to do so. I have always been very proud to be part of a party, formerly the Reform Party and now the Canadian Alliance, that stands for representing our constituents. However, I will say unequivocally that I have never once in the House voted in a way that I did not agree, in other words I was persuaded, not forced or coerced, and there is a fantastic difference in that particular measure.

I have used quite a bit of time. In deference to other members I will allow the member to respond, but in the event that no one else rises, I will be up again.

S. O. 31

●(1055)

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his remarks and his compliments. By the way, this is a good example of what I was saying. These questions and answers are an opportunity to engage in whatever we wish.

It was my colleague who spoke previously who made the remark about it being more common for Liberals to vote against their party than members of any other party. It was not I, Mr. Speaker. On the other hand, my colleague is using the standing orders to make a point and is referring to a previous speaker.

As it happens, I can answer his question. My colleague was absolutely right. I cannot give the exact reference, but there is a study by Professor Wearing, I think of the University of Toronto. He studied voting patterns, not in this session but in previous sessions. It is more common for members on this side to vote against their party than it is for members on the other side. That, by the way, is a statistical fact.

If I could go further though, I accept absolutely what the member said about having always voted the way he thought was most appropriate and having voted with his conscience, if that is the right way to put it. I do accept that. The same is true of members on this side of the House.

The Speaker: When the debate resumes on this matter, the hon. member will have six minutes remaining in the time for questions and comments on his remarks. Given the hour we will now move to statements by members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

QUEEN'S JUBILEE MEDAL

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize citizens of the city and county of Peterborough who have been awarded the Queen's Jubilee Medal.

These are all people who have made outstanding contributions to the life of our community and Canada. The recipients are: Fred Anderson, John Bannan, Barbara Beck, George Clements, Brent Dawson, Susanne and Herb Franklin, Ralph Johnson, Bill Judge, Steve Kylie, John Martyn, Anne and Jim McCallum, Jean Murney, Tom O'Grady, Lesley and Don Parnell, Wally Smith, Eleanor Speight, Ian Sutherland, Marg Tunney, Pat Wilford, Robert Winslow and Kirk Wipper.

I call on all members to salute these fine Canadians.

* * *

HOMELESS AWARENESS

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, depriving the mentally challenged and the sheltered poor, decent, and affordable independent housing is disgraceful, particularly when funds were available to help.

Some \$753 million for the homeless have been squandered, but no independent living homes have been built. None. The in at dusk and

out at dawn emergency shelters keep the mentally challenged and the disadvantaged shackled to a treadmill of shelter misery.

The homeless minister's new, architecturally resplendent high-rise emergency shelters are full and the national homeless count still climbs. The homeless are the victims of a failed Liberal housing shelter strategy and an inadequate minister of the homeless. This winter the luckiest of the homeless will be forced to endure overcrowded insecure shelters. The unlucky will die in the street.

On this national homeless awareness day the homeless do not need Liberal ministerial hugs and debilitating emergency welfare shelters. The homeless need homes.

* * *

●(1100)

TOM FLANAGAN

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I learned this week of the passing of former Ottawa Police Chief Tom G. Flanagan. His distinguished career began in 1951 and continued until his retirement in 1993 after having served 40 years as chief of police.

Chief Flanagan had a remarkable sense of duty that was proven throughout his career. In 1958 he was awarded the Queen's commendation for brave conduct and in 1980 the Governor General's Star of Courage. After retirement Tom continued to give his time freely in the service of Canada as an active member of the Military Police Complaints Commission. Tom was both a great friend and a devoted public servant, and he is without a doubt a loss to Canada.

I ask all members to join me in expressing our deepest sympathy to the Flanagan family in this difficult time. He will be greatly missed.

* * *

LANDMINES

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in December 1997 the hon. Lloyd Axworthy and the House of Commons guided 122 countries into an anti-landmine treaty.

The Ottawa convention encouraged all nations to stop producing, exporting and using anti-personnel mines. Five years after this landmark treaty was signed between 50 million and 100 million landmines are still active in the world. The removal of landmines is one of the most pressing humanitarian issues of our age.

By hosting a fundraising dinner for the Canadian Landmine Foundation as part of the Night of a Thousand Dinners campaign, we can show support for this important issue while enhancing the quality of life for many innocent people all over the world.

* * *

CHRISTMAS SEAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. Carmen Provenzano (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the holiday season fast approaching I would encourage all members and all Canadians to give to the Canadian Lung Association's Christmas Seal Campaign.

This campaign began when a Danish postman, Einar Holboell, looked at the needy children around him and had the idea that a single extra stamp on each Christmas letter would cost each individual so little but do so much good. Canada's first Christmas Seal Campaign was in 1927. The money raised supports research and treatment of lung disease, tuberculosis as well as raising funds for sanatoria and community programs. Although TB is no longer as serious a problem in this country as it was in the earlier part of this century, there are still about 3,000 cases every year, and the occurrence of other lung diseases such as emphysema, chronic bronchitis and asthma has increased enormously.

This Christmas I encourage everyone to put a Christmas seal on their Christmas cards, websites or e-mail greetings.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the tainted blood scandal is not a closed file. This week the RCMP charged senior Health Canada bureaucrats with criminal negligence and more charges are possible.

To recap the events is instructive. HIV and hepatitis C infected many patients who required blood transfusions or blood products. The HIV patients were all compensated but the hepatitis C patients were compensated only between 1986 and 1990. The Krever report called for compensation for everyone infected and ill due to the failure of the federal watchdogs. Quebec and Ontario compensated everyone.

The federal government should also compensate every victim of hepatitis C from tainted blood who is ill. One patient who called me this week has \$11 per month left after paying for her rent. She has to live with her son so that she can survive. She deserves compassion and not legalistic arguments.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNITED WAY

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we already knew how generous federal public service employees are. Today, we have proof again. Contributions by public servants to the United Way of Ottawa campaign account for over one third of all the money collected. They have contributed more than \$7 million of the \$20 million collected.

Also, public servants exceeded their objective for Centraide Outaouais, contributing \$2.2 million, or 50% of all the money collected.

The reasons for giving so generously are many. The common thread, however, is the desire to help Canadians. In their everyday work, our public servants help people in one way or another. Their contribution to United Way/Centraide is a visible extension of their generosity.

I want to congratulate all public service employees for their great generosity, and especially the organizers and many volunteers who give their time and energy to help improve the lives of many people

S. O. 31

in need. Too often we take for granted the professionalism of our public service.

Today, I would like us to acknowledge their great generosity.

* * *

• (1105)

INGRID BETANCOURT

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise the awareness of hon. members of this House about a very important humanitarian cause, that of Ingrid Betancourt. Everyone remembers this Colombian woman, who ran in the presidential election of her country and was abducted by the FARC on February 23.

There is nothing that can justify the abduction of civilians. A true peace process cannot develop as long as such practices continue.

We must do everything in our power to bring about the release of Ingrid Betancourt and other civilians held captive by armed groups. A political dialogue must be established as soon as possible to restore the peace the vast majority of Colombians hope for.

In a show of solidarity for the fight that Ingrid Betancourt is leading, I urge everyone to take part in the walk that will be held tomorrow and on the 23rd of each month. Join supporters in Montreal, at the corner of McGill College and Sainte-Catherine, and in Quebec City, in front of the National Assembly building.

* * *

LITERATURE

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, literature has always been very important in our country's cultural development. Literature is a reflection of our history and society and it allows thousands of people to recognize themselves through the imaginary world of our authors.

I am proud to see that Laval West has some great talents. Indeed, Claire Varin, who has written three novels, was just awarded the 2002 Prix de la Société des écrivains canadiens for her third novel, *Désert désir*. She tied with Nicole Brossard for that prize.

Let me also point out that Maxime Mongeon just announced the upcoming publication of his second novel. Mr. Mongeon is currently working with young pupils in Fabreville's elementary schools.

I am taking this opportunity today to congratulate these two authors from Laval for their work and their contribution to Quebec and Canadian literature.

* * *

[*English*]

GRAIN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a private member's bill that allows the labour minister to step in when the collective bargaining process at west coast ports bogs down and before costly work disruptions take place.

S. O. 31

Since August 25, 650 grain handlers have been locked out at the port of Vancouver. At a time when western farmers are suffering through one of the worst droughts in Canadian history and one of the poorest harvest seasons, they are unable to move what little grain they managed to grow through the port of Vancouver.

If the government had passed final offer arbitration when I first presented the bill in 1996, this work stoppage could have been averted. It is time we had a permanent and fair resolution process that is removed from the whims of government.

The minister stands idly by while the reputation of Canada's largest port and the livelihood of 650 grain handlers hangs in the balance. Besides all of that, Canada's farmers deserve better.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with Canadian offshore oil and gas activities expanding, issues are emerging that require advanced scientific knowledge.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada is establishing a national Centre for Offshore Oil and Gas Environmental Research, or COOGER, at the Bedford Institute of Oceanography to build on DFO science expertise and to provide enhanced levels of scientific information for future needs.

COOGER will improve scientific knowledge, identify priority research needs, and coordinate and implement collaborative research efforts. Through national DFO science coordination COOGER will optimize current and future research initiatives, and build on existing regional research expertise and infrastructure.

I would like to commend the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans for his commitment to see the establishment of this important centre.

* * *

• (1110)

HOUSING

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is National Affordable Housing Day.

Since the government came to power we have seen a steady systematic dismantling of federally funded social housing programs. It is now to the point where the government has virtually removed itself from the business of supporting affordable housing.

Earlier this week we heard a lot of talk, with the release of the government's urban strategy, the so-called "Blueprint for Action", about the need for a national housing program. I want to point out that the NDP and thousands of Canadians have been calling for such a program for years.

However, it was only talk because yesterday in the House, during the debate on Bill C-229, an act to amend the Bank Act, members of the government had the opportunity to stand up and be counted and they did not. What they did was they stood behind the banks and that is unfortunate because the U.S. has this legislation and it has increased its affordable housing.

The next time one of the Prime Minister's staff calls anyone in the U.S. a moron, maybe that person should consider reflecting on our own policy and direct that comment where it is more justly deserved.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC CITIZENSHIP WEEK

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is Quebec Citizenship Week. This week is an opportunity for the Quebec government to recognize the major contribution of citizens, organizations and businesses to the development of the Quebec society.

It is a unique opportunity to reaffirm our values as a distinct society on the North American continent, with a language, a culture, a history and even a joie de vivre that truly reflect the Quebec nation. This event allows all of us to reflect on Quebec citizenship and on the means through which we can further promote the fundamental values that are at the core of our identity.

All the regions of Quebec have scheduled activities to promote cooperative and harmonious relations between citizens of all origins.

This evening, the Bloc Québécois will stress the importance of this week through a discussion on achieving a balance between cultural pluralism and belonging to the political community.

I wish a good Quebec citizenship week to each and everyone.

* * *

[English]

OPERATION APOLLO

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday and this morning in Halifax over 800 Canadian sailors were honoured for their contribution to the war on terrorism. Medals were presented to personnel who served on Canadian naval ships in the Persian Gulf. These ships were part of Operation Apollo, Canada's contribution to the U.S.-led campaign against terrorism.

The first ships arrived in the north Arabian Sea exactly one year ago this week. Among their many tasks the ships assisted French and U.S. vessels with maritime interdiction operations in the Arabian Gulf, joined the American Amphibious Ready Group as an escort ship, and conducted replenishment at sea operations in the Arabian Sea.

Canadians are proud of the military personnel who served on these ships and who performed such vital duties to make us all safer from the terrible threat that terrorism poses.

I ask the House to join me in congratulating them on the medals they received.

SPORTS

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, earlier this month Canada's National Women's Soccer Team qualified as one of 16 countries for next year's Women's World Cup in China.

Like the young ladies who proudly play for Canada's National Hockey Team, they are competing for the love of their sport and the pride of representing Canada, not for million dollar contracts. While women's sports are finally starting to get the attention they deserve, we still have a long way to go before we reach parity with men's teams.

After both our men's and women's hockey teams won gold medals at the Winter Olympics, the Vancouver *Province* newspaper printed a two page, colour photograph of the victorious men's team. Thinking I had missed the same photo of the women's team, I called the paper to purchase the women's team photo. A male editor of the paper informed me that the paper did not run a similar size photo of the women's team because Canadians did not have the same interest in women's sports.

I would like to ensure all athletes who represent Canada that Canadians are equally proud of them regardless of their gender.

* * *

[Translation]

WORLD TELEVISION DAY

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week we are celebrating World Television Day. The United Nations proclaimed November 21 as World Television Day in 1996, to draw attention to the great value this medium has for social development and education.

More than 50 studies on the learning process have proven that technology can help children learn.

Canadian teachers and their students can use their knowledge of this medium to address such issues as peace, security, economic and social development, and to foster cultural exchange, all issues to which the UN attaches great importance. All Canadians can learn more about these issues through the medium of television.

I am pleased to help Cable in the Classroom to draw attention to this world day by making the public more aware of the value of teaching media skills to all Canadians.

* * *

• (1115)

[English]

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is no news to the House that the province of Newfoundland and Labrador is going through a very difficult time. Just during this past week, we have become aware that government intends to close down the cod fishery. We are not saying whether that is right or wrong. That will be debated.

However, at the same time other departments of government are also tightening the screws on the people of Newfoundland. For

Oral Questions

example, the Department of Human Resources Development is closing down or cutting back on services in rural areas to save a minuscule \$30,000. It says that some of the work done in the rural areas does not fit the regulations precisely. This is a complete and utter embarrassment because the offices, particularly at this time, are so essential.

I ask the minister responsible to please look at the decisions that have been made by officials and act responsibly.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's attempts at NATO to defend his negligence toward our military are quite frankly absurd. The Prime Minister has said we are competitive in NATO.

We are competitive, all right. We are competitive with Luxembourg, a country just about the size of Toronto, and competitive with Iceland, a country that does not even have a military.

When we are facing a war with Iraq, surely, is that the best that the Prime Minister can do, comparing us with those small countries?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my friend displays a profound ignorance of the capabilities of the Canadian military. The fact is that the Canadian military has outstanding resources and outstanding personnel who have been deployed in a number of conflicts around the world.

We realize there is a funding issue and that has been addressed by the Minister of National Defence and it was addressed by the Prime Minister in Prague yesterday, where he said unequivocally there will be more spending for the Canadian military.

I can say from my experience of three years as minister of defence that the Canadian armed forces were highly regarded in NATO.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in fact the Canadian military is highly regarded in spite of this government.

Here is where we are. The Prime Minister is saying on the one hand that the Canadian military is in need of more money, yet he also says it is not a high priority for Canadians. That, frankly, is wrong.

Canada's sovereignty is threatened with every dollar that is taken away from our military. How can we expect our U.S. allies to help us when we insult them? Why are we waiting until February's budget to put more money into the military?

Oral Questions

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian military is highly regarded around the world in spite of the negative criticisms of the official opposition in this place, who should know better. If the Canadian military was not as good, as the opposition alleges, why is it that our allies in the United States have come and requested certain things for us to contribute to the particular forum that is going to unfold in the next few weeks? They do so because they know we have the capabilities, they know we have the personnel and they know we have the will.

* * *

CANADA-U.S. RELATIONS

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Canada's relationship with the Bush administration was damaged when his nephew, who was then the ambassador to the U.S., said he preferred Gore over Bush.

Now we have a senior government official calling President Bush a moron. Is it not a fact that this anti-American attitude hurts our diplomatic relationships with the United States, our major trading partner?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister addressed this allegation yesterday in Prague. Specifically, he reiterated his support and friendship for President Bush and supported the United States in the difficult situation we now find ourselves in with respect to Iraq.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, he did not address it.

Françoise Ducros is the top spokesman for the Prime Minister's Office. As such, she represents this country when speaking abroad. This week she called the president of the United States a moron at the NATO heads of state meeting.

At a time when we are involved in conflicts with the United States over softwood lumber and agricultural subsidies, these types of comments are particularly damaging to our most important trade relationship.

Given the seriousness of her diplomatic blunder, why is this offensive official still representing the Government of Canada?

● (1120)

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is some degree of confusion about what allegedly was said.

I would invite the hon. members to turn their attention to a statement that has been issued by Ms. Ducros, the director of communications for the Prime Minister, wherein she says:

The comments attributed to me in no way reflect my personal view of the President of the United States. I have never, in any of the many briefings I have given reporters as the Prime Minister's chief spokesperson, ever expressed, on the record or off the record, any negative opinion concerning President George Bush.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that is a finely crafted non-denial coming from the communications director, but the problem is that the attitude reflected in her remarks betrays that of the entire Liberal Party.

I have here a mailing from the Liberal member for Durham who says that the United States poses a bigger security threat to Canada than Iraq.

Is not the real reason the government is defending this disgraced communications director that her sentiments precisely reflect the anti-Americanism of the Liberal Party of Canada?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is typical of how the Alliance does business. They want to talk about allegations about statements made with respect to the President of the United States by someone in the Canadian delegation.

They do not want to focus on the achievements of the summit at Prague. They do not want to talk about all those new nations, those former communist nations that have joined the alliance. They do not want to talk about the unanimous support of the UN resolution with respect to Iraq. They do not want to talk about the establishment of a NATO response force.

These people do not want to talk about the real issues that Canadian people are concerned about.

* * *

[Translation]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we learned this morning that the federal government did not include in its motion a commitment to ratify Kyoto before the year 2002 is out.

Yet, the objective of Kyoto is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Since 1990, certain provinces, particularly Quebec, have made a considerable effort to do so. However, by choosing 2010 as the reference year, the federal government is deliberately choosing to ignore these efforts for the benefit of the oil industry alone.

Why is the government backing down—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of the Environment.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in the Government of Canada's position. We support ratification. Indeed, I hope and expect Kyoto to be ratified before the year is out.

Yesterday, we indicated in the plan we tabled in the House that no industry or company would be penalized for measures they took prior to the protocol entering into effect.

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when the minister says, "I hope", clearly he has not read his own motion, which does not specify any date for ratification. Therefore, the plan he tabled makes no sense whatsoever.

Why ask those who have already made an effort since 1990 to take on the additional burden of those who wantonly polluted in the past and will be able to continue to do so with the government's blessing until 2010?

Oral Questions

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have to distinguish between two things. First, there is the issue of ratification. A motion was moved yesterday in my name by my hon. colleague, the government House leader. Then there is the plan to reach our Kyoto objectives.

These are two separate things and there will be a vote before year's end on the first issue. We will work together with the provinces and territories to improve the plan that was tabled yesterday. We will listen to their suggestions for the lowest cost solution with the greatest benefits.

• (1125)

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the polluter pay principle is a fundamental one as far as the environment is concerned. This means that the one who has caused the damage pays the bill. With his plan, the minister is abandoning this principle and telling us that it is the ones who have already made the greatest effort who are going to bear the brunt of the costs.

Can the Minister of the Environment deny that, by giving carte blanche to polluters until 2010, under his plan, he has abandoned the polluter pay principle? I invite him to provide proof to the contrary.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always hard to provide negative proof. Nevertheless, in response to the question raised by the hon. member, it is clearly indicated in the plan that no industry that has taken measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions would be disadvantaged for so doing because of the timing of those measures.

The plan makes this very clear.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I invite the minister to read his so-called plan. With his so-called plan, the government is abandoning forever the principle of polluter pay, and abetting the oil industry.

Does the minister not understand that the true principle that must apply where greenhouse gas emissions are concerned is that the biggest polluters must pay the biggest share of the bill?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in a plan as complicated as Kyoto, a plan that applies to all of Canada, all of the industries, all of the provinces, and all of the territories, it is certain that there cannot be one principle, one single principle, ignoring all others, which are also important.

The hon. member is forgetting the principle we set out in the plan, that no region would be disadvantaged. This principle was accepted by the Province of Quebec, and all the other provinces, some years ago.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today, on National Housing Day, tens of thousands of homeless Canadians are lining up for shelters, sleeping in doorways, freezing, suffering from TB and hungry. Homelessness funds are now being stretched to fund food banks and soup kitchens.

By any measure, the government has failed both on the emergency and the long term housing needs of Canadians. Will the minister have the guts to stand up today and admit this failure and commit the resources that are necessary to produce the 30,000 units of affordable housing that are needed to meet the housing needs of Canadians? Will the minister have the guts or admit the failure and to produce—

The Speaker: The hon. member, I think, knows this word is not one that is commonly used and I would discourage its use in the House. The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I could be criticized for many things but the kinds of things the hon. member asks of me I can tell her I have in great quantity. I could tell her that we have no hesitation in defending what we have done for the homeless and for housing in this country.

I do not know where she was when we announced \$753 million for the homeless and \$680 million for housing. Has she read the throne speech that recommits us to affordable housing in key markets across the country? She has not done her homework. She does not know the facts. She should congratulate the government for the great job that we have done.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have read every single thing that the government has put out. The failure here is that what is written on paper has not been translated into helping homeless Canadians or building the housing.

This is the one year anniversary of the housing agreement. The government has produced only 200 units outside of Quebec. Half of the provinces have even cut money for spending on housing.

Why has the government failed to enforce the housing agreement for which the minister is allegedly so proud? Why has he failed homeless Canadians? Why has he not produced the housing? Is 200 housing units a record that the minister is proud of?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I should say that the Minister of Labour, who is responsible for the homeless initiative, has done an outstanding job across the country working with municipalities and the provinces. She has great credibility. We are making progress in dealing with this terrible social dilemma of our time.

However, with respect to the housing agreements, the hon. member should give recognition to the fact that we have signed agreements with 10 out of the 13 jurisdictions, that they are now in force and that housing units are coming on stream.

We have a good record in this field.

* * *

• (1130)

CANADA-U.S. RELATIONS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, the double standard has become the trademark of this disintegrating government.

Oral Questions

In 1997 the Prime Minister removed Canada's ambassador to Mexico when the ambassador criticized corruption in Mexico. This session so far he has fired from cabinet the hon. members from Beaches—East York, York Centre and Cardigan despite their protests they had done nothing wrong. Career diplomats and elected MPs get fired but the Prime Minister's personal friend, an unelected adviser, is protected.

How does the government defend this blatant double standard?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue to read from a statement of Ms. Ducros. She said:

If I made comments in the context of what I understood to be a private conversation, I regret that they have attracted so much media attention. I accept full responsibility for them and I sincerely apologize. So as not to have this matter overshadow the Prime Minister's important work here at the Summit I have offered him my resignation.

The Prime Minister has refused to accept her resignation.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, and there is the double standard.

Francie Ducros' only status is that she speaks for the Prime Minister. This is at a time when Canada is trying to convince the Americans that any war on Iraq should be conducted under UN auspices. We are trying to protect Canadian farmers against U.S. subsidies. We are trying to resolve the softwood lumber dispute. We need the cooperation of the elected president whom the Prime Minister's spokesperson calls "a moron".

Why is protecting Francie Ducros more important than protecting Canadian farmers or protecting the Canadian softwood lumber industry?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as usual the right hon. member gets involved in extraneous issues.

The fact is that the Prime Minister has spoken about his support of the president and his friendship with the president, and that these events in no way will have any impact on any dealings between the two countries.

* * *

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the federal government tabled its latest Kyoto plan yesterday. The reworked numbers are unbelievable, not credible and totally unacceptable to all Canadians.

The provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland are upset. They want into this process.

Why is the government in such a rush to complete the Prime Minister's legacy? Why are we not abiding by the concept that this is a Confederation? These provinces do have equal status, believe it or not.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no sudden rush. We have been working on this issue since the Rio meeting back in 1992. We of course have had the agreement that Canada entered into at that time with other countries refined at the Kyoto meeting in 1997.

We have been working consistently with the provinces and territories. The federal government and the government of Alberta were co-chairs of the 14 government processes up until last summer when Alberta pulled out. Since then, Alberta has consistently attempted to adjourn every meeting we have had.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government knows that it must have the cooperation of the provinces to be successful in reaching its target with the Kyoto plan. This make them pay but no say approach is doomed for failure.

Forget about a plan. The government process already has derailed before the process even began.

I ask the minister, what will it be, provincial cooperation or provincial alienation?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's understanding of what has taken place is simply wrong.

The fact is that we have been working with the provinces and the territories. All 14 governments have been working together. We have been doing it for more than a decade. It goes back to 1979. In the last five years, in particular since Kyoto, we have had close working relations with them.

It is certainly true that when the plan for implementation is being put forward, every province wants the burden to be borne by a province on either side or perhaps even further away than that. That is understandable. Provinces will be—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Joliette.

* * *

[Translation]

SECURITIES

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in its response to the MacKay report, the government considered establishing a centralized Canadian securities commission, thereby confirming its intention to interfere in an area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

However, the Minister of Finance is creating confusion by stating that he will not force the provinces into anything and that they will be free to decide whether or not they wish to join.

Is the Minister of Finance aware that his statement is causing confusion and uncertainty on stock markets and among investors?

● (1135)

[English]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no confusion whatsoever.

MacKay has sent out a letter saying that if after the consultations the provinces want to join in a national security commission then they are free to do so. They are not forced to do so. There is no gun to any head. I do not see where the confusion is.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, not only have the minister's statements damaged provincial harmonization efforts, but they are against the interests of small investor.

Will the government acknowledge that the sole purpose of its project is to satisfy the Toronto business world, which would like to control the financial markets?

[English]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Again, Mr. Speaker, the only confusion seems to be in the mind of the individual across the way.

Again, the stakeholders have made their comments. MacKay has made a report. We invite the provinces, if they would like, to look at a national system. Again, we only invite them. They are not required to do so. If the province of Quebec or any other province does not want to join, they are free to do so.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, western farmers are not in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. Western farmers did not get a vote to establish a monopoly. Farmers did not vote on Bill C-4 in 1998. Farmers do not set the initial price. Farmers do not vote on all 15 directors. Farmers do not vote on the appointment of the president. Farmers do not vote on amending the Canadian Wheat Board Act, only politicians can.

How can the minister say that farmers are in charge when he makes all the decisions?

Mr. Paul Szabo (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board is comprised of 15 directors, two-thirds of whom are elected by western Canadian farmers.

The Canadian Wheat Board is not a crown corporation and, contrary to what the member said, the minister does not control the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is worse than that. The board of directors of the Canadian Wheat Board, with this minister's knowledge, has been stealing prairie farmers' money to pay wheat export permits for Ontario and Quebec farmers. This activity actually directly contradicts the minister's own legislation.

The board is breaking the law and working against the interests of prairie farmers. Will the minister continue to allow the board to operate outside the law or will he step in to recover the money stolen from prairie producers who now need protection from the Canadian Wheat Board?

Mr. Paul Szabo (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member says that the farmers need the protection of the Canadian Wheat Board. What I do not understand is that the Alliance itself came forward with a motion calling for the end of the Canadian Wheat Board. This contradiction should be known by western Canadian farmers.

Western Canadian farmers have the tools to make the necessary changes to the Canadian Wheat Board Act. They have the vote. The government respects the democratic rights of western Canadian farmers.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

ÉCOLE DE MÉDECINE VÉTÉRINAIRE DE SAINT-HYACINTHE

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food confirmed that he has given up the fight for federal funding for the École vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe. This is an investment that is necessary for this veterinary college to get its accreditation back. The college in Saint-Hyacinthe is the only one of four Canadian university colleges to have lost its full accreditation.

Since the litmus test for the veterinary college in Saint-Hyacinthe is coming in a few short weeks, I call on the Prime Minister to make funds available quickly to ensure the survival of the only French language veterinary school in North America. Will he make that commitment?

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have repeated a number of times that the government understands the role of the veterinary colleges, whether they be in Quebec or the ones in the other three provinces of Canada.

I also stated yesterday that they have the opportunity, as we as government are looking at ways of supporting them. In the future, they will have the opportunity of applying through the Canada Foundation for Innovation. I have since been informed that the University of Montreal has been successful in the past in applying to that arm's length organization with applications, and it has received \$5.5 million to date.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government's attitude on this issue shows that, as far as it is concerned, there is one too many veterinary schools in Canada and that the three with no problems, that is the University of Prince Edward Island for the Maritimes, the University of Guelph for central Canada, and Western College for the west, are all that is needed.

Is the government sabotaging once again a francophone institution in Canada, as it did with the military college in Saint-Jean?

• (1140)

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is being very unfair to the university, to the students, to the importance they have, and to the recognition that we as Canadians have for these types of facilities across Canada.

We know that there are not only the institutions that he is referring to. Their accreditation is being reviewed. Three out of the four are in that situation right now, whether they be in Quebec or in some other province. We will continue to find ways to work with the provinces as the provinces need to continue to support those institutions as well.

*Oral Questions***GRAIN TRANSPORTATION**

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Labour proudly blustered about the role of the government in resolving a dispute at the port of Prince Rupert.

For the minister's edification, the grain handlers' dispute is at the port of Vancouver. Other than two minor picketing disruptions by the Vancouver union, a matter of a few hours, Prince Rupert Grain has handled every tonne sent its way.

Why does the minister not get her facts straight and recognize that Prince Rupert Grain has been the saving grace for this season's grain shipments as opposed to trying to score cheap political points for solving a fictitious dispute?

Hon. Claudette Bradshaw (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to announce yesterday that the port of Prince Rupert had reached a tentative agreement with its union. The grain will be moving in B.C.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there was no grain dispute at Prince Rupert. There was an ongoing negotiation which never became a dispute.

If the minister wants to take credit for settling a dispute, why does she not try Vancouver where the grain workers have been without a contract for two years, have been locked out for three months and where mediation and conciliation were tried and failed?

Hon. Claudette Bradshaw (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there was a dispute in Prince Rupert. The hon. member should know that because we have a good process in place 95% of the disputes in Canada are settled without a strike or a lockout. That is why Prince Rupert went very well.

I am urging the parties in B.C. to do the same, to return to the table and negotiate a good collective agreement.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, health care is a major concern for constituents in Ottawa Centre as well as across the country. The Romanow commission has gone across the country to consult with Canadians on how to improve the health care system and their priorities for health care.

Could the Minister of Health give us an update in terms of the recommendations of the Romanow commission? When will those recommendations be made public and when will the minister table them in the House?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House this morning that on behalf of the government I will be tabling the report of the Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada on Thursday, November 28 in the House.

In addition, I want to inform the House that I and my provincial co-chair, the Minister of Health for Nova Scotia, will be co-hosting a meeting of provincial, territorial and federal health ministers on December 6. This obviously will begin discussions among federal, provincial and territorial governments as we all move forward toward a first ministers meeting in the new year, which we hope will

renew our health care program, our most cherished social program, on behalf of all Canadians.

* * *

GRAIN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, despite the settlement at Prince Rupert, the real problem has always been in Vancouver with the grain workers' lockout that has been going on for over three months. Reopening Prince Rupert simply allows grain companies to ship the smallest crop in 30 years through that port and leaves the Vancouver folks high and dry for the next nine months. It also impacts prairie farmers who have plugged up terminals and are unable to dry tough grain.

My question is for the Minister of Labour. She has said she is urging the parties but there is one party that is not terribly interested in coming to the table—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour.

Hon. Claudette Bradshaw (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about the length of time of the B.C. terminal dispute. Our conciliators and mediators are meeting with the groups.

My understanding with regard to Prince Rupert is that the grain is moving. They are able to move twice what they were moving.

Our conciliators and mediators are meeting. I urge both parties to come to the table immediately and negotiate a good collective agreement.

* * *

● (1145)

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister has shown absolutely no leadership whatsoever on the issue of the grain workers. She should appoint Vince Ready as a mediator now.

My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Burnaby residents are very concerned about threats to their health and environment from the Chevron oil refinery in North Burnaby, especially after a major spill of MTBE.

What steps will the government take to ensure tough, enforceable standards for air emissions like SO₂ and VOCs and for above ground storage tanks at oil refineries in Canada?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the details we have about storage tanks and fuel generally are readily available on the website. I refer the hon. member to the Natural Resources website and the Environment Canada website. A good deal of the responsibility within the province is handled by the provincial government in British Columbia which, for most of the last 10 years, has been in the hands of the NDP.

*Oral Questions***FISHERIES AND OCEANS**

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has indicated that he will probably close the cod fishery in most of Atlantic Canada. Will he assure the House that instead of just forbidding Newfoundland fishermen to fish, he will also deal with the other issues, including the ballooning seal herds, bycatch and foreign overfishing which also affect the growth of the stocks?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Farrah (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the minister indicated yesterday, no decision has been made to date as to whether or not there will be a moratorium on groundfish. Preliminary data available to us are definitely worrisome. In that sense, never has a minister been as transparent with data, because what he wants is to be proactive and to take a position that provides a degree of security to coastal communities, both in Newfoundland and in Quebec, and in the Gaspé in particular.

I suggest my hon. colleague to wait for the final data. We will make sure to also involve our provincial partners to ensure that our communities—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the PMO's staff gaff, the rift between the United States and Canada has widened by the government's action. The recent B.C. Supreme Court case the United States v. Licht demonstrates how our influence has diminished.

In 1999 without the approval of the RCMP, a United States drug enforcement agency carried out an illegal sting operation on Canadian soil. Notification of such operations are required by an agreement between our two countries.

I ask the Solicitor General, has he discussed the Licht case with his U.S. counterparts? What is he doing to prevent unauthorized operations by foreign law enforcement agencies on Canadian soil?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing we can be proud of, it is the intelligence work that CSIS does and the good cooperation it has with its American counterpart south of the border.

I can assure the member that in all intelligence matters we cooperate with other intelligence services around the world in the interests of the health and safety of Canadians and in the interests of national security.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, federal tax collectors are now auditing teams in the Saskatchewan junior hockey league and have assessed some for up to \$14,000.

Let us consider the facts. All teams are non-profit. All teams are operating in the red. No player receives a salary. The players are billeted out to homes that receive \$250 to \$300 a month for accommodation and meals.

Why are federal tax collectors attempting to bankrupt an amateur junior hockey league?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite knows that I cannot comment on any individual case. However I can tell him and other members that we have a responsibility at CCRA to determine employee status. It is something that we do on a regular basis. I can tell him as well that we are reviewing this particular situation, as we do all situations where concerns have been raised.

* * *

TERRORISM

Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday with monstrous joy Hamas once again celebrated its ongoing murdering of innocent children and others, this time with a bus bombing in Israel. It said that this pleased God and it promised even more killings.

We now know that the Liberals, in shame and not on principle, may at some point reluctantly ban groups like Hamas and Hezbollah, as Great Britain and the United States did decisively long ago.

Will the Liberals, with action, not words, please save a shred of dignity for Canadians and for these murdered children and announce as of today, not sometime in the future—

• (1150)

The Speaker: The hon. Solicitor General.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada condemns in the strongest possible way the brutal and senseless murder that took place yesterday in Jerusalem. It strikes against everything that a civilized society stands for. Our hearts do go out to the victims of that senseless killing.

With respect to the listing, I have told the member before that there is a process in place. As the Minister of Foreign Affairs has previously said, Hamas is listed on the United Nations Suppression of Terrorism Regulations. CSIS does not need a list in this country in order to do its job.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we recently learned that Grand River Enterprises, an Ontario tobacco company, is selling packs of cigarettes under the brand Seneca that do not display the usual health warnings required under the Tobacco Act. Such warnings are compulsory.

Oral Questions

What is the Minister of Health waiting for to implement the act and ensure the protection of public health?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must say I am not aware of the specific case that the hon. member has raised. Obviously he is quite right that there are rules and regulations. If they are not being enforced, after I investigate this matter on his behalf, I will take the matter up directly with those involved.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Health pledge to use every means available to her to stop the sale of these products, since there is evidence that the producers are not complying with the act?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the commitment I will make is to investigate the specific matter that the hon. member has raised. If there are any violations of existing regulations, laws or policies, those will be dealt with expeditiously.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, on the subject of stoning in Iran, the minister has been silent. On the subject of female genital mutilation, the minister has been silent. On the subject of raising the age of sexual consent and the banning of child pornography, the minister has been silent.

I ask the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and the Status of Women to explain her lack of action and her position. Is she muzzled? Does she condone these events? Or is she simply not interested?

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada, with particular reference to a sentence of stoning passed on a woman in Nigeria, has been very forceful and very outspoken in expressing our strong disregard for that kind of action.

We have been very much reassured by the remarks of the President of Nigeria that the appeal will not succeed and in fact that kind of punishment will not be meted out.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, first we had tainted blood imported from U.S. prisons. Now we are importing semen from U.S. prisons to produce Canadian children. The catastrophic fallout from disease spread by tainted blood has created thousands of victims and 20 years later continues to occupy the House and destroy the lives of the victims.

With recent deaths from organ transplants that contained the West Nile virus and untold pathogens yet to be identified, why is the Minister of Health establishing agencies to facilitate the international trade in human embryos, human cells and human body components?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly sure what the hon. member is referring to. If he is referring to our assisted human reproduction legislation wherein we will establish a regulatory agency to deal with in vitro fertilization among other issues, a vast number of Canadians generally and those who work in the health care profession have requested such a regulatory agency. This is largely an unregulated area and we need regulations to protect the health and safety of Canadians.

* * *

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the people of northern Ontario face a number of economic challenges brought on by geography, lower population densities and the cyclical nature of resource industries.

Will the Secretary of State for Rural Development and FedNor please tell us what the Government of Canada is doing to ensure that the citizens of northern Ontario enjoy the same economic and social benefits as those shared by Canadians in the rest of the province?

• (1155)

Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have just engaged in a process of consulting with northern Ontario citizens, over 400 of them. Through that we have developed an action plan to deal with a number of specific areas, including access to capital, access to a competitive business environment, access to infrastructure, and access to a higher quality of life.

I look forward to working with the stakeholders, along with my caucus colleagues in northern Ontario, to bring this action plan forward and to carry out these actions. We are committed to creating an environment in northern Ontario in which wealth and jobs can be created.

* * *

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in the supplementary estimates, CCRA is asking for an additional \$52 million to “pursue revenue generation initiatives”. That is bureaucratic code for squeezing the taxpayer until he squeaks.

This week we have heard how the crooks, including prisoners at the Kingston pen, are getting rich on the GST scam.

My question for the Minister of National Revenue is, will she shut down these scams, save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars and go after the crooks rather than squeezing the legitimate taxpayers for their last dime?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is actually confusing the car-flipping scam, which is fraud and illegal, with the legitimate GST rebate.

I want to inform him that anyone who is in jail for more than 90 days is not eligible to receive that GST rebate. For those who are there less than 90 days, the only reason they are eligible to receive it is because they paid GST before they were put in jail. That is the law of Canada. For the member to confuse the two is irresponsible.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Larry Spencer (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Sharpe decision by the Supreme Court opened the door for pornographers to legally produce child pornography by filming themselves in consensual sexual activity with 14 year olds. They can later break off the relationship and use the legally produced pornography for illegal distribution.

I ask the government, how will the Minister of Justice make both ends of this activity illegal if he continues to refuse to raise the legal age of sexual consent?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite should know that the government sees it as a priority. Protecting children against sexual exploitation is a high priority. We are going after the predators. We have done that. There have been a number of changes to the Criminal Code to improve it. The government will continue to see that as a priority to prevent sexual exploitation against minors.

* * *

[Translation]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of Natural Resources said, regarding the softwood lumber issue, that he would take action in five or six months. In the meantime, many companies, including Tembec, Abitibi-Consolidated and Uniforêt, are suffering major losses. The situation is deteriorating in several regions, particularly in the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean.

Does the Minister of Natural Resources not agree that it is high time he stopped watching and start acting, including by offering a loan guarantee program to companies?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true that the softwood lumber problem exists everywhere in Canada. Unfortunately, some regions and companies are very affected.

As for helping a specific company, this is an issue that is in the hands of my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources. He is trying, along with the industry, to create a balanced plan for all of Canada, not just one region or another. I hope that the details of his plan will be tabled in the House in a few weeks.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the library community in the London area has expressed concern about the impact of a merger of two government programs; Canadian government publishing and depository services programs.

Oral Questions

Specifically, they want to know if this potential merger that they are hearing about will affect government publications being delivered free of charge to the library community.

● (1200)

Mr. Paul Szabo (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the hon. member that neither the funding nor the operations of the depository services program are at any risk as a result of the coming changes.

All services previously offered will continue to be offered, including a full suite of services with the library community. The advantages of the close relationship between the two programs are significant. We are confident that the public and the depository libraries will be better served as a result of these changes.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately my home city now leads North America in auto theft. Auto theft results in tragic deaths or injuries to innocent people and major property damage, not to mention the tying up of fire, police and ambulance resources.

Cars are stolen to commit crimes. Home invasions are perpetrated to get the keys. The government could mandate federal driving prohibitions, minimal sentencing for repeat offenders, consecutive sentencing and the use of auto theft devices. However it does nothing to address this crime that affects virtually every community in Canada. Why?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject entirely the preamble of the member's question that the government does nothing. It has been improving and putting more resources into the public safety of the country.

In the last budget the government put in place in moneys for anti-terrorism and other policing measures. We have improved, because of that bill, our communication between all police forces across the country. It is with that communication that we can do a better job of policing, and we are doing it.

The Speaker: The Chair has notice of a question of privilege from the right hon. member for Calgary Centre.

Privilege

[Translation]

PRIVILEGE

KANANASKIS SUMMIT

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, earlier today I gave notice that I would be rising on a question of privilege. Monday of this week, the government presented its response to written Question No. 10 concerning the cost of security at the two sites of the G-8 Summit, in Calgary and at Kananaskis, as well as the total cost of the Summit.

A number of departments provided figures: Health, Foreign Affairs, Industry, Justice, National Defence and Public Works, as did Correctional Services and Customs and Revenue Canada. Yet the Solicitor General and the RCMP maintain they do not yet have a total for their costs.

The response from the Canadian Security Intelligence Service is a matter of huge concern to me, and should be to the rest of the hon. members as well. CSIS stated:

[English]

[It is the policy]...the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, CSIS, does not comment on operational activities nor release specific details of its budget and expenditures for reasons of national security.

I find this response, that it is a blanket policy not to disclose information to Parliament, to be troublesome. I understand fully that some of the information in which CSIS deals must by its nature be treated as confidential. There are specific cases, perhaps several of them, where national security can be involved. CSIS is stating a quite different principle here. It claims to be beyond the reach of Parliament on every single issue. It claims a right to live in a black hole and to operate without any responsibility to the House of Commons.

The Department of National Defence does not claim that blanket exemption from responsible government although that department, too, deals in matters which must sometimes be held confidential. The same is true of the Department of Foreign Affairs.

CSIS is not more important than these two departments. Its attempt to put itself in a special, secret status above the rules, is a fundamental affront to this Parliament.

I want to know if this policy was established by the minister or have the director and the agency decided to thumb their noses at Parliament. Are we supposed to blindly vote the funds for CSIS and never again think about those expenditures?

I have today written the chair of the Security Intelligence Review Committee to request answers to a number of questions, including how this policy was established. At this time, I want to give notice to the House that I am reserving my right to raise this matter later as a possible contempt of Parliament.

● (1205)

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the right hon. member is really referring to a point of order. He is alleging that a Standing Order of this House was not respected by an organization. It is stretching it to say that there is a question of privilege here.

An hon. member: That is the Speaker's job.

Hon. Don Boudria: If the right hon. member can invoke that it is one point, I am equally entitled to invoke that it is something else, particularly when I believe that the position I have is the correct one, just as he presumably thinks the same about his.

On the issue in question, the right hon. member knows perfectly well, and even alluded to it during his answer, that because of the threshold of security for visits and anything else of high security involving CSIS, there is a mechanism established by Parliament with a review to have the threshold of security respected and the civilian overview that goes on top of that to protect Canadians.

Second, the estimates of that organization are tabled before the House. The right hon. member knows that. That process carries through the House. The votes are then proceeded with in Parliament and those are all occurring.

The right hon. member says that he can understand why specific security issues involving CSIS should not be revealed. In fact that is exactly what this is. It involves probably the highest level of security that one could ever achieve; receiving heads of state of other countries. I will not refer to how that is in the language of the security community, but I think all of us recognize that visits of this nature must represent the highest threshold.

Obviously, the amount of resources that are utilized regarding a very high level security incident like this forms part of the information which must be kept by that security community. That is why we have the Security Intelligence Review Committee. Not only that, we have a committee of Parliament that reviews its report in addition to that threshold. We all know that those points are not valid.

The right hon. member, having been a former prime minister and having been the minister of foreign affairs, will know of the level of security involved in foreign visits, particularly heads of state and heads of government. He is well aware of all this, as we all are. He was a member of cabinet that appointed members to the Security Intelligence Review Committee in the years presumably when he was prime minister, even though he was only there a short while, and when he was minister later on in another cabinet.

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will not take much time on this issue because I know how anxious we are to get back to a very busy government program.

After having listened to both sides of this issue, I would certainly strongly support the position of the right hon. member for Calgary Centre on this issue. The government has been secretive in setting up new programs where members of Parliament are not given the information they require. As always, Mr. Speaker, we will accept your ruling fully.

The Speaker: I note that the right hon. member for Calgary Centre did not ask the Speaker for a ruling. He indicated at this time that he was giving notice of his intention to raise this question should he not get satisfactory answers from the Security Intelligence Review Committee.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

This is, therefore, a decision that is not before the House at this time. The right hon. member for Calgary Centre no doubt greatly appreciates the comments by the hon. government House leader. He will take them into consideration on his return to the House at a later point if necessary.

[English]

If he has now advance warning of what the arguments against his position will be, then I presume that he will load his arguments accordingly. Of course, the government House leader also has notice of what is coming and he can prepare his argument in greater detail should it be necessary to do this at a later date.

In the meantime, I note the Chair is absolved from any responsibility at the moment and will remain out of the fray. We will wait to see if the right hon. member is satisfied elsewhere or has to come back to the House. Accordingly, we will leave the matter there.

● (1210)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION TO ICELAND

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the report of a Parliament of Canada delegation's visit to Iceland from August 11 to 13, 2002.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to 20 petitions.

* * *

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs concerning the lists of associate members of standing committees.

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 11th report later this day.

* * *

[English]

CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-315, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (parole hearings).

He said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to reintroduce my private member's bill that would amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act with respect to parole hearings. This amendment would permit a victim of an offence to read a victim impact statement at a parole hearing, a statement describing the harm done or the loss suffered arising from the commission of an offence.

Bill C-79, the victims rights act adopted by the House in the 36th Parliament contained a provision that granted victims the right to provide an oral statement in court at the time of sentencing. Corrections department policy currently allows victims of crime to present oral statements at parole hearings. However, there is nothing expressly provided in the statute governing the practice and policy can be changed at any time.

My private member's bill would guarantee victims the right to make an oral statement if they so choose.

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

* * *

NATIONAL WAVE OF SILENCE ON REMEMBRANCE DAY ACT

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): moved for leave to introduce Bill C-316, an act to promote a national wave of silence on Remembrance Day.

He said: Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure once again to introduce this bill, modelled on a similar bill which was passed by both the Westminster Parliament and the Ontario provincial legislature.

It calls on Canadians, more seriously and broadly, to observe a moment of silence on Remembrance Day, and to ask the government to ensure that in every way possible that two minutes of silence is observed from coast to coast in every workplace and school, and by every broadcaster.

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

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): moved for leave to introduce Bill C-317, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (allowances paid to elected provincial or municipal officials).

He said: Madam Speaker, once again this is the reintroduction of a bill that I had in the earlier session which seeks to eliminate the double standard which Parliament has created in the Income Tax Act which allows elected officials alone among Canadians to exempt a third of their income from federal taxes.

This was changed in the Parliament of Canada Act for MPs and Senators, but still there are hundreds of elected officials in Canada who do not have to pay the full tax burden that their constituents do. This bill would correct that matter.

Business of the House

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

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A few weeks ago I rose in the House about a bill that did something similar for people in another industry. The result of the legislation that is proposed today is to increase a tax against a group of Canadians, as a matter of fact thousands of them.

I wish to bring to the attention of the House that this bill is out of order. It raises a tax that needs to be preceded by a ways and means motion which must be concurred in and then the bill introduced. It can only be proposed by a minister of the Crown.

I know the Speaker might want to take this under advisement because there was a decision of the Chair, only a few weeks ago, where the Chair ruled that a bill, I would allege, similar to this was declared out of order.

• (1215)

Mr. Jason Kenney: Madam Speaker, on the same point of order, the bill was vetted by legislative counsel. I understand it is perfectly in order. Furthermore the bill has been introduced in three other sessions of Parliament and in no instance has a point of order been raised against it. Finally, the bill does not require a ways and means motion insofar as it does not raise a tax but rather eliminates a specific exemption.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The Chair has heard the arguments from both sides of the House. It will be taken under advisement and one of the Chair occupants will be back with a decision.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if the House were to give its consent I would move that the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented to the House earlier this day be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is there agreement?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[*Translation*]

ASSISTED HUMAN REPRODUCTION ACT

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Standing Committee on Health that they have power to divide Bill C-13, An Act respecting assisted human reproduction, into two bills in order to deal with all matters related to the criminalization of practices such as cloning in another bill.

He said: Madam Speaker, pursuant to the notice of motion on the Order Paper, I want to speak to the motion that I have brought forward asking that Bill C-13 regarding new reproductive technologies be divided into two bills.

There is not one member of the Bloc Québécois who does not see the importance of this bill—

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt the member, but I have here a proposal that has the approval of all parties.

[*English*]

I would like to dispose of that first before we get into this debate which may continue for some time.

Discussions have taken place between all parties and there is an agreement pursuant to Standing Order 45(7) to re-defer the recorded division scheduled for Monday, November 25 on Bill S-2 until Tuesday, November 26 at 3 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Does the House agree with the proposal?

Some hon. members: Agreed

[*Translation*]

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Réal Ménard: Madam Speaker, it always pays to persevere in life.

I was saying that every member of the Bloc Québécois understands the importance of the issue of reproductive technologies. I am aware that this type of bill concerns one couple in five on average, since 20% of people experience reproductive difficulties at some point or other in their life.

However, we do have some real concerns, concerns that are shared by the Government of Quebec, led by Bernard Landry. Quebec's minister of health sent a letter to his federal counterpart, the federal Minister of Health, outlining some of these concerns.

What we would like, is for the federal government to use the valid constitutional power that it has, under section 91.27 of the Constitution Act, 1982, to criminalize certain practices around which there is consensus for ethical reasons and because of our values.

In the time I have left, I will come back to the prohibited practices and the need to criminalize them. Remember that, since 1997, the Bloc Québécois with its sense of responsibility it has always had, and through the member for Drummond, whom I would like to commend, has introduced a private member's bill three times, to criminalize cloning for reproductive and therapeutic purposes.

Back then, members will recall that the government had turned a deaf ear to the member for Drummond. If it were not for the member for Drummond, who is part of a too small group of visionary people who really paved the way for the government when it comes to reproductive technologies, I believe this government would never have acted with the diligence that we should expect from the members opposite.

Business of the House

We would feel quite comfortable voting in support of a bill that would maintain the 10 prohibited practices in Bill C-13 as it now stands.

We cannot be a party to an attempt to invade a provincial jurisdiction. Let me explain. With Bill C-13, a federal regulatory agency is established, which will administer an annual budget of \$10 million and—who would have guessed?—regulate the medical profession. It will determine under which conditions physicians will be authorized by regulation to perform medical procedures related to insemination or other activities related to reproductive technologies. In Quebec, in the Act respecting health services and social services, section 112 confers that power to the Quebec health minister. So, let us not mix two debates and two issues that should be kept separate.

As a society, we may say that certain activities are immoral, unethical, and as lawmakers, we may not be prepared to condone them; we have no problem with that. We may want to prevent potential manipulations and such practices in government or private laboratories; we are willing to follow the government in that direction.

All our fellow citizens may not be aware of this, but I can sense the Chair's contagious interest in this matter. Still, clause 5 of the bill lists 10 activities prohibited under Bill C-13. Once again, we hope this will be enacted in legislation, as was recommended by the hon. member for Drummond, who is ahead of her time in this field. Under clause 5, it is prohibited to create a human clone for reproductive or therapeutic purposes.

We believe that each human being is unique, that each has a personality of its own, and therefore we do not want cloning to be made possible.

● (1220)

It is also prohibited under the legislation to:

(b) create an *in vitro* embryo for any purpose other than creating a human being or improving or providing instruction in assisted reproduction procedures;

It is also prohibited under the bill to:

(c)—create an embryo from a cell or part of a cell taken from an embryo or foetus or transplant an embryo so created into a human being;

It is prohibited to:

(d) maintain an embryo outside the body of a woman after the fourteenth day of its development—

This 14th day is the recognized time when the formation of the nervous system begins.

It is prohibited to alter the germ line, that is to:

(f) alter the genome of a cell of a human being or *in vitro* embryo such that the alteration is capable of being transmitted to descendants.

This means that we cannot create custom made human beings. We cannot say, "I want a girl with blue eyes and I want all her descendants to have blue eyes". It is not possible to use genetics for such purposes.

Under the bill, it is also prohibited to:

(g) transplant a sperm, ovum, embryo or foetus of a non-human life form into a human being.

It is easy to understand the need for such a prohibition. Under the bill, it is prohibited to:

(h) for the purpose of creating a human being, make use of any human reproductive material or an *in vitro* embryo that is or was transplanted into a non-human life form;

Under the bill, it is prohibited to:

(i) create a chimera, or transplant a chimera into either a human being or a non-human life form;

Finally, it is also prohibited under the bill to:

(j) create a hybrid for the purpose of reproduction, or transplant a hybrid into either a human being—

If the government had been logical, had introduced Bill C-13 and had limited its scope to these 10 prohibitions, we would have immediately given our support to this legislation.

However, when it comes to health, the federal government wants to engage in nation building, it wants to interfere and get involved in provincial jurisdictions. The Kirby report is indicative of this trend. The national forum on health, which proposed a national pharmacare program, is also a case in point. On Thursday, we will see what the Romanow report recommends, but we think it is going to be more of the same.

The Quebec government, which is one of the best to have presided over the future of Quebecers, examined all the acts that would be deemed incompatible, totally or partly, with Bill C-13.

I will tell you about this, if I may. Our Civil Code—one of the things that is most distinctive about Quebec, since the rest of Canada has the common law tradition—this most important legal system prohibits such things as payment for the services of surrogate mothers, as well as reimbursement of surrogates or donors for certain expenses.

The Civil Code, the legislator and the National Assembly have taken stands on this issue, stating that donors and surrogates must live with their choices. Donation must be a purely altruistic act, and that is why under the Civil Code no reimbursement of any kind is allowed.

Bill C-13 makes an exception to this principle and acknowledges that certain expenses might be reimbursed with ministerial authorization. The bill proposed to us is therefore incompatible with the wishes of the Quebec legislator.

There is also incompatibility with Quebec's Act respecting Health Services and Social Services. As I have said, section 112 of this legislation empowers the minister of health to determine those facilities which will provide services relating to infertility and reproduction. Any issues relating to the approaches to be used in this service delivery are determined by the legislation.

● (1225)

The regulatory agency would, therefore, be superimposed, adding another condition which is central to health and social services, although these are a provincial area of jurisdiction.

I trust that the government House leader will bow to this logic. It is not too late to influence the Minister of Health, a lady who must be treated with kid gloves because she can sometimes be a bit obtuse. But I am counting on him.

Business of the House

There is also incompatibility with another piece of Quebec legislation, the Act respecting the Protection of Personal Information in the Private Sector. If the regulatory agency did come into being, it would be possible, admittedly only with consent of the parties involved, but nevertheless possible, to disclose identifying information. In Quebec, in such cases, such information cannot be disclosed under any circumstances.

It is therefore clear why it is important for all references to the assisted human reproduction agency of Canada to be deleted from this bill and for the provinces, which already have legislation on this, to be left to do their work.

The list of legislative measures is a lengthy one. It is a great shame that such a bill has been allowed to see the light of day. The government is going to pay dearly for its desire to centralize.

So, as I said, it is incompatible with the Civil Code, with the Act respecting health services and social services, the act respecting access to documents held by public bodies and the protection of personal information, and the act respecting the protection of personal information in the private sector, the act respecting medical laboratories, organ, tissue, gamete and embryo conservation, ambulance services and arrangements for corpses, and last, but not least, it is incompatible with Quebec's Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms.

I cannot mention Quebec's Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms without getting emotional. First, because the charter was one of the first ones in North America. It was adopted in its final version in 1977—the work on it having been started by the Liberals with Jérôme Choquette at the National Assembly—but it was really the Parti Québécois government, a government that has always been progressive, which was the first to give the charter its shape, and make it the envy of other parliaments.

Of course the charter contains provisions regarding the protection of life and the equality of citizens. However, the charter also contains the right to confidentiality and the right to privacy. Section 10 of the charter also contains provisions on social condition. I have had the opportunity to speak to this on several occasions; there are only three provinces, and the federal government, that do not have provisions regarding social condition in their charters of human rights.

However, rest assured that I am here, keeping an eye on the situation. I have sponsored a bill that has been chosen that would allow us to amend the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to include social condition. While the government has done nothing, the Bloc Québécois is fulfilling its responsibilities.

So, the bill is incompatible with Quebec's Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms, with the medical code of ethics, with the guidelines of the Quebec health research fund, better known to people in the field as the FRSQ as well as with the ministerial action plan on ethics and scientific integrity.

So clearly, the Government of Quebec has not waited for the federal government to get to work on the issue of assisted reproduction. The Government of Quebec took action. It has already established practices. Civil law has rules on a number of issues, but despite all that, the federal government once again wants to stick its big nose into areas that are not under its jurisdiction.

●(1230)

I have had the opportunity to meet physicians such as Doctor Bissonnette, not to mention names. This is a physician who is involved with the firm Procrea. They cannot see why, with the expertise we have in Quebec and what Quebec is doing, and doing well, in the field of reproduction technology, another structure, one which is cumbersome, inefficient and complicated, would be superimposed on the existing one.

Let me touch on this briefly. There are at least 15 good reasons to defeat Bill C-13. If passed—thank goodness, this has not happened yet, and we will not let it be passed as it stands—Bill C-13 would block any new initiative by Quebec to manage assisted reproduction techniques, even if Quebec has made strides in that field in the past decade.

The assisted human reproduction agency of Canada would superimpose a cumbersome and expensive structure on a system that has been tested and is already operational in Quebec.

It is important to note that the Quebec government's approach is to empower the stakeholders, an approach which is not always compatible with this desire to make certain procedures illegal, except for the ones listed in clause 5, with whose prohibition we agree.

Again, the saddest thing about Bill C-13, and we will never tire of pointing it out, is that it infringes on the power vested in Quebec's Minister of Health and Social Services concerning the exclusive delivery of services under section 112 of the Act respecting Health Services and Social Services.

This is a direct infringement upon a provision of the legislation passed by the National Assembly, under which Quebec took its responsibilities.

Again, criminal sanctions are created for medical procedures that have been enshrined in our civil law. I addressed earlier the whole issue of paying surrogate mothers. Bill C-13 interferes with provisions of the Civil Code, particularly with respect to the whole issue of consent to treatment—the government House leader will recall that this is covered in articles 10 and 11 of the Civil Code—and that of the relationship of parentage as it regards adoption, and articles 538 to 542 of our Civil Code.

Seventh, Bill C-13 does not reflect the positions taken by Quebec, particularly as regards adoption when we dealt with civil union. As hon. members know, Bill 84 was unanimously passed. It is rather unusual in our parliamentary system to have a bill that is unanimously passed. That was the case at the National Assembly with Bill 84, which instituted the civil union and which established new parentage rules.

Bill C-13 creates discrimination between children who were born through the use of new reproductive technologies and the others, since there will be a national register in which information will be available. This information will not necessarily be made available to adopted children.

One of the saddest aspects of the bill is that it interferes with the confidentiality of assisted human reproduction files.

Business of the House

I could go on and on, but I am asking hon. members to do something sensible and to allow this bill to be split, so that we can all vote as one. We know how beneficial this is for society. The bill could be quickly passed if it only dealt with prohibited activities. Let us leave it to the provinces, since it is their responsibility, to the extent that it relates to the delivery of health and social services, to adopt the practices relating to these issues, which are covered by clauses 25 to 39 of the bill.

• (1235)

I think such a measure would reflect common sense. It would be respectful of our constitutional law and it would allow us to move forward very quickly on issues which, again, are extremely important from an ethical and moral point of view.

Since my time is almost up, I am asking the House to unanimously agree to this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am quite familiar with Bill C-13, as the member knows. This issue related to criminalization matters as well as provincial equivalency agreements has been the subject of much debate. Indeed, the matter is still before committee and we do have the opportunity. I think the member has raised some interesting points.

Yesterday, the Canadian Bar Association, I believe, made a presentation to the health committee specifically with respect to the criminalization of certain acts under the bill. It would be important if the member would like to comment on the following. If the legal community and Canadian law were to agree that the criminalization of certain activities that are prohibited under the bill should not be treated as criminal law, I wonder whether or not that would satisfy the member vis-à-vis what would be the case in Quebec.

• (1240)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois has been asking for a long time, through the hon. member for Drummond, that some prohibited practices be added to the Criminal Code.

The situation is as follows. If there were a void, as is the case at the moment—we might think of cloning for instance—and if those doing the cloning were not punishable under the Criminal Code, there would be very little deterrence. If we had a definite scheme and fines were provided for, it is quite possible that a large pharmaceutical company would not be deterred by the risk of being fined \$50,000, compared to the profits to be obtained from research that led it to do cloning.

I believe that some practices must be prohibited under section 91.27 and that penalties must be provided for in the Criminal Code. However, the bill must not go any further. As for the rest, namely the regulatory agency, equivalency agreements and so on, they should not be legislated since provinces are responsible for offering services related to infertility through clinics, hospitals and local community service centres. These are public facilities funded mainly by the provinces.

This is why we ask that the bill be split. However, we believe that the 10 prohibited activities must be added to the Criminal Code.

[*English*]

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, the member has raised an interesting subject. I have to admit that I missed the early part of his intervention, so my question may ask him for clarification of something he has already covered.

The bill does raise some very challenging components. It is a very broad bill, purporting to cover assisted human reproduction but going into a very broad area of scientific research as well, such as issues of cloning and therapeutic cloning. We know that the bill would ban cloning and, at the current time, therapeutic cloning. There is still some discussion about that.

I want some clarification. In the area of regulation, scientists are certainly looking for a lot of openness. There is a controversy about embryonic stem cells versus adult stem cells and a lot of questions remain to be answered on that front. There are very serious concerns concerning importing and exporting of sperm, of parts and even of embryos in relation to the bill, and even about the provisions regarding anonymity in donations.

My question is really about the equivalency provisions currently in the bill, which would allow provinces to have their own regulations that they could argue are equivalent to the federal jurisdiction. Does that not satisfy his concern about the provinces? It is still enabling an umbrella that would cover the country but allow provinces to make their own minor variations that they could argue are equivalent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Madam Speaker, the hon. member knows that the current regulations already provide for the importation of sperm, an issue that raises many concerns, including possible contamination by infectious agents. We were told at committee about the regulations already in effect.

Second, prohibitions are the responsibility of the federal Parliament since they come under the Criminal Code. As for the rest, if the procedures are carried out in provincial institutions, then I think it is up to the provinces to determine if donor anonymity is possible or not.

At first, in committee, I thought disclosure should be made compulsory. I have changed my mind, because now I understand that those who donate sperm are not doing so, for instance, to be able to raise a family. We fear that compulsory disclosure would allow the child to go to court to get a living allowance, student financial assistance, or similar things that have more to do with family law than with criminal law.

When sperm or ova are donated, it is not to help a family, but to help those who are facing fertility problems.

An hon. member: Those issues come under provincial jurisdiction.

Business of the House

● (1245)

Mr. Réal Ménard: Madam Speaker, my colleague is right in mentioning that these issues are up to the provinces. For this reason, the only concern this Parliament should have is related to criminal law and to maintain these prohibited activities.

When it comes to stem cells, what people need to know is that what makes these cells special is that there are approximately 150 of them that are available in the first days after conception of an embryo. These cells are extremely malleable and they can be used to regenerate tissue to treat a number of debilitating diseases.

However, using these stem cells requires destroying the embryo. This is an ethical and religious issue that is a concern for a great many of our colleagues here. I believe that if a person gives informed consent, if it has been proven to be unavoidable to use the cells, and research cannot be performed with other existing genetic material, then such a use should be authorized because it would allow us to improve the human condition.

Women who go to fertility clinics and who undergo cycles of ovarian stimulation may produce several embryos. If these embryos are not used, they will be discarded and destroyed. I believe that with informed consent—obviously this cannot be done without the person knowing—this could be a good way to advance research. It is a way to improve the human condition, particularly in cases of cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy and juvenile diabetes.

[English]

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to ask a question on this matter. It is a very important issue. I am sure that at the root of my colleague's concern is the impact Bill C-13 would have on some provinces.

I understand that Quebec is very concerned about embryonic stem cell research. In fact some dialogue has taken place as to whether Quebec will allow embryonic stem cell research to be done there. I applaud Quebec for that. I think it is a progressive move, one that is ahead of many other areas in the country.

However, the piece of legislation has an equivalency agreement contained within it. If it allows embryonic stem cell research, which will take precedence: the provinces or this piece of legislation?

I also wonder if my hon. colleague would speak to the reason why he wants this piece of legislation split, the appalling procedure of therapeutic and reproductive cloning? If his province feels so strongly about embryonic stem cell research, does it also feel the same about cloning? Is the idea that Quebec will not allow human cloning within the province on its books?

I am also a bit confused about this jurisdictional thing, because we are seeing from the provinces intense pressure on Bill C-13 and this area, reproductive cloning. I am a bit confused because my colleague, his party and his province seem less interested in provincial jurisdiction with regard to the impact of the Kyoto accord, which would have many more repercussions on his province than this bill would have.

● (1250)

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Madam Speaker, once again, as far as criminal law is concerned, we do not believe that this Parliament has the appropriate jurisdiction to regulate such things as the whole issue of the practice of health professionals or that of a donor registry. These are areas of jurisdiction that are connected with the delivery of health and social services.

Our colleague is right in reminding hon. members that, generally speaking, Quebec totally prohibits the use of stem cells and research on those cells. Each hospital where such research is carried out has its own ethics committee. Once again, first and foremost, areas of jurisdiction are involved.

[English]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as you know, this matter does not fall under my minister's portfolio but it is one in which I have played an active role in by informing myself about Bill C-13 and some of its important provisions.

The member who has just spoken has moved a motion in the House that would call on the Standing Committee on Health, which is presently studying Bill C-13, an act on reproductive technologies, assisted human reproduction, to have the bill split in two so that it can deal with matters related to the criminalization of practices such as cloning and have that handled in a separate bill.

I believe that the motion is relevant. This is a very, very complex bill. It is a bill that in fact has its genesis in a royal commission from at least 10 years ago. The response of the public to it, certainly with regard to certain aspects, for instance cloning, I think was fairly definitive, but the science was evolving with a rapidity that the public was not able to really be fully aware of.

There was an attempt in 1997, I believe, to have a bill that responded to the royal commission. It did not get through the legislative process before the subsequent election. It was not until this Parliament that a legislative effort actually came forward.

It is interesting that after a number of years of having a royal commission, of certainly many people having advocacy positions with regard to reproductive technologies, both with regard to prohibitions and support for other aspects of reproductive technologies, the then minister of health came forward with a draft bill. That draft bill went through second reading here and to committee, where over 100 witnesses were heard on a variety of aspects. That is very significant. Hearing 100 or more witnesses on a bill indicates that it is not an insignificant bill.

Business of the House

I have to credit the committee with having prepared one of the most comprehensive, thoughtful and constructive reports of a standing committee, and on a very tough bill. That report was tabled in the House in December 2001. The response of the then minister of health was to not address specifically the 34 recommendations of this report on the draft legislation. In fact, on the last day on which it was possible for the minister to respond, the minister, and I believe it was on May 9 of this year, tabled Bill C-56 in response to the draft report.

There have been changes made between the draft bill and this one. One of the things I noticed was that in many of the clauses there was this standard phrase, for instance, "this is prohibited", and then "unless otherwise provided for in the regulations". If we were to look at this bill we would find that reference to the regulations spread throughout the entire bill, to the extent that I am not entirely comfortable that I know what the bill stands for in all regards and what I would be voting on if I were to vote for the bill, because I will not see the regulations until after the bill is passed and receives royal assent. This is backwards. I would like to see the regulations before the bill is passed.

• (1255)

I believe the relevance here is that the member has raised an issue with regard to jurisdiction. It is an issue, particularly with regard to criminalization related to the prohibitions. It is a relevant question and has been argued by others back at the beginning of the debate on Bill C-56, which transformed itself into Bill C-13 after prorogation.

There were calls for the bill to be split between the reproductive technologies part, i.e. cloning, genetic alterations, surrogacy issues, et cetera, and another part which dealt with issues, such as the restrictive use of stem cells from embryos for research purposes, a very difficult issue for many Canadians because of the ethical implications.

This particular bill, as the mover of the motion laid out, includes provisions whereby if provinces have existing legislation and regulations in place that address elements of the proposed bill, Bill C-13, that with consultations and negotiations the provincial legislation or regulations would be the relevant or the operative jurisdiction on those matters where there was an agreement. Therefore there are these kinds of provisions in there.

It is a rare case where federal jurisdiction and federal law would be seconded to a province. At any point in time we can imagine what would happen if there was a case before the courts and somebody asked what the federal law said on it. The federal would say "This you cannot do, blah, blah, blah". However it is subject to whether or not there is an equivalency agreement. The fine line of the law being what it is, the interpretation of whether or not there was an offence, criminal or otherwise, could be very fine. Therefore a significant effort would have to be made to ensure that should there in fact be any equivalency agreements, that those clearly reflect the legislative intent of the federal legislation.

The member who moved the motion did not mention it specifically but I thought it was interesting to note that the Quebec minister of, I believe, health and social services announced very quickly after the bill was tabled in the House that the province of Quebec would be banning the utilization of embryos for harvesting

stem cells; in fact banning embryonic stem cell research outright. The words he used were "It is forbidden". I remember reading that in the press article.

While all this is going on, we have a group called the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. It came forward with an interesting set of guidelines. It is the funding agency for publicly funded research in Canada, including things on embryonic stem cell research, and it has laid out the guidelines and the criteria under which they would permit such research.

That was quite controversial to this place and certainly to the health committee because those guidelines were developed and it was announced that they would be in place almost immediately at the same time as the committee was in the middle of dealing with Bill C-56, the legislation on precisely that issue. The controversy was that we now had another jurisdiction.

• (1300)

This agency was set up by the Government of Canada. It transferred funds to publicly funded research projects. I believe it was formerly called the Medical Research Council and is now called the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. It even brings more relevance to the question of whether or not there is a jurisdictional problem here, because it is not just the federal government and provincial governments, it is also funding agencies, et cetera. Our bill right now, I believe, but I do not have my papers with me, seems to take the approach that this is the law but if the law is silent on some aspect then that other aspect still comes into play. I am thinking of the tri-council policy statement that permits research on embryos up to 14 days. We know that is in there.

What I do not believe is fully covered in the bill is the element of education and training and whether or not all of the provisions with regard to the safeguards, controls, consent, et cetera, with regard to donations of gametes or embryos for education and research purposes, are fully articulated in the current bill. I think we may want to consider whether there has to be some amendments. That is another jurisdiction.

The tri-council policy is basically the recognized leader or association of all researchers that makes pronouncements and provides guidelines for all research.

We have the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the tri-council policy statement and the provinces all having the opportunity to establish equivalency agreements and negotiate those with the governments, and then we maybe have another dimension that enters into this and that is the disciplines.

The Canadian Bar Association, which appeared before the health committee yesterday, said that it had a problem with criminalizing prohibitive behaviour. If a person makes a clone that is prohibited by this law should the person be treated as a criminal and penalized as a criminal? Bill C-13 says, yes. The Canadian Bar Association says, no. Other representatives of the medical research community obviously have come to us and said, no.

Business of the House

Now we have, not necessarily a formal jurisdiction, but certainly an industry, that being the lawyers, doctors, researchers and whoever else, having a problem with jurisdiction. I do not know how they will fight their cases if every province will be able to establish their own rules and require respect for their laws, practices and regulations, which will be incorporated, I guess by reference, in this legislation.

Now we are getting complicated. This now is a multidimensional problem. The member therefore has raised a quite straightforward motion, the implications of which are enormous. They are enormous because if we open up this matter with regard to the criminalization issue we must necessarily open up the matter with regard to splitting the bill between reproductive technologies and related research.

Eighty-five per cent of the bill is acceptable to Canadians and to the House. There was such a strong consensus on the bill, which deals with cloning, genetic alteration, surrogacy for profit, et cetera, all in line with what the health committee report on the draft legislation laid out, that today the legislation would have been passed.

However, it is not passed today and there is one reason and one reason only, and that is because the bill incorporated the whole aspect of related research.

●(1305)

I understand that research using embryos is an activity and that those embryos have to come from somewhere. Where they come from and prescribed to come from under the act is embryos which are surplus or left over after the process of in vitro fertilization, test tube babies.

The only linkage to this bill is the fact that those embryos are surplus to an IVF process. The IVF process is part of the reproductive technologies bill. It is a very small linkage. This whole area of embryo related research, education and training, finding therapies and cures for Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, multiple sclerosis, cancer and diabetes, is a wonderful science. I know of no one in Canada who is opposed to stem cell research because stem cells occur naturally in the human body. Every organ in the human body has stem cells. They also occur in placentas, umbilical cords, umbilical cord blood, aborted fetuses, as well as in embryos. The only linkage of related research in Bill C-13 is the fact that embryos from the IVF process will be used in the research, and the IVF process is linked to reproductive technologies.

A perfect argument would be to say that we should split the bill and take the reproductive technologies as one bill. Eighty-five per cent of the substance of this bill is acceptable to Canadians and to the House, party by party. It could be passed immediately and put into law. We could then ban cloning and genetic alteration in Canada. We would be able to deal with surrogacy for profit in Canada. We could have done this a year ago but the bill included related research. Now we have a problem.

If we look at the volume of the bill, we see that only about 50% of the pages are on reproductive technologies. The rest of the bill sets up an agency. We are going to set up an agency with a full time chair and representatives from all disciplines and provinces, part time people, and their responsibility will be to license fertility clinics and researchers. We are going to set up a bureaucracy.

On top of that, and I will not talk about it in any detail but I will just raise it, when we deal with research we are dealing with commercialization issues, and money gets made. Things like generic drugs versus brand names, the patent process and the legal issues of informed consent really start to come in on the related research.

When we look at this, the provisions to establish this agency are enormous. After the bill gets royal assent, which I expect might be in a year from now, it will take an additional two years to establish this agency and the related regulations. We are two and a half years away from having laws on the books to ban cloning. Shame.

I would argue, just as did the member who moved this motion, that we should split this bill and get the related technologies out of it. If it is going to take that long to come up with regulations to figure out how to deal with this, why not spend the time to look at this carefully, but let us get legislation on the books banning cloning, banning genetic alteration, and dealing with surrogacy for profit. Let us get those other prohibitions on there and the other controlled activities. It has nothing to do with embryonic stem cells. It has to do with the fact that Canada does not today have any legislation whatsoever dealing with matters such as cloning. We are one of the 128 countries in the world that does not even have legislation on these important matters.

We could have that legislation immediately. All it would take is to split the bill. I could make that argument just as well as the hon. member from the Bloc who moved this motion to split it. With regard to jurisdictional issues it is tremendously complex.

●(1310)

It has taken a long time to deal with the bill. I suspect it will take a lot longer. I know that members are very concerned about this issue. Certainly there are ethical issues that are involved which are not universal.

Canadians must be heard. We must respect the due process of the legislative process. If it means that we have to have a vacuum in our legislation on matters such as cloning, because we have put things in there which perhaps should not have been there to make an efficient disposition of legislation, there is always time for common sense to prevail.

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my hon. colleague. He knows the subject very well. Some things have been excluded from his dialogue and it is probably because of a time restraint. I am quite concerned about the issue and the idea of splitting the bill. He has laid out the argument very well.

Other nations have wrestled with the same difficult subject. The United Kingdom has moved and has a regulatory agency. It is probably the leader in the world as far as the direction of technology, the regulatory body and in some things it allows in the area of research.

Business of the House

The Americans have also been wrestling with this. Over the last year we have heard them say that there will be no embryonic stem cell research. They have gone one step farther than that. An advisory committee for President George Bush has suggested that embryos, the fertilization of an ovum and a sperm, should not be called an embryo but rather a human subject.

Are the dialogues and what is happening in the States and has happened in the United Kingdom related to some of what we are wrestling with here? Could the member shed some light on his feelings on that?

Mr. Paul Szabo: Madam Speaker, the member is also very knowledgeable. He has been on this file since the very beginning. Maybe Canadians do not know but he knows that the United States already wrestled with this one. With an election of presidents, the position of the U.S. government changed from President Clinton to President Bush. Individually, they have different views.

The current position of the United States of America with regard to the embryonic stem cell research is that there will be no more killing of embryos, no more killing of human beings. However, it did allow researchers to get public funding for the purposes of purchasing pre-existing stem cell lines that had been harvested from embryos prior to it coming to its position. It identified that there were some 14 cell lines around the world that were available. Oddly enough, I was very much surprised to find that the cost of a vial of stem cells was only \$3,000. If people can get what they want by purchasing vials of embryonic stem cells to do their research, that raises some question about why they would even want to go through the hassle of establishing an agency or the regulatory framework to ensure that there is this control.

The member also mentioned the U.K. Last night I printed off its bill. It actually had its genesis back in 1990, and there have been amendments since. I looked specifically at schedule 3, an excellent schedule on informed consent. In fact Dr. Françoise Baylis recommended that we should have a similar schedule 3 in Bill C-13 to deal with the complicated issues related to what consists of informed consent, when that occurs, et cetera, and the implications.

We definitely have to apprise ourselves of the work that has been done in other jurisdictions. We do not want to have to reinvent the wheel but we want to make it consistent with the intent of the legislation and compatible with the laws of the land, as they are a combination of federal and provincial laws and regulations. Respect for the jurisdictional aspect is extremely important.

We have asked at committee that a representative of the Government of Quebec, we were hoping either the minister of justice or the minister of health and social services, be invited to come to committee to help us to better understand the Quebec position. We know that Quebec was very quick to review the matter and to give its preliminary view. I understand its first step was to ban embryonic stem cell research outright. Subsequently I understand it is open to following the CIHR guidelines on it, but I am not sure.

We will see some other things happening too. Dr. Leon Kass is the head of President Bush's advisory council on biomedical research. Dr. Kass is eminently qualified and highly respected in the field. He is on record as recognizing that human life begins at conception as an undisputed biological fact.

The President has specifically asked Dr. Kass and his advisory committee to pursue as vigorously as possible research related to the storage of ova, women's eggs, so that there would not be any surplus embryos from IVF and this entire debate on the ethical level could be dispelled.

• (1315)

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the intervention by the hon. member. I know that he is very knowledgeable on this subject and has done a lot of research, particularly in the area of the stem cell research embryonic versus adult.

There is a lot of discussion today about which is the right way to go, not only ethically but scientifically. We know that in our day we had tremendous breakthroughs, unlike the U.S. and Great Britain when they were dealing with this subject earlier. There really was confusion about which would be the right way to go. It seemed as though the industry felt it had to have embryonic stem cells.

However we have seen tremendous advantage in the plasticity of adult cells, which can change into different types of cells. Also, as he mentioned, we have tremendous possibilities if ova can be used. Then we would not need to have a bunch of extra embryos created for the reproductive purpose.

Dr. Françoise Baylis did some research on the effect of freezing these embryos and thawing them and on how many would be effective or would need to be destroyed in order to find any useful stem cells. Could the hon. member comment on that?

Mr. Paul Szabo: Madam Speaker, the member will well know that when the whole issue on embryonic stem cell research came up, the assertion was that embryonic stem cells had more potential than adult stem cells, that is non-embryonic stem cells. The member is quite right. In fact there have been over 50 research papers since that time showing the plasticity or flexibility of adult stem cells.

Probably the most significant study comes out of the University of Minnesota Stem Cell Research Institute, by Dr. Catherine Verfaillie. Dr. Verfaillie has the research evidence now that stem cells taken from the bone marrow of a human being can be morphed or adjusted to become virtually any cell in the human body. It can do anything an embryonic stem cell can do. This is very significant because the intent of one of the recommendations, I think it is recommendation 14, of the report of the health committee on the draft legislation is that embryonic stem cell research be permitted only if necessary and that necessary be defined as there is no other ethical alternative that could achieve the same research objectives.

If the bill were to incorporate that definition of necessary, and I am not sure who could be against that definition, then the whole question of whether we want embryonic or adult stem cells used for therapies is moot because there is an ethical alternative.

Business of the House

On top of that, Canadians may not know this, but stem cells out of embryos have a different DNA than the patient in which they would be used. As such, if we were to use those stem cells to treat someone else, there would be an immunosuppressive reaction, that is immune rejection. It would mean that the patient would require lifelong anti-rejection drugs.

On the other hand, adult stem cells would come out of the patient's own body. They would be adjusted to become the cells necessary to repair damaged cells. They would be injected into the blood and automatically migrate to the area that had the problem. All of a sudden, having the same genetic makeup and same DNA, there would be no rejection.

Therefore, if there is an ethical alternative and no need for anti-rejection drugs lifelong, why would we ever consider using embryonic stem cells? That is why we had people like Dr. Ron Worton and Dr. Alan Bernstein advocating for therapeutic cloning, which is a process of taking the nucleus out of embryonic stem cells and re-introducing the patient's own cells, and that would be compatible. The only problem is it is cloning. If we allow that new nucleus in there to start dividing, all of a sudden we would have a full human clone. This is banned under the legislation.

• (1320)

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am quite pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this debate on this important issue. I had initially thought that we would deal with Bill S-2 today, which would have been my preference, as it is an important international treaty. However that not been possible, we were then going to discuss parliamentary modernization, which I thought would have been our next subject.

It is a little peculiar because, at the same time we were going to discuss parliamentary modernization, we had the opposition today use a loophole of sorts to cause a vote on a bill in which it was in favour for no reason other than to cause an artificial delay. That does not sound like a very modern thing to do. Maybe it is because the opposition is not a very modern group. That is okay. It has a right not to be modern. If it does not want to be, I cannot help it.

Now we have another motion brought to us with the alleged purpose of splitting a bill. Perhaps it is a genuine purpose, I am not sure. That is a real parliamentary procedure and there is no doubt about it. However I wonder about the application in this case.

[*Translation*]

I would now like to quote the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve. He will no doubt be pleased that I am quoting what he said in a parliamentary committee.

During a discussion in committee, the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve wondered about hearing certain witnesses again. Being totally satisfied with the good work the committee had done to date, he was opposed to this. I cannot fault him for that. He said, "We now have 18 potential witnesses. We can hear them over three days at the most, if we have three meetings. Therefore, let us not get into ideological debates". He was speaking to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works. He said, "The member has to sit down with the minister, who has to settle a certain number of

issues, but he cannot transfer a debate that should be happening in caucus to the committee, because that does not make any sense. If clarifications are needed, I absolutely agree that this should happen, but I do not want the committee to become a hostage to those who want to wage a pro-life crusade and who want speak to defend ideological considerations".

He then went on to refer to Canadians and Quebeckers. Quebeckers are, of course, automatically Canadians and proud of their citizenship. We are proud of belonging to this fine great country. I did not want to break into the quotation but I did want to cite it factually. He went on to say, "Canadians, Quebeckers and members of the House expect new legislation as soon as possible".

He went on to say "The Canadian Alliance, in its recommendation, asked us to table a bill as quickly as possible. Well then, that is what we must work towards. If we were to work every day next week, say from 10:00 a.m. until 8:00 p.m., we can get a serious amount of work done, but I hope that we can count on all the members around this table not to hijack the committee".

We see what is happening. The committee is still sitting and, today, the measure proposed in the House would have the effect of hijacking the committee. Yet, the hon. member told us that he was opposed to the idea of hijacking the committee. He did not have to say that. No one asked him to do so. He said it, presumably without being forced to. No one had wrestled him to the ground to force him to make that comment during the sitting of the parliamentary committee.

I am quoting the proceedings of the parliamentary committee. Without being overly specific, this was said on June 6, 2002, at 10:57 a.m.. He concluded his remarks around 11:25 a.m.. So, as we can see, the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve was then opposed to any measure that would have had the effect of delaying the bill presented by the minister. He was primarily opposed to members defending ideological concerns.

• (1325)

Today, the ideology that he expressed is to the effect that we must destroy everything that is federal and give it to the provinces. This ideology is a pretext to split the bill and delay its passage.

I see that the Parliamentary Secretary for the Minister of Health is very concerned about the hon. member's suggestion. Like me, he has a hard time figuring out why the Bloc Quebecois member made such a quick about face. He wanted the bill to be passed quickly, that is until his recent conversion. Since then, for ideological reasons, he has been wanting to delay its adoption by splitting it, even before the parliamentary committee has made a decision and reported to the House. This is hard to believe.

[*English*]

There a few more points that I think need to be raised before the House.

The bill was introduced and debated in the House and then voted on. The same member voted in favour of the bill. No motion was brought forward to split the bill at that time. When the bill was before the House no reasoned amendment was proposed, or anything like that, suggesting that the bill should not be read a second time and should be redrawn. That was not done.

I am told that the bill is established in a way to deal with provincial concerns, but whether that is or is not the case is surely an issue to be raised before the parliamentary committee on which the hon. member sits.

[*Translation*]

I want to go back to my initial point, namely that the bill is before the committee. It is not before the House.

It is with great regret that I see that I will not have enough time. I have so many things to say on this bill. We will have to conclude our remarks. Of course, we can carry on some other day and discuss this bill, even though it is with great regret that I must conclude.

Madam Speaker, you are indicating that, unfortunately, we are running out of time.

• (1330)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The hon. government House leader will have eleven minutes left the next time the House debates this motion.

It being 1:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

CANADA HEALTH ACT

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.) moved that Bill C-202, an act to amend the Canada Health Act (linguistic duality), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise, and I am doing so eagerly, to speak to Bill C-202, which will be debated in the House today for the first hour at second reading stage. Before going any further, I want to thank my colleague, the member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, for supporting this bill at first reading, and the member for Leeds—Grenville for supporting it at second reading.

I said eagerly because I have been waiting for this moment for five years, since this initiative started its journey in the House in 1997.

This bill would add a sixth principle to the Canada Health Act. This basic principle would ensure that Canada's linguistic duality is respected in the health care system everywhere in Canada.

When we put it like that, it sounds cold, legal and perhaps even incomprehensible to people who have better things to do than to read the Canada Health Act, things like earning a living for instance. However, for those who, like us, look into issues that are of concern to Canadians and are responsible for deciding on the best course of action for the future of one and all, this is downright scary.

Private Members' Business

This is when people start looking for—and they always find some unfortunately—the kind of arguments that hold us back. The most common one is that it is too expensive. Believe me, there will always be complaints about anything having to do with the rights of minorities being too expensive.

That it is not true, however. Quite the contrary. Bill C-202 asks that we take account, and I quote, “of the human, material and financial resources” of the facilities involved in developing health care access plans or delivering these services. No action shall be taken without looking at the capacity of each facility.

Also, with new technologies like telemedicine and diagnostic software, health care professionals will be able to provide services to several facilities.

Granted, hiring personnel capable of providing health care services in both official languages will entail additional costs. However, given that health care reform is unavoidable and actually well underway, we need to train more physicians and nurses anyway. So, why not train enough health professionals capable of working in both official languages of the country?

The current political climate suggests that the Government of Canada will have to reinvest in health care. So, with a sixth principle, a portion of the additional contributions would be dedicated to steps taken to respect the principle of linguistic duality.

The other reaction we get to the addition of a sixth principle is to say that this is an area that does not fall under the jurisdiction of the federal government. I say that it is not so. Yes, and everyone agrees on this, health programs and their management are the responsibility of the provinces. But the Canada Health Act and the Canada Health and Social Transfer are within the federal jurisdiction. In fact, the highest court in this land has recognized the constitutionality of the Canada Health Act. It is wrong, therefore, to say that the Parliament of Canada cannot set the conditions for the transfer of credits to the provinces.

You do not have to be a rocket scientist to realize that Canada and each of its provinces and territories are having serious problems in the area of health, especially in terms of ensuring that everyone has equal access to top quality health care and services.

The whole country is facing significant shortages in terms of doctors and health professionals. There are also too few nurses. We see a shortage of family physicians in big cities, something that, not so long ago, used to occur only in remote areas. Even at that time, it was unacceptable.

I am not blaming anyone, but we have to realize that governments were unable to find a solution and to stop that shortage from affecting the big cities and now almost everyone.

Private Members' Business

And as if that were not enough, our governments now have to pay more just to maintain the current level of health care. A huge portion of every government's budget goes to health care. We restructure. We merge. We innovate. We introduce new methods. We close beds. We perform more day surgeries. We keep looking frantically for a solution to this problem, which has reached epidemic proportions.

• (1335)

In its substantial report, the committee chaired by Senator Michael Kirby raises these concerns and proposes solutions. In Canada, the people wants this to be the number one issue.

The commission chaired by the hon. Roy Romanow will be releasing its final report next week.

[English]

I draw hope from the words of Commissioner Romanow in a speech he delivered for the John Kenneth Galbraith lecture on public policy at Memorial University in Newfoundland last October 23:

The principles of the Canada Health Act were built on basic values like equity and solidarity. To Canadians, these values mean everyone should have access to our health care system on the same terms and conditions, and that this access is ultimately a right of citizenship.

They mean that access to the health care system should be based on need, not a person's wealth, province of residence, gender or age. Canadians still feel strongly that these basic values must set the direction upon which the system is governed in the future. They have served us well and they show us the way.

In fact, as long as change is built from these values, I believe change will be acceptable to Canadians. In other words, I think Canadians are prepared to rethink some of their ideas about medicare, provided we do not retreat from our ideals.

[Translation]

Following those words from Mr. Romanow, I remind members that all minority language communities in Canada support the bill.

Umbrella organizations, which represent those communities, namely the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadiennes du Canada, or FCFA, and the Quebec Community Groups Network, or QCGN, asked that a sixth principle be added to the Canada Health Act. Those groups made that request to Mr. Romanow during his Canada-wide hearings and they made the same request to the Senate committee chaired by Senator Kirby. Our communities want it.

This debate and the subsequent vote will not be an easy task, but hon. members will agree that we are not here to make easy decisions. If everything always went well, we would not even need to be here. We are here because the task is difficult and because people, in each of our ridings, regardless of the political party or the region, expect us to deal with issues that are difficult but important for their future.

I dare say that issues dealing with linguistic minority rights are central to our idea of this part of America, where we chose tolerance and diversity rather than the absolute quest for uniformity. We have chosen difficult tasks because they allow us, collectively and individually, to reach a higher level.

All parties in the House acknowledge the relevancy of Official Languages Act, the rights of Canadians enshrined in the Constitution and the preponderance of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We all have undeniable rights.

Even the Canadian Alliance which, as the former Reform Party, did not consider linguistic duality as important, in its policies, now acknowledges the importance of our two official languages, and I quote:

We support the need for key federal institutions, such as Parliament and the Supreme Court, to serve Canadians in both English and French.

In its policy statement of May 2002, the party also acknowledged, and I quote:

—the federal government's responsibility to uphold minority rights.

No one will be surprised to hear that the million francophones making up minority communities in Canada have an urgent need for services and health care in their language. A study published by the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadiennes, the FCFA, indicates that at least half of that community has no access to health care in French.

• (1340)

[English]

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the member of Parliament for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, has recognized the difficulty minority communities experience in accessing proper health care services in their official language.

In addressing the Quebec Community Groups Network on October 20, he said:

You have identified access to quality health care in one's mother tongue as a very high priority. A Missiquoi Institute-CROP survey in 2000 indicated that 84% of anglophones [in Quebec] rate that type of access as "very" or "extremely important". This is particularly relevant because a greater proportion of the anglophone community is 65 years of age or older...and more likely to use the health care system.... This older population also tends to be far more unilingual: 56% of them do not speak French.

The minister also said that access is particularly difficult outside the greater Montreal region.

[Translation]

As far as I am concerned, we have first and foremost a moral obligation to these communities.

Furthermore, I would like to underscore to the government and the cabinet that there is a constitutional obligation to add this sixth principle. I realize that, when the Canada Health Act was enacted, it was left out. Our history is full of such omissions, but also corrections that we have made when our mistakes became apparent.

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Official Languages Act of Canada require that the federal government take into consideration linguistic minorities.

While this may not have been clear in the past, it is quite clear now. All of the successive judgments from the courts have confirmed this constitutional obligation, particularly judgments handed down by the Supreme Court of Canada on Quebec's secession and in the Beaulac decision, not to mention the unprecedented decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal in the Montfort Hospital case.

And I would go so far as to say that if the Government of Canada ignores its responsibilities, how can we expect provincial governments to shoulder theirs?

Private Members' Business

The Official Languages Act, backed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, particularly at section 16, requires that all Government of Canada programs take into consideration our linguistic duality. Without a doubt, this includes the cash transfers to the provinces for health care services.

In fact, one only has to read the Canada Health Act to realize that failing to specify the vital nature of services to minorities was an oversight. Take only a few of these principles that are considered sacred by Canadians.

Take universality. If service delivery is to be universal in a country where there are two official languages, then it goes without saying that we must serve linguistic minorities the same way we serve the majority.

When it comes to accessibility, having equal access to health care services no doubt means access to services in one's own official language.

As for portability, let us reflect for a moment on what is included in this principle. It says that we will be treated as we would be treated in our home province, should we need to call upon health care services in a province other than our home province.

In some Canadian provinces, residents enjoy linguistic rights when it comes to health care services. This is the case in New Brunswick, which is the only officially bilingual province.

Let us ask ourselves this question: can Canadians who have certain language rights with regard to health care in their province of residence transfer those rights to the other provinces, particularly the ones that do not offer these language rights to their own residents? We have to wonder about that.

If the principle of transferability, or portability, in the health care system implies language rights for some Canadians, should we not ensure that these rights are extended to all Canadians, regardless of their province of residence?

Despite these arguments that I believe to be sound, some will ask whether the existing principles imply respect for linguistic duality. If the act, the charter and the unwritten principles in the Canadian Constitution already require that minorities be protected, why add a principle that may be redundant after all and therefore useless?

We all know the answer to that question. We have learned, after nearly a century and a half of history that, unfortunately, keeps repeating itself, that we cannot rely solely on the goodwill, the understanding and the vigilance of our governments with regard to linguistic duality.

This is why we legislate. This is why we have a Constitution. This is why we have a Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It must be written in black and white in our statutes. And even then, we know that we have to be vigilant.

I will ask those who argue that it is not necessary to add a principle to protect our country's linguistic duality with regard to health care a question that is just as valid. If the existing principles imply respect for linguistic duality, why then would anyone be afraid of adding such a principle?

● (1345)

Here again, we know the answer, and it is not pretty. The truth is that, politically, it is not worth it. It creates problems for nothing. In Canada, as we know, linguistic issues have always been explosive.

So we are back to square one, caught in a vicious circle of our own creation, immobilized by fear, unable to act, while the rights of the linguistic minorities keep on being ignored.

How many more court decisions will it take before we take action?

If I may, I will appeal to your sense of history, our history. We are all victims of misinformation when it comes to our history, which includes having us believe that the founders of our country were not preoccupied by linguistic duality. It is absolutely not the case.

When the Fathers of Confederation took the bold step of creating a new country, 135 years ago, they would not have conceived of Canada not respecting the rights of its linguistic minorities. The protection of these minorities was the underlying principle in all their efforts and actions.

If ever there were any doubts regarding their intentions, the decision of the Appeal Court of Ontario in the Montfort case erases them all. The judges of this highly respected court wrote, and I quote:

Protections granted to linguistic and religious minorities are an essential characteristic of the 1867 Constitution, without which Confederation would not have come into being.

The court also quotes a reference to the Supreme Court dated 1932, in which Lord Sankey wrote, and I quote:

It is important to keep in mind that the preservation of the rights of minorities was a condition on which such minorities entered into the federation, and the foundation upon which the whole structure was subsequently erected.

It is high time we lived up to the promises made by the Fathers of Confederation. It is time to set aside our traditional arguments. It is time to make hard decisions.

Under the law, under our Constitution, in keeping with our history, and in the name of the legacy we will leave to humanity, in the name of everything good this country represents, in the name of past, present and future generations, I urge this House to demonstrate a spirit of generosity, the Canadian spirit, when it comes to this bill.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Madam Speaker, first, I wish to congratulate the member for Ottawa—Vanier. I know he has been interested in this issue for years and have no difficulty in acknowledging his sincerity and his staunch convictions.

I have consulted with my colleague from Repentigny, the Bloc Québécois official languages critic. It is true, as the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier has said, this is not an easy position to determine. The right to be served in one's own language contributes not only to people's happiness, but is also an inalienable right. It is unbelievable, in a country that claims to be bilingual, that people in crisis situations requiring them to seek health care should be unable to obtain services in the language of their choice.

Private Members' Business

The problem—and this is where I differ with my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier must accept—is that we do not in fact believe that Canada is a bilingual country, nor do we believe that it can be one. That is the first point on which we differ with the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

The second is that we have never accepted the legitimacy of the Canada Health Act. My colleague invited us to review history and I believe he was right to do so. The health act was enacted in late 1984, when the government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau was in its last days.

This was such a controversial act that it triggered a doctors' strike in Ontario. It is not a common occurrence for physicians, even those paid from the public purse, as they are in most provinces—

An hon. member: We have seen that in Quebec.

Mr. Réal Ménard: And not just in Quebec.

An hon. member: We have had that in Quebec recently.

Mr. Réal Ménard: But not for the same reasons, sir.

So, in 1984, Ontario doctors went out on strike, but not on the language issue. It was because they said their ability to organize themselves as self-employed workers was threatened. But all parties were in favour of the Canadian act.

Mr. Mulroney had been elected in a byelection and all parties represented in the House in 1984 were in favour of the act, but the bulk of the provinces were not. The bill was passed, regardless.

They played around with various scenarios of constitutional challenge. I studied constitutional law with the member for Chapleau and I do not think he can be suspected of having sovereignist leanings. So the National Assembly member for Chapleau, Mr. Pelletier, who is a very good teacher by the way, told us that, strictly speaking, a constitutional challenge would have been possible. In 1984, the government passed the Canada Health Act not because it had jurisdiction in that area, but by virtue of its overall spending authority. We must never forget that this is the authority under which this legislation was passed.

I appreciate what the member for Ottawa—Vanier is doing; once again, I think he is a sincere man and I do not say that every day, so I really believe his efforts are genuine and that he has been fighting this battle for a long time. However, should we not state clearly that this is a provincial jurisdiction and that provinces should be responsible for providing services to minorities in their own mother tongue? Yes it is important. It is bad enough to be sick; one does not choose when this will happen, any more than one decides to have bad luck, but if and when we are sick, it is unconscionable that we should depend for our care on people who do not speak our language, who do not understand us.

I believe that this cannot be a federal area of responsibility, especially not health care services. The member for Ottawa—Vanier is asking us to endorse a very noble value.

• (1350)

Earlier, a member said that there is one officially bilingual province in Canada. But in reality, as we know, there are two,

because bilingualism also exists in Quebec. It is such a noble value that, in Quebec, there are public institutions, including the educational system from kindergarten to university, which are funded by the state.

Under the laws in Quebec—and this is true for the health care system where, of course, this is legislated—the Anglophone minority, which is made up of just under one million people, can have access to health care services in its own language. This is entirely desirable. We must evaluate societies and our ability to live together. The test of civilization is the interest we take in our minorities. There is no doubt about that.

No one, and certainly not I, would like to live in a society where, because of the influence and tyranny of the majority, a minority would be deprived of certain services in its own language.

The member for Ottawa—Vanier knows as well as I do the sorts of setbacks that francophones living outside of Quebec have suffered in this regard in the past. However, the past must not be allowed to dictate the course of the future. It is not because francophones outside of Quebec have experienced injustices, of which the member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes has reminded us, that we should not envisage the future with much nobler ideas and a desire for equality.

I believe that the battle that the member for Ottawa—Vanier wants to wage should also take place in the provinces. All the provinces, from Newfoundland to British Columbia, must undertake to offer services both in French and in English.

Hon. members will recall that at the in 1977, René Lévesque—whom I am not sure is considered an icon by all members of this House—had proposed a goal somewhat similar to the one pursued by the member for Ottawa—Vanier. Obviously he did not want the federal government calling the shots. He suggested that there be interprovincial agreements. The Bloc Québécois members would feel much more comfortable with that sort of scenario.

I am in total agreement with the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier that this must not be a money matter. Access to services, especially at a moment in life when people are not at their best, should not depend on financial means. I cannot go along with the argument that this is implicit in the legislation. The five conditions mentioned by our colleague do not show any bias for or against the delivery of services. She explained which principles should apply.

I have been the Bloc Québécois critic for health care since 1997. When public servants appear before the health committee, they state that those five principles are national standards. The legislation does not state that they are, but public servants do. We know that the federal government does not have any expertise in health care, except as concerns the aboriginal people, inmates serving a sentence of more than two years, and research in epidemiology and on immunization.

This is why we think we should not have a Canada Health Act. I can tell the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier that if he were to launch a crusade to create a coalition to make sure, through interprovincial agreements, that all provinces provide adequate services to their national and historical minorities, he could count on me. I would wholeheartedly join his campaign, and I am sure most members in the Bloc Québécois would do the same.

I wish the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier good luck, and I thank him for his initiative. I hope he will nonetheless consider that our argument has at least some historical merit and some basis in law.

• (1355)

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is with pleasure today that I rise to speak to this important bill, Bill C-202, standing in the name of the member for Ottawa—Vanier. I feel very passionately about this bill.

As a member of the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages, I come across all sorts of things concerning the legislation on bilingualism in Canada.

The bill proposed by the member for Ottawa—Vanier focuses on the health sector. It deals, more specifically, with a sixth principle to be added to the Canada Health Act. This is an important issue, which members will have to seriously consider.

I am really disappointed that the Canadian Alliance decided not to address this issue, today. But we shall see what happens in the coming hour.

We should learn to accept the reality of official languages, not merely respect it. Furthermore, this issue goes beyond official languages. It is about respecting others. The purpose of the bill is to help people. It is a bill about linguistic duality in the health sector.

The place of French and English, in minority communities, is a current issue. A few days ago, the Commissioner of Official Languages tabled a report asking that the government do more on this issue. The Commissioner's efforts do have some impact.

A few days ago, in this very room, an hon. member challenged the role of official languages in the public administration. We cannot tolerate such unparliamentary language by members.

We still have a long way to go. We need the change mentalities and behaviours, which is even more difficult. Believe me, we have had a lot more examples of that this week.

Fortunately, a few minor improvements can easily be accomplished. A bill or a motion could be more helpful than we think. I am glad to see this bill from the member for Ottawa—Vanier being introduced here.

I concur with the idea to introduce an appropriate bill whose purpose is to help people. However, I can only object to a member bringing forth a destructive bill or uttering racist comments.

It is often assumed, incorrectly, that all the people's rights are protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is a wrong assumption. The charter provides a certain amount of protection to francophones and anglophones, but it is not enough.

Private Members' Business

In most of the provinces, rights recognition did not translate into meaningful action, especially in the health sector.

Bill C-202 is quite simple. It is so simple that everyone here can understand it. If we give it some thought, it makes no sense to oppose it. The bill establishes that language will not be an obstacle for people when they seek care, when possible.

This is simply common sense. The country has two official languages and still people cannot receive hospital care in the language of their choice.

The most important thing in life is one's health. Ask someone who is sick if he would prefer money or health. If we asked someone who is rich and healthy which he would choose between the two, he will go for the million dollars. But ask someone who is sick which is more important. He will answer health. He would give anything for his health. Imagine then, when it comes time to seek medical attention, if he cannot talk to the doctors or nurses in his own language. He cannot even describe his condition in his own language.

• (1400)

This is when Canadians must show open-mindedness. Quebec, New Brunswick, Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia, all the provinces of Canada must be open to these two communities, the French-speaking and English-speaking communities, so that people can receive treatment in the language of their choice and understand what they are being told.

The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier is proposing that a sixth principle be added to the Canada Health Act. Great. Adding a sixth principle to the Canada Health Act makes sense. Canada is a bilingual country. Debates in the House of Commons, as well as federal government documents, must be bilingual. Since the federal government is giving money to provincial governments for health, it makes sense that it would enforce its own bilingualism requirements.

With all due respect to Bloc Québécois members, including my hon. colleague from Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, I am sure they are going to argue that this is a provincial jurisdiction. I respect their opinion. But at the same time I would expect the opinion of Canadians to also be respected. If the government is going to spend money in an area, it should have a say. In many parts of Quebec, people who speak English are respected. I am sure, however, that there are places where they are not.

An hon. member: Where?

Mr. Yvon Godin: Such as in New Brunswick.

An hon. member: In the Gaspé; in the Eastern Townships.

Mr. Yvon Godin: I will not talk about Quebec, I will talk about New Brunswick. We were forced to fight in that province, where bilingualism is officially recognized. We were forced to fight to get services in French in Miramichi, in my province, and I am not proud of that.

Private Members' Business

Recently, in New Brunswick, in the region of Bathurst, where francophones account for 85% of the population, they decided to make the hospital in Bathurst a bilingual hospital because we believe in our two communities. The government and the residents of that region made that decision while taking provincial jurisdictions into consideration. I salute them. We are talking about human beings, about sick people. How can we not respect that?

That is the way it is. Some provinces are not prepared to do that. The bill tells the federal government "You should be the watchdog in this regard, since there is a national act on bilingualism in Canada. There are two recognized peoples, the francophones and the anglophones". Many francophones from northern Ontario may get services in French. But those from southern Ontario or northern Manitoba, from Saskatchewan or from British Columbia must also be able to get services in their language. As human beings we have a responsibility.

There are francophones and anglophones in this country who cannot understand those who provide care to them. Is this logical? Is it logical that a patient would get important instructions on his health without understanding them, just because the caregiver cannot speak to him in his language and there is no other option? Is it logical that someone would contact the hospital to get information and not be able to find anyone to speak to him in French or in English?

Efforts are being made in Canada, but it is time for the federal government to do its share to ensure the delivery of health care in French and in English. As I said earlier, efforts have been made in New Brunswick and in Quebec. But I would not even give carte blanche to these two provinces. There is still a lot of work to be done. But the rest of the provinces should also make the same efforts. Imagine what they could accomplish if they did. I do not see why the other provinces should not do the same.

To those who are against this bill, especially to the members in this House who argue that the federal policies are racist, I would be very glad to point out that the bill is for both French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians. It deals with the two languages recognized in Canada.

I want to commend the hon. member for Ottawa Centre for his bill. It is a very important piece of legislation concerning both our official languages. Again, I am sorry that the Canadian Alliance, chose not to take part in this debate.

• (1405)

I would like to find out what they think of Canada's two official languages. It is unfortunate, but it is their decision and I will respect it. But I want Canadians to at least realize that it is as if they do not recognize our official languages. It is important to the people of Prince George, in British Columbia. It is important to the French minorities in Alberta. It is important to the English minority in Rivière-du-Genard and it is important to all Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I find it rather interesting to be told over and over that my party has chosen not to speak to the bill, since I like to hear debates. I like to hear people's arguments. I like to find out what they have to say. Because I do not have a prepared speech I wanted to hear the points

of view of different members before I got up to speak. It was rather unfair of my colleague to say that the Alliance has chosen not to speak just because I did not get up immediately after the member. I think that was an unfair comment.

I would like to make a few comments. We have had some experience recently with the medical system. The issue in the bill before us, as the member who presented it has said, is to make sure that health care is available universally for people in Canada.

My family has had some recent experience with the medical system. I saw my mother suffer for eight hours waiting for health care for a fractured hip. This happened on the day of my dad's funeral. I know where I would put the money for health care. I would make sure that competent staff is available so that health care is available in a timely manner for someone suffering as my mother did. It was distressing for us to leave her in the hospital while we went to my dad's funeral waiting to know what was going to happen. Nobody was able to look after her. After eight hours the hospital finally decided to move her by ambulance over Saskatchewan's roads to the Regina hospital. Very frankly, that caused us more distress than the fact that we were to attend my dad's funeral. I do not think anyone would argue that a viable health care system is high on everyone's priority list. I do not think there is an argument there.

With respect to the availability of healthcare in the provinces, it is very interesting that this member should have this bill. I had a visit from a constituent, a couple of years ago now, who had the misfortune of having a heart attack when he was visiting his relatives in Montreal. He was in the middle of a heart attack and needed health care, but before the hospital would serve him he had to post a bond or give the hospital a cheque. The hospital in Montreal would not accept his Alberta health care card. It was not an issue of language at all. He had to write the hospital a cheque before the hospital would look after him. He came to my office to complain about this. He asked if this was what the Canada Health Act was about and wanted to know what was meant by universality. We checked into it and found that there had been a little glitch in the system.

I support the member when he says that health care should be available. Maybe I should not be throwing out ideas just off the cuff because someone is liable to say it is Canadian Alliance policy. I want to emphasize that it is not. It is a question, though, that we should ask.

There is a massive intrusion by the federal government into our health care system. As my colleague from the Bloc said, the government did it originally by the simple brutal application of its spending power. It was able to tax Canadians. It was able to give money to the provinces for health care. The government originally put 50% into health care and there was hardly a province that could say it would not participate, because that is an awful lot of money. Over time the government has so eroded its health care contributions that some provinces are receiving less than 15%. Less than 15% of their health care costs, in some cases, is derived from the federal government.

Now I am putting out a little feeler. Maybe we should seriously start considering changing our Constitution so that we in fact have a national health care system. Perhaps we should change our Constitution so that the federal government does have a role to play. This would ensure that Canadian citizens, when they go from Alberta to Quebec or from any province to any other province, can present their Canada health care card and receive proper medical service right then and there, no questions asked, instead of having this interprovincial thing.

• (1410)

I also hold the federal government totally responsible for the fact that it has been unable to negotiate between parties, between the provinces, so that there would be a full accession to the universality clause in the Canada Health Act. It has to be there. If we are going to have a Canadian health care system that meets the needs of Canadians, then we had better be able to go anywhere in Canada, present our card and say, "I am entitled to this kind of service".

I also want to say something with respect to the language part of the bill. In hospitals I have visited, I have observed the need to be able to communicate. That is absolutely critical. In one instance I am thinking of right now, there was a person who spoke neither of Canada's official languages. I would like to say, with great respect for the particular hospital involved, that it bent over backwards to find a person who could interpret from the language of the person into, in this case, English, so that the communication between the doctor and nurses to this individual who could not speak either language was facilitated.

I saw the same thing not long ago at the airport. A person spoke neither English nor French and a member from the Air Canada staff spoke to her in German. I know just enough German to be able to understand that it was German she was speaking, notwithstanding that was my first language. Over the last 40 years, I have lost it.

I would like to say it is true that if one wants to retain a language over time one has to take extraordinary measures. In my family that is very obvious. Our family came to this country not speaking English. Now all my cousins, all their children and mine, and all the grandchildren and everyone are fully unilingual English and almost none of them speak German. We lost that language because we were assimilated into the English language. If one's goal is to maintain the French language, then yes, one must take extraordinary steps to maintain it and that is a whole other debate.

I am very pleased to participate in debate on the bill. I found the debate very interesting and certainly it is an issue that we should pay a great deal of attention to, particularly on delivery of health care services to all Canadians regardless of where they happen to be at the time within our country and irrespective of their ability to pay.

• (1415)

[Translation]

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased and proud to take part in this debate on two important subjects, those being health care and the equality of the two official languages of Canada.

Private Members' Business

[English]

I will begin my remarks by offering my congratulations and good wishes to my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier. I recognize, as do members of the House, that the member has long been a champion of and a contributor to the defence of minority linguistic rights in Canada.

I say with some humility on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party that we too have always respected the linguistic duality of the country and have a record to back up that assertion.

With respect to my colleague's initiative before the House, I want to note some of his commitments and contributions in the past. As this is a private member's bill, it is clearly the position of our party that in keeping with the best traditions of respecting an issue as important as this, we will be permitting our members to freely vote their conscience and vote freely on behalf of their constituents on this matter. I also want to assure the hon. member that this initiative will be taken very seriously by the Progressive Conservative Party, for the very reasons I have stated.

[Translation]

The Progressive Conservative Party has always taken an interest in issues concerning the official languages. The French fact in Canada is something that has shaped our history, our culture and our future.

[English]

Along with the ethnic diversity and our long historic relationship with first nations people, our linguistic duality contributes to the richness of the country and the entire Canadian experience. I would suggest it also contributes to our ability to connect and to associate with the wider world.

Specifically with regard to minority linguistic rights, the Conservative Party of Canada has always sought to defend the minority against the natural intrusions that come about as a part of majority rule.

Under a Conservative government, the linguistic status of New Brunswick was enshrined in the Constitution. Our government provided substantial financial assistance to the province of Manitoba when it was required by the court to translate rulings of all its statutes. There is a history of action on this file.

I am sure Quebeckers in particular will recall the attempts we made through the Meech Lake accord to further protect the rights of linguistic minority communities throughout Canada.

I also want to note that language is very much a determinant of health, which is the pith and substance behind the hon. member's motion.

For instance, according to recent studies, statistical and anecdotal evidence suggests quite clearly that francophone communities in which services are available in French tend to be healthier than communities in which services are only available in English, in one language. That stands to reason for clearly an individual's ability to communicate with the health care provider in a language in which the individual is comfortable is extremely important. That comprehension, that comfort level is extremely important.

Speaker's Ruling

I would go further in suggesting it is important for health care response and also the preventive elements of health care. In fact in keeping with some of the Romanow recommendations that are anticipated, there is a greater need to allow health care service providers to help Canadians anticipate and cut off some of the actions, behaviours and health risks in a proactive pre-emptive way.

It stands to reason that whatever minority language, French or English, if a patient is unable to understand and communicate effectively on their very treatment, on their very health, this is something we have to take very seriously and we have to respond to. This is very much the spirit of the bill.

I do not want to undermine that sentiment, I would like to put on the record a few reservations I have about the bill itself. First and foremost, it is fair to say that the atmosphere, the crisis that is facing health care in the country today places it as the number one priority for most Canadians. For those in government at all levels this is what has been dominating the debate. That is in no way to take away from the thrust of the bill. However, I suggest reservedly that there are higher priorities on how we bring about improvements in the health care service.

The federal government already is not doing its fair share when it comes to health care funding. The provinces are strapped for cash and it is inconceivable that the government would impose another condition on the provinces without equally appropriate financial assistance. That is to say given the current state, figures suggest that as little as 18 cents on every dollar that is spent on health care in most provinces comes from the federal government. The rest is carried and picked up by the provinces. To put a system in place, as laudable as it is in this case, that would not be accompanied with sufficient and significant cash increases would further impinge upon the provinces' ability to deliver health care.

I do not want to go off on a partisan jaunt, but we have heard a great deal from the former finance minister about the democratic deficit. At the same time that particular individual likes to claim ownership over having defeated the deficit.

What happened is the deficit was transferred. It was transferred to the provinces and deficits were created in other areas such as health care, the military, and education for students. These are very telling issues when one looks at priority spending and at responsibility and accountability for the status of health care today.

● (1420)

The Progressive Conservative Party has been calling for a sixth principle to be added to the Canada Health Act. This bill in essence calls for the creation of a sixth principle in the Canada Health Act. However, instead of binding provinces further, our sixth principle would in fact bind the federal government to stable funding for health care. Then and only then would I suggest we would be able to add the further principle envisioned by the hon. member's bill.

I believe the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier has brought forward a very worthwhile proposal, but it has to be viewed in the broader context. It has to be viewed through the lens of the status quo of health care as it exists today. Without stable funding, all of the other principles are meaningless. Creating new principles would

simply further act as a drain on those who are tasked with the very serious day to day delivery of health care.

When one examines any social issue at this point in our country's history, that has to be part of the discussion. The current crisis today in health care has to be laid directly at the feet of the federal government because of cuts to transfers. Cuts to transfers in Canada's health and social spending have devastated the health care system and it has whittled away at the status in every province.

I hope that the member at some stage might review his proposal and add an explicit commitment that any movement on this front would be accompanied immediately and automatically by increased funding to accomplish this worthwhile initiative.

I also note that Canadians are still waiting for action from the government on health care. We have heard a great deal about the various reports, the Mazankowski report, the Senate report, the upcoming Romanow report. If we were to speak to any nurse or doctor in any community in this country, they would tell us what is wrong with health care. While a patient has to wait for basic treatment, the government has indulged itself in a dance of all these different studies.

● (1425)

[*Translation*]

The time for study is over. We must now take action.

[*English*]

Again I strongly urge the member for Ottawa—Vanier to put his issue to the government so that it can consider within the wider context of health reform this very principled, very worthwhile initiative.

On that principle, I recommend that we recognize the practical reality of the other circumstances that affect the consideration of his bill. I am sure the member would agree that a reasonable means test be applied to provinces and communities.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

INCOME TAX ACT—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised earlier today by the hon. government House leader concerning the bill introduced by the hon. member for Calgary Southeast. I would like to thank the government House leader for having raised this matter as well as the hon. member for Calgary Southeast for his comments.

The bill proposes an amendment to the Income Tax Act that would have the effect of eliminating from the act an existing exemption from taxation for allowances paid to elected provincial or municipal officials for some expenses that are incidental to the discharge of their duties. The net result of the elimination of these exemptions would be an increase in the level of taxation for affected taxpayers.

As stated in a ruling on October 24, 2002 regarding another private member's bill, a bill of this nature can only be brought before this House if it is preceded by the adoption of a motion of ways and means.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* states at pages 758-9:

The House must first adopt a Ways and Means motion before a bill which imposes a tax or other charge on the taxpayer can be introduced.... Before taxation legislation can be read a first time, a notice of a Ways and Means motion must first be tabled in the House by a Minister of the Crown—

Furthermore, it goes on at page 898 to state:

With respect to the raising of revenue, a private Member cannot introduce bills which impose taxes. The power to initiate taxation rests solely with the government and any legislation which seeks an increase in taxation must be preceded by a Ways and Means motion.

The bill sponsored by the hon. member for Calgary Southeast seeks to eliminate an existing tax exemption. If adopted, the bill would result in an increase of the tax payable by a certain group of taxpayers. Our practice in these matters is clear.

Since the bill has not been preceded by the necessary ways and means motion, the proceedings this morning are null and void. The Chair therefore rules that the order for second reading of the bill be discharged and the bill withdrawn from the Order Paper.

I thank the hon. government House leader for bringing the matter to the attention of the Chair.

(Order discharged and Bill C-317 withdrawn)

Private Members' Business

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CANADA HEALTH ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-202, an act to amend the Canada Health Act (linguistic duality), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to point out, even though the government strongly supports the intent and the spirit of Bill C-202, that we have had the health act of Canada since 1984. The government cannot interfere with provincial jurisdictions. This is a responsibility of the provinces. It is so mandated and we cannot interfere. The government, clearly and without question, cannot support the bill.

• (1430)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

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 House

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.
Bélangier, 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 November 22, 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 Members

Jim 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
Christiane Gagnon

Roger Gallaway
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 PickardDiane Ablonczy
Mark Assad
Yvon Charbonneau
Antoine DubéJohn Godfrey
Steve Mahoney
Inky MarkGrant McNally
Anita Neville
Joe PeschisolidoDavid 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 CumminsLibby 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 HillHoward 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 PensonJames 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:		Vice-Chair:		
Stéphane Bergeron	Mark Eyking	Pat O'Brien	Bob Speller	(9)
Bill Casey	Mac Harb	Svend Robinson	Tony Valeri	
Rick Casson				

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
 Scott Brison
 Roy Cullen
 Ken Epp

Liza Frulla
 Robert Lanctôt
 Steve Mahoney

Pat Martin
 Gilles-A. Perron
 Gerry Ritz

Andy Scott
 Alex Shepherd
 Paul Szabo

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Diane Ablonczy
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 André Bachand
 Roy Bailey
 Rex Barnes
 Leon Benoit
 Rick Borotsik
 Garry Breitkreuz
 Andy Burton
 Chuck Cadman
 Bill Casey
 Rick Casson
 David Chatters
 Joe Clark
 Paul Crête
 John Cummins
 Stockwell Day
 Odina Desrochers
 Norman Doyle

John Duncan
 Reed Elley
 Brian Fitzpatrick
 Christiane Gagnon
 Cheryl Gallant
 Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
 Yvon Godin
 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
 Gary Lunn
 James Lunney
 Peter MacKay
 Inky Mark
 Keith Martin
 Philip Mayfield
 Grant McNally
 Réal Ménard
 Val Meredith
 Rob Merrifield
 Bob Mills
 James Moore
 Deepak Obhrai
 Brian Pallister
 Pierre Paquette

Charlie Penson
 James Rajotte
 Scott Reid
 John Reynolds
 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
 Lynne Yelich

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 Wasylycia-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:		Vice-Chair:		
Mauril Bélanger	Norman Doyle	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Anita Neville	(9)
Carolyn Bennett	Reed Elley	Wendy Lill	Tony Tirabassi	
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral				

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN YOUTH AT RISK

Chair:	Vice-Chair:
---------------	--------------------

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 Reynoldson
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:

Vice-Chair:

Bill Blaikie	Peter MacKay	David Pratt	Vic Toews	(11)
Marlene Jennings	John McKay	Geoff Regan	Pierrette Venne	
Derek Lee	Lynn Myers	Kevin Sorenson		

LIAISON**Chair:**

Peter Adams
Reg Alcock
Sue Barnes
Mauril Bélanger
Raymond Bonin

Bonnie Brown
Charles Caccia
Joe Comuzzi
Joe Fontana
Gurmant Grewal

Vice-Chair:

Charles Hubbard
Walt Lastewka
Clifford Lincoln
Judi Longfield
Bernard Patry

David Pratt
Andy Scott
Tom Wappel
John Williams

(19)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Eugène Bellemare
Paul Bonwick
Chuck Cadman
Murray Calder
Rodger Cuzner
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Stockwell Day
Nick Discepolo
Stan Dromisky

Paul Forseth
Yvon Godin
Mac Harb
Richard Harris
John Herron
Howard Hilstrom
Dale Johnston
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Karen Kraft Sloan

Derek Lee
Diane Marleau
John McKay
Dan McTeague
Réal Ménard
James Moore
Carolyn Parrish
Beth Phinney
Jerry Pickard

David Price
Marcel Proulx
James Rajotte
Monte Solberg
Peter Stoffer
Yolande Thibeault
Tony Valeri
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne

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	Christiane Gagnon	Dan McTeague	Benoît Sauvageau	(17)
Gérard Binet	John Herron	Massimo Pacetti	Raymond Simard	
Sarmite Bulte	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid	Bill Young	
Jeannot Castonguay	Jason Kenney			

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston	Gerry Ritz
Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	Gerald Keddy	Werner Schmidt
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Yvan Loubier	Carol Skelton
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Gary Lunn	Monte Solberg
André Bachand	Ken Epp	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Peter MacKay	Larry Spencer
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	Keith Martin	Guy St-Julien
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Philip Mayfield	Darrel Stinson
Stéphane Bergeron	Peter Goldring	Grant McNally	Chuck Strahl
Rick Borotsik	Jim Gouk	Val Meredith	Greg Thompson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Gurmant Grewal	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Scott Brison	Deborah Grey	Bob Mills	Vic Toews
Andy Burton	Art Hanger	James Moore	Suzanne Tremblay
Chuck Cadman	Stephen Harper	Lorne Nystrom	Maurice Vellacott
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Deepak Obhrai	Elsie Wayne
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	Brian Pallister	Randy White
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Charlie Penson	Ted White
Joe Clark	Jay Hill	Louis Plamondon	John Williams
Joe Comartin	Howard Hilstrom	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	John Reynolds	

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	André Harvey	Mario Laframboise	Raymond Simard	(16)
John Cannis	Ovid Jackson	Robert Lanctôt	Paul Szabo	
Bev Desjarlais	Stan Keyes	Alex Shepherd	Lynne Yelich	
Jim Gouk				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
Gérard Asselin	Brian Fitzpatrick	Jason Kenney	Werner Schmidt
André Bachand	Paul Forseth	Yvan Loubier	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Ghislain Fournier	Gary Lunn	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Christiane Gagnon	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Bernard Bigras	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Inky Mark	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitreuz	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	Réal Ménard	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 Crête	Grant Hill	Brian Pallister	Ted White
John Cummins	Jay Hill	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Howard Hilstrom	Dick Proctor	

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Chair:	Paddy Torsney	Vice-Chairs:	Carole-Marie Allard Randy White	
Bernard Bigras	Mac Harb	Réal Ménard	Kevin Sorenson	(13)
Libby Davies	Dominic LeBlanc	Jacques Saada	Greg Thompson	
Hedy Fry	Derek Lee			

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:

Elizabeth Hubley
Serge Joyal
James Kelleher

Shirley Maheu
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

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, November 22, 2002

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Tax Conventions Implementation Act, 2002

Bill S-2. Report Stage	1771
Mr. Boudria	1771
Motion for concurrence	1771
Division on motion deferred	1771

Parliamentary Reform

Motion	1771
Mr. Harb	1771
Mr. Epp	1774
Mr. Adams	1774
Mr. Adams	1775
Mr. Epp	1777

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Queen's Jubilee Medal

Mr. Adams	1778
-----------------	------

Homeless Awareness

Mr. Goldring	1778
--------------------	------

Tom Flanagan

Mr. Harb	1778
----------------	------

Landmines

Ms. Leung	1778
-----------------	------

Christmas Seal Campaign

Mr. Provenzano	1778
----------------------	------

Health

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	1779
--------------------------	------

United Way

Mr. Proulx	1779
------------------	------

Ingrid Betancourt

Mr. Dubé	1779
----------------	------

Literature

Ms. Folco	1779
-----------------	------

Grain Transportation

Mr. Johnston	1779
--------------------	------

Natural Resources

Mr. Cuzner	1780
------------------	------

Housing

Mr. Masse	1780
-----------------	------

Quebec Citizenship Week

Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	1780
---------------------------	------

Operation Apollo

Mr. Pratt	1780
-----------------	------

Sports

Ms. Meredith	1781
--------------------	------

World Television Day

Mr. Castonguay	1781
----------------------	------

Newfoundland and Labrador

Mr. Hearn	1781
-----------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

National Defence

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	1781
Mr. Collenette	1781
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	1781
Mr. Collenette	1782

Canada-U.S. Relations

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	1782
Mr. Collenette	1782
Mr. Kenney	1782
Mr. Collenette	1782
Mr. Kenney	1782
Mr. Collenette	1782

Kyoto Protocol

Mr. Guimond	1782
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	1782
Mr. Guimond	1782
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	1783
Mr. Bigras	1783
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	1783
Mr. Bigras	1783
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	1783

Housing

Ms. Davies	1783
Mr. Collenette	1783
Ms. Davies	1783
Mr. Collenette	1783

Canada-U.S. Relations

Mr. Clark	1783
Mr. Collenette	1784
Mr. Clark	1784
Mr. Collenette	1784

Kyoto Protocol

Mr. Abbott	1784
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	1784
Mr. Schmidt	1784
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	1784

Securities

Mr. Paquette	1784
Mr. Wilfert	1784
Mr. Paquette	1784
Mr. Wilfert	1785

Canadian Wheat Board

Mr. Hilstrom	1785
Mr. Szabo	1785

Mr. Szabo	1796
Mr. Merrifield	1798
Mr. Lunney	1799
Mr. Boudria	1800

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Canada Health Act

Mr. Bélanger	1801
Bill C-202. Second reading	1801
Mr. Ménard	1803
Mr. Godin	1805
Mr. Epp	1806

Mr. MacKay	1807
------------------	------

Points of Order

Income Tax Act—Speaker's Ruling

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos)	1808
(Order discharged and Bill C-317 withdrawn)	1809

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Canada Health Act

Bill C-202. Second reading	1809
Mr. Dromisky	1809

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**