



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 033 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, November 27, 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

Wednesday, November 27, 2002

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

• (1400)

[*English*]

The Speaker: As is our practice on Wednesday we will now sing O Canada, and we will be led by the hon. member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore.

[Editor's Note: Members sang the national anthem]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, December 6 is the National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women in Canada. Established in 1991, this day coincides with the poignant anniversary of the deaths of 14 young women who were tragically killed on December 6, 1989, at École Polytechnique in Montreal because they were women.

Although this day is to remember and honour those who died, remembering is not enough. We must also educate and take action.

Violence against women is all too common. It is an issue that simply will not go away. December 6 is a day for communities to consider concrete actions that each Canadian can take to prevent and eliminate all forms of violence.

Children who live in violent situations learn that violence is a way to gain control and power over others. This perpetuates the problem even further.

The National Clearinghouse on Family Violence can provide Canadians with a list of publications that can be ordered free of charge, as well as information about video resources on wife abuse that can be borrowed. Most important, women and children who live in fear of violence need to know they have a place to go for help. They need to know that they are not alone and that violence is simply not acceptable.

JUSTICE

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, under the watch of the federal Liberal government, crime in Surrey has reached a five year high with nearly 50,000 criminal code offences.

Surrey has high auto theft, marijuana grow-ups, assault, break and enter, arson and property damage cases.

Throughout the lower mainland, drugs, gangs, prostitution and other organized crime is rampant.

Among Indo-Canadians alone, 70 youths have been murdered since 1995. The Surrey RCMP is understaffed and has heavy caseloads, yet the Liberal government has done nothing to help.

The Canadian Alliance believes that the rights of victims of crime must take precedence over those of criminals. We believe in truth in sentencing and will ensure that sentences handed down are actually served. Parole should be harder to earn and easier to lose, and multiple convictions should draw consecutive rather than concurrent sentences. There should be deterrence to commit crime, not motivation.

When will this weak Liberal government subscribe to these beliefs and act so that the people of Surrey will feel secure on their streets?

* * *

INVERNESS BAGPIPE COMPETITION

Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate Halifax resident Bruce Gandy for winning the gold medal at the Inverness bagpipe competition. Although I am told Mr. Gandy shudders when he hears this, this medal entitles him to be called the best bagpiper in the world.

A strong part of Nova Scotia's highland heritage, it is no surprise that bagpipers are common in my home province. However to have one of this calibre based at the Halifax Citadel is truly fantastic. Since the competition began in 1841 only five other Canadians have won this prestigious award.

What is particularly striking in Mr. Gandy's case is the incredible recovery that he went through over the last several years after suffering from arthritis and a pinched nerve.

On behalf of the people of Nova Scotia, I want to congratulate Bruce Gandy for his hard work and well deserved success.

S. O. 31

•(1405)

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, two days ago in the House, the member for Red Deer said something inconsistent with the facts. He said:

The Prime Minister even said in the House that in 30 years our children and grandchildren will be dying from the heat. There is not a scientist in the world who would agree with that. None of the people in the IPCC, in those models, say that in 30 years people are going to be dying from heat.

Now if the member for Red Deer had bothered to do some research, he would have found that the Prime Minister was completely correct. The IPCC "Summary for Policy Makers Climate Change 2001: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability" on page 12 states:

Projected climate change will be accompanied by an increase in heat waves, often exacerbated by increased humidity and urban air pollution, which would cause an increase in heat-related deaths and illness episodes.

The hon. member owes the Prime Minister and the House an apology.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1943, a Vickers Wellington bomber was intercepted and shot down by a German fighter aircraft. Flight Sergeant Gordon Carter and Flight Sergeant Howard Hoddinott were able to jump safely from the burning aircraft before it crashed into a peat bog.

As the plane disappeared from sight it took with it the lives of three brave members of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

I am honoured to rise before the House and inform members that a funeral ceremony with full military honours took place earlier today at the Wilnis General Cemetery in Wilnis, The Netherlands.

The three airmen honoured were: Flight Sergeant Joseph Evariste Adrien Thibaudeau, Flight Sergeant Joseph White and Warrant Officer Class I Robert Benjamin Moulton.

Family members of the crew members travelled from Canada to attend the service and the widow of Flight Sergeant Howard Hoddinott travelled from Scotland. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs represented the Government of Canada.

On behalf of all Canadians I would like to express our gratefulness to the people of The Netherlands for their assistance in the recovery effort of our fallen heroes.

* * *

CHRISTMAS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Well, Mr. Speaker, once again we have new, though hardly improved, levels of political correctness to go with the Christmas season.

Our own Canadian Mint is running an ad to sell coins. It is calling the ad "the 12 days of giving" instead of "the 12 days of Christmas". Apparently the jingle won out over some other trial balloons like

"we wish you a merry loonie" and that other old favourite "have yourself a merry little time at the Mint".

On the one hand, people of faith get used to this political correctness. After all, removal of Christian liturgy at the Swiss air memorial, removal of Easter and Christmas from the Department of Heritage calendar, and the rejection of prayers of all faiths at the September 11 ceremonies here on the Hill are examples of what happens all too commonly.

Now Toronto has raised a decorated tree at city hall, but of course it is not called a Christmas tree, heaven forbid; it is a holiday tree.

It is time for a little steel in the backbone, I figure. I admire the Canadian Jewish Congress for supporting the right of Christians to publicly display their faith, because we do not promote understanding and tolerance in a multicultural country by forcing any faith to go underground with its celebrations.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Gérard Binet (Frontenac—Mégantic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on November 27, 2000, the Liberal government was re-elected to ensure that Canadians from coast to coast could explore new opportunities and develop their personal and economic potential.

Local solutions to specific situations can spur the development of rural economies and attract investments. This is the way that the Liberal government has chosen to develop regions while encouraging ordinary citizens to get involved in the development of its policies.

Allow me to thank again the residents of Frontenac—Mégantic for having given me the opportunity to work toward a critical objective, which is to ensure that our riding and region are among the priorities of the Canadian government. I will continue to fulfil this social role with vigour and energy, in the hope of ultimately building a better, safer and more prosperous society.

* * *

EGG MARKETING

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière—L'Érable, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today, I want to highlight the 30th anniversary of the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency. The agency, which was the first one to look after the interests of Quebec and Canadian producers, created a supply management system that is now used by other agricultural agencies, namely the turkey, chicken, hatching egg and milk agencies.

The Fédération des producteurs d'oeufs du Québec and its then president, Ovila Lebel, were among the pioneers who quickly realized the importance of the collective management of production and marketing operations.

They were convinced that supply management is the best way for farmers to make a good living with their production, while promoting the development of human size farms.

Let us also not forget that supply management ensures constant and quality supply for consumers, without direct government subsidies.

The achievements of the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency benefit Quebec society and all those who make a living in this sector. Supply management must be protected by the government. It must not be watered down. Quebec producers are expecting stronger measures on the part of this government, which must now put its money where its mouth is.

* * *

• (1410)

VETERINARY MEDICINE

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since its opening in 1947, the department of veterinary medicine of the Université de Montréal, in Saint-Hyacinthe, has made significant advancements and trained many veterinarians. It is hard to believe that the December 9, 2002, deadline for the accreditation of that department is fast approaching.

Very few institutions in Canada provide this professional training. Besides the protection and health of domestic and farm animals, one must recognize that what is at stake ultimately is human health. Think for instance of the role played by these institutions in the pharmaceutical, agri-food and cosmetics industries.

Need I remind the hon. members of all the questions that have been asked about mad cow disease, listeriosis, or the equine infectious anemia outbreak in southern France since last February?

Let us not wait for a serious emergency in Canada to act. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Let us find the financial resources to replace outdated equipment and inadequate infrastructures.

Let us make sure that our veterinary colleges can continue to operate.

* * *

[English]

AMBER ALERT SYSTEM

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last summer we watched many successful recoveries of abducted children because of the AMBER alert system in a number of the states in the U.S. They are now in the process of implementing this system on a nationwide basis.

I would like to praise the efforts of Alberta Solicitor General Heather Forsyth and Alberta Justice Minister Dave Hancock for their promise earlier this month to be the first province in Canada to have the AMBER alert system up and running by the end of the year. They both recognize the need for a system to be in place for child abduction cases. It will be a valuable complement to their high risk offender registry.

Many lives have been saved in the United States because of this program. I challenge the Liberals to follow the lead in both the U.S. and in Alberta and set up an AMBER alert program on a nationwide

S. O. 31

basis. Canadians would undoubtedly support this issue and every child would benefit from it.

If the Prime Minister really wants to leave a legacy, then why not borrow an idea with a proven track record for success? What better legacy could one leave than the protection of our children?

* * *

[Translation]

ÉCOLE DE MÉDECINE VÉTÉRINAIRE DE SAINT-HYACINTHE

Mr. Claude Duplain (Portneuf, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to increase the awareness of my peers in the House of Commons and the Canadian government regarding the situation of the École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe.

As was said so well by my colleague, the hon. member for Shefford, who has been closely involved in this issue and works with the stakeholders and key players, there is a significant lack of funding which could compromise this college's ability to maintain its accreditation.

The deadline for maintaining the accreditation is coming in December and the department still has not received any funding. Because this deadline is fast approaching, it is essential that support be provided to our veterinary colleges in Canada and Quebec, if we want to protect the health of domestic and other animals in Canada.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH CARE

Ms. Judy Wasylcia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the big day. Tomorrow the Romanow commission releases its long awaited report on the future of health care.

For the past 18 months Canadians have been actively engaged in the debate. Thanks to new technology it has involved Canadians like never before speaking out about matters that desperately concern them. What they are saying is, "I am Canada, hear me roar, in numbers too big to ignore: health care, public, not private, universal, accessible health care. Is Ottawa listening?"

This week the finance minister callously rejected to unanimously support a recommendation to ease the circumstances of persons with disabilities. All parties in the House agreed to this but one member who ducked the vote may get to decide whether the voices of the people of Canada will be heard.

Canadians have told Roy Romanow the thing they cherish most is equal access to health care for all, that respect for equality is our most basic democratic premise. Tomorrow all Canadians will be measuring whether the government will live up to the democratic values of its citizens.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

QUEBEC'S WATER POLICY

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to the important step taken by Quebec with yesterday's announcement of a new water policy.

With this policy, Quebec becomes a world leader in the management and preservation of water, a precious but fragile resource.

Quebec's water policy is decentralized, transparent and participative and will involve community organizations and the general public. The policy is also aimed at reducing health risks and fighting pollution.

The federal government must also play a role in financing municipal drinking water supply and treatment infrastructures, while respecting the jurisdiction of Quebec and the provinces.

With this ambitious project, the Quebec nation will protect an asset that is not a mere commodity but part of our collective heritage. This resource must be conserved, representing as it does for us a source of life, prosperity and national pride.

* * *

• (1415)

ÉCOLE DE MÉDECINE VÉTÉRINAIRE DE SAINT-HYACINTHE

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at this time, two of Canada's four schools of veterinary medicine no longer meet international standards. One of these is the faculty of veterinary medicine of the Université de Montréal in Saint-Hyacinthe.

Since the spring, I have been involved in one effort after another to help out this faculty and keep its doors open. There has still been no positive response forthcoming. I am therefore returning to the charge here in this House today, in order to remind hon. members of the urgency of the situation.

On December 9, the American Veterinary Medical Association's Council on Education might withdraw the partial accreditation currently enjoyed by the Saint-Hyacinthe school of veterinary medicine.

Accreditation is an assurance of quality. Graduates of accredited faculties have a solid grounding in the basic principles of medicine, the scientific knowledge, and the physical, technical and intellectual skills necessary for good veterinary practice.

With the support of the members of the Quebec caucus, I am repeating my request and urge the government to take prompt action on this.

* * *

[English]

INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, fighting within the Liberal government has prevented the Prime Minister from keeping a commitment his government made in the September throne speech.

Yesterday, mayors from across Canada met in Ottawa to seek the federal government's help in dealing with issues such as affordable housing, transportation and urban infrastructure, issues that affect every Canadian.

Put simply, there is a functional disconnect between revenues and responsibilities in Canada. Clearly the provinces and municipalities need a greater share of the existing fiscal pie. For municipal governments, that means access to new sources of funding. Canada's municipal leaders will tell us that solving these issues takes a commitment from all levels of government.

This fall the federal government committed to meet with municipalities to put in place a 10 year infrastructure program. Like many throne speech commitments, the government has backed away from that promise.

Provinces and municipalities are very important partners in this Confederation. The government should treat them as equals, not just as inconveniences.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government's health care commissioner, Roy Romanow, said yesterday that health care will need an additional \$7 billion. With federal spending rising at the rate of about 8% a year, and the government talking about another \$20 billion of spending in the throne speech, the finance minister has already been suggesting that spending is out of control and a new fiscal watchdog is needed over there.

Where does the government intend to get the additional dollars it says it will need for health care?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will have the pleasure to say to the Leader of the Opposition at the time of the budget how much money we can allocate for health care. However, for the past for nine years the opposition has wondered what we were going to do. We have been the first government ever to have five surplus budgets in five years, and it will be the sixth this year.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that is true, but it started that process by cutting spending for health care. I see the Prime Minister applauding that.

For nine years the government has opposed structural reform of the health care system. The government and Roy Romanow have opposed harnessing private investment and alternative delivery within the public health care system. The government has dealt with problems by spending more tax dollars.

Does the government still believe that spending more tax dollars alone will solve the problems of the health care system?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have not received the report yet so I cannot make specific comments on that. However, there is one thing. Our neighbours to the south are spending 14.5% of their GDP on health care. Within the Canadian system, which is a better system than theirs, we are spending 9.4% of GDP.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister I suppose makes the point that health care has not really been the priority of the government.

Last year it raised spending in health care by less than other things like corporate welfare, hiring more bureaucrats and other departmental spending. This is why the finance minister is now warning that the government may not have enough money to spend on health care.

I ask again, it is something we have asked before, will the government commit to finding money for health care within the existing budget envelope and commit to ruling out tax increases for health care?

• (1420)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is not a day that we come to the House when the opposition party members are not always complaining that they are afraid of a deficit that never comes or that we are spending too much. However, they want more money for this and more money for that. There is not a week when we do not have a request from the official opposition of \$3 billion, \$4 billion, \$5 billion, or \$6 billion of new spending.

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government has never been a friend of the provinces when it comes to health care. When provinces introduced reforms to improve patient services and to save money, the government responded with threats and medicare costs. Mr. Romanow is now turning up the rhetoric against alternative service delivery within a public system.

Will the government use Romanow to roll back the clock on real health care reforms?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has committed to working collaboratively in partnership with the provinces and territories in the delivery of health care.

In fact, far from being in the face of the provinces, just a few months ago we were able to agree to dispute avoidance and resolution mechanisms. Therefore if there is a dispute between the provinces and the federal government around the interpretation of the Canada Health Act, or something the provinces or the federal government are doing, we have a mechanism, a third party mechanism, by which these disputes can be avoided.

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, reports indicate that Romanow will recommend a watchdog to oversee health care spending. If the government would start working with the provinces and stop fighting with the provinces a watchdog would not be necessary. A watchdog will only add to bureaucracy.

Will the government put more money into bureaucracy and less into patient care?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on what Commissioner Romanow may or may not recommend.

What I can say is that on this side of the House we have worked very hard to work in partnership and collaboration with the provinces. We acknowledge the fact that the provinces are the deliverers of health care. In fact, the accord of September 2000 spoke to not only more money for health care but a new partnership in delivering health care to Canadians.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUDGET SURPLUS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois has been saying so for five years, and now the Minister of Industry is also publically criticizing the government's decision to put 100% of its surplus toward the debt, rather than half, despite what the Liberals had promised.

The former Minister of Health, who incidentally is pretty slow on the uptake on this, has suggested that by doing so, the federal government is largely responsible for creating the problems that the health care system is experiencing.

Will the Prime Minister agree with the Minister of Industry and acknowledge that his government's budget practices have exacerbated the problems that we are experiencing when it comes to health care?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am always very honoured when I am criticized for having to manage a surplus. As for whether or not we managed it well, I believe that it was split about 45-55%. It is impossible to calculate it down to the penny, but we kept our promise to divide it between tax cuts, debt repayment and investments to address existing problems in the country.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is ridiculous. Every year, the size of the surplus has been hidden, as we know, intentionally. The public has been kept in the dark about the size of the surplus and the full amount was put toward the debt. All of the money was used on the debt, when there was a promise to divide it 50-50.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that if there is a responsible party, one that is most responsible for all of the problems with health care, it is this government, which has made cuts to health care on the backs of the provinces, and on the backs of the sick, just like it did with the unemployed for EI?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we met in September 2000, we came up with an agreement. Each of the premiers present signed it. At one point, they were running after me in the hallway to speak with me. The Premier of Quebec was adamant at the time that the federal government must do something, which we did, and he congratulated me publicly. I hope the member can recall this.

Oral Questions

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, had the government listened to the provinces, monitored how expenditures evolved and maintained its contribution to health at the same level, as the Bloc Québécois has been requesting for five years now, there would have been no need for the Romanow commission.

Will the Prime Minister admit that, had he invested as little as one third of the huge surplus, as suggested by his Minister of Industry, the health system would be in much better shape now, and the Romanow commission would therefore have been totally unnecessary?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that the Romanow commission was a suggestion of the provincial governments and that—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: Indeed, and that the selection of Mr. Romanow was approved by the premiers.

Mr. Romanow was very interested in this problem. He had indicated his interest, and several premiers recommended him to me. I knew him and thought he would make a good commissioner. We will receive his report tomorrow and will determine what in that report we can or cannot accept.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to health, the government is like the firefighter that sets a fire so that he can put it out. It has cut funding, and now, it is playing saviour with its billions of dollars.

Does the Prime Minister realize that, by pouring billions into health as he is preparing to do, he is fooling no one and is, at best, making up for the havoc his cuts have caused in the health system?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we have done to manage public finances has been to take the \$42 billion deficit we inherited when we took office and put the fiscal house in order. And the provinces greatly benefited from this, because when we took office, they were paying 11.5% interest on their debt, while now, it is down to a mere 5% or 6%.

* * *

[English]

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Prime Minister.

A week ago today the House voted unanimously to support a motion to withdraw the proposed changes to the disability tax credit released on August 30, 2002. Yesterday in the House the finance minister showed breathtaking contempt for democracy making it clear he had no intention of respecting the will of Parliament as expressed in that 234 to 0 unanimous vote.

In view of the finance minister's contemptuous performance, has the Prime Minister now instructed the finance minister to withdraw the disability tax credit changes immediately.

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's

question, the Minister of Finance has heard and respects the will of Parliament. The proposal of August 30 is off the table. He has advised his department to respond with alternate proposals and they will be brought back in a timely fashion.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, not only did the finance minister not show that he had heard the unanimous vote, he thumbed his nose at the unanimous vote of the House yesterday when he stood in his place.

Maybe the finance minister thinks 234 people voting together are nobodies, but there are five million persons living with disabilities in the country who want to know that the government has withdrawn those draconian measures and, by the way, that they have been removed from the government website immediately.

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, can the hon. member not take yes for an answer? The issue is very clear. The proposals have been withdrawn. The minister is engaged both with the department and with stakeholders and at an appropriate time will come back to the House. The answer is yes, they have been withdrawn.

* * *

[Translation]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question about the Kyoto protocol.

Yesterday, I asked the Prime Minister to confirm that he would negotiate with Quebec a bilateral agreement that would respect provincial jurisdictions. He did not answer the question.

Can the Prime Minister tell us if he received an indication from the Quebec government to the effect that it is prepared to renounce its jurisdictions? Otherwise, will he confirm today that Ottawa is committed to signing a bilateral agreement with Quebec?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as regards Kyoto, we are prepared to sign bilateral agreements with each of the provinces if they want to, and also with the various sectors of the Canadian economy.

We only have 10 years to adapt. We will have a vote very soon, I hope, in the House, so that we can ratify the Kyoto protocol. This will help us sign agreements at the earliest opportunity and eliminate the uncertainty that creates problems for everyone.

By voting immediately, we will ensure that all sectors of the Canadian economy know exactly what to expect.

• (1430)

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the implementation of Kyoto.

There is a major disagreement between Ottawa and the provinces over the use of credits relating to carbon sinks.

The federal government wants the credits to be applied to the country in general. However, the provinces insist that the credits should be given to the province where the carbon sink is located.

Oral Questions

Can the Prime Minister tell us if he is prepared to negotiate on this issue?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, I am very pleased to hear the Conservative Party leader talk about carbon sinks, because this is a major victory for this government. We convinced foreign governments to give us credits for carbon sinks, which represent about 60 megatonnes.

As to how these credits will be divided between the provinces and the central government, this is something that we are prepared to discuss with the provinces.

[*English*]

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Kyoto protocol states, "Each Party...shall, by 2005, have made demonstrable progress in achieving its commitments under this Protocol". The Prime Minister has repeatedly stated that Canada has 10 years to meet our obligations under the treaty. Clearly the Prime Minister is confusing Canadians.

Does the Prime Minister really not understand the Kyoto penalties, or is it that he does not want Canadians to know the truth about the consequences of not meeting our targets?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member simply points out how wrong-headed the approach of the Canadian Alliance is in opposing ratification of Kyoto. If in fact we have to meet certain obligations by the year 2005, surely we should get going now instead of holding things up with filibusters.

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, under the government's latest plan, our greatest industrial emitters will be allowed to miss their targets, with the government making up the shortfall. Between those emitters and the government's own planned shortfall of 60 million tonnes, Canada will have to pay billions in buying international credits.

How does the government expect to spend this kind of money on hot air and still be able to fund health care, education and the military in this country without raising taxes?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at least the hon. member in this question is making it clear from his assumptions that he expects there to be ratification and that he expects us to proceed with the Kyoto agreement. At least I give him that credit, he recognizes that his party's position is wrong-headed.

As for achieving our goals, we have said repeatedly that we do not intend to purchase what he called hot air from Russia or any other country. Any purchases overseas by the corporate sector or by a government would have to be a real reduction, not something that has happened in the past by reason of a change in the economy.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the softwood lumber situation, when the Minister for International Trade says that there is no question of negotiating concessions and that he intends to continue with legal

proceedings, he has our support. He must, however, understand that his delay in unveiling phase two of his industry assistance plan is putting companies at risk of closure.

Is the minister aware that every day that passes has a heavy impact on these companies and that the government needs to provide them with prompt assistance, primarily in the form of loan guarantees?

[*English*]

Hon. Herb Dhaliwal (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the hon. member's question. As he knows, this file is a work in progress. It is in the interests of both Canada and the U.S. to resolve this issue, and my colleague, the Minister for International Trade, is working every single day. It is our priority for the government to resolve it. It is in the interests of both the U.S. and us to resolve it.

Meanwhile we are supporting our workers and industry and it is a work in progress. If we need to do more we have said we will, but let the opportunity be there that we try to resolve it first, and if we cannot we will do more.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ) Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister for International Trade seem not to understand that, while their international position may be good, their domestic position is weakened by the shortcomings of their plan, due in part to the lack of support from their colleagues in Industry and Human Resources Development.

What is the Minister for International Trade waiting for to convince his colleagues of the need to implement effective measures to assist workers and companies hurt by the softwood lumber crisis?

● (1435)

[*English*]

Hon. Herb Dhaliwal (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member first should recognize what the government has done. We have put in \$340 million to help industry and to help workers.

Let me just outline it for the hon. member: \$71 million to assist displaced workers; \$110 million for community adjustment; \$40 million for the pine beetle; \$25 million for R and D; \$20 million for the advocacy program; \$45 million for market diversification, and we can go on and on.

*Oral Questions***TERRORISM**

Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, from recent senate committee hearings in the United States we now have sworn testimony that Hezbollah's high ranking terror officer, Mohamad Dbouk, has organized a terror cell based in Vancouver, and we have a recent quote from Hezbollah's worldwide leader expanding the call for murder-suicide attacks, not just against Israel and the United States but against western targets in general.

Hezbollah's murder rate is much higher than that of other groups banned in Canada. What is it about Hezbollah that makes these Liberals afraid to ban it in Canada?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member knows that the government is not afraid to ban entities that we are worried about in terms of terrorist activities.

There is a process in place. It is the law of the land and we will abide by that process. At an appropriate time, when all the work is done, we will table the entities that we want listed under that act.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Hezbollah's work is being done around the world. It kills in Israel, it kills around the world and it brags about it.

We now have videotapes showing its treatment of small children, punishing them and forcing them to chant the Hezbollah cry. We have videos and evidence that it purchases equipment so that it can video these murders for its own home videos.

I ask again, what is it about Hezbollah, of all other groups, that the minister will not list it?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, we do our intelligence work on the basis of substantiated facts. Some of the information that the member has brought forward will certainly be considered.

Hezbollah has been banned under the United Nations and the member knows that. We will do our duty in Canada in a very balanced and accurate way and list entities as we see fit as the information comes forward.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ÉCOLE DE MÉDECINE VÉTÉRINAIRE DE SAINT-HYACINTHE

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

The Quebec Liberal MPs have just wakened up to the situation of the Saint-Hyacinthe school of veterinary medicine. Today, three of them have risen in this House to make statements in connection with this important school.

Can the minister tell us whether, since the last set of questions the Bloc Quebecois asked in the House, he has at last decided to recommend that the government provide this school with the necessary financial assistance to allow it to retain its accreditation?

[*English*]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can certainly proudly say that long before the

Bloc Québécois members raised this issue, this caucus over here was talking about it, and members of the caucus in Quebec and the other provinces in Canada that have veterinary colleges have raised the issue as well. As I have said a number of times, the government is working toward that and we look forward to being able to support the veterinary colleges in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ): Mr. Speaker, partisan politics aside, and given the importance of getting a prompt decision on this before the holiday season, will the minister stop contemplating and studying the issue and finally make a decision on whether the Saint-Hyacinthe school of veterinary medicine will or will not be able to carry out the expansion necessary for accreditation?

• (1440)

[*English*]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House that as soon as the government can make an announcement we will do so.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Treasury Board guidelines clearly state that no firm, including its subsidiaries, can be awarded more than 25% of government contracts.

According to the minister's own website, over 75% of government advertising is now being funnelled through Media/I.D.A. Vision.

How can the minister justify breaking Treasury Board rules again by continuing this monopoly with Claude Boulay's companies? How can he do that?

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, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman clearly does not understand the role or the function of an agency of record. There is one agency of record for the Government of Canada. That is Media/I.D.A. It won that position in a competition four years ago and its function is to place all of the radio, television and newspaper buys for the entire Government of Canada through a centralized control point. It obviously does not receive the full value of the advertising. It only receives the 3% commission.

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): The minister is leaving a slippery trail with that one, Mr. Speaker.

On June 5 the new Minister of Public Works promised to clean up his department and he pledged, "If there were errors, or mistakes or wrongdoing, they will be corrected".

Oral Questions

Six months later, Claude Boulay's companies control 75%, three-quarters, of government ad contracts. Nothing has changed.

Has the minister conveniently forgotten his pledge or was it just the exuberance of a rookie?

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, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the compliment on my youthful exuberance, but I am happy to say that unlike the hon. gentleman across the way and the opposition, Canadians have responded warmly and generously, saying that they appreciate the action that has been taken. We got to the bottom of a problem, we have fixed it and put it on a solid foundation for the future.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the cod stocks in the north sea have been in decline for a number of years and are now at their lowest recorded levels. Other stocks around Scotland and Ireland are also very low.

Given this evidence, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea has recommended a closure of cod fisheries in several European areas and the implementation of recovery plans.

Could the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans comment on the similarities between the current European context and Canada's recent experience with groundfish declines?

Hon. Robert Thibault (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his question. In 1992, Canada went through much similar circumstances. We have had to invest over \$3.5 billion in economic development packages and bought back 3,600 licences. We still have challenges.

I commend Commissioner Fischler for his courage in acting in such a way in Europe. He has been a good partner for us at NAFO. With his understanding of the situation we are going through, I trust he will be an even better partner at the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a vessel owned by Canada Steamship Lines has received a \$125,000 fine for illegally dumping oil into the ocean. A Transport Canada official commented, "Clearly it doesn't pay to pollute in our precious waters". It appears it may well pay if we can stick the Canadian taxpayer with the bill. Right now CSL will be able to deduct the fine from its income tax.

Will the Prime Minister change his absurd tax policy that allows polluters to get away with stiffing taxpayers for their illegal activities? Will he put an end to law breakers deducting their fines?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite should be aware that there has been a court case which dealt specifically with what fines were acceptable for deduction. He should also aware that the Department of Finance is reviewing that at the present time because we are concerned and

we want to ensure that only legitimate business deductions are acceptable for tax purposes.

* * *

● (1445)

CANADA PENSION PLAN INVESTMENT BOARD

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is another useless answer from a minister.

Yesterday, in the finance committee, Mr. John MacNaughton, of the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board, said that right now pension dollars from Canadian taxpayers were going to profit tobacco companies in this country. At the same time the government is spending millions of dollars trying to stop people from smoking.

Will the government now change the legislation to put an ethical screen into the Pension Plan Investment Board so that our pension dollars will not go to aiding and abetting the killing of thousands of people in the country? Will it do that now, please?

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows from yesterday's discussions, the fact is that there is a restricted list for the government in terms of countries and companies in which it can invest. However it invests in a broad range of things approved by this Parliament, and is able to do so. I think the answer was very clear yesterday and it is very clear again today.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, this past week the Prime Minister finally indicated that the military would get more money in the next federal budget, and thank God for that, but why does the military have to wait until next February's budget to find out what financial help is on the way for it when it needs replacements for the Sea Kings, it needs new ships and it even needs new uniforms right now?

Why does the government not give the military the money right now?

An hon. member: A new leader.

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think they do need a new leader, as I just heard it stated.

Apart from that, the hon. member has been here a lot longer than I have, yet even I, with my short experience in the House of Commons, know that budgetary decisions are made at the time of the budget and the budget will be in February or thereabouts.

*Oral Questions***KYOTO PROTOCOL**

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has stated that he does not need a provincial consensus to ratify Kyoto. The government knows it cannot implement the accord without the active participation of the provinces. Brian Mulroney was able to reach a consensus with the provinces on acid rain. Brian Mulroney was able to reach a consensus on free trade.

The first lesson in federal-provincial relations 101 is to get the first ministers together. The PM said that it was not a bad strategy to receive a premier who has asked to be seen. Why is it a good strategy to meet with two premiers when 13 leaders are demanding a first ministers meeting?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hope Mr. Mulroney will not run against him to be the leader of the Tories.

I want to say that we have talked with the provinces. The Tory administration did that after Rio. We have talked since Kyoto. There have been 10 years of discussions and we have decided to ratify the Kyoto agreement. A lot of people already realize that the best thing on that file is to make sure that uncertainty disappears, that we proceed quickly so we will be able to meet the targets for 2012 and that we have enough time to put all the mechanisms in place. I am sure Canada will rise to the challenge.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services is blowing smoke around this issue because the Treasury Board guidelines say nothing about contractors of record. The minister does not know whether they have passed these contracts on or kept them to themselves, according to the information that we have.

My question is for the Minister of Public Works and Government Services. When he says that he has fixed this up, how can he assure the House that I.D.A. has not kept these contracts to itself, has not broken the Treasury Board guidelines and is, therefore, using taxpayer money fraudulently?

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, Lib.): Because, Mr. Speaker, all the relevant information is publicly available.

An agency of record acts on behalf of all the government to have one control point where all the advertising is placed so that it can be measured and competed for properly. All the dollar value appears to go through one agency but in fact that agency of record does not get the normal commercial rate. That agency of record gets 3.25%, which is for the placement of the media buy and nothing more.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we know all about the agency of record but I said that the Treasury Board guidelines did not allow for agency of record. It says that 75% of the contracting is not allowed. No one can have more than 25% of the market.

Let me ask the President of the Treasury Board: Do the rules allow an agency of record to have more than 25% of the contracting?

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, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we had more than one agency of record we would not have an agency of record. We need to have one control point where the media buy is made. Other advertising agencies handle the creative work for departments and do the campaign design but we need one control point where that buy comes through, and that is the agency of record which receives a low commission of approximately 3%, which reflects the value of the work it does and does not in fact reflect the creative work.

* * *

● (1450)

[Translation]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Neigette-et-la Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today the town of Asbestos shut down in support of the 320 workers who lost their jobs following the closing of the Jeffrey asbestos mine. We know that 62% of them are 55 years old or older. Under these circumstances, retraining is not realistic. Only something like the Program for Older Worker Adjustment can help these laid-off workers.

Prior to 1993, when in opposition, the Liberals protested to save the POWA program. Once in power, they eliminated it.

Will the minister be compassionate enough to revive the Program for Older Worker Adjustment?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, on this side of the House we do not discount employees who are 55 years old and assume that they cannot go on to other work. On this side of the House we believe that Canadians can make a contribution through the course of their lives.

Specifically with regard to older workers, however, we have a program in place and have transferred considerable moneys to the province of Quebec so that it can develop pilot programs specifically designed region by region, incident by incident, to deal with the challenges faced by older workers.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Neigette-et-la Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am starting to get exasperated with the minister's responses, with her six-plan points, or her six-point plans. I suggest she put in a new tape.

Does the minister realize that she has helped only one person, and that is the former Minister of Finance, by helping him siphon off money from the EI fund at the expense of workers?

Oral Questions

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary. If the hon. member would take the time to look at the results of some of the pilot projects that are now in place in her own province she would see that this approach is making sense.

We look at the particular circumstances surrounding an incident in a region, as I said, or with an employer, and focus specifically on the needs of individual employees. We find that this approach works well. It is a strong partnership with the government of the province in support of Canadians who are living in that province, and others.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government spends over \$7.5 billion directly on Canada's aboriginal people but to do this it uses more than a dozen different government departments. This can cause waste and duplication. For example, when Indian Affairs and Northern Development replaces a chief that it claims is not competent, other government departments continue to funnel millions of dollars through that same chief.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Why does the government allow some departments to flow taxpayer dollars through the same chief that other government departments claim is not competent?

Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member has his facts somewhat incorrect. Every single department in the Government of Canada that has work that relates to first nation people on reserves has agreements. Those agreements are audited on a yearly basis and assessed. The work of those departments and the audits are to see whether the programs that we deliver to the communities are successful. If there are financial difficulties, then we move to help them deal with those issues.

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the right hand and the left hand should get introduced.

Next week the Auditor General will release a report that will again condemn the government for failing to protect taxpayers and aboriginal people.

Bureaucratic overlap, duplication and waste eat up taxpayer dollars before they can ever better the lives of aboriginal people.

When will the government realize that its bloated bureaucracy needs aboriginal people a lot more than aboriginal people need its bloated bureaucracy?

Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member must be better advised than anyone in the House. I understand that he is talking about a report that will not be released until next week. I have not seen it. I do not know what it says but I suspect that he does.

However, in answer to his specific question, the government has put forward a number of major initiatives, one being the first nations governance legislation with the objective to bring modern tools of governance to first nations to help them with their administrative issues on reserves.

● (1455)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa.

In light of his recent visit to Cuba, I and the people of Canada would like to know the present status of the relationship between the Government of Canada and the government of Cuba?

Hon. Denis Paradis (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the president of the Canada-Cuba friendship group for his question.

First, I would like to say that we are number one in tourism in Cuba, with 400,000 Canadians who will be visiting Cuba. We are number two in investment in Cuba. Trade and investment are two good ways to promote dialogue and promote Canadian values like human rights and democracy. We are planning right now an exchange of parliamentarians with our amigos.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I need some clarification from the Minister of Veterans Affairs regarding a letter dated November 21 addressed to war hero Al Trotter. I received a copy late yesterday.

The minister makes reference to the quasi-judicial review board and says, "As Minister, I do not have the authority to intervene on an individual's behalf or to overturn decisions of the board".

Is that ministerial lingo for "too bad, so sad, not my problem", or does it mean that the minister finally realizes he needs to convince cabinet to change the legislation?

Hon. Rey Pagtakhan (Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is right. A minister may not intervene in the decision of the Veterans Affairs review board. However, when the principle of law in a nation competes or collides with the principle of justice, we have a duty to search for a solution and that is why the minister is searching for a solution. When the answer is ready it will be given in the House.

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what that was all about.

The minister said that this was a heart-rending case, but it was absolutely heartless for him to fire off a form letter to this war hero.

A prisoner of war camp could not shatter Al Trotter's spirit but the minister has come very close. The minister knows that Mr. Trotter is being shortchanged. He also knows that the legislation that he hides behind is flawed and should be changed.

Oral Questions

Will the minister finally commit today in the House, in front of Canadians, to make the changes to that legislation that would right the wrong that has been done?

Hon. Rey Pagtakhan (Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member is now following the principle of law. In her question a few days ago she indicated that she would like to find a loophole in the law.

This minister does not find loopholes in the law. We follow the process of law-making in this country. We are searching for a solution. When that is done within the spirit of law and justice, the answer will be provided in this hall of Parliament.

* * *

[Translation]

SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this week, the egg producers of Quebec were pointing out the merits of supply management in their sector. They are concerned about the government's shilly-shallying and are calling for specific commitments relating to their production.

Will the Minister for International Trade finally admit that supply management mechanisms are essential for the development of the egg sector, and can he assure us that his position with respect to supply management bears no connection to the one set out in a memorandum to cabinet made public some weeks ago?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure all members of this House that our government is firmly committed to supply management. We consider it to be a system that has served farmers throughout the country well. It is also a system that serves the interests of our consumers very well, and is good for people's health.

Our government is therefore firmly committed in all trade negotiations, be they connected with NAFTA or the WTO, to promote supply management, a system that was created by one of our past governments.

* * *

PROTECTION OF CHILDREN

Mr. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because they care about their children's well-being, Canadians want to know what the government is doing to better protect them.

In the Speech from the Throne, the Government of Canada pledged to better protect children from exploitation, and to provide a legal system that is more receptive to their needs, whether children are victims or witnesses.

Could the Minister of Justice tell us about his timeframes for fulfilling these commitments?

• (1500)

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we know, the protection of children in Canada is a priority, if not the top priority for this government. In the past, we took action. For example, changes were made to the Criminal Code to create the new offence relating to the use of the Internet to lure children.

We also launched, in cooperation with the Manitoba government, a new Internet site called Cybertip, which is working very well. Following the Sharpe ruling, we said we would review the defence based on artistic merit, and this will be done soon.

I am taking this opportunity to thank the members of the Liberal caucus for their interest and excellent work in this area.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, only eight laboratory workers in Canada have the resources to test our blood supply for the dangers of West Nile virus. These are the front line people with whom we entrust our blood safety.

With patients having to wait for up to nine weeks for test results, we have a disaster in the making.

Why is the government and the minister not providing the needed resources to protect Canada's blood supply?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Health Canada works closely with the Canadian Blood Service and works with the provinces and territories. They are very conscious of the challenges in relation to our blood service.

I am very pleased to announce that the most recent independent report of our blood service suggests that our blood system is the safest it has ever been in the history of our country.

* * *

[Translation]

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the report of the Transportation Safety Board on the Air Satellite tragedy revealed the following, and I quote:

Transport Canada did not comply with its established audit standards for regulatory audits of the operator, thus increasing the risk that training and operational deficiencies would not be identified.

Instead of continually investing in jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces, why does the government not look after its responsibilities properly? What does the Minister of Transport intend to do to address the shortcomings identified by the Transportation Safety Board?

[English]

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this question was asked yesterday by the member for Churchill and I gave the answer.

Transport Canada is not reducing the number of inspectors with respect to air inspection. Safety of course is our number one priority, so the report in the newspapers was in error.

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Order. I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Raul de la Nuez Ramirez, Minister for External Trade of the Republic of Cuba.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

• (1505)

POINTS OF ORDER

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised on Tuesday, November 19 by the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst alleging that some remarks made by the hon. member for Saskatoon—Humboldt during Statements by Members were unparliamentary.

[Translation]

Having had the opportunity to review the *Debates* of November 19, I heard the hon. member for Saskatoon—Humboldt who rose on November 20 to reply to the allegations of the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst.

[English]

My predecessors have on many occasions commented on the always difficult issue of determining what language is unparliamentary. They have often characterized this issue as a question of balance and they have been clear in insisting that every hon. member shares a part of the responsibility for using respectful language and so helping to maintain order in the House.

I refer hon. members to page 526 of the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* where it states:

In dealing with unparliamentary language, the Speaker takes into account the tone, manner and intention of the Member speaking; the person to whom the words were directed; the degree of provocation; and most importantly, whether or not the remarks created disorder in the Chamber. Thus, language deemed unparliamentary one day may not necessarily be deemed unparliamentary the following day.... Although an expression may be found to be acceptable, the Speaker has cautioned that any language which leads to disorder in the House should not be used. Expressions which are considered unparliamentary when applied to an individual Member have not always been considered so when applied "in a generic sense" or to a party.

It is only to be expected that we in this chamber will hear strong language and forceful expressions of opinion where there are strongly held views on contentious issues. The House of Commons is a place where competing ideas are tested and conflicting passions are given expression. Here in the chamber, members enjoy the privilege of freedom of speech that permits them to speak freely. This freedom however implies a great responsibility as well. We must bear in mind the potential impact of our comments.

It can have come as no surprise to the hon. member for Saskatoon—Humboldt that objection has been taken by members of this House to being characterized as "modern day Klansmen". This is the phrase he used in his original statement and a phrase he made a point of repeating in replying to the original objections raised.

There can be little doubt that the hon. member meant to provoke his colleagues, not merely to make a strong statement of his views.

Speaker's Ruling

Under the circumstances, I find that the language used is unparliamentary and I ask the hon. member to withdraw his comment immediately.

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, in order for me to properly reply to this, I need clarification. You stated that the member for Acadie—Bathurst rose on a point of order. In fact it was a question of privilege. Mr. Speaker, are you ruling that there is a prima facie case of privilege, yes or no?

The Speaker: I have given a ruling in which I have indicated that whether it is a question of privilege or a point of order, the hon. member will withdraw his words. I ask him to do so at once.

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, the sixth edition of Beauchesne's states in section 485(1) that unparliamentary language may be brought to the attention of the House by any member but when this is done, it must be done as a point of order and not a question of privilege.

In that regard, you will note from *Hansard* that the member for Acadie—Bathurst stood on a question of privilege, not a point of order as required—

• (1510)

The Speaker: I have heard argument on this point before. I heard the hon. member give his reply to the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst on a previous occasion. I am not disposed to hear further argument on the point at this time.

I am going to ask the hon. member to withdraw. If he chooses not to do so, I will deal with the matter in another way.

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, according to Erskine May, *Parliamentary Practice* 22nd edition, chapter 6, "Privilege of freedom of speech", a member is entitled to explain the sense in which he used the words so as to remove the objection of their being disorderly. I would now like to exercise that entitlement.

The Speaker: I will leave the matter there and deal with the matter in my own way. I have asked the hon. member to withdraw and he has refused to do so. Accordingly, I am not going to name the member, but he will have trouble speaking.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst on behalf of the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair concerning events in the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources on Thursday, November 21, 2002.

[Translation]

I would like to thank the hon. member for having drawn this matter to the Chair's attention as well as the hon. Government House Leader and the hon. members for South Shore, Sherbrooke and Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot for their contributions on this question. I would also like to thank the member for Nickel Belt, Chair of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources and the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair for their later interventions.

Points of Order

[English]

It is alleged that, while the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair was in the process of speaking on a motion to summon a witness to appear before the committee, the Chair intervened to suggest that the question be now put on the motion. This was done notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair had not concluded his remarks.

As Speaker, I appreciate the responsibility that I have to defend the rights of all members and especially those of members who represent minority views in the House. At the same time, it is a long tradition in this place that committees are masters of their own proceedings. Ordinarily the House is only seized of a committee matter when the committee reports to the House outlining the situation that must be addressed.

[Translation]

However, this is not an absolute requirement. As Speaker Fraser said in a ruling given on March 26, 1990 (*Debates*, p. 9756):

—in very serious and special circumstances, the Speaker may have to pronounce on a committee matter without the committee having reported to the House.

I listened carefully to the interventions that were made when this question was first raised and I have also examined the blues of the committee meeting which is at issue.

[English]

There are two points I would like to draw to the attention of all members. First of all, I would remind everyone that the liberty given to committees by the House to organize their business is not an absolute liberty. Standing Order 116 states:

In a standing, special or legislative committee, the Standing Orders shall apply so far as may be applicable, except the Standing Orders as to the election of a Speaker, seconding of motions, limiting the number of times of speaking and the length of speeches.

Committees are expected to follow the rules and practices of the House, unless specific exceptions are made, as in the rule just cited. Further, I think all members will agree that if a committee chooses to exercise its judgment in an area where it is not bound to follow the practices of the House, it must do so in a regular and orderly fashion. By this I mean it ought to proceed by adopting motions that set out the rules that the committee will follow in governing its work.

A second important point to make in this particular circumstance is that the use of the previous question, that is “that the question be now put”, is not permitted in committee.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* points out at page 786, the previous question is not permitted in any committee of the House, even a committee of the whole. This rule is found in all of our authorities dating as far back as the first edition of Erskine May in 1844. It is expected, not just by the Speaker, but also by the House itself that its committees will conduct business that is before them with consideration for these time-honoured practices.

● (1515)

[Translation]

That being said, it is true as well that committees are permitted a greater latitude in the conduct of their proceedings than might be allowed in the House. It may not always be clear in a particular set of

circumstances how best to proceed and so the ultimate decision is left to the committee itself.

[English]

Even the rulings of the chair of a committee may be made the subject of an appeal to the whole committee. The committee may, if it thinks appropriate, overturn such a ruling. In the case before us, I note that no formal appeal of the chair's ruling was made.

Where irregularities occur, or if a committee feels that there has been some disrespect of its authority, the committee may draw the matter to the attention of the House and the Speaker to the problem, by means of a report to the House.

In the present case the Speaker has been asked to reach into the proceedings of the committee to overturn something that was done there. Such requests have occurred on many occasions in the past and previous Speakers have, without exception, resisted the temptation to intervene.

The issue raised originally by the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst concerning the experience of the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair is an issue that lies within the power of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources to resolve. That is where it properly belongs. Although this is a serious matter, it is not one in which the Speaker feels compelled to intervene.

[Translation]

Once again, I would like to thank all hon. members who intervened on this matter.

[English]

The Chair has notice of a point of order from the hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ROMANOW COMMISSION REPORT LOCK-UP

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have two points of order but I will start with the first one, which is regarding a lock-up announcement for the Romanow report.

A letter was sent around from the Minister of Health indicating the commission's conditions for the lock-up tomorrow at 7:30 a.m. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have our own practices with respect to lock-ups and they are laid out in Marleau and Montpetit. The practice allows staff to attend and allows members to leave at any time they want. The commission's rules do not comply with our practice. As they say, when in Rome, or in this case, when in Parliament. On page 767 of Marleau and Montpetit it states in the footnotes:

Routine Proceedings

Members' research staff are usually allowed to attend... Members may not be prevented from leaving a lock-up room.

While the commission's conditions do not comply with these two practices I would think that since the lock-up is taking place on our turf, for a report intended for our use in the House, then our rules should apply.

I would ask that you do whatever you need to do, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that members' staff are permitted to attend this lock-up.

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. opposition House leader for his comments and for having raised this issue today.

Yesterday this was raised at our House leaders' meeting and I undertook at the time to do my best to ensure that the lock-up would be in the way in which we are accustomed to having it. I understand that there was, later that day, resistance on the part of some. I am happy to report that whoever it was changed his or her mind earlier today and that we are now able to have the lock-up tomorrow in a way that respects the traditions of the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for having raised this point of order. Perhaps we could have more clarifications regarding the traditions of the House. According to the most recent news that we have received, each member will be allowed one employee. There is also a great deal of confusion regarding whether or not members will even be allowed to leave the lock up, and things to that effect.

We would really like to maintain the tradition used in Parliament. We are used to it and we need our employees to help us with our work. We would like to know from the government what the tradition really is and which rules will be used.

[*English*]

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, this is not a government-sponsored lock-up. It is one that is organized by the commission. We have intervened everywhere that we could and I was given assurance today that a staff person could accompany a member to the lock-up, and pursuant to those traditions, staff people could use technical equipment such as recording devices, computers and so on. It is not a tradition to remove those from the room because it is the same as carrying documents out of the room. Those of course will have to remain behind.

If anyone were to suggest that an MP could not leave a lock-up inside a Parliament Building, I would suspect, although I have not heard that, that if anyone were to prevent an MP from leaving a lock-up within the building, it would probably result in another question being raised in the House. I believe the issue then would be similar to the one that was brought to the attention of the U.K. House of Commons in relation to one of the guards at Westminster. That incident has often been quoted in this place and I would not want that very badly.

I think everyone is aware of the rule that one cannot stop an MP from leaving a lock-up, particularly one who wants to attend to other parliamentary duties.

● (1520)

PASSPORTS

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order and I seek your advice on a serious issue.

A constituent of mine and his wife applied for Canadian passports. Instead of receiving two passports they received three. One passport belongs to some unknown individual. National security is important. A Canadian passport is an important document, particularly after the Auditor General's report on fraud and abuse of social insurance cards.

My constituent had no faith in the passport system so he came to my office and dropped off this passport. I do not know what to do with it. I would like to seek your advice—

The Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member feels the matter is serious, but I fail to see how it possibly concerns the rules or procedures of the House. Therefore it cannot be a point of order.

I would suggest he go and have a chat with the Minister of Foreign Affairs whose office issues these things. I am sure the minister would be delighted to talk with him and perhaps even have him for a cup of tea in his office.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to 10 petitions.

* * *

TERRORISM

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advise the House that the government has listed six more entities, pursuant to the Criminal Code, bringing to 13 the total designated since last July under Canada's Anti-terrorism Act.

The newly listed entities are the following: Islamic Army of Aden, Harakat ul-Mudjahidin, Asbat Al-Ansar, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, Jaish-e-Mohammed, and Hamas.

The decision to list an entity is a very serious one. The consequences are severe, not only for terrorists but for those who support them. The listing is a public confirmation that these entities are subject to engaged in terrorist activity.

It is now a crime to knowingly participate in, contribute to, or facilitate the activities of these entities. Any person or group that is listed may have its assets seized and forfeited. People or groups who deal with the property or finances of these entities are subject to severe penalties, including up to 10 years imprisonment.

Routine Proceedings

That is why the work to prepare for this listing is very thorough and deliberate. The listing of such entities is a work in progress. As we are listing these six entities today, steps are already underway for the next additions to the list.

I can assure the House and Canadians that there will be more. The government has always taken seriously its responsibilities to keep Canadians safe and secure. The tragic events of September 11, 2001, made this job even more important and its success even more critical.

Fighting terrorism is a top priority for the government and this list is one of the many steps we have taken in our fight against terror. After September 11 we moved quickly to implement our anti-terrorism plan which has four objectives: first, to stop terrorists from getting into Canada and protecting Canadians from terrorist acts; second, to enhance the tools we have to identify, prosecute, convict and punish terrorists; third, to prevent the Canada-U.S. border from being held hostage by terrorists who would want to affect the Canadian economy; and, fourth, to work with the international community to bring terrorists to justice and to address the root causes of this kind of hatred.

This is an important part of our effort to fight terrorism and keep Canadians safe and secure. It sends a strong message that Canada will not tolerate people who carry out terrorist acts and those who would support them.

• (1525)

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in response to the Solicitor General's statement regarding the listing of a further six entities pursuant to the Criminal Code.

It is somewhat of an understatement to say that the Solicitor General's claim that the government "moved quickly to implement the anti-terrorist plan" is a misnomer.

Bill C-36 received royal assent on December 18, 2001, yet it took the Solicitor General seven months to bring forward the first group of entities to be listed as illegal terrorist organizations. It took seven months for the government to determine that al-Qaeda was in fact a terrorist organization. It has now taken an additional four months for the government to finally determine and list Hamas as a terrorist organization, a fact that has long been recognized by the United Nations as well as many other countries.

Hamas, the Tamil Tigers and Hezbollah are among the over 200 organizations identified by the United Nations as terrorists. In July when the first seven entities were listed we, as well as many others, publicly criticized the government for failing to list Hezbollah. There have been ample justification and evidence, such as the 1983 truck bombing of a United States marine barracks in Beirut and the 1994 bombing of the Israeli cultural centre in Buenos Aires, proving that not only is Hezbollah a terrorist organization but it is one of the most violent. Hezbollah is known for using terrorist tactics, such as suicide bombings and missile attacks, to promote its agenda of imposing an Iranian style Islamic rule in the Middle East.

It is a well-known fact that Canadian intelligence agencies say that Hezbollah has operatives in every major city in the country and that it has been using Canada as an offshore base for a decade. In its 2000

report on international terrorism CSIS reported that Canada was a primary venue of opportunity to support, plan or mount terrorist attacks.

Just recently Senator Bob Graham of the senate intelligence committee in the United States described the leader of a Canadian cell of Hezbollah as making bin Laden look like a schoolboy. According to the United States, Canada is proving to be a true haven for Hezbollah and not only will the government not ban this known terrorist organization, we will not extradite Hezbollah members to the United States to face justice as it is requesting.

If the government were in fact truly committed to the global war on terrorism, the Solicitor General would ensure that the list is complete and that it does not take such an inordinate amount of time to bring forward those names and entities. Clearly, our intelligence agencies, particularly CSIS, are overwhelmed by the tremendous workload thrust upon them since September 11. By the CSIS director's own admission, more resources are needed if we are to determine and list all terrorist activity.

I implore the Solicitor General to list Hezbollah, to recognize that it is a threat to world peace and to the safety of Canadians.

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, given the importance of this issue, it is disappointing to see the shortness of the statement of the Solicitor General on terrorists, terrorism and innocent civilian victims.

The opportunity given to ministers to make statements in the House is usually a solemn occasion marking a major change in government policy. However, the Solicitor General's statement, far from meeting these criteria, shows the government's flippancy when it comes to fulfilling its responsibilities in the fight against terrorism.

This is not serious. In the fall of 2001, Bill C-36 was rammed through Parliament as if terrorism were a new reality. Then, it took the government almost a whole year to realize that the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Hamas are terrorist entities. Yet, for years now, they have been claiming responsibility for suicide attacks. Normally, it should not have taken close to a year to add these organizations to the list.

The addition at this point of these six entities to the very short list of organizations having direct or indirect ties with terrorist activities in Canada or abroad is stunning.

It seems to us that merely mentioning the name Hamas should be enough to trigger thoughts of terrorist activities in the Middle East and all over the world. The same is true of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

It would have been interesting to know why the government suddenly woke up today. This would have given some substance to the minister's statement.

Since the government singled out these organizations and put them on its list of terrorist entities, I am surprised that Hezbollah is not mentioned anywhere. We are fully aware that, as charities go, this entity is nothing like the Knights of Columbus.

Generally speaking, we feel that the government, particularly with Bill C-17, formerly known as Bill C-42 and Bill C-55, has not managed to strike a balance between public safety and individual rights and freedoms. The comments made by the Privacy Commissioner are evidence of that.

In conclusion, the Bloc Québécois is pleased that these entities were added to the government's list, but it is disappointed to see the Solicitor General using a piecemeal approach on such an important issue. We would to know when the list will be made longer, to paraphrase the Solicitor General, and we would like to know why it is currently not as complete as it should be.

[English]

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, I see the minister is returning and I am pleased he is. First, I want to congratulate the minister on the practice of making a statement to the House of Commons. It is a practice that should be followed much more regularly by the government and I regret that is not the case.

In the case of the Solicitor General's department, his statement proves that it is not fatal to give information to Parliament on questions of security. I raise that because this Government of Canada is probably the most secretive in the western world; secretive of all the democracies with respect to the information that it makes available to the elected Parliament of Canada with respect to matters of international security.

I raised the other day a position taken by the Canadian Security and Intelligence Service in which it claimed, as a matter of policy, that it did not reply to questions of members of the House of Commons.

The Speaker may recall that on an earlier occasion I asked the Prime Minister for information about al-Qaeda. He said that it would be a breach of national security to present that information. That very night, precisely the information that I had outlined of the al-Qaeda network was published on the website of the prime minister of the United Kingdom, indicating a far different standard for Parliament in that case.

There is a very real concern as to whether information on security matters is not only shared with Parliament, but is shared among departments of government. I am particularly concerned that the department, of which I once had the honour to be minister, the Department of Foreign Affairs, is not being kept advised on matters that should be within its purview because of turf wars over intelligence in the government.

Routine Proceedings

I am bound to say that I think all of us in the House have heard enough from the Solicitor General saying that there is a process in place when we put questions to him. The only process in place that we have been able to identify is to keep this Parliament as much in the dark as possible.

I find it very curious in his statement today that the minister says that there will be more lists. Is that a guess or does he know of other organizations that will go on the list? If he knows, why is he delaying adding those organizations to the list? This is not a matter about which the Solicitor General should tease public opinion. There will be a stigma attached to organizations that are not on the list, knowing that there is another shoe to drop and knowing that the minister has a group in mind but he is not, for some reason or another, prepared to add them to the list yet.

One of the things we would like to know is the procedure that is followed by the government and what sources of information and intelligence it bases its decisions on when it adds to this list.

● (1535)

The Speaker: I regret to interrupt the right hon. member, but as he knows, the rules are quite explicit and the right hon. member does not get any more time than the minister did in making the statement. I am afraid his time has expired.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources regarding its order of reference of Tuesday, October 29 in relation to Bill C-4, an act to amend the Nuclear Safety and Control Act.

The committee has considered Bill C-4 and reports the bill without amendment.

The Speaker: Introduction of private members' bills.

The hon. member for Peterborough on a point of order.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, could we return to presenting reports from committees, which we just finished prematurely?

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

*Routine Proceedings***PETITIONS**

COAST GUARD

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present to day. The first petition has to do with the concerns of some constituents and others about the funding of the Coast Guard. The petitioners bring to the attention of the House the fact that there was what they might refer to as a botched rescue attempt this summer after the capsizing of a vessel. They blame that on the lack of funding by the government for the Coast Guard. They would like to see that funding restored and they would like Parliament to separate the Coast Guard from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

• (1540)

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in the second petition, the petitioners call to the attention of the House their concerns about child pornography. They suggest that the courts have not applied current child pornography laws in a way that Parliament had intended.

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

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on the protection of children against pedophilia and sado-masochistic activities. The petitioners call upon Parliament to protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, back in May I asked Question No. 167 and the question was repeated in October. The question has to do with the failure of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to enforce the Fisheries Act and the Navigable Waters Protection Act. The question dealt with the simple matter of numbers of fish farms that have been licensed.

Apparently the government has to ask the provinces for the answer that it should know. If the government really does not know the answer, could it tell me it does not know rather than keeping me in suspense?

This matter is well over the 45 days notice.

Mr. Geoff Regan: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for this question as well as his written one. I can advise him that I have information that indicates that the answer to his question is being prepared. However I will certainly endeavour to contact those who are preparing it and urge haste upon them to try to get this answer for him as quickly as possible.

The Speaker: Shall all questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have had an opportunity after your calling me to a halt moments ago to check House Standing Order 33(1) relating to statements by ministers. It states:

A Member from each of the parties in opposition to the government may comment briefly thereon.

There is no reference to equivalent time. It then goes on to state:

The time for such proceedings shall be limited as the Speaker deems fit.

I of course respect the authority and decisions of the Chair and expect to be guided by the same rules as other members in the House. We have not had much experience in this Parliament with the practice of ministerial statements. I hope we will have more.

I would hope also that the Speaker may have an opportunity to reflect upon the flexibility available to members responding to statements, bearing in mind that while the minister in this case did the House the courtesy of making a copy of his statement available in advance, that is not always the practice and a rigid adherence to a rule of equivalency would put some limitations upon members of the opposition.

The Speaker: I would cite for the right hon. member the guidelines I was following that are set out in Marleau and Montpetit at pages 378 and 379. They are ones that in my experience in the House have been fairly strictly observed for many years. The guidelines state:

During "Statements by Ministers", Ministers are expected to make brief and factual statements on government policy or announcements of national interest. Only Members speaking on behalf of parties recognized by the House are permitted to speak in response to a Minister's statement. However, with the unanimous consent of the House, other Members have been allowed to respond. In responding to the statement, Members are not permitted to engage in debate or ask questions of the Minister. The length of each response may not exceed the length of the Minister's statement; Members who exceed this length are interrupted by the Speaker. The rules provide no explicit limitation of time allotted to the Minister or the overall time to be taken for these proceedings, although the duration of the proceedings can be limited at the discretion of the Chair.

I hope the citation helps the right hon. member. I am sorry to have had to interrupt him, but I did enforce the same time rules, I assure him, with respect to the other hon. members who spoke. In fact, I was signalling quite vigorously the hon. member for Crowfoot to indicate that his time had expired, and he sat down before I got up.

* * *

• (1545)

[Translation]

MOTION FOR PAPERS

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Points of Order

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

POINTS OF ORDER

KYOTO PROTOCOL RATIFICATION MOTION

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Yesterday in the other place a point of order was raised regarding the Kyoto motion that I believe must be raised in this House as well.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the motion in the Senate is identical to the motion before the House. While the Speaker in the Senate has reserved his decision, I do not think that should be a deterrent to raising it at this time, since the Senate Speaker's ruling, while we would of course consider it, is not binding on the House and in the past conflicting rulings on an identical matter have been brought down. Bill S-13 from the last Parliament comes to mind. The Senate Speaker ruled that it did not infringe on the financial privileges of the Commons and the Commons Speaker ruled that it did.

In any event, I hope the Senate Speaker rules before Françoise Ducros gets appointed there and becomes the Senate's next Speaker.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister appoints the Senate Speaker, another reason why we should be raising the matter here with our duly secret-ballot elected Speaker.

Having said that, I will go over the points made in the Senate and add a few more to those arguments.

Points were made regarding statements in the press that Parliament would ratify the Kyoto protocol and the statements were attributed to statements made by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister gave the impression that Parliament would ratify Kyoto, and the motion that we ended up with calls on the government to ratify.

Although this adds to the confusion over the issue, what is more important is that Senator Cools and Senator Kinsella argued that the government motion calling on the government to ratify the Kyoto protocol could not be considered a government motion. They argued that a motion that calls on the Senate to recommend something to the government could hardly be considered a government motion.

In our case, the motion calls on the House to recommend something to the government. That is the job of private members during private members' business and it is the job of opposition parties on supply days.

I would like to point out to the government that if it thinks that by passing a motion calling on itself to do something it will get action, I advise the government to check its own record in these matters. The government should know that it does not listen. The last NDP supply day is a perfect example. Our supply motion dealing with the conditions that must be met before Kyoto is ratified is another example. The government ignored those motions and many others like them.

Or maybe the government will comply only with motions that call on itself to act. The government does not mind telling itself what to do; the government just does not like it when others tell it what to do. I have some news for the government: the House speaks with one voice, and when it adopts a resolution the respect given to the motion should be the same no matter who sponsors the motion. Motions should not be judged by the colour of the sponsor's party banner but by the content of the motion adopted by the House.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, you made a ruling in regard to the motion in the name of the right hon. member from Calgary. He had placed a motion on the Order Paper instructing a committee, asking it to determine the level of provincial support for Kyoto. The motion was listed to be moved under the rubric "Motions". I suspect it was there because the member asked that it be placed there. However, Mr. Speaker, you ruled that it should properly be placed on the Order Paper as a private member's motion. As a result, its designation was changed and it was moved.

It is very important to get these things right, Mr. Speaker, because as you know there are different rules for different motions. The case of the motion from the right hon. gentleman is a good example. If the member's motion would have been allowed to be placed under "Motions", it could have been moved as early as today at routine proceedings. Now that it is a private member's motion, the member will have to wait until his name is drawn in a lottery, and by the time that takes place Kyoto will have destroyed our economy.

This illustrates that the Speaker can decide these matters and it also illustrates what a difference a designation makes with respect to a motion.

● (1550)

One of the points made in the Senate was in regard to the Senate's rule of closure. The same argument can be made in the House. It is not a surprise that the Canadian Alliance will do whatever it can to prevent any ratification of the Kyoto protocol. With the government's record of using 80 closure motions, it is no surprise that it might use closure. In any event, the motion is eligible for closure and any motion that is closure worthy will be too irresistible for the government House leader to pass on his favourite pastime of moving closure.

Senator Kinsella pointed out the absurdity of the government asking the House to ask itself and then forcing the issue through closure of the government asking the House to ask itself. It is kind of a schizophrenic situation.

The government has many prerogatives that private members do not. It controls most of the business of the House. It can move certain motions and bills that private members cannot, like bills requiring royal recommendations. It can raise taxes through ways and means motions and it decides how the money is spent. Does it really need to be muscling in on private members' turf?

Does it need to beg itself to do something? While it is not always dignified, it is the role of private members and the opposition to beg the government. Maybe the Liberals see the writing on the wall and are already in opposition mode, calling on the government to take action. Maybe they have some internal polls they are not sharing with us.

Government Orders

Under the circumstances, I am tempted to recommend that this motion be moved to private members' business or be considered as a supply motion, but since it is sponsored by a cabinet minister it is disqualified. It is disqualified as a private member's motion, a supply motion and a government motion. To complete the set, I would argue that it cannot be moved as a motion under routine proceedings either because, as you have pointed out many times, Mr. Speaker, very few opportunities exist for private members' motions or motions of a private member's nature to be moved under the rubric "Motions".

The fate of the motion, Government Business No. 9, should be that it be removed altogether from the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, I would also ask again for your considered opinion. Until you have given us a decision on this point of order and the other point of order, I would recommend for your consideration the actions of the Speaker in the other place, whereby he set aside the motion until he could come back with a decision as to the efficacy of moving forward with the motion at this time.

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that for the most part you have dealt with the substance of this point of order already. When the hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia speaks about statements of the Prime Minister in the media that Parliament would ratify the Kyoto protocol, it is clear that we all know here that we use words in different ways. We do not always, when we are outside this place, and even inside, use words in the strict legal sense. I am sure that my hon. friend and his colleagues would be the last ones to want us to always use legalistic phraseology in this chamber.

In this case it has been made clear that the Prime Minister and cabinet do respect Parliament and want to hear from Parliament on this. They have asked for Parliament to give its advice on the question of ratification, and yes, they have made it clear it is their intention to do so, but they certainly want to hear from Parliament, and I think they would like to hear from all sides of Parliament, not just repetitive statements from one side of the House, which we have heard over and over.

For example, we know that the hon. member for Red Deer was told the Speaker he is going to repeat himself. He said nine times that he was going to repeat himself. Nine times he stated this to the Speaker, so it seems to me that if he is going to say that nine times that is a clear admission of repetition.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that this point of order is not a point of order and that, as you have ruled already, clearly the motion is in order.

●(1555)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia indicated to the Chair that he had an open and shut case. The parliamentary secretary to the government House leader has indicated his views on the matter so I will now indicate mine. I am quite prepared to dispose of the point of order immediately.

Page 406 of Marleau and Montpetit states:

Any item of business proposed by a Minister outside of proceedings on Supply, Ways and Means, and bills is listed under the heading "Government Business". They typically include, for example, motions to establish special committees, to refer

business to committees, to propose a resolution declaratory of some opinion, or to make arrangements for the conduct of the business of the House.

I will skip on to:

The business that the House is to consider during Government Orders is determined solely by the government.

It seems to me the government can put before the House any motion it wishes. We have had some motions in my own experience urging the government to proceed with a war, urging the government to do this or do that, stating the opinion of this House, and all those motions have been held to be in order.

In my view this motion is in order. We are debating it. The debate is underway. The motion was put to the House. I had numerous arguments before it was put as to whether it was acceptable and in every case I ruled that it was.

In my view, the point of order is not well taken and the motion is in fact properly before the House and is one that can be debated by the House, as we have been enjoying for the last couple of days.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

The House resumed from November 26 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement, government orders will be extended by 12 minutes.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly nice to be back. I got out of the swing of talking about Kyoto.

The most exciting part of this is that Canadians are engaging in the debate. The e-mails and calls are amazing. I would not believe that I would suggest to anyone watching, to those reporters watching, that they make sure to tell people to send their e-mails and faxes and make their telephone calls to the Prime Minister's Office so he can know what Canadians think about this whole issue.

So as not to repeat anything that I said in the last couple of days, I want to start off by talking about the provinces. We need to talk about the fact that the provinces were supposed to have a meeting on November 21 but it was postponed by the government. There was no new material. The second edition did not rate any change.

The meeting was postponed until Friday, November 29, two days from now. That meeting has now been cancelled and has not been rescheduled. All the provinces say the federal government is not proceeding in good faith.

Government Orders

I will use some quotes from across the provinces so that members understand what the various provincial ministers and premiers are saying about the government's action to ram through this debate in the House and to ratify this very important treaty before Christmas. That is what this is all about. It is all about the actions of the government, which has known about climate change since 1992 when it signed the first agreement. In 1997 it signed the Kyoto accord, and now, all of a sudden, it has to be ratified by Christmas.

The reason it has to be ratified by Christmas is that the government fears that when Canadians find out what it is the government is committing them to, they will be totally and absolutely opposed to it. The Canadians out there who really matter are the moms and dads who will be taking their kids to the hockey game tonight after work. They are the single moms who are trying to make a go of it. They are the people on fixed incomes who, because of our demographics, are increasing. Those are the Canadians who matter. Those are the Canadians who will be affected by Kyoto. The government is ignoring them by ramming this through.

Let us examine where the provinces are at on this issue. Let us start way out west in British Columbia, a long way from planet Ottawa. Let us hear what the premier had to say, who by the way the Prime Minister called down here to try to divide and concur, and with whom he tried to make a special deal. The only problem is it did not work very well. The premier was on television last night saying it is a bad deal, that it is something we should not be going ahead with, that it is something that needs a lot more discussion, a lot more costing and a lot more discussion on the implementation.

I will speak about the first plan and the second plan. For people to keep track of what this is, the first plan is the one that was issued on October 28. The second so-called plan was the one that was prepared for the meeting on November 21. These are the closest things the government has to some kind of statement as to what it is going to do, what implementation might include, but it will not reveal any of the costs of it.

Mr. Campbell, the Premier of British Columbia, said that this is no way to build a country. He said:

We are not going to stand by while the federal plan, the favoured plan, blows away 11,000 British Columbia jobs.

That is his evaluation of the first plan. Then we go on to the second plan. Remember that the Prime Minister attempted to coerce him in between. He said:

British Columbia has grave concerns about the Kyoto accord. There is no implementation plan, there are no targets that have been set. The federal scenarios that we see, British Columbia seems to be taking a greater hit in terms of job loss, a greater hit in terms of gross domestic product and that is not acceptable to us.

• (1600)

That is fairly clear. I could quote the energy minister and the environment minister of British Columbia, but I think that gets the point across. British Columbia is saying no way to the Kyoto accord, no way to ratification by the end of December, and no way to proceeding with the plan.

Moving on to Alberta, many people do not know Alberta's stand on this but let me quote Mr. Klein about the first plan. There have been many quotes but I will choose one. "We are giving as strong a signal as we possibly can that the Kyoto protocol, as it is now

written, is the wrong way to go". That was on November 5. The energy minister, Mr. Smith, around the same time said, "It is a long way from completion. It is very clear that they are not ready".

Of course the environment minister, who largely has carried the ball for Alberta, has made many comments about how there is no plan, there is no costing, how they have not been consulted, and how there has not been anything to allow the ratification of this protocol. Remember, as I pointed out, there are penalties when we ratify.

Mr. Taylor commented on the second plan, the one issued a month later. He said, "It is a clear breach of trust. It looks just like the original plan that all of the provinces rejected. One might say it is like putting lipstick on a pig". That is fairly clear as to how acceptable this plan is to Alberta and how ready Alberta is that the government should ram through the ratification, should do it now, and then force it on the provinces, on industry, and on the Canadian people.

Moving east to Saskatchewan, Mr. Eldon Lautermilch, the industry and resources minister, has had a lot to say on television. A lot of people would be familiar with him. Saskatchewan derides the document as a non-plan. "No detail, no specific information, no cost estimates", said Mr. Lautermilch, the Saskatchewan industry minister.

Then he got the second draft, which I intend to review today. I reviewed the first draft yesterday and I will review the second draft today. He said, "I can say from our perspective it is not acceptable in any way, shape or form from what we see". Three provinces have spoken out. He further said that the province will not accept the plan for the ratification of Kyoto. It will not accept the plan.

If members recall, we have a Prime Minister who does not care. There is a potential future prime minister who says we should not ratify this agreement unless we have the full cooperation of the provinces. It is time that the future prime minister stood up, was honest with Canadians and said, "That is what I believe. I know the implementation can only work if the provinces are on side, and I do not believe they are on side yet".

Let us move on to the Prime Minister's beloved Manitoba, the one province that is on side. Mr. Tim Sale is the minister of energy for Manitoba. Remember that Manitoba wants to take hydro power, get credit for it, run it to Sault Ste. Marie, provide however many thousand kilowatts per day and have a guaranteed source of income from Ontario because it will capture half of that energy market. That is not about the environment; it is about economics.

Government Orders

●(1605)

Let us hear what he has to say about the first plan. The New Democratic provincial minister said, “Everybody in Canada now agrees that we've got to lower our greenhouse gas emissions and that's a real step forward. The question is what is the plan going to be and how are we do it so we share the load and share the benefits? That hardly sounds like a great endorsement for Kyoto or for the plan. That is reading between the lines. We do not know what the plan is so we do not know if we are for it. Remember, they are supporters of it.

With regard to the second plan, the conservation minister, Steve Ashton, said, “It's time to move beyond the issue of Kyoto, yes or no. It's time to move on to the issue of whether we can have a real Canadian plan that's going to have a substantive response in terms of greenhouse gases”. That is a question. He is saying that he wants to see the plan and how it will be implemented, then he will support it. He is saying that there has to be a real Canadian plan. Who does not believe that? If that is outright support, then I would hate to see the ones who are opposed if that is the best they can say about this government. That is almost a condemnation of the government for not having a plan. That is the best friend the government has in terms of Kyoto.

I do not know if you were part of this before, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to give an update of the number of cars parked out front because a lot of viewers are very interested in that. Just prior to Question Period 13 cars were parked out front and three were running. It is interesting to note that so many were turned off in a day. I wonder if next week they will still be running. At present the Prime Minister has four big black limos outside, with red lights on top, and they are all running. That is just an update so people will know what kind of example the government is showing in front of the House of Commons. Obviously we would not want anyone to catch a cold.

Let me move on to Ontario where I can provide lots of quotes from the Ontario environment minister. Speaking about the first plan, the Ontario environment minister said, as noted in *The Star*, “Candidly I think the federal government has misread the provincial mood and the public's mood. They want the information and without the information they are not prepared to take a flyer on this one. We should not have a vote until we can have a first ministers meeting to really seriously look at a plan”.

That makes a lot of sense. All those people in Hamilton on Sunday said they did not know about this. They never thought it would affect them. They did not know they would have to slow their cars down. They did not know they would have to have smaller cars. They did not know they would have higher power bills and heating bills.

The government did not tell them its plan and how it would be implemented. That is exactly the point. The government has not told the provinces, industry, the small businessman, Canadians, or the mom who is taking her kid to hockey after school. The government has not told anybody its plan. It does not know what the plan is. It does not know how it will be implemented. It does not know what it will cost.

Let me go on to the second plan and what the environment minister had to say about it. He said “We haven't seen any funds set aside. We have not seen any commitment to dollars and we really haven't seen the cost projections of what Kyoto will be”.

There is no plan. The government does not know what it will cost. The government does not know how it will be implemented. Ontario is a long way from being on side as well and is asking for a plan and a cost of implementation.

●(1610)

Let us move on to Quebec, the other friend of the federal government. Let us look what the environment minister had to say on the first plan. He said, “We stopped debating the opportunity of the ratification and we then decided to concentrate ourselves and our efforts on the implementation plan of the federal government”. Quebec wants to talk about the implementation plan and it has given up trying to get any ideas about ratification: let us do it and let us get on. However, it has asked for the costs and how it will be implemented. That is hardly an endorsement.

Mr. Boisclair tabled a motion calling for a new deal with Ottawa and all the parties in the legislature supported him. He said, “If the current plan is far removed from the principle of polluter pays, it is geared toward the principle of polluter pays. This approach goes against Quebec's vision because it attempts to protect the businesses that produce the most greenhouse gases. This proposal softens the impact of the protocol implementation on the sectors that emit the most greenhouse gases to the detriment of the manufacturing sector which is very present in Quebec”.

That is an endorsement. In other words, he is saying that we have to give them credit for a lot of different things, that we have to have a whole different plan if they are to buy in and that we had better not count on support for the implementation plan unless we take these things into consideration. That is a big caveat. That is why all provinces are not showing up on Friday, including Manitoba and Quebec. They do not agree with this government's mini me plan which simply will not work.

Let us move on to New Brunswick. Jeannot Volpé said, “Within the next few weeks or month, we will be in a much better position to see what the financial impact will be on New Brunswick”. New Brunswick is concerned about the financial impact on it

On the second plan, the energy minister went on to say that the Kyoto accord was a moving target. He said his main concern was remaining competitive with the United States and getting credit for emissions cut on power sold to the U.S. He said, “Eighty-eight per cent of our exports are going to the United States. If the emissions reductions that we are achieving in New Brunswick cannot be credited it will be a major challenge”.

Government Orders

Again I apologize. I went through all the reasons why we will get clean energy credits. The bottom line is Europe will not give them to Russia for the natural gas that Russia provides Europe so why would the Europeans agree to give them to Canada for sending clean energy to the U.S. which is a non-Kyoto participant? We cannot have a deal with a non-Kyoto participant because it would totally upset the whole European plan and would require a great deal more credits that it would have to buy from Russia.

Obviously, New Brunswick has a major concern. I come back again to the guy that picked me up at the airport when he said, "Hey, you guys in the federal government are about to knock us down when we have our first chance to stand up on our own two feet". That is exactly what that minister had to say.

Let us move on to Nova Scotia and hear what Mr. Gordon Balsler the vice chair of the committee had to say.

• (1615)

Mr. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been listening to the member and I am a little confused. I know he has been going on for a couple of days. For me to understand, is this somebody who picked him up at the airport a minister?

I know that the Alliance has complained that we have nothing to do, but it is about time the hon. member start making some sense. A minister does not pick him up at the airport. It must have been a taxi driver. Therefore, I am confused as to who picked him up at the airport.

Mr. Grant McNally: That is not a point of order. That is debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Exactly, this is not a point of order.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, I will move on to Nova Scotia and will quote the energy minister there, Mr. Gordon Balsler, who is also the vice-chair of the province's committee. He said, "They have repeatedly treated the provinces and territories, I think, with contempt". The Nova Scotia energy minister went on to say that this was a charade of a partnership and the way the government has treated the provinces and territories had been fairly dismissive.

Obviously we are getting our verdict and I hope that the future prime minister is hearing that message loud and clear, about the cooperation of the provinces. All these quotes are from the last month and are on where the provinces stand on the issue today.

Let us finish off with Newfoundland. Premier Roger Grimes has been the major spokesman there. He said that what they were being told was "It doesn't matter what you say. We're doing this anyway". He went on to say, "From what I know of it today, I think we will be left with no option but to examine every single avenue for us to resist any unilaterally imposed sanctions upon Newfoundland and Labrador".

That is pretty clear. I have gone through the provinces and everyone has heard what each one has had to say about the government plan. The last comment probably summed it up best.

Yesterday someone from the other side stood up and said that it really did not matter what we said in the House. The government will not listen to the provinces, members of Parliament, the Canadian people or the Canadian industry. It will ratify Kyoto by the end of the

year and if we do not vote for it, there will be an election. That is where it is at. No blackmail. No ifs, ands, or buts. That is a dictatorship. That is how dictators talk and I think Canadians are starting to get pretty tired of that kind of action.

Canadians want to understand what Kyoto is. They want to cooperate. They want their provinces to participate. They want industry to participate. Now, industry is ready to participate. Somebody yesterday said that industry did not care.

I am holding an ad by Shell Oil from *The Economist* in which it promotes clean air. Shell Oil is saying that it wants to clean up the air and to be players. It is interesting that it has also invested 25% in alternate energy for the future. It wants to sell energy, whether it is carbon, solar or hydrogen. How can anyone say that industry does not want to participate? It wants to participate but it does not want to be dictated to. Those people who industry does not want to participate are obviously not on top of this issue and do not know what they are talking about.

When it comes to cooperation, I think we have demonstrated that there is none, that this will be rammed through and that members of Parliament will have to go home. As Kyoto unfolds and as its implementation begins, the price of fuel will go up and the requirements of implementation will start to grind down, because remember that by 2005 we have to show substantial decreases in CO₂ levels.

When that starts to happen, members of Parliament will have to answer their constituents' questions. Their constituents will pull out some of these quotes, and the media is aware of these things, and ask us where we were in informing them about Kyoto and its implications and did we tell the Prime Minister that he needed to consult.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest, Terrorism.

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that consultation must occur and that the provinces must be brought on side.

I have a number of items that I would like to cover today. One of them has to do with the IPCC modelling that has been done; that the government has chosen to nitpick and cherry-pick the good stuff and leave out the bad stuff. I also want to talk about the analysis of the second report.

Government Orders

Unfortunately, I only analyzed the first report into about four or five pages. The second report I thought we should do in a little more detail. I have about half of it completed at this point. I would like to do a clause by clause discussion of that. I will try to abbreviate it as much as I can but we really need to do a pretty major analysis of it, which is what no one else has done, and certainly the government has not done. It certainly has never been sent to a committee where a committee could call witnesses and try to analyze what exactly Kyoto is all about and its impacts. Obviously if it had been sent to a committee it could have done this clause by clause study and analyzed this protocol.

However it has been thrown into the House and we are told it will be ratified, whether we like it or not, and that it will happen before Christmas and tough luck. None of the provinces agree. Nobody agrees but it will happen to us.

I guess if there is one purpose of my standing here it is to let the government know that we do not agree with the way it is handling this file. It should have been dealing with this file in a committee in a proper and democratic way in the House.

Obviously there are many things we could say as we get into this. The major thing is that the government says that Kyoto will only cost pennies. Only 3¢ will be added to a barrel of oil and only 13¢ will be added to a barrel of oil for its extraction, which is an additional cost from the tar sands.

We have to remember the importance of the tar sands. They represent a supply of oil bigger than Saudi Arabia, that it is a major part of Canada's economy and that 60% of the dollars spent on the tar sands are spent in the province of Ontario; 60% of that money will go to manufacturing jobs in Ontario.

I received a call from a truck driver who owns five trucks. He had a contract to haul pipe from Hamilton to Alberta as part of the oil industry. All of a sudden he was given 30 days notice that his contract was over, that he would stop hauling pipe. He asked, "Is it because I have done the job poorly or is it because I have not delivered on time? I thought everything was fine". The company said that everything was fine and that he was doing a great job. Everything was right on time. However the uncertainty of Kyoto has resulted in an investment freeze in that industry and the company will not take that pipe any more. The owner of those trucks here in Ontario said that he had to lay off four of his drivers because of that.

I am sure the people producing the pipe also had to lay people off because that pipe was not in demand any more.

For people to think that Kyoto will not have an impact across this country, they are totally wrong. Anybody who says that it will not have an impact is simply not telling the truth.

Obviously there have been all kinds of reports. I want to talk about the modelling. We see headlines that state that Kyoto could push the cost of gasoline to \$1 a litre. I think if the Europeans had their way they would probably like to see it at \$2 a litre.

• (1625)

The only person who will benefit, certainly in the cabinet over there, will be the environment minister who drives an energy efficient car. However when he tried to encourage the other ministers

to drive energy efficient cars, none of them responded. Now we only have two. We also will have a check soon on how many cars are outside and how many are running, just to keep everyone posted.

There was a recent report done by an economist here in Ontario about the costs. There have been many reports, and I do not want to say that this one is the most accurate, but this is just one example of the costs. The report came to the conclusion that we should go with a middle of the road model. We must remember that the government cherry-picked the bottom end model, but going with sort of the middle of the road model, this is the report's findings.

The report states that to get to 6% below 1990 levels under a fully implemented Kyoto, which is what we are talking about, we would need to have a natural gas price increase of 90%. We would need to have a gasoline price increase of 50% as a minimum or between 30¢ to 35¢ per litre. The average household would expect to pay \$2,700 per year. The Kyoto plan will do nothing to reduce global warming.

The government talks about all this voluntary stuff. I have driven on the highways in Ontario. If people would slow down to 100 kilometres per hour, that would be a huge saving. The speed limit of course is 100 kilometres per hour, but the government is talking about reducing the speed limit, putting tolls on roads and having people drive smaller cars. Will Canadians do that when they do not see the benefits, when they do not see the results, when they have not bought into the plan and when the provinces are not being consulted? I do not think so.

We can go on to talk about the effects of GDP. We can talk about the industry minister's officials who did their research and said that the government was underestimating in its modelling by at least 30%. If one government department is saying that it is under by 30%, who knows what that might be? When has anyone found government to be accurate in its estimate of costs?

Many of us will remember Bill C-68, one of the most famous bills, where the government estimated \$87 million and now it has been estimated at \$1.53 billion for the next couple of years. That is how inaccurate government estimates usually are.

Again I come back to the point that every single member in the House, every one of us, you and me included, Mr. Speaker, will have to tell that fixed income person, that mom and dad with two kids, that lady driving her son to the hockey game right now, before we knew the costs, before we knew how it would be implemented and before we knew the plan, why we agreed and how we could possibly vote to ratify something like that. How does one justify that? I really do not have any idea.

I have heard the minister often say that there was no investment freeze and nothing was happening. However we have headline after headline. This one involves EnCana, which says that it has shifted investment out of Canada for the fourth quarter because of the uncertainty of what ratification will do. That is a large company. The article is dated November 20. It is pretty recent stuff. That is exactly what is happening in company after company after company. They are sending—

Government Orders

•(1630)

Mr. Janko Perić: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe the hon. member is repeating himself. Did we not hear that yesterday? Did anyone notice that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): That is not a point of order at all.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the members across the way are giving me a break and giving me a chance to have a drink of water. I appreciate their consideration and concern but I am just fine. I believe so strongly that what the government is doing and how it is misleading the Canadian people that I think I could stand here until Christmas or after Christmas just to make that point.

Let us go on. One company has said that Kyoto will cost oil sands projects \$100 million. Others are announcing a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there. I have an interesting one. The president of Syncrude is a friend of the government, has consulted with the government and has had dinner with the Prime Minister when he was here. He has done so much for the development of the tar sands but he has been a very close friend of the Prime Minister. He says that Canadians do not realize that the reductions promised are so significant that only if we eliminated all transportation, planes, cars, trucks, rail, could we meet the targets. If we shut down all the oil, natural gas and coal industries, we would only get halfway there.

Those are the targets we will be signing onto. A friend of the government is telling us to look at the targets and to look at how big they are. What does the government not get about that? How can the government not get it when even a friend has said that and has delivered that message during a dinner at 24 Sussex.

This friend has said that Kyoto means that these projects will be put on ice. That means jobs, income, GDP and our standard of living, which is what we all depend on in a modern industrialized country. Does the minister want to drive this country into third world status? Is that what his aim is? Kyoto, obviously, is just one more part of the legacy of the Prime Minister to drive us under.

I have to repeat this, and I apologize for repeating anything, but there is so much that needs to be said. According to the Marrakesh accord, "Nations that ratify Kyoto but do not meet their targets in round one by 2012, will be penalized another 30% in emissions cuts and, in addition, such nations cannot sell carbon credits in round two. If at the end of this period, a party's emissions are still greater than its assigned amount, it must make up the difference in the second commitment period, plus a penalty of 30%. It will also be barred from selling under emissions trading and within three months it must develop a compliance action plan detailing the action it will take in order to meet this commitment".

The accord goes on to say that a nation can make up a deficit if it wants by buying the credits from a country like Russia, a country that has much dirtier industries than we do, but we will send Russia money to buy its hot air under the Kyoto accord.

If we ratify Kyoto and do not meet those targets, there are penalties. For any future prime minister to stand up and say, "Look Canadians and industry, we will let him ratify it. It is good to give him his legacy, but if it is going to hurt our country or our industries, we will just opt out of it. We just will not do it". That does not put

much onus on one's signature. I like dealing with people where word of mouth is everything and a handshake means they will deliver.

Obviously if we sign on, if what a future prime minister is suggesting, we are not even good for a signature let alone a handshake.

•(1635)

What does that say about our country? What kind of legacy is that for our children and grandchildren? I do not think the minister or the Prime Minister care about that. They want to bull ahead with this thing and they really do not care. I do not think that is where Canadians are at. I am sure of that. It is an irresponsible action.

Many people are saying that we need to have a lot of things happen before ratification. I have four letters here that have been written by pretty important groups: the Canadian manufacturers and the Canadian coalition for responsible environmental solutions. I have a letter from the mayor of my city written to the Prime Minister, which is after a great deal of discussion about Kyoto. I have another letter written by the chamber of commerce. All of these people say that we should not ratify Kyoto until we know the cost and we have an implementation plan.

The number of people who are saying that is huge. In fact 71% of Canadians are now saying that, until there is a plan and until we have the cooperation of the provinces, we should not ratify. Boy, is that a change? A year ago I could probably not have interested anybody in talking about Kyoto. Today I could go to any city anywhere in Canada and get a crowd to talk about Kyoto. That is how much more interest there is.

If there are some Liberal members who want to put together some ridings and have me debate Kyoto with the environment minister, I would love to have that challenge. That would be the thing to which I would look forward to more than anything else. But I imagine that the minister will not accept that.

It was pretty interesting to be at a breakfast meeting in Victoria and realize how little a large number of the business community and professionals know about Kyoto. That is from the minister's riding. It is shocking that they know so little about Kyoto.

Obviously Canadians do not understand it very well. Canadians also need to be sure that they understand the 12 requirements of the provinces. I meant to mention that when I was talking about the provincial issue. I will not read all 12 at this point, but I really think that the 12 issues that the provinces want to hear, want to have answered, are the ones that the government needs to address.

Government Orders

I would like to talk about the modelling. The government says that models are the key. We had a few members across the way make sarcastic comments about models yesterday. Obviously they think it is a fairly funny issue. I do not find any humour at all in Kyoto. I do not find any humour at all in the potential of what it could do to our country. I find it an extremely serious matter. So when I talk about modelling, it is important that we look at some of the input.

First, we must go back in time to look at what changes have happened over the last 1,000 to 2,000 years. We must remember that the science has been done, the figures and the detail on how much rain there was, how many droughts there were, what kind of life existed and what was the chemical makeup of the air. The science has been done through ice samples and cores. There was a major study done in western Canada where cores were taken out of slough bottoms and interesting things were found.

• (1640)

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for interrupting the hon. member. I know he was just getting ready to wrap up his comments. In view of the great interest in this debate, I would ask for unanimous consent that the House continue to sit after the ordinary time of adjournment until 10 p.m. to consider Government Business No. 9 in order to have a more fulsome debate on the Kyoto protocol.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, it is pretty amazing that the government keeps trying to play these games.

We came back here for a throne speech and in the throne speech the government promised all kinds of weird and wonderful things. We have not seen anything. All we have seen is reintroduced bills. Committees have just been studying old bills. The government has been playing games month after month and now all of a sudden, as we get close to Christmas, it starts introducing things like the Romanow report and Kyoto. What kind of a game is the government playing?

Why would we agree to do things differently for it when in fact it has had nothing on the agenda? It has had to filibuster its own motions and has had to close the House on several occasions because it did not have any speakers here. For the most part quorum could be called here a hundred times a day and there would be no one here. Those are the kinds of games that the government plays. It has its nerve to stand up and do that sort of thing. Canadians are getting pretty sick and tired of that kind of non performance from their government and the kind of dictatorial nonsense that it is trying to impose on us.

Let us get back to talking about Kyoto and the issues. I will wrap up at a point and at that point we will have all kinds of opportunity to hear other members, unless the government is so afraid to hear the facts that it would use something like closure.

I said that there was a lot of data available on what kind of CO₂ levels there were, and so on, in the past. I do not think there is too much point in stressing the sources of many of these. There are many scientific studies and I do not think a lot of parliamentarians or

Canadians want to hear about them. Let me summarize some of this work. This work has been collected by the IPCC, which is a United Nations group of 200 different scientists. I will not read this into the record, although some members might like me to. However, I would like to quote little pieces of it.

In the study done from 1000 to 1900, which was the first block the IPCC looked at, it found in that period that there was a trend of lowering temperatures. It got that information from ice cores and samples from the bottom of the ocean. Samples were taken from the mud going down into the earth's core, through glaciers, the rings on trees and so on. That is how all this data was collected.

The scientists found that in the 20th century there has been an increase in temperature. There was a decline and then there was an increase. They also found that there was a period of major cooling between 1400 and 1900. The minister may have even published some of the work in another life. The big threat in the 1970s was that there was an ice age coming. Of course that was another Chicken Little thing. Running across the country talking about that is similar to the Chicken Little that we see now.

There was also a period of time in the 12th century when we had a two to three degree Celsius warming. We have had an ice period, a cooling period, and in the 12th century a major heating. The models show that, and the scientists have developed those models and tried to analyze why that all happened. According to the data the snow line in the Rocky Mountains was about 300 metres higher than it was in 2001.

• (1645)

Everyone says that the ice caps are melting and the mountains are being exposed. That is something that happened once before in the 12th century. Through modelling it can be shown why that happened. Moreover the data seems to indicate that there has been a regular recurrence of episodes like the little ice age and the medieval warm period in roughly 1,500 year climatic cycles over the last 140,000 years.

For our minister to all of a sudden come running through the fence saying that the sky is falling, that we have floods, ice storms and droughts, and that when we sign Kyoto they will all be gone is not the way it works. None of the IPCC models say that. None of the data says that. None of the science says that. Not a scientist would agree with that, yet the minister uses that as his number one prop, that if we do not do this, these are the disasters that will befall all of us.

The next major analysis period was from 1856 to 2100. What is going to happen in that period? The interesting part is that they have broken it down into 40 models. These 40 models, determined by what is put in, determine the predicted outcome. One model says that we will actually have a decrease in temperature of 0.4°C to 0.8°C. Another model, using the same data but forgetting about the cloud factor, shows that we could have a 5°C increase. The models on which the government counts, from those 200 scientists and many other scientists, have a range of reduced temperature or raised temperature. I do not know. I think we should err on the side of caution.

Government Orders

We should get CO₂ levels under control. They are higher than they have been for the last 100 years, but there were periods when they were much higher. Let us err on the side of caution and say that we will deal with climate change, but really what Canadians want us to deal with is pollution.

Pollution is killing people in the Fraser Valley and southern Ontario. Pollution is the big problem in Toronto and why it has 45 smog days. Canadians think that signing Kyoto will fix that problem. Well it is nothing about that. Kyoto is about climate change. I am even saying that we should deal with that.

Here are the questions that the IPCC raises. How much effect does CO₂ have on the temperature? We have this greenhouse gas around the earth. It is made up of 97% water in the form of clouds and water vapour, and 3% is made up of things like CO₂, ozone, methane and various gases. Kyoto has decided to target one of the major greenhouse gases representing part of that 3% as CO₂.

At townhall meetings a lot of people think that carbon monoxide is CO₂. A lot of people who do not have chemistry or biology backgrounds do not understand that. Carbon monoxide also comes out of cars but that is not what this is targeting. This protocol is targeting CO₂.

We have the greenhouse gases around the earth that keep us from getting too cold. The model says it would make a 37°C difference if we did not have the greenhouse gases. The reason that the climate would warm up is because the greenhouse gas sheath becomes too thick.

•(1650)

So the first question is, how much effect does CO₂ have on temperature? The important question is not whether the climate is affected by human CO₂ but by how much. If the effect on the climate of any increased amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere is slight, global warming may not be particularly important. This is sort of like the premiers' endorsement of this whole proposal. These scientists are quite a long way from really endorsing.

Second, they ask, could there be other causes behind the increased temperature? They are asking. They do not know for sure that it is CO₂. They do say further on that they believe that within 10 years they will have perfected the science to understand global warming much better and will be able to really get the model right and know that they have the answers.

They go on to ask, "Are the greenhouse scenarios reasonable?" They then examine all of them, asking what the consequences are of a possible temperature increase. What are the consequences if the temperature goes up? What about cost curbing? What is it going to cost us to reduce those emissions and how should we choose what to do?

Obviously in Kyoto it was decided that CO₂ is the thing to target. Is it the right thing to target? Obviously the modelers are saying they do not know.

It is important to point out that all of the IPCC's predictions are based on such climatic computer model simulators, and it has found that many of its models are not accurate now. Every year it changes the model and comes up with other answers.

The IPCC basically tells us that its previous models were wrong. Either it will not be warming up as much as previously claimed or something is hiding the warming. The scientists are saying that maybe it was not CO₂ that was causing this global warming.

We are about to embark on a signing of the Kyoto protocol, ratifying it and committing every man, woman and child in this country to a 20% cut in the use of carbon products. We are committing to do that when the scientists are saying that maybe the models this whole thing is based on are not accurate.

I think that maybe going a bit slower and waiting until after Christmas might be a pretty good idea. I do not know that after Christmas the scientists will know if they have it right or not, but I sure as heck know that they do not feel that they have it totally right now.

So what is wrong with a made in Canada program? It would not be held up by problems if the scientists say, "Yes, definitely it is CO₂ and we have to deal with it". Obviously then Canadians would get behind that, but when they read stuff like this I just cannot believe that they will be as solidly behind it as the government says they will: "...most...modelers still believe that accurate models are a decade away. Moreover, the simplistic models used by the IPCC appear to overestimate" climate change. It is changing every day. At this point, turning to the 40 new IPCC scenarios, the modelers have explicitly abandoned the idea, and if I can repeat that, they have explicitly abandoned the idea of predicting the future and instead they talk about projections and possible futures. As one of the modelling groups fairly honestly points out, the IPCC scenarios are an attempt at computer-aided storytelling.

We are about to embark on this major impact on Canada and we are dealing with something that may not be totally accurate. How can we do that? How can we as politicians in the House in good conscience say that we will be going ahead because of a potentially incorrect model?

•(1655)

How can we do that? How in conscience can we do that to the people of Canada, to our constituents, to the single family mom, to the people on fixed incomes? It is not possible. Even scientists do not agree that we should be doing that, yet the minister cherry-picks these ideas and says they are fact. Again, I really think that Canadians need to ask some serious questions.

I want to come to what I consider a very well written letter from a person who has many questions about Kyoto, who has examined it and has brought in experts to speak about it. These experts have not convinced her that Kyoto is the way to go, much as we look at those models, which would hardly be convincing as I quote various parts.

Government Orders

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There always has to be a sufficient number of members in attendance during debates to make a judgment on what is being said. I do not see a quorum here but my count may be wrong.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): There is a quorum call. There are 17 members present. There is no quorum. The bells shall ring for not more than 15 minutes. Call in the members.

• (1700)

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): We have quorum now. The hon. member for Red Deer may continue.

Mr. Bob Mills: Madam Speaker, I am certainly pleased that we now have a much bigger crowd here to listen. Members can get caught up on their note taking. I am very pleased that the environment minister is taking this so seriously and absorbing every word of it.

I have received so many letters. The one I want to read, which I think has a lot of meaning, is from my constituency, but I think it echoes what a lot of people are saying. This lady, who is head of the Chamber of Commerce in my riding, probably represents, as I said, what a lot of people are thinking. She states in her letter:

The...Chamber of Commerce believes the environment is of paramount importance. However, the Kyoto protocol is not the means to the desired ends.

A lower environmental burden can be achieved with appropriate time frames by the private sector in Canada, working alongside governments and environmental groups.

That is exactly the cooperation that we believe in as well, but that is not what the government believes. I hope the minister heard what each of the ministers of the environment and the premiers of the provinces had to say when I outlined their comments. The letter continues:

We have the proven ability to create innovative new technologies that will allow us to produce energy, resources and manufactured goods to meet the needs of the world's people.

The Kyoto Protocol will not advance this important environmental call to action. Instead, the...Chamber of Commerce supports a made-in-Canada solution to greenhouse gas emissions and is joining the other Chambers of Commerce across the country in the call that would result in a Canada-made plan.

The proposed made-in-Canada solution would leave decision-making power in Canada and preserve jobs and our way of life. It would consist of the following elements:

It would combine immediate actions to address climate change with a more realistic time frame for overall reductions in greenhouse gases.

It would keep capital in Canada to invest in technology, research and development, rather than spending it primarily on international Kyoto emissions permits.

It would negotiate agreements with specific economic sectors, including electricity, oil and gas, transportation, forestry and the public sector to achieve reduction targets mutually agreed upon by all levels of government.

It would implement energy conservation education and awareness campaigns, and include initiatives for individual Canadians to reduce their energy consumption.

It would factor in our trade relations with the United States, our largest trading partner, to ensure our ongoing competitiveness.

It would involve immediate investment in new energy, emissions and environmental technologies as the key to environmental improvements and sustainable development.

Admittedly, an effective and responsible plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will affect all Canadians and require us to make tough choices. Citizens across the country must be kept fully informed of the risks, uncertainties, results and

opportunities of any national program with an impact as great as [that of] the Kyoto Protocol.

Canada's national climate change plan must identify how targets will be met and how the burden will be shared among the country's various sectors and regions.

A feasible and predictable policy framework at the national and international level is also required before industry can play a full role. This should involve:

Better understanding the scientific basis for climate change, including the magnitude of emissions impact and the earth's ability to handle it.

Obviously that is exactly what the modelers are saying. They want better science. The letter continues with what should be involved:

All stakeholders—industry, government, citizens, other nations—taking measures to reduce their energy intake.

Supporting the awareness that greenhouse gas reductions have implications not only for industry, but for consumers as well.

The Red Deer Chamber of Commerce encourages you to join the Chamber—

The writer goes on to talk about the many public meetings they have held.

• (1705)

This letter was from Jan Fisher, the Executive Director of the Red Deer Chamber of Commerce. She pretty much hits on most issues that Canadians feel are true.

Again without a plan, without knowing how it will be implemented, without targeting the sectors and telling them what they will be responsible for and without any costs, how can the government possibly bull ahead with the ratification of Kyoto by Christmastime? That is just an impossible thing to do and obviously an irresponsible thing for any government to do anywhere in the world. I do not think any other country that we are partners with in the industrialized world would operate this way.

I believe everyone heard the evaluation of the first plan. I would like to now talk about the second plan, which of course was hastily put together for the meeting in Toronto on November 21 with energy and environment ministers. However, that meeting was postponed because there was no real plan. The federal government said it would not listen to the provinces and would not agree to the principles for the meeting. All provinces and territories agreed with those 12 principles.

The federal government said no, that it would not talk to the provinces. The meeting was scheduled for Friday, November 29 and that meeting has been cancelled. So much for consultation and the guarantee that the Prime Minister gave when he said that we would not ratify until we had the cooperation of the majority of provinces, of industry and of the Canadian people. The Prime Minister promised that would be the case. His promise is turning out to be the same as his GST promise. He will not deliver on that because he says that his legacy is to ratify Kyoto.

Let us evaluate this clause by clause. Let us do what committee should do with this bill. Let us analyze this bill for Canadians. I have heard people say that what has been happening in here is very interesting. Someone even asked for the transcript. I cannot imagine reading all those pages, but there are people out there who are that interested and that concerned.

Government Orders

There is no committee. The government is not consulting with parliamentarians. As was said yesterday, it does not matter what happens in here because no one is listening. I hope that is wrong. Just because the government is not listening, does not mean that Canadians are not listening. I think Canadians are starting to listen. I think they are starting to listen to their industries. I think they are starting to worry about their jobs. I think they are starting to listen to their provincial governments. I think they are starting to listen to their chambers of commerce. I think they are starting to listen to the MPs who are being honest with them and who are trying to give them all the information they possibly can on the Kyoto accord.

I think Canadians will start to engage. If they have not engaged before ratification, they will engage during implementation. When they engage during implementation and the costs of their fuel, heating and consumer goods go up, I think there will be a lot of questions asked of lot of members here. How did they vote on the accord? Did they ask the cost of it? Did they ask for the implementation plan? Did they ask how industry would be affected? When pink slips arrive at people's houses, does anyone not think they will ask why this happened? When they hear it was because of Kyoto, I do not think they will be very happy with their members of Parliament who did not inform them.

Let us evaluate it clause by clause. I will go as rapidly as I can. I would like to wrap this up as soon as I possibly can. I will certainly make every effort to do that within the next day or so.

● (1710)

At that point, I will then turn it over to my colleagues. I know every one of them want to speak on this most important matter. I know they want the opportunity to say that when it came time to speak about Kyoto, they were here to speak about it and vote on it. They want to be able to say that they were here to stand up for that fixed income person, for that mom and dad, for that single mom, for farmers, for foresters, for those who could potentially lose their jobs, et cetera. They want to be able to say that they voted to delay this thing so they could have an opportunity to find out what it would cost, how would it be implemented and how would it affect Canadians.

That is the bottom line. That is why this place could become relevant again, and I hope Canadians will make it so.

Let us start off with the basic introduction. I know there is at least one member who will actively follow along with me as we do our clause by clause review. This will be a little different than in committee because I am not sure how many of the members on the other side are listening. I am not sure how many of them are taking notes and are trying to evaluate this along with me. Had this gone to the environment committee, I know that it would have taken it seriously. I know that it would have given it an evaluation and I know that Canadians would have become informed.

However, this will not go before any committee or anybody else. In fact the Prime Minister has said that he did not have to take it anywhere and he did not have to even bring it to the House. That is arrogance. He has said that we have to rush it through and have it done by Christmas. Why by Christmas? He has said that it does not matter what the House has to say.

What I would like to do is talk about some of this. The cornerstone of the arguments against the ratification of Kyoto is the fact that the government has failed to come up with an implementation plan. The document does not provide us with how this will be implemented. It does not tell us how Kyoto will affect each sector across the country. It gives us a bunch of generalities but does not tell us how it will affect business by business. We need to know that because the people's jobs are a concern.

The government has put forward this document called "Climate Change Plan for Canada", but it is not a plan. It does not tell us about the costs of anything. It does not tell us what it will cost Canadians. In this clause by clause analysis then, I would like to, as I did with the first one, show the House how foolish the whole document is.

First, the government has carelessly, hastily and recklessly put together this plan. It was done quickly. It was done because the provinces said that they would not meet with the government because it did not have a plan. The provinces are not meeting with them anyway because it does not have a plan. Therefore it did not accomplish that.

Second, on the basis of what has been happening, the risks to the country are not being pointed out to Canadians. There is nothing in here about the risks to Canada when the document is signed.

Third, it does not even come close to meeting the Kyoto commitments. That is a very serious claim. The document does not meet the Kyoto targets. It is short 60 megatonnes and it has no clue from where it will get it. Again, it has used this sort of false wording, "we will get clean energy credits". That is a non-starter and is not acceptable. That is not what anybody is agreeing to.

Fourth, it does not mention anywhere that there are penalties for ratifying Kyoto, or not living up to it or not implementing it.

● (1715)

The document says that we will not meet our targets. We have to assume then in the year 2012 the government will have to buy credits. Where do we buy credits? From Russia and from other East Bloc countries.

Finally, the government has not put forward any kind of legislation, has not talked about how it might go to committee or what the legislation might look like. It has told us absolutely nothing about that. This document, which is supposedly the next version to go to the provinces, and the provinces will not be there, is nothing different than the first one. Many of the things we said when analyzed the first one could apply to the second one, but let us go a little further through this.

Sometimes I wonder whether all the work in analyzing this is really worth it, the clause by clause study. It has become so obvious, as we have worked through it, that this is a farce. The government is not taking this seriously and is, in a reckless manner, dangerously playing with our economy. The sad part of this whole document is that it does not tell us anything about how we will improve our environment.

Government Orders

If people who are watching this want more information about this document, I refer them to www.climatechange.gc.ca. This is an overview of the document the government has put together. After reading the first couple of pages, Canadians will be amazed. They will be so shocked that the government would dare say that it will ratify this piece of garbage. They will not believe what is happening.

Let us start with the preface of this whole thing. "There are few things more fundamental to Canadians than the rich natural legacy we have inherited. Canadians understand the importance of the environment, both to the quality of life we enjoy and to our future economic progress. There is also clear recognition that certain activities are having a harmful effect on the environment and that the choices we make today can determine the health of our environment, not only for tomorrow or next year, but for 100 years from now".

That is a really good Liberal statement. I really like it and so far that is just perfect. Who could not agree with that? The only problem is the whole document is like that. It is a bunch of feel good, Liberal propaganda.

"One of the most pressing environmental challenges is that of global warming. The international scientific community has concluded that the rapid increase in the concentration of greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere can be expected to increase the earth's surface temperature and change our climate, alter our environment and endanger our health". I think the Prime Minister said that in 30 years our children and grandchildren would die of heat.

The scientific truth, as I went through the models, does not say that and it does not agree with that. The problem is a lot of scientists as they learn more about this are starting to ask more and more questions. The international scientific community, which I have talked about a lot, the IPCC, was formed in 1988 to help coordinate and research the scientific and socioeconomic aspects of climate change. It has been around for a long time, working hard and perfecting its science as time has gone on.

As we go on through this, we must also remember that 17,000 scientists have disputed the global warming alarmist concept. It is time that we say we need more information. We need to do something. Let us err on the side of caution, but let us not do something that will so damage our economy and our people that we will not be able to recover to fix the real environmental problems which we have.

• (1720)

Lorne Gunter, a columnist in the *Edmonton Journal*, addressed this point as well as anyone. He wrote, "Our tiny effort is insignificant. If Canada ruins its economy to cut emissions, will the earth be better off?" That is a pretty strong statement. It is based on a lot of what we have read.

I could read another long story that Lorne Gunter wrote, but I do not want to be found reading something into the record, because up until this point I have tried to speak from the heart in dealing with the various facts that people really want to hear. I will pass over this very good article.

An hon. member: What side is your heart on?

Mr. Bob Mills: This is the Liberal side for the heart. When they feel good that they have really done something, that is where they place their hands just so they feel really good about everything, even though they are going to do nothing about what they feel so good about. That is the Liberal way. That is what it is to be a Liberal. It is easy to define.

I am not going to read that article. It is very good and if people want it, they can get a hold of it. We will keep it. I am sure other members will find it so inspiring that they will want to put it in their speeches.

It states, "That is why in 1992 Canada supported the United Nations framework convention on climate change. Since then the government has announced its intentions to ratify the Kyoto protocol which sets out specific targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions".

I just read from the document. In 1992 the government said it recognized we had a problem. In 1992 it said it was going to do something about it. In fact, it signed an agreement in 1992 that emissions would be stabilized by 2000. Let me remind members that in 1999 we were 15% above our 1990 CO₂ emissions. In 2000 we were 20% above 1990 emissions levels. Now we are close to 23% or 25% above those levels.

We agreed in 1992 that we were going to stabilize our greenhouse gas emissions of CO₂. We did not do anything and now the government has the nerve to bring a forced ratification to the House. There will be an election if we do not ratify this.

The House leader had the nerve to come in here and say that we should extend the hours because we need more time. What has the government been doing for the last 10 years?

Ten years ago the government said in its own document, which I just quoted, that there was a problem and it was going to deal with it. It signed an international agreement saying it would and it has done nothing. What kind of a sham is this? What kind of a phony excuse is this for the handling of a subject?

As we have been saying all along, we can develop and should develop a made in Canada plan. We should not be going with the made in Japan plan called the Kyoto protocol.

The document goes on, "It is vital to have a plan that will enable Canada to successfully meet its climate change objectives. The initiatives included in the climate change plan for Canada will do that". That is a claim that is made in writing by the government and it is totally not the truth. It does not have a plan yet. It does not tell us how it is going to implement it.

The document continues, "Moreover they reflect the priorities identified through the extensive consultations that have taken place with provincial, territorial, municipal, industry representatives, non-governmental organizations, individual Canadians over the years". Extensive consultations?

Government Orders

• (1725)

I wonder how many Canadians think that they have been extensively consulted on this subject. The provinces say they have not been consulted. The Chamber of Commerce says it has not been consulted. Canadians by the hundreds are saying that they have not been consulted, yet the government has the nerve to say that it has fully consulted with Canadians.

In our clause by clause study I would recommend that we eliminate the first two pages of the document because they are totally incorrect and untrue. Madam Speaker, I know you are not keeping track, taking a dark pen and going through it line by line, but we can probably move faster because we have eliminated the first two pages. By the end of this I do not think there is going to be very much left. Probably you can already guess the conclusion, that we need a new document that includes an implementation plan, that includes the costing and that includes full consultation with Canadians.

It goes on to say that the Government of Canada is committed to continuing collaboration in an effort to find the most effective ways to build on the proposals presented in the plan.

I just quoted what every province in Canada thinks of this plan, and the government has the nerve to say it is committed to continuing the collaboration. The provinces have said it has not collaborated at all. How can the government commit here that it will start collaborating?

“Participating in the global effort to address climate change is an issue for all Canadians in every region and every walk of life, indeed it will require a national effort, one that summons the best from our citizens, entrepreneurs, scientists, communities and government”. That is a true statement.

It will involve a commitment from every single Canadian. Every man, woman and child in the country will have to eliminate 20% of his or her use of carbon. I have heard some people say that they do not use any carbon. Every bit of transportation uses carbon. Most every manufacturing takes energy and uses carbon. Electricity is made by burning carbon. The heat in this building is made by burning carbon. We use carbon for everything. Our whole way of life is based on the burning of carbon.

Can we change that? Yes we can. Will alternate energy take over? Yes it will, but it will not take over by 2005 when we have to show substantial decreases in CO₂ under the Kyoto accord. That is the very point. While we agree that we have to do something, obviously we are showing a real problem with doing that.

The truth is while the government is saying these things, it has not done much to tell every Canadian about all of these increases. I am still quoting:

This plan strikes the balance needed to enable our economy to flourish even as we reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. Moreover, it advances these goals without placing an unreasonable burden on any region of the country and assists Canadian industry to make a successful transition to a less carbon-intensive global economy.

Is that not just wonderful. These statements are just so Liberal, they are just so feel good. They make one feel like the Viagra man, just jump out the door and dance down the street. They make one feel so happy. But there is no plan here. There are no results from

this. We will not dunk the basketball or dance into the elevator with a smile. There will not be an elevator because carbon use has been cut. In actual fact it cannot deliver on these things but they are such feel good things.

• (1730)

Remember that by the time we start to do this, we will have to be close to a 30% reduction in the use of our carbon. That is going to hit every single person.

There is a lot of evaluation in this document. If I do not get through it all, even analyzing the graphs, I will be sure the minister gets it so that he can read it. I am sure he will be very interested because they are not going to listen to us anyway.

This plan proposes both short term action and long term perspective. Something can be done now, such as providing Canadians and Canadian businesses with the tools and incentives to make more energy efficient decisions. Others will be done over a number of years, such as investing in more energy efficient technologies and production methods, and switching to less carbon-intensive forms of energy.

That sums up to investments, both short term and long term, but by the time we tax our companies, by the time we force them into what Kyoto will do, will they have that money to invest in jobs and new initiatives? I question if they will. Most scientists question, the manufacturers question, the chambers of commerce question, everybody questions that the government will have that. By ratifying this without an implementation plan, how can we possibly make these false claims?

In our clause by clause analysis of the preface of this document, it is a bunch of feel good Liberal philosophy but none of it is factual or deliverable. It cannot deliver something which does not have an implementation plan.

I am not going to go through each word, but I hope people have gotten the idea about how fictitious the whole document is. More than anything else, I think people will understand why the premiers, the environment ministers and the energy ministers are not booking their tickets to Toronto for Friday. If this is the sort of garbage that the government comes out with, why would they show up? Why would they bother to come when the government shows absolutely no interest in anything but feel good Liberal philosophy?

The people who are not coming are from many different political parties. This has become a non-partisan issue. NDP premiers, Liberal premiers and Conservative premiers, all the premiers of the provinces are saying, “We have 12 proposals. We want them addressed and if they are not, then we will not come”. They are not going to proceed. I do not think anyone really knows why the Prime Minister has decided to ram this through, including his ministers.

Private Members' Business

Another section says, "With commitment and resolve, we will build that future together". Who wrote this stuff? It is amazing. Perhaps the minister's aides could let me meet the people who wrote this stuff. I would like to know what they are on because obviously, it allows them to spew out this stuff.

It talks about the science. It says, "There is a strong consensus among scientists that climate change is already occurring and that human activity is contributing to it". There are some scientists who do agree with that. "The earth's temperature is determined in part by a naturally occurring process known as the greenhouse effect. While certain greenhouse gases occur naturally, human activities are releasing additional greenhouse gases into the atmosphere".

● (1735)

In actual fact, 5% of greenhouse gases are produced by humans and 95% are produced by natural activity. I do not want to re-read those words, but those words say that humans have something to do with it. Technically that is true, 5%, but what will the government do? Will it stop volcanoes? Will it stop methane coming out of landfill sites? Will it stop the natural processes of decomposition? Will it outlaw the breakdown of dead plant material? Obviously if humans only represent 5%, the 95% is from nature. Why would we do what we are doing when 95% is coming into the atmosphere from natural processes? That is the huge question that we have to ask.

I have many other examples here. The government in its document should probably have stayed away from the science, because now it really starts to get itself into trouble. It has decided to ignore 17,000 scientists who signed the Oregon petition and who in fact said that this alarmist plan that is Kyoto will really not achieve anything.

The government has chosen to ignore those people. It has chosen instead to pick a few people, just like it did with the models. It cherry-picked what it wanted to hear then it went ahead. The most common question I get is: why would the Liberals do this? The only answer I can give is that it makes them feel good in the Liberal way and it gives a legacy to the Prime Minister. It has to be a political reason because it is not a scientific reason and not an economic reason.

When a member stands up and says, "We are ratifying it. I don't care what the rest of you think. If you backbenchers do not ratify it, I will call an election and you will have me for four more years", that is the political reason behind Kyoto.

For today I will wrap up. I will try to wrap this up as quickly as I can tomorrow and we will move on.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): It being 5:42 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]

WORLDWIDE ALL-NEWS TELEVISION NETWORK

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier, BQ) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should, in conjunction with the Government of Quebec and the other partners in the Francophonie, given consideration to the creation of a worldwide all-news television network.

● (1740)

He said: Madam Speaker, I would like to speak as long as the hon. colleague who spoke before me; unfortunately, our time is limited.

The idea for Motion No. 141 was first suggested by the President of the French Republic, Jacques Chirac. He suggested the idea that the world needed an international French language all-news channel. I agree with this objective. Today's world cannot accept English language information only, information with a single colour.

Madam Speaker, like many of us in this House, you have travelled pretty extensively. When we travel around the world, whether for personal purposes or for purposes relating to our business as federal elected representatives, we realize that, besides the local media, the main sources of information are the American network CNN and the British BBC. Both play a major role, even an essential one, in maintaining the flow of information around the world. Two networks is not enough, however. CNN and the BBC cannot meet all the needs for information worldwide.

The Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada—the latter under pressure from the former—who are fighting for cultural diversity, and rightly so, should realize that one aspect of this cultural diversity is the basic need for information from various sources and various cultures, each with a vision of the world quite different from the others. We should not have a uniform vision of information; that is not good for the whole planet.

France is currently looking at three options. The first is to have a French language, French only news network. This would be an exclusively French network based on the public television system, such as France 2 or the LCI news network. It would present the world with almost nothing but the French vision. While it is important, the main player in the Francophonie, France is not the only important player when it comes to the French language on this planet. This is nevertheless an option being contemplated by France.

The second option is a European network, based on the EuroNews system, which we get here, in Quebec and Canada. This would be a multinational but European network that would broadcast to the rest of the world.

The third option being considered by France is a multilateral French language network, somewhat similar to TV5. I am of the opinion, and this is the purpose of my motion, that the Quebec and Canadian governments—since we are in the federal Parliament, in Ottawa—should insist that the third option prevail. It would be a matter of telling our partners, our friends, our French cousins that we too want to diversify worldwide news sources, that we too want to be involved in the broadcasting of a different vision of news, and that this option should be examined by the Francophonie, which is an increasingly important forum at the world level.

Private Members' Business

• (1745)

I want to make it clear that I am not asking that TV5 be replaced. TV5 is a great success and it works fine. However, one of its objectives is also to broadcast cultural programs and films. That is fine. I want French language culture to be increasingly known all over the world. It is important that this culture be known, regardless of its origin, whether it is French, Quebec, Canadian or African.

However, it would also be important to have access to a French news source 24 hours a day. When we travel, we often watch TV5. We often find ourselves watching a movie. The only news sources available are the BBC or CNN.

The world needs an all-news network in French. Except for English, French is the only language spoken on all five continents. Therefore, I urge this House to ask the government to give consideration to—that is to keep an open mind and to explore the possibility of—creating a worldwide all-news French television network. Let us send to our French friends the message that we are interested in taking part in a multinational French language project that will help support cultural diversity in all this news, which is essential in the 21st century.

Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am tempted, as a response to the motion presented by the member for Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier, to remind the House of Canada's presence within the institutions of the international Francophonie, our participation in TV5 in particular, and of the benefits its presence has for Canadians.

The Francophonie is, first and foremost, the community of peoples who, to varying degrees, speak or use French in their national life or their international relations. It is also a group of organizations and associations, both governmental and non-governmental, involved in various sectors of interest to members of the francophone community, including culture.

Sensitive to its own francophone reality, Canada was one of the first countries to promote the Francophonie, by participating in particular in the creation and development of its many institutions. Thus it was one of the founding members of the Agence de Coopération culturelle et technique in 1970, which has since become the Agence intergouvernementale de la Francophonie. I will come back a little later to TV5, which some consider one of the Francophonie's finest achievements.

Canada is now the second largest donor to the multilateral Francophonie, after France of course, while it pays out more than \$25 million annually to the various operating bodies of the Francophonie, including TV5.

The Francophonie is one of the major focuses of Canada's foreign policy. Domestically, our participation is designed to promote our linguistic duality and to affirm and promote the vitality of the French fact in Canada. Internationally, the Francophonie is a natural zone of influence for Canada, just like the Commonwealth or the Organization of American States.

• (1750)

But beyond considerations of a geopolitical order, Canada's membership in the Francophonie is primarily an alliance with the

rich network of 56 states and governments that have French in common, a network that extends from Europe, Africa and the Middle East to the West Indies, the Indian and Pacific Oceans, and of course our continent.

Finally, it gives the rest of the world a true appreciation of Canada's contribution to the dialogue among cultures and an opportunity to embrace the values of openness, democracy and tolerance, and to appreciate the richness of our francophone culture.

The year 2001 reminded us that it is up to the better-off on this planet to lend an ear and listen, but also to share our perceptions and our understanding of the reality that surrounds us.

The theme of the most recent Francophone Summit, held in Beirut last October, was the dialogue of cultures. I must tell hon. members how very proud I was to accompany the Prime Minister to Lebanon. The Minister of Canadian Heritage also attended, given her longstanding involvement with cultural dialogue.

During the Beirut summit, the heads of state and government affirmed their desire to breathe new life and new energy into the dialogue of cultures and civilizations, and to bring peoples closer together through mutual understanding.

They identified various tools and programs of the Francophonie to promote a closer relationship, be it by increasing Francophone cooperation in international forums on the great issues of the day, by participating in initiatives to prevent and settle conflicts, or by encouraging exchanges among young people throughout the Francophonie.

As I mentioned earlier, TV5, the international French language channel and operating body of the international Francophonie, is also one of the best vehicles for promoting dialogue among cultures.

Created in 1984, the international channel, TV5, is the fruit of a close partnership among five members of the Francophonie, the Government of Canada, France, Switzerland, the French community of Belgium and the Government of Quebec. TV5 also benefits from the participation of a number of African countries, namely Cameroon, Ivory Coast and Senegal.

TV5 is now the third largest television network in the world, after MTV and CNN. The channel broadcasts 24 hours a day by cable and satellite on five continents. One hundred and thirty million households have access to TV5, which means a potential audience of almost 600 million viewers who can watch the best programming from the major public French language channels, including Radio-Canada and Télé-Québec.

• (1755)

The Government of Canada pursues two fundamental objectives by participating in TV5: helping to promote Canada on the international scene by offering Canada's Francophone artists and producers a special international showcase; and offering Canadians an additional French language channel and a window on the international community.

Private Members' Business

The Government of Canada has been involved for nearly 20 years in this multilateral undertaking that is unique in the world, and in 2002-03, the Government of Canada provided it with \$8 million in funding.

In terms of content, TV5 is primarily a generalist channel in which information, in other words news, is the real backbone. In this respect, we should remember the outstanding contribution of Radio-Canada and RDI, which constantly feed TV5 news programming of the highest quality. These programs are broadcast all across the globe.

I want to take this opportunity to mention that the professionalism of Canadian journalists is greatly appreciated by the great TV5 family. Their reputation is firmly established. Canada thus makes an active contribution to ensuring that the news broadcast on TV5 is of high quality and reliable.

TV5 is also a well-respected undertaking around the world, where it is often the only alternative to local news sources. I am thinking of Africa, Latin America and the Middle East, where TV5 is in turn educational, entertaining and informative.

For over 20 years, Canada has been helping to build a world television network that, over the years has, become a news broadcaster on par with CNN and the BBCs of this world.

• (1800)

Canadian and international news occupy an important place in RCIs programming. The channel also broadcasts programs on culture, economics and politics, thus offering the rest of the world an overview of the realities of Canadian life today.

I am particularly proud to talk about Radio Canada International because its transmitters are located in my riding, not far from the lovely town of Sackville.

[English]

From the Tantramar Marshes in New Brunswick, near the Nova Scotia border, people around the world can hear via shortwave signal Radio Canada International.

[Translation]

Given the success of TV5 and the Government of Canada's oft-renewed commitment to this operating body of the Francophonie, and given the existence of other Canadian tools already in place that broadcast quality French language news internationally, I believe that we should first focus our efforts on consolidating these tools. Of course, it would be interesting to envisage other vehicles for distributing our television programming, but at this stage, such a project is not realistic.

[English]

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to make some remarks with regard to Motion No. 141. The motion states:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should, in conjunction [I believe that is a very co-operative approach] with the Government of Quebec and the other partners in the Francophonie, give consideration [that is a word of moderation] to the creation of a world-wide all-news television network.

I would say to the hon. member for Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier that New Brunswick is an equal partner within the Canadian context and the Francophonie. I assume that he recognizes one of those partners to be his neighbouring province of New Brunswick which is the province I reside in.

In this era of media concentration, the idea is entrenched in the Canadian psyche that the more perspectives we can have that would disseminate news and information regardless of what language they are distributed in is a positive initiative.

As a founding partner of the Francophonie, and as a representative of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada which was instrumental in the establishment of the Francophonie, my view is that this initiative deserves consideration. I think that is what the member for Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier is advocating. A prudent approach should be taken. My colleague from the Bloc sits on the standing committee on official languages. It may be a reasonable approach to have this committee study the issue itself as to whether this is the track our nation should take.

We know there are intrinsic advantages, not just from a cultural perspective but economically as well, of maintaining the French language within the international community. The Francophonie has provided us with a forum to reach out and speak to nations. Other nations do not have the same kind of inroads from a north south perspective.

As the critic on official languages for the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada this type of initiative speaks to the same spirit of the strong institution that we have in Radio Canada International. There is a level of expertise there. Perhaps there could be some form of joint venture done in conjunction with France, Quebec and New Brunswick. I am quite comfortable going down that track.

[Translation]

On behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party, I will be supporting the motion by the hon. member for Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier.

• (1805)

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, from the outset, let me say that I support the motion put forward by my colleague from Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier. I wish to read the motion again, because the hon. member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac was misinformed or he misinterpreted—at least that is what I humbly believe—the motion before us and found it to be not realistic.

This motion states:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should, in conjunction with the Government of Quebec and the other partners in the Francophonie—

Last I heard, there were approximately 42 member countries in the Francophonie.

—give consideration to the creation of a world-wide all-news television network.

We are examining, with our partners in the Francophonie, the possibility of having a worldwide French language all-news television network.

I find that this motion is much in keeping with the new realities of the francophone community. Francophonie summits, which emulate to some extent Commonwealth events, are relatively new in the francophone community. The involvement, and even its establishment, of the International Organization of the Francophonie is relatively new. The Francophonie is growing. It is a community discovering itself, a community with very different realities within it.

The majority of countries in the Francophonie are African countries. They have French in common, but also the evolution and promotion of this language.

As the hon. member for Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier aptly said, and also my hon. colleague from the Progressive Conservative Party, with this evolution of the Francophonie, we can seriously contemplate the possibility of creating a worldwide all-news information network.

Perhaps the outcome of these discussions within the international forums of the Francophonie is a matter that should be brought up at the next Francophone Summit. Perhaps the outcome will be to say no. But, for the time being, how can one do like the member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac and state that it is not realistic before even looking at the possibility of creating a network, when such an all-news network exists in English. I am referring to the BBC. There is also CNN, although this is a private network.

There are national news networks within countries. Could we, within the Francophonie, use this news, these structures, to make international news from primarily French speaking countries around the world available and accessible in French?

It is said that information goes hand in hand with democracy. I was surprised to hear my Liberal colleague say that it was not realistic to imagine giving information to countries that, all too often, suffer from a lack of information, such as countries in Africa. In many cases, these new and emerging democracies are deprived of international news about what is going on among their neighbours, their allies and around the world. These days, we live in a global village, and we are being told it is not realistic.

One only needs look at what the member states of the Francophonie have accomplished in recent years. The *Sommets de la Francophonie* have, more often than not, been a great success.

We have witnessed the role of the Francophonie in education. Countries with a common interest in the French language, such as Canada, form committees to assist, communicate and consult. It is not that some have a monopoly on the truth and the others are wrong. We are there to share knowledge and information about education and to give access to the member states of the Francophonie that are less developed to this education, to help people who are in circumstances that are all too often regrettable improve their lot.

•(1810)

An all-news network could broadcast information on the various means of education that are available to these different countries.

The same is true for culture. The member states of the Francophonie share a common culture, which is language, but we

could learn so much more if every country in the Francophonie shared its own culture by making it available through information.

When an election takes place in an emerging democracy, the Francophonie sends an observer mission to monitor and observe what happens. An all-news network could broadcast what is happening in these countries to the rest of the world, particularly to concerned Francophones. I do not think it is not realistic to share the emergence of democracies, the emergence of events that carry hope in certain countries, these types of news, with other countries in their language, which is French.

There is also the issue of the economy in certain emerging countries of the Francophonie, where we share an interest through microcredit; the same could be said with regard to the status of women, and other issues.

It seems to me that a million and one subjects could be addressed by a French language all-news network. All countries need to be aware of all this information, as well as of international events as broadcast in English and in French by our networks in the western world.

My friend and colleague from the Progressive Conservative party has had an interesting idea. We might suggest that the motion of our colleague from Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier be examined by the new standing committee on official languages. This used to be the joint official languages committee, which was made up of MPs and senators and has had a number of successful outcomes to its credit. We now have the pleasure of having a committee made up solely of members of the House of Commons.

Last summer, hon. members will remember the ruckus about Radio-Canada not wanting to continue to carry hockey in French, thus depriving all French Canadians of a heritage they had enjoyed on state television for 50 years. The committee was one of those instrumental in remedying that situation, and now hockey is available to all Canadians, francophones in particular.

As for the situation involving the use of French on Air Canada, the committee was in large part responsible for rattling their cage so that minority language communities' rights were respected. Within a few weeks, there will be comment sheets available on planes in recognition of the rights of members of francophone communities who fly Air Canada.

At the present time, the debates of this House are broadcast across Canada by CPAC. Until recently, francophones from Manitoba westward were not able to tune in in French, because the French language channel was not available to them. The committee addressed this, and now it is.

The idea of our Progressive Conservative colleague, to refer this question to a committee, is very interesting and could be adopted by the members of this House.

Before I go on, I must say that I believe my colleague from Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier, my colleague from the Progressive Conservative Party and myself have managed to demonstrate the importance of this motion, which unfortunately is not votable, because of the rules and procedures governing the business of the House.

Adjournment Debate

I would, therefore, like to quite simply seek unanimous consent of the House to allow this motion to be put to a vote, in order to lend a little more weight to it. I believe that will be unanimously supported.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is there unanimous consent of the House to make the motion votable?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau: Madam Speaker, I am disappointed to see that there is not unanimous consent. The members who said no are mostly members who live in a French minority. Through their vote, they willingly accept not to benefit from another all-news network in their own language. It must be because they already have enough, or because they do not want it. One would have to ask them in order to find out. But it is somewhat surprising and disappointing that they would not want to create, together, this all-news French network.

Some members are wondering what they opposed. I just told them that they said no to an all-news network in their language. I am sorry to tell them, but they should know what they are saying yes or no to. I am sorry for them.

We were told "Sure, but where will the money come from?" This issue, the money issue, will be discussed at international forums. However, if we were to follow the example of TV5, there would not even be a money issue, since we share the news and the technology of the countries that are part of this network.

• (1815)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The hon. member for Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier has five minutes left to conclude the debate.

Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier, BQ): Madam Speaker, first, I wish to thank my hon. colleagues from Repentigny and from Fundy—Royal for their contribution to this debate.

I want to say that I was bewildered, to put it mildly, by the remarks of the hon. member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac. He declared the idea impractical from the word go, before giving it any thought. Unless he knows everything, which I doubt, I wonder on what basis he is making such a silly statement.

If we read the motion as presented, we can see that we are asking that consideration be given to the creation of an international French language television network. He jumped the gun by declaring the idea impractical before even considering it. Allow me to question the seriousness of the approach and pronouncements of the hon. member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac.

There is another point I absolutely want to bring to the attention of those listening. Both speakers who opposed considering having an international French language network are francophones in minority communities, namely the member for Madawaska—Restigouche and the member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac. These are two individuals who should normally be very sensitive to the importance of promoting French language information tools. These two members of this House refused unanimous consent to make this motion votable. This speaks volumes about their personal and

political involvement in championing francophones outside Quebec living in minority communities.

To conclude, we have learned today that the House will be changing its rules to allow each and every member of this House to bring in at least one votable bill per Parliament. I wish to announce, therefore, that I will very seriously consider reintroducing this motion or one very similar, so that it can be declared votable. This way, members will have to publicly take a stand for or against such a proposal, which, I repeat, is intended as a response to the suggestion by the President of the French Republic, Jacques Chirac, about creating an international French language all-news network.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The time provided for the consideration of private members' business is now expired. As the motion has not been designated as a votable item, the order is dropped from the order paper.

Do I have consent to see the clock as being 6:30?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[English]

TERRORISM

Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC): Madam Speaker, we arrived at this point a little earlier than I expected. I am glad I came over to the House a little early.

A week or so ago I asked the Minister of Health a question on bioterrorism. The point I was making was that Canada simply was not prepared for a bioterrorist attack. What I specifically spoke about and questioned the minister on that day was the fact that if terrorists had the ability to deliver the smallpox virus to Canada it would have a catastrophic effect on our country. I compared the preparedness of the United States and the United Kingdom to that of Canada. I pointed out that the United States was prepared to vaccinate 280 million people within a week if it became necessary. I also pointed out that the United Kingdom had taken steps to vaccinate its people in the event that something like that should happen. The fact of the matter is, it can happen and we must be prepared for it.

I also questioned the antidote. When people receive the vaccination that would protect them against smallpox, an antidote is required to counter the effect of that particular drug. Out of every 10,000 people who are vaccinated against smallpox there will be at least one death and possibly more. The antidote is something that we never even considered in Canada and the government does not have a supply of it, yet that antidote itself is manufactured in Canada.

The question would be, if the United Kingdom and the United States are prepared, why are we not prepared? That was the point I was driving at in my question to the minister that day in the House.

Adjournment Debate

I want to quote from an article that appeared in the *Edmonton Journal* on November 14, about two weeks ago, in which the Defence Science Advisory Board said:

The country should expect attacks which deny "immediate and effective response" says the report, prepared by the Defence Science Advisory Board, whose members are drawn from industry and the academia.

The article goes on to say:

Even if it were possible to distribute cases nationwide in an instant, a major disaster which created 3,000 urgent or critical cases would break the entire system.

It went on again to say:

And health-care cuts have left provinces "with minimal capacity to respond to any emergencies beyond the scale of a bus crash.

What we are saying is that we have to be prepared, we should be prepared and it is important that the Government of Canada act on this real possibility. If other countries have done it we should do it. Why does the government not act? Why does the minister not act?

On top of that, the bioterrorist advisory group that the government set up about a year ago has not yet met. It has been over a year. The only thing it has had is a long distance telephone conference. This advisory group that the Government of Canada thought was so important to set up in response to any terrorist attack on the biochemical front has not met.

The question for the minister is: Why has it not met? Why will it not do something? Why will it not prepare Canada, as the United Kingdom has prepared itself, as has the—

• (1820)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's question. I will try, in the next few minutes, to give him the exact status of where we are today, the position the government has taken as well as the position of the Minister of Health.

I would like to assure my colleague, and obviously all of my colleagues that are listening, as well as all Canadians, that our government is working with public health officials from the provinces and territories to ensure that in the unlikely event that smallpox were used as a terrorist weapon, we will be prepared to deal with the threat.

These preparations are twofold. The first element consists of a plan. The second element is having a sufficient quantity of smallpox vaccine in Canada. On both of these fronts, we have taken the necessary measures to protect Canadians. Allow me to explain.

There is the Canadian contingency plan for smallpox. We have obviously consulted with the Chief Medical Officers of Health from every province and territory.

This is a very important step because any plan must reflect the way we work together in a real emergency situation. For this reason, Health Canada officials have carefully examined the plan with all of the appropriate provincial and territorial stakeholders, the Chief

Medical Officers of Health and their staff, as well as emergency services and emergency social services staff.

The contingency plan has been carefully studied. The final version will soon be released to the public. What does this plan call for?

We have taken the research and confinement approach recommended by the Council of Chief Medical Officers of Health and the World Health Organization. This strategy was applied successfully in the years prior to 1979, and led to the eradication of the disease.

Under this approach, the spread of smallpox is contained by identifying infected persons and any persons who may have contact with them. The vaccine is administered to these people in the four days following their exposure to the smallpox virus, and to those who work with smallpox carriers, health care workers and laboratory workers.

We have been very actively involved in procuring the vaccine. Our intention to get it from a Canadian supplier has been revealed today as part of the government tendering process. Public Works and Government Services Canada issued an advance contract award notice via MERX, the government electronic tendering service.

Our objective is to have a stock of smallpox vaccine available that would be sufficient to react to multiple smallpox outbreaks in Canada, should that event ever occur.

At the same time, we will have the capacity to produce more doses in Canada expeditiously. This would be required if ever we were required to expand the vaccination effort, even to the entire population if circumstances required.

As for the immunoglobulin, which is used to treat serious vaccine side-effects, there is a limited quantity of this in the world, because it is produced from the blood of recently vaccinated individuals, and most countries stopped doing systematic vaccination in 1972.

The United States has recently begin to rebuild its stocks of immunoglobulin, by vaccinating a small number of volunteers who then donate their blood to produce the immunoglobulin. Via discussions with the U.S. Center for Disease Control, Health Canada is taking steps to obtain a certain quantity of the immunoglobulin. I can assure hon. members that Canada has no intention of vaccinating anyone whatsoever against smallpox until this immunoglobulin is available.

This is, obviously, part of our campaign against smallpox, which includes what we call pre-exposure vaccination. Before any outbreak whatsoever occurred, a certain number of individuals would be immunized in order to be in a position to provide medical care to anyone who might be exposed subsequently.

Clearly, we do have a plan and will do everything in our power to implement that plan, if ever the need arises.

• (1825)

[*English*]

Mr. Greg Thompson: Madam Speaker, thank you for reminding me that I had a one minute response to the minister's response to me. I appreciate that. I was captivated by his speech and I forgot that I had one minute, although now I am down to 50 seconds.

Adjournment Debate

After listening to the parliamentary secretary's response, I do not think we are really ready for a bioterrorist attack. I do not think we can simply hide under our desks and pretend or hope that it does not happen, because the fact is that it could happen. That is why these other jurisdictions have prepared themselves for that eventuality—I should not say it in those terms—that possibility is probably a better way of saying it because we are hoping and praying of course that it does not happen, but we have to be ready if it does happen.

The antidote that other countries have subscribed to is manufactured—

• (1830)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay: Mr. Speaker, obviously, other countries have taken a different approach. Their approach is to vaccinate the entire population, while we came to the conclusion,

following consultations with experts in the field, that here in Canada, we will only vaccinate groups at risk, and confine these people.

We have procured the vaccine required for this need. If the entire population needed to be vaccinated, we could meet this objective using the dilution factor.

This is a choice that we made based on consultations with experts who suggested it. This is also, incidentally, the approach suggested to us by the World Health Organization. We are fully aware that other countries have preferred to take a different approach.

I thank my colleague for having raised this issue, to let all Canadians know where we are at on this issue.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6:31 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, November 27, 2002

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Violence Against Women

Ms. Neville 1937

Justice

Mr. Grewal 1937

Inverness Bagpipe Competition

Mr. Regan 1937

The Environment

Mr. Godfrey 1938

Royal Canadian Air Force

Mr. Price 1938

Christmas

Mr. Strahl 1938

Liberal Government

Mr. Binet 1938

Egg Marketing

Mr. Desrochers 1938

Veterinary Medicine

Mr. Patry 1939

AMBER Alert System

Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose) 1939

École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe

Mr. Duplain 1939

Health Care

Ms. Wasylcia-Leis 1939

Quebec's Water Policy

Mr. Cardin 1940

École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe

Ms. St-Jacques 1940

Infrastructure Program

Mr. Borotsik 1940

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Health

Mr. Harper 1940

Mr. Chrétien 1940

Mr. Harper 1940

Mr. Chrétien 1941

Mr. Harper 1941

Mr. Chrétien 1941

Mr. Merrifield 1941

Ms. McLellan 1941

Mr. Merrifield 1941

Ms. McLellan 1941

Budget Surplus

Mr. Duceppe 1941

Mr. Chrétien 1941

Mr. Duceppe 1941

Mr. Chrétien 1941

Mr. Ménard 1942

Mr. Chrétien 1942

Mr. Ménard 1942

Mr. Chrétien 1942

Persons with Disabilities

Ms. McDonough 1942

Mr. Wilfert 1942

Ms. McDonough 1942

Mr. Wilfert 1942

Kyoto Protocol

Mr. Clark 1942

Mr. Chrétien 1942

Mr. Clark 1942

Mr. Chrétien 1943

Mr. Chatters 1943

Mr. Anderson (Victoria) 1943

Mr. Chatters 1943

Mr. Anderson (Victoria) 1943

Softwood Lumber

Mr. Bergeron 1943

Mr. Dhaliwal 1943

Mr. Bergeron 1943

Mr. Dhaliwal 1943

Terrorism

Mr. Day 1944

Mr. Easter 1944

Mr. Day 1944

Mr. Easter 1944

École de médecine vétérinaire de Saint-Hyacinthe

Mr. Plamondon 1944

Mr. Vanclief 1944

Mr. Plamondon 1944

Mr. Vanclief 1944

Government Contracts

Mr. Ritz 1944

Mr. Goodale 1944

Mr. Ritz 1944

Mr. Goodale 1945

Fisheries

Mr. Cuzner 1945

Mr. Thibault 1945

Taxation

Mr. Masse 1945

Ms. Caplan 1945

Canada Pension Plan Investment Board

Mr. Stoffer 1945

Mr. Wilfert 1945

National Defence	
Mrs. Wayne	1945
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	1945
Kyoto Protocol	
Mr. Herron	1946
Mr. Chrétien	1946
Government Contracts	
Mr. Williams	1946
Mr. Goodale	1946
Mr. Williams	1946
Mr. Goodale	1946
Human Resources Development	
Mrs. Tremblay	1946
Mrs. Stewart	1946
Mrs. Tremblay	1946
Mrs. Stewart	1947
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Pallister	1947
Mr. Nault	1947
Mr. Pallister	1947
Mr. Nault	1947
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Dromisky	1947
Mr. Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi)	1947
Veterans Affairs	
Mrs. Hinton	1947
Mr. Pagtakhan	1947
Mrs. Hinton	1947
Mr. Pagtakhan	1948
Supply Management	
Ms. Girard-Bujold	1948
Mr. Pettigrew	1948
Protection of Children	
Mr. Godfrey	1948
Mr. Cauchon	1948
Health	
Mrs. Skelton	1948
Ms. McLellan	1948
Transportation Security	
Mr. Asselin	1948
Mr. Collenette	1948
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	1949
Points of Order	
Statements by Members—Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	1949
Mr. Pankiw	1949
Privilege	
Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources—Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	1949

Points of Order	
Romanow Commission Report Lock-Up	
Mr. Reynolds	1950
Mr. Boudria	1951
Mr. Godin	1951
Passports	
Mr. Grewal	1951

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Regan	1951
Terrorism	
Mr. Easter	1951
Mr. Sorenson	1952
Mr. Marceau	1952
Mr. Clark	1953

Committees of the House	
Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources	
Ms. Karetak-Lindell	1953

Petitions	
Coast Guard	
Mr. Cummins	1954
Child Pornography	
Mr. Cummins	1954
Mr. Brison	1954

Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Regan	1954
Mr. Cummins	1954

Points of Order	
Statements by Ministers	
Mr. Clark	1954

Motion for Papers	
Mr. Regan	1954

Points of Order	
Kyoto Protocol Ratification Motion	
Mr. Abbott	1955
Mr. Regan	1956

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Kyoto Protocol	
Motion	1956
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	1956

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Worldwide All-News Television Network	
Mr. Marceau	1968
Motion	1968
Mr. LeBlanc	1969
Mr. Herron	1970
Mr. Sauvageau	1970
Mr. Marceau	1972

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Terrorism

Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)..... 1972

Mr. Castonguay..... 1973

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**