



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 104 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, May 16, 2003

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 16, 2003

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 81, it is my duty to inform the House of the motion to be addressed Monday, May 26, during consideration of the business of supply.

[*English*]

It reads:

That this House, acknowledging that health issues transcend political borders as seen with the recent outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, SARS, express its support for the admission of Taiwan as an Observer to the World Health Organization and call upon the government to actively urge other member states and non-governmental organizations to support this goal.

This motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia is votable. Copies of the motion are available at the table.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2003

The House resumed from May 14, 2003 consideration of the motion that Bill C-28, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 18, 2003, be read for the third time and passed.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on the most recent budget brought down by the Minister of Finance.

There would be a lot to say about this last budget, but I will try, in the next 20 minutes, to stick to the basics and to the most fundamental aspects of the Minister of Finance's presentation.

First, let me tell the House that, since 1994, every year, before the budget is brought down, the Bloc Québécois holds some consultations with the Quebec people to complement the ones made by the Standing Committee on Finance, to determine exactly the needs and

the priorities of Quebecers in the budget, in addition to those of Canadians.

Until now, we have not been very mistaken on the priorities given to some budget items, but that the government has not been able to follow up on in the many successive budgets since 1994. I will get back to those priorities for Quebecers and Canadians.

In addition, let me point out a certain exercise the Bloc Québécois has been engaging in twice a year since 1995. It involves a very sophisticated device, but one which has become very familiar to most taxpayers, namely a calculator, a little pocket calculator on special this week or \$3.95 at Jean Coutu. Taking the figures for government revenues and expenditures—in the first quarter, for example—we simply extrapolate, using the rates of growth provided by the major financial institutions. This could be the Mouvement Desjardins, the Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec, the Bank of Montreal, the Royal Bank or Wood Gundy—any of the outfits who deal with economic growth.

So, we simply extrapolate with certain adjustments that come from our observation of the trends in budgetary revenues and expenditures year after year. As for the state of public finances, in calculating the budgetary surplus—something the former Finance Minister and potential successor to the current Prime Minister made forecasting errors about, in the size of the surplus and deficit, at the beginning, of around 200% per year, on the average—we have every reason to be proud, because our forecasting errors are around 3 to 4%, which is the margin of error one usually expects when making this type of forecast.

And yet, it was the \$3.98 pocket calculator and a few connections, especially in the major financial institutions, that enabled us to get these results. I am always shocked to see the forecasts and results from the Minister of Finance, year after year. He must be doing this on purpose, presenting us with such fantastical figures as those he has been dealing in since 1995.

It began with the hon. member for LaSalle—Émard as finance minister and continues with the current finance minister, who is also hoping to become Prime Minister. I wonder whether or not being able to count is a prerequisite to standing for election as leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, that is as a potential Prime Minister. Moreover, the first sizeable deficit leading to debts that accumulated year after year within the federal public service was created by the current Prime Minister, who was once, himself, Minister of Finance. It makes one believe that history repeats itself with all these successions, that is, succession as finance minister and succession as Prime Minister, too.

Government Orders

The same thing happened again this year. My colleague, the member for Joliette, who still uses the pocket calculator bought at Jean Coutu for \$3.98, was right on in estimating that the surplus for the 2002-03 fiscal year would be somewhere around \$10 billion. It so happens that we have just been told that, indeed, the surplus for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2003, would be just over \$10 billion.

When my colleague took over as finance critic, I gave him the pocket calculator, and it is still working just fine. We have been using the same \$3.98 pocket calculator since 1995.

● (1010)

How can we obtain such accurate results when, just a few months ago, the Minister of Finance was telling us that the surplus for the previous fiscal year would be around \$3.5 billion or \$4 billion? He was wrong again. It is not \$3.5 billion or \$4 billion, but \$10 billion, just as we had predicted.

What does that do? What it does is that the government, which should be addressing the real priorities of Quebecers and Canadians, is not meeting these priorities, claiming as an excuse that it does not have the money to do so. That is what we are seeing year after year.

Since memory is not infallible, when the Minister of Finance opens his mouth and says that we must be careful because the surplus will not exceed \$2 billion, \$3 billion or \$4 billion, people believe that they do indeed have to be careful. We are always afraid of going back into a deficit, and rightfully so.

If anyone is being responsible about the management of public funds, it is the Bloc Québécois. It is the only party that told the former Minister of Finance, some five years ago, it would support anti-deficit legislation, balanced budget legislation, requiring him to be accountable. It is a matter of being accountable for the aboriginals. It would perhaps be a good idea to include the management of public accounts too. The system is far from being as transparent and as accountable as we are being told.

The Bloc Québécois is responsible with regard to the management of public funds. But being responsible does not mean accumulating astronomical surpluses. Does the House know what an astronomical surplus is? It means that the federal government is taking more money from taxpayers than it needs to face its challenges and administer its programs.

This is serious, because people are overtaxed, particularly in terms of federal tax. I have often compared federal taxation to Quebec's taxation system and Ontario's, for example. We could also talk about Nova Scotia's tax system. The Bloc did a comparative analysis of all these income tax systems. As a result, we see that Quebec taxpayers, like those in the rest of Canada, start paying federal income tax when their income exceeds \$12,000 or \$13,000. The poverty line is nearly three times as high. There is no provincial income tax for those earning less than \$12,000 or \$13,000. Yet, taxpayers do pay federal income tax on such amounts.

For example, a family of four would pay no provincial income tax on earnings under approximately \$23,000 or \$24,000, but this is the base amount for families to start paying federal income tax. Under Quebec's income tax system, this same family of four would start

paying income tax only on earnings over \$43,000. That is a huge difference.

Does this mean that the federal government is taking too much tax money from a middle income family of two adults and two children? It should not be taking as much, particularly from a family like that with an income of \$23,000. It makes no sense.

The federal government is amassing huge surpluses. It is a matter of billions, whereas the forecast was—how convenient—a maximum of \$4 billion. It is the same every year. Does this also mean that what the Minister of Finance has been doing to the employment insurance fund—theft, pure and simple—with the federal government's blessing, every year for the past six years, is unjustified? Mosat definitely, because this is theft, since the federal government does not contribute a cent to that fund. The money in it comes from the workers and the employers, who pay into it in order to insure those who had the misfortune to lose their job, not in order to line the pockets of the Minister of Finance.

Does this mean that there is not only no ethical justification, but probably no legal justification as well. The CSN has a case before the courts at the present time. Does this mean that not only is it unjustified on these bases but also unjustified on the very basis of the federal government's arguments, which are that we would be running a deficit again if not for the surplus? That is not true.

● (1015)

With a \$10 billion surplus, the government would not have needed to steal this year's forecast surplus of \$4 billion from the employment insurance fund. It also means that more than only 39% of EI applicants could have qualified for benefits. That figure is quite low. It means that 61% of applicants who have lost their jobs or who are in regions with seasonal employment and who have to cope with the infamous gap could have collected employment insurance. However, because of the Minister of Finance's greed, and the government's greed, and because of the lack of expertise in managing public finances, which are being hoarded year after year, these people are still being refused EI. The same will hold true for this year.

Incidentally, there is a protest movement that is starting up again across Quebec, and we hope that it will catch on in the Maritimes and the rest of Canada. The Maritimes are also hit harder than most other regions in Canada. There is a movement that goes by the name "sans chemise" that has started up again; it is based in the Charlevoix region. At one point, the government wanted to reorganize the regions to set the number of weeks of work needed for people to qualify for EI.

The "sans-chemise" said, "No, you cannot do that", because it would exclude about a third of EI applicants if the government went ahead. So there was a demonstration and the "sans-chemise" were born.

The movement has started up again, because people find the whole situation unbelievable. So far \$44 billion has been pilfered from the EI account, and the tradition has been maintained in the latest budget; \$44 billion has been stolen and could have been used, in part, to ensure that more than just a minority of applicants qualify for EI benefits.

Government Orders

Some of this \$44 billion could have been used to help softwood lumber workers, for example. On Wednesday I heard the Minister for International Trade say that the government has already done a great deal. Of course, we agree with the minister, but success still eludes the government. And employment insurance could have been a catalyst with regard to the impact of this international trade decision.

I heard the secretary of state for economic development and member for Bruce say "Quebec did nothing". Quebec has done a lot in this area even though it does not come under its jurisdiction. The government is very good at talking about jurisdiction when it suits its purpose, but when it does not, when the time is not right, it does not talk about it. However, international trade is an area of federal jurisdiction and the federal government is responsible for any proceedings relating to countervailing duties imposed by the Americans or sanctions against our exports.

One would have thought that the federal government would have taken part of that \$44 billion to help the hardest hit workers and to broaden eligibility criteria. When the situation is such that only a minority of the targeted clientele can benefit from a policy, it means that policy is not working, because any given policy is meant to benefit the clientele as a whole. If it does not, changes are needed.

Three years ago, members a House committee unanimously agreed to change the insurance employment plan. Even the Liberal members voted in favour of doing that. That mollified somewhat the coalition of the "sans-chemise". They thought, "If a committee of the House of Commons is unanimous in this respect, it means the employment insurance plan can be changed and that we can count on at least some of the 15 recommendations being acted upon, particularly the recommendation asking that restrictions on eligibility be reduced". But no. Three years later, we are back to square one. Nothing has changed. It is business as usual with this budget. Of course, premiums have been lowered and we are very happy about that. However, there is always a way to find balance in life. And that also goes for managing the employment insurance plan.

Contributions may have been reduced, and this qualifies as an indirect tax cut, but at the same time benefits must be increased. The government must take a good hard look at itself and say, "The plan is no longer working; it is time to change it". But no, someone stands up in every day this place and sings the same tune every time we ask questions—I would almost feel like saying plays the same broken record—and tells us, "We have done a lot; the EI plan is much improved", and sits down. Then, that someone stands up again and says, "This is unwarranted; the criticism is unwarranted", and sits down again. Meanwhile, 61% of the unemployed are not eligible for benefits.

• (1020)

This is one of these situations. We are told that the \$44 billion has been spent. We know very well what it was spent on, but it should be entered in the government's books as a debt to the workers, employers and unemployed, who have not been able to rely on employment insurance for the past six years and continue to be penalized because of the federal government's inaction.

Once again, the budget ignores the humanitarian considerations that should guide all parliamentarians, and government members in

particular, out of concern for serving the people we are supposed to be representing, and serving them well.

Many references are made in the Speech from the Throne to aboriginal issues. I would like to clarify a few things. This is my third throne speech since 1993, and it is still fashionable, it still looks good to state in the introduction that the first nations have needs that must be recognized, that the good federal government will do everything in its power to help its aboriginal people. Putting things that way smacks of colonialism.

In the last budget, there is practically nothing for the first nations. In the past 10 months I have been able to observe how much the first nations are suffering all over Canada. There was even a UN observer who came here for about a week and a half. He went around to a number of reserves in Canada and he was completely flabbergasted. He thought that situations like that could only arise in Africa, for example. He found that even within Canada, one of the G-8 countries, one of the eight most industrialized countries, there were many reserves that did not even have running water and drinking water. He also saw that people were living in unhealthy housing. He also noted that underemployment could reach 95% in certain first nations communities. That means that only 5% of the people are working, if we look at it the opposite way. Such situations prey on the mind.

Despite all that, at the present time, there are 500 specific claims negotiations with first nations that are pending. There are 500 more coming along. For example, the negotiations on self-government could have been completed with a few million dollars more in the budget for the first nations. Unfortunately, the money is not there.

Another 500 claims will be filed over the next two years. Instead of concentrating on improving the first nations' socio-economic conditions and tackling the real issues, we are being handed garbage like Bill C-7, which no one wants.

I have just come back from Kenora, in the riding of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. There were 8,000 first nations representatives. It was not the chiefs, as this minister claims when he says that only the chiefs oppose the legislation on governance. No, there were 8,000 aboriginal children, adolescents and adults, who were not chiefs. They spontaneously took to the streets in the riding of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to ask for his head.

He does not get it at all, and his attitude harks back to colonialism. The bill reeks of racism, and the government continues to claim that this will relaunch plans for self governance, thereby accelerating the process by which the first nations obtain this right. I did not say that the minister was racist. I said that the bill was racist, with all due respect.

Government Orders

Much more could have been done with this budget. Unfortunately, the other side of the House has no imagination and is unable to show openness and above all to recognize the inherent right of the first nations to self governance.

As a result, Bill C-7 continues to hurt communities which have already suffered for 130 years under the Indian Act and which are continuing to suffer also from unqualified prejudice that cannot withstand ten minutes of analysis. People still think that aboriginals do not have the right to want more than the federal government is willing to give, although all the courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada and the United Nations, have said that they are nations and, as such, entitled to respect. It is our duty to negotiate with them on an equal footing.

I am completely opposed to this budget for these reasons.

• (1025)

[*English*]

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Surrey North.

It is my pleasure today to rise and join in the debate on Bill C-28 regarding the 2003 budget. Before the bill was tabled in the House of Commons, Canadians, and in particular my constituents in Nanaimo—Cowichan, were hopeful that the government would actually realize what was happening in the real world outside of Parliament Hill. Canadians were hopeful that the government would begin to come to grips with the disappointment and disbelief that has arisen out of past budgets presented by the member for LaSalle—Émard.

My constituents have expressed to me, in the strongest possible terms, the conviction that the government does not even know that they exist. My riding on Vancouver Island is one of the western most ridings in this country and simply put, out of Liberal sight, out of Liberal mind. Indeed, the staff in my riding at one point had a letter from the Prime Minister's Office wanting to inquire about someone who lived on Victoria Island. Members can imagine how crushing a blow that is to our ego out there to realize that the Prime Minister's Office does not even know the right name of the island on the west coast of Canada.

My constituents were truly hoping for tax relief, but received none. Instead, they received \$17.4 billion in new spending initiatives over the next three years. The simple truth is, and it is an easy truth to understand, that while the government attempts to lay claim to tax reduction, the budget says that for every one dollar in tax relief the government puts in additional \$7.56 in spending. That is the new math. That is not a tax reduction budget; that is a tax and spend budget.

I would like to speak to several specific points in the bill. There is no question that tax changes for small business and the eventual elimination of the capital tax would benefit many Canadians. We have called for this for a long time. The government has paid far too little attention to the small business community in this country. This is only a feeble step in the right direction. Small business is Canada's economic backbone and has been ignored for far too long.

I am pleased with the proposed 40% reduction in the air security charge, something that the former finance minister refused to do. I

eagerly wait to see if the current finance minister will actually deliver on these promises or if there is any real difference between these two members as they vie for the leadership of their party. In a country the size of Canada and the speed at which business of all sorts is conducted, air travel is absolutely imperative. The current air tax reduction of 40% is a good start, but it will continue to discourage air travel in Canada. I know and have heard from many business people in my own riding about the negative impact of the air tax. This tax should now be eliminated, not simply reduced.

The next point is child care. The Canadian Alliance believes that child care options should be given to parents, not to bureaucrats. I believe that the family is the cornerstone of society and we will prosper or collapse on the basis of that strength. We support a \$3,000 per child, up to age 16, deduction for families and therefore allow them to choose the best child care option for their children and family by keeping the money in their own pockets.

With the national child benefit, Canadians once again see how the Liberals give and the Liberals take. The Liberals give the national child benefit to low income families with one hand and then tax thousands of dollars away from these very same families with the other. If the Liberals were so concerned about Canada's working poor, why would they tax them so heavily? They tax them through rising Canada pension plan premiums. They overcharge them through their employment insurance premiums as well as through low income contingent GST credits. The Liberals simply have not given working poor Canadians a fair break in the budget.

• (1030)

The spending on health care is another issue covered by the bill. Perhaps there is nothing that affects Canadians more than health care. Whether it is for our aging parents, our growing children or ourselves, each one of us here and across the country is impacted by health care and the costs of the system. Simply put, the money is now on the table and it is time to get on with the job of real health care reform.

When will the federal government realize that it cannot stay mired in the past? This path of health care has led to the many problems that we are currently attempting to deal with in Canada. The Liberals balanced the books largely on the backs of the provinces' own health care budgets. This was not acceptable, and it is not acceptable today. The Canadian Alliance will hold the federal and provincial governments accountable to ensure that new health spending buys real change, not simply more of the status quo.

An issue that affects all Canadians, but most notably many constituents of mine in Nanaimo—Cowichan, is the budget allocated to aboriginal affairs. Despite the billions of dollars the government has spent on aboriginal programs over the past decade, the standard of living for aboriginal Canadians remains appalling. I have visited numerous reserves, homes and sat with councils and understand this issue as well as anyone in this chamber.

Government Orders

I support the reallocation of departmental funding for key issues such as health, education and capital infrastructure, such as water and sewage. Let me be perfectly clear on this. I do not support the role of an increased bureaucracy. The absolutely last thing that aboriginal Canadians need is one more hurdle to jump over, one more hoop to jump through and one more piece of red tape to cut through.

Aboriginal Canadians need real assistance. Neither native nor non-native Canadians can afford to be saddled with any more administrative costs with which to deal. The number of mouldy homes, non-potable drinking water and non-existent sewage systems is simply not acceptable.

This is not a problem that has just cropped up recently. This is an issue that has been with us for years. It is an issue that existed when our present Prime Minister was the minister of Indian affairs 40 years ago, and had an opportunity then to change things and make things right. Now aboriginal Canadians are living with the failed promises and the poor attitudes that were displayed in those days. The Prime Minister of this day did not do then what had to be done to change the life of aboriginal Canadians in this country.

The Liberal government likes to talk a good story under the guise of being protectors of the environment. The Liberals have already wasted over \$3 billion without a plan for Kyoto, and at this date have absolutely no results to show for it. Throwing more good money into the Kyoto cookie jar will simply lead to more waste and misuse and will not protect the environment for Canadians. The Canadian Alliance supports the need for targeted funding for new green technologies that will bring real environmental benefits to Canada. There are viable options available, yet to date this government refuses to consider them or to implement them.

An issue that is important also to many Canadians, but in particular importance to the many active and retired Canadian armed forces personnel who live in my riding, is the appalling way this Liberal government has undermined our military. This also shows up on the radar screen of a lot of polling that we do. The Canadian Alliance agrees with the Auditor General as well as many other organizations calling for an immediate increase of \$2 billion per year in our defence spending. The Liberal commitment of \$600 million per year falls far short of what is necessary to sustain our armed forces let alone start to rebuild it.

●(1035)

The examples are almost endless and they are shameful, indeed scandalous: the ill-fated replacement helicopters that have caused the death of armed forces personnel; a lack of camouflage uniforms for Afghanistan and the necessary equipment when we sent our troops into battle zones or put them into harm's way; now the government's refusal to spend any money on any heavy lift capability, expecting our allies to do the job for us; as well as underpaid personnel which leads to a deteriorating moral among our armed forces personnel. That is simply scandalous. It has to change and a Canadian Alliance government would make sure that that change takes place.

The government is making some token gestures toward tax changes. The move to increase RRSP limits to \$18,000 by the year 2006, to increase the small business deduction limit to \$300,000, to eliminate the capital tax over the next five years and lower the

resource tax rate in line with the general corporate rate are positive moves. Unfortunately, from our point of view they are being implemented far too slowly and they fall short of what could and should be done.

I presume that my time is drawing to a close, but I would like to say that there are other issues I would love to talk about such as foreign aid, amendments to the federal-provincial fiscal arrangements, the Canada Student Financial Assistance Act, the employment insurance compassionate care benefits and of course the Liberals favourite tax, which they were going to scrap and abolish, the GST. However I do not have time to speak about all those things even though I would love to.

The bottom line however is this budget is a tax and spend budget, not unlike many budgets that have been presented in the House by previous Liberal governments. It builds on the broken promises brought in by the current Prime Minister. It builds on the boondoggles to which Canadians have been witness at HRDC and the failed gun registry.

Canadians can see through this Liberal smoke and mirrors show. They recognize that there is no significant tax relief for them in the 2003 budget. Instead the Liberal government has increased spending by 20% over the next three years. I would challenge the government to go to the people and ask if they really feel that kind of spending is in line with the priorities of Canadians. Canadians are growing weary of this, and I will continue to oppose this budget until real tax relief is available to all Canadians.

●(1040)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank the member for his comments. Of course, I do not agree with everything he said. However, I believe there is a lot of common ground.

I would like to ask him two very specific questions. I would like to know if he considers, as I do, that the February 18 budget is a budget that throws money around indiscriminately. We see that it contains 74 expenditure measures, 14 tax measures and that none of these gets our attention. I would like to know if the member agrees that, in this budget, a lot of money has been thrown around without really solving an essential and priority problem for Canadians and Quebecers.

Second, I would like the member to tell me—he referred to employment insurance premiums—whether he considers that it is normal, or totally abnormal, that, this year again, at \$2.10 per \$100 of insurable earnings, the employment insurance fund will rake in a surplus of \$2.8 billion, as the Minister of Human Resources Development confirmed yesterday. This will bring the debt accumulated by the federal government with people paying into employment insurance to almost \$45 billion. Is it normal that the government has used EI premiums to pay down a part of the federal debt?

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Reed Elley: Mr. Speaker, my colleague's questions are indeed good ones.

In response to his first question, yes, it is a budget that tends to sprinkle money across the country, going to favourite pet projects that often will reward friends of the government, and it is attached only to the government's priorities for Canadians.

I do not think if Canadians were asked if the spending priorities of the government were in line with theirs, there would be much of a consistency in their answer and the government's response in this budget. Unfortunately, Liberal governments, when they do finally get into a position where they have surplus funds, do not tend to take the right decisions that will affect the majority of Canadians across the country long term.

This government is not proactive. It does not come up with great plans that lead the country into the future, with a 5, 10 and 15 year plans that look down the road as to what might happen for the country. Instead, it is a very reactive government that continues to react to crisis. It goes from crisis to crisis, finally being forced to take action on some huge issues, not building up any kind of confidence within Canadians with any kind of proactive plan for many things. That concerns me greatly.

In terms of the EI fund, we know that this has gone on for years. Even though the government boasts of having lowered EI premiums, it continues to take far too much out of the pockets of Canadian taxpayers by way of these kinds of taxes. It does not give Canadians back in return what they deserve.

In my own riding at a time when the EI fund was boasting of billions of dollars of surpluses, HRDC did not renew contracts to organizations in my community that had previously done retraining and counselling of laid off workers. In my mind the spending of EI funds should be used for workers. That is the workers' money and it should be spent on workers. It should not sit someplace in a government fund which is too easily raided by the government to balance its budgets or to go into some kind of general revenue to be put to a pet project for the government.

That is scandalous and it is wrong but the government continues to do it and workers are paying the price.

• (1045)

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on behalf of the people of Surrey North to participate in this budget debate.

The government balanced the budget a few years back by downloading costs either directly to the taxpayers or on to the provinces. Taxes have been high for far too long. Ottawa continues to maintain an artificial annual budgetary surplus created by high taxes, and every year it uses the surplus as a slush fund.

Unfortunately there is no government-wide search for duplication or wasteful spending. Although there is much need to eliminate waste and reduce spending in non-priority areas, there is at the same time much need for increases in important areas that the government has neglected.

At this late stage in this year's budget debate, many of my colleagues responsible for critiquing particular cabinet portfolios have already spoken. For my part I will concentrate my remarks on the criminal justice portfolio. This is an area that could be bolstered by an increase in spending with funds salvaged from areas of non-priority spending. First I will touch on the youth justice system.

The Liberals' new Youth Criminal Justice Act that came into effect on April 1 of this year is a prime example of what I am talking about. The provinces, municipalities, probation officers and virtually anyone involved in our country's youth criminal justice system told the federal government that more resources would be needed to implement and administer the new youth justice system that the Liberals were designing. However, the government went ahead and passed legislation creating a whole new youth justice regime that the provinces are expected to administer.

Everyone was looking to this budget for the resources that the provinces would require to run the new system but there was nothing in the budget to address those concerns. The new Youth Criminal Justice Act forced on the provinces by the government fails to accomplish what Canadians wanted because of its extreme complexity and lack of funding. The provinces continue to pick up the lion's share of the costs involved, around 75%.

The Liberals claim that they do not have the money to carry out the originally agreed upon arrangement to pay into a fifty-fifty cost sharing scheme but unbelievably, they still expect the provinces to come up with the money for their plan. This situation is shameful.

Our youth need a criminal justice system that serves their needs. Some youth need help so they can be steered away from a life of crime. This takes money and it is a worthwhile investment yet there was nothing in the budget for youth justice. And the government crows about its so-called children's agenda.

Second, I want to talk about children in danger. For some time now, I and others, have called on the government to implement a nationwide Amber alert program. Amber alert uses radio, TV, electronic billboards and emergency broadcast systems to immediately alert the public about abducted children whose lives are in peril.

Some provinces have developed their own programs without any support from the federal government. Although it was not successful in preventing the recent tragic death of Holly Jones in Toronto, we did see the Ontario program in operation this past week. Amber alert has saved lives in other jurisdictions, however, provincial programs stop at provincial borders. A truly effective program must be national. Canadians want the federal government to show some leadership by instituting a nationwide amber alert program for the sake of our children.

It would have been nice to see such an initiative provided for in the budget but the government did not respond. Again, it brags about its so-called children's agenda. There was nothing in the budget for children in peril.

Government Orders

Finally, I want to discuss the issue of marijuana cultivation, grow ops. Yesterday I had the opportunity to question the Solicitor General during his appearance before the justice committee to answer questions concerning the recent federal budget. I used my time to focus on marijuana grow ops, a major problem in my constituency of Surrey North.

In Surrey alone, there are an estimated 3,500 to 4,500 grow ops that generate annual revenues conservatively estimated to be in excess of \$2 billion. That is in my constituency alone.

Much of that marijuana is exported to the United States as currency for the guns and cocaine that are then smuggled back into Canada. The grow ops are run by violent criminal gangs and are located in quiet residential neighbourhoods where children play. My constituents are concerned and they are angry. They fear for their own safety but more important, for the safety of their children.

Day after day, letters, e-mails, faxes and phone calls come into my office from constituents demanding that something be done about it. The criminal intelligence directorate of the RCMP issued a report on marijuana cultivation in Canada which is dated November 2002. For some reason it only found its way into the public domain on April 24 but that is a question for another day.

The report indicates that grow ops have increased sixfold since 1993. As I said to the Solicitor General yesterday, the sixfold increase happened under his government's watch.

• (1050)

The report also says that the grow ops have reached epidemic proportions. That is the RCMP's wording, epidemic proportions, and it cites the lack of resources for law enforcement as part of the problem. Since the report was dated November 2002, I must assume that the Solicitor General received it in the prebudget phase.

The Solicitor General said that he did inform the finance minister as to what the RCMP had told him. Either the Solicitor General downplayed the serious nature of the RCMP's concerns or the finance minister did not listen because I do not see anything in the estimates or the budget to directly address the issue of marijuana grow operations.

There have been drive-by shootings, murders and assaults. Just the other night over 60 shots were fired at a residence in that area. No motive has been established but such incidents have occurred before and found to be cases of mistaken identity in that the wrong house was targeted. Innocent lives are at risk.

Other communities in Canada face the same problem. A number of our colleagues on the government side, members from Ontario, have raised the issue of marijuana grow operations in their constituencies. They too understand the negative impact they have on communities, yet we do not see any resources directly targeting these operations. Worse yet, there appears to be no strategy in place to reduce and eliminate these scourges in our neighbourhoods.

Resources for our law enforcement agencies to take down grow ops should have been a budgetary item. There should have been tax dollars specifically earmarked for this effort but there are none.

The Solicitor General told the committee yesterday with great pride how people come from all around the world to examine our criminal justice system. What he did not say was that international criminals examine our system too and they come here to set up shop with whatever criminal activity they are engaged in because the government has a legacy of lax laws and lenient sentences.

This is especially true when it comes to marijuana grow operations: high profit and low risk. Getting caught is considered nothing more than the cost of doing business.

The Solicitor General recalled visiting Surrey and learning from the local RCMP about the problem. He called it serious and admitted that it should be challenged head on. He said that we have to do more. The fact is that the resources to do more are not in the budget. He concluded by declaring that in the next few weeks the government will bring forward proposals that will in a more comprehensive fashion challenge the grow operations, to increase penalties and take them down.

Those are lofty words but words nonetheless and hollow words without the commitment of resources to back them up. Certainly there will always be competing priorities for tax dollars. The job of government is to establish those priorities in the best interests of the people of Canada. Sadly the government does not appear to place the safety of our children and communities very high on its list of spending priorities.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the member from the Canadian Alliance who spoke at length about the navy. He also spoke about the Solicitor General.

I think that he has read the budget just as we, the members of the Bloc Québécois, have done. I would like to hear what he has to say about fiscal imbalance. This budget demonstrates that federal taxes are increasing while federal transfers to the provinces are decreasing, even though that is where the needs are. The federal government is raking in the money. In Quebec, the Séguin commission has shown that fiscal imbalance is a very serious problem in Canada. All Canadian provinces have said that the federal government will have to withdraw from certain areas of taxation so that they can get the money they need to meet the expectations of Canadians and Quebecers.

I would also like the member to make a few comments on the issue of employment insurance. What does he think about the infamous gap and about the \$45 billion, which the government collected from workers and employers and which has disappeared all of sudden? It has just vanished into thin air. I would like to hear what he has to say on these various issues.

S. O. 31

[English]

Mr. Chuck Cadman: Mr. Speaker, I think the previous speaker spoke quite eloquently toward the problems with the employment insurance fund. This has been an ongoing issue. This is certainly something I have received many complaints about in my constituency, the fact that the government is taking far more than it needs to keep the fund afloat. We can understand why there has to be a certain amount of surplus for a rainy day, but the idea of essentially taxing workers and employers to fund its own pet projects is something that is of extreme concern to Canadians when that money could be put to far better use.

As far as the imbalances in the provinces that the member speaks of, again it is an ongoing problem. We have seen downloading and downloading year after year. We only have to look at what happened in the provinces when the health transfers were cut. Certainly my province of B.C. has suffered enormously because of that.

Then we look at the boondoggles and the HRDC scandals of a couple of years ago and we still find problems. Every time some of these programs come across our desks, as they do on all members' desks in this place, we have to wonder what the blazes the government is doing. The gun registry has cost \$1 billion. Could that money not have been spent in better places?

I spoke of youth justice and the problems that are occurring in the provinces trying to fund that. We know the problems that the police are running up against with child pornography, trying to have the resources available to take that out. It is an incredible problem yet the government keeps piling up resources to throw around.

I expect fully that we will see some of these issues answered just before the next election when the money starts to flow. We talk about infrastructure. I expect to see a lot of infrastructure money flow into my constituency before the next election when the government tries to buy votes with the employment insurance that people have paid in this country.

•(1055)

The Deputy Speaker: From past experience, I know that members do not always appreciate being asked to start a speech for a minute or two and then are interrupted for members' statements. Without prejudice, I say to members on either side of the House, someone may want to ask a question or make a comment with regard to the budget implementation bill.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague has a tremendous interest in youth justice and justice generally. I know the reason for that interest is partly a familial one, his family having been a victim in one major issue.

I want to ask the hon. member a slightly different question. He has a very practical bent of mind and understands what some of the problems are with regard to infrastructure, particularly highways.

I am sure my hon. colleague knows only too well what has happened to the price of gasoline for example, and the fact that the federal government collects huge taxes on each litre of gasoline that is purchased. The hon. member is from British Columbia where there seems to have been some kind of discrimination against the

spending of moneys that have been collected from the taxes levied on gasoline bought in British Columbia.

I wonder if my hon. colleague would care to comment about the relationship between the money that is collected by the federal government from the sale of gasoline and the spending of money on infrastructure, in particular highways. The hon. member lives in the Surrey area where there is an awful lot of heavy duty traffic. I wonder if he could comment on that.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not doubt that the hon. member for Surrey North would love to have a great deal of time to answer a very pertinent question. However, given the time of day, I must proceed to Statements by Members. I will begin with the hon. member for Northumberland and I certainly appreciate the cooperation of the hon. member for Kelowna.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

OLYMPICS AND PARALYMPICS

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Northumberland, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my constituents and I would like to congratulate and thank the Vancouver 2010 Bid Corporation for its continuous hard work to win the right to host the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in 2010. Canada is still competing against Austria and South Korea to host the world in 2010 and in this Olympic competition there is only one medal.

We have a great team made up of great players and I know we can win the gold for Canada. The team, led by Mr. Jack Poole, includes volunteers and governments, first nations and athletes, the Canadian Olympic Committee and the Canadian Paralympic Committee, and leaders from the business and finance communities from right across the country. We thank them for their good work.

The Vancouver 2010 Olympic and Paralympic bid is a true Team Canada project. I ask members to please join the citizens of my riding in congratulating the Vancouver 2010 Bid Corporation for its success to date. Let us go for gold. Let us bring the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games home in 2010.

* * *

•(1100)

HOCKEY

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to congratulate the Kelowna Rockets hockey team, their coach Marc Habscheid and their general manager Bruce Hamilton.

The Kelowna Rockets were pegged in a pre-season poll to finish last in the western conference. Due to the excellent skating, speed and defence, this team won the Western Hockey League championship and is competing for the Memorial Cup next week.

“Defence wins championships” is what the Rockets live by. It paid off for them in the west and will figure strongly in their battle for the Memorial Cup. In addition to strong defence, fast transition became the trademark of the team. Bruce Hamilton said, “Our transition is based on stick-to-stick passing because good passing gets the puck out quicker when the opposition dumps the puck in”.

Special recognition is also warranted for Marc Habscheid. He was named coach of the year. We all need to recognize the important role people like Mr. Habscheid play in the development of championship hockey players and citizens among our youth. We wish them well for the Memorial Cup. Yay Rockets.

* * *

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Oak Ridges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in an age of integration, harmonization and deregulation, I believe the time has come to have an open and frank debate about the level of foreign ownership in Canada.

Foreign investment has had positive effects, improving our standard of living and economic output. Foreign ownership, however, has resulted in key sectors of the economy being controlled by non-Canadian interests.

Since the investment review division's records were begun in 1985, until June 2002 there had been a total of 10,052 foreign takeovers, of which only 1,394 were actually reviewed. Not a single takeover application has ever been rejected.

It has been pointed out by author Mel Hurtig that “excessive foreign ownership leads to hollowing out—cities without head offices or corporate leaders”.

A Decima poll showed that 72% of Canadians opposed foreign ownership in the media and telecommunications industries, 60% in the telephone industry and 66% in the newspaper industry. In a recent *Maclean's* poll, 81% of Canadians agreed that Canadian ownership of businesses operating in Canada was necessary in order to maintain a strong Canadian identity.

Canadians have made clear their views. It is time to engage them in the wider debate.

* * *

WHEELS IN MOTION

Mr. Tony Tirabassi (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the members of the House that on June 14 the City of Thorold in my riding of Niagara Centre will be sponsoring, along with local Scotiabank branches, the only event in the Niagara region in support of Rick Hansen's Wheels in Motion initiative.

In the words of the Rick Hansen Man in Motion Foundation, “Wheels in Motion is the new annual signature awareness and fundraising event, brought to you by locally organized volunteer teams to help improve the lives of people with spinal cord injury”.

Participants in this fundraising event will be walking, running, biking, skateboarding and using wheelchairs and collecting money through pledges. I wish to extend congratulations to all involved in organizing this event and best wishes for success.

S. O. 31

COMMONWEALTH WAR GRAVES COMMISSION

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House the important work of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, which is celebrating its 86th anniversary on May 21.

Through the years, the commission, supported by Veterans Affairs Canada and our Commonwealth partners, has contributed greatly to the commemoration and remembrance of the achievements and sacrifices of those who gave their lives for peace during the first and second world wars. This includes over 110,000 Canadians who paid the ultimate price.

Sir Winston Churchill once said that these beautifully maintained graveyards and monuments would, “preserve the memory of a common purpose pursued by great nations in the remote past and will undoubtedly excite the wonder and the reverence of future generations”.

I salute the Commonwealth War Graves Commission for its mission of caring for those sacred places which will help future generations better understand the magnitude of the sacrifices made by our Canadian troops and those of our allies.

Lest we forget.

* * *

NATIONAL MINING WEEK

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, May 12-18 marks National Mining Week in Canada. As a world leader in the export of minerals and mineral products, the mining industry makes a significant annual contribution of over \$36 billion to our economy.

In British Columbia, the mining industry is a major employer. However, due to the recent closure of several mines over the past few years and the lack of new mining developments, the industry has suffered over 1,200 job losses since the year 2000.

The town of Tumbler Ridge in my constituency is anticipating the opening of a new coal mining project by Western Canadian Coal that will yield an estimated 1.6 million tonnes of coal a year. It is hoped that this mine will employ hundreds of people who have previously been laid off due to the recent closure of two other coal mines in that community.

While we recognize mining week let us also acknowledge the important role the federal government should be playing to foster economic growth within this vital industry.

S. O. 31

•(1105)

ABORIGINAL AWARENESS WEEK

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, May 20-23 is Aboriginal Awareness Week. Next week is set aside to honour and increase awareness of aboriginal peoples in Canada and in the workplace. Inuit, first nations and Métis make up the fastest growing population in Canada.

Government of Canada departments across the country will host Aboriginal Awareness Week celebrations, which will include speeches from elders as well as other guests, demonstrations by artists, musicians and dancers, opportunities to try aboriginal foods and more.

Let us increase communication and promote greater understanding and cooperation across cultures. Let us recognize the contribution of the first peoples of Canada to our country.

* * *

[*Translation*]

JOURNÉE NATIONALE DES PATRIOTES

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Mr. Speaker, May 19 will mark the Journée nationale des Patriotes. As Patriote of the year 2003 for the Jean-Olivier Chénier chapter, I am proud to remind Quebecers of the courage of those who sacrificed themselves for their rights, in the early 19th century.

The Patriotes fought for justice, freedom and democracy, the very foundations of our institutions.

Quebec has its own identity, its own culture, and its own institutions. It owes them to people like the Patriotes, were not afraid to stick up for their convictions, even if it meant putting their lives on the line.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I pay tribute to the exceptional courage of the Patriotes and their families, and in particular to Dr. Jean-Olivier Chénier and his comrades from Saint-Eustache.

* * *

OFFICIAL VISIT BY PRIME MINISTER OF FRANCE

Mr. Georges Farrah (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you are no doubt aware, the Prime Minister of France, Jean-Pierre Raffarin, will be in Ottawa next Wednesday at the start of his first official visit to Canada. He will be in Canada a total of four days.

He will be accompanied by ministers of foreign trade, industry and cooperation and la Francophonie as well as business leaders. Hon. members hardly need reminding that, in addition to our strong cultural ties, France is also the second largest foreign investor in Canada.

Prime Minister Raffarin and his Canadian counterpart will be discussing bilateral trade, the international situation and cultural diversity, along with commemorations of the 400th anniversary for the first French settlement in North America.

The government sees these commemorations, which will start gathering momentum next year, as a wonderful opportunity for

drawing attention to the richness of our relations with one of Canada's two mother countries.

Vive la France. Vive le Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, what a double standard: 218 aboriginal communities across our country have boil water advisories right now and are in a high risk health situation. Children, the weak and the elderly face serious health consequences if they drink, bathe in or even eat food prepared in the water of their communities. Something so simple as wetting a toothbrush is a danger.

Let us ask ourselves: If these were non-aboriginal communities, would this not be an urgent priority of the federal government? Would this not be a crisis? It is, and this week the government announced a pitiful spending program for aboriginal infrastructure. Over the next half decade it will only try to address one in five of the water systems problems. That is pathetic.

Yet in the coming fiscal year the dozen federal departments that each deal with aboriginal issues will devote 15 times as much money per year to their communications budgets. Sadly, it appears that this government seems to care more about selling Canadians on the job it is doing than actually doing the job itself.

* * *

WORLD TELECOMMUNICATIONS DAY

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is World Telecommunications Day. Canada has a distinguished history of innovation in the telecommunications field, starting of course with the invention of the telephone by Canadian Alexander Graham Bell in 1876.

In this era of modern communications, Canada is recognized as a leader in the digital economy and information society. Our policy of connecting Canadians, our innovation agenda, ensured that Canada was the first country to connect our schools to the Internet, digitalize our national heritage, encourage e-commerce and use information and communications technologies for economic and social development.

Kofi Annan, the Secretary-General of the UN, has identified this year's theme as "Helping all of the world's people to communicate", with a primary goal to narrow the digital divide and lay the foundation of a truly global information society.

Canada will be working with members of the UN to achieve this goal at the World Summit on the Information Society at the end of the year. All Canadians can be proud of this country's leadership in the future of world communications.

•(1110)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday thousands of first nations people stood up in Kenora, in the heart of the riding of the minister for aboriginal affairs, to tell the Liberal government to kill Bill C-7.

Jack Layton was there and Ontario NDP leader Howard Hampton was there. And the member for Winnipeg Centre, who has fought tooth and nail in committee to stop Bill C-7, was also there.

Other members of the House say they too oppose Bill C-7, but first nations and the NDP worry that the government will do to first nations on governance what it did to taxpayers on the GST: say one thing and do another. We say that is not good enough. Across Canada first nations are speaking loudly against Bill C-7, and after centuries of not listening, it is time the House did.

Clearly Bill C-7 is dividing a Liberal caucus already in chaos and disarray. Why prolong the agony? It is time for a free vote on Bill C-7 so every member of the House can stand up and be clear with first nations where we stand, and that includes the former finance minister.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SALON DU LIVRE ANCIEN ET DU LIVRE D'HISTOIRE

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with enthusiasm that I have agreed to be the spokesperson for the very first Salon du livre ancien et du livre d'histoire, to be held on May 24 and 25 at Collège de l'Assomption, which has been designated a cultural heritage site. Given the interest in history, heritage and genealogy, this event is a guaranteed success.

Naturally, history will hold an important place at this antiquarian and history book fair, but so will literature, the arts and sociology. Book lovers and others will be delighted to see and touch the treasures put on display by the booksellers.

Visitors will also be treated to a display of rare and antiquarian books from the college's archival funds and an exhibit on genealogy. In addition, a designer bookbinder will be talking about his trade and his passion.

Throughout the fair, visitors will have the opportunity to learn more about Jean-Baptiste Meilleur, who was recently recognized as a person of national historic significance by the Department of Canadian Heritage.

We wish the first Salon du livre ancien et du livre d'histoire de l'Assomption every success.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL MUSEUMS DAY

Ms. Carole-Marie Allard (Laval East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, May 18 is International Museums Day. This year's theme is "Museums and Friends", in recognition of the important contribution of volunteers to our Canadian museums.

S. O. 31

The Government of Canada recognizes the importance of volunteer work in museums. Volunteers make up 65% of the staff in Canadian museums. Through the Canada volunteerism initiative, the government is working at maintaining and strengthening volunteerism in Canadian cultural institutions, and volunteer organizations in other areas.

We do recognize the contribution volunteers make to our museums and are very grateful to them. I invite all Canadians to celebrate International Museums Day by visiting a museum and volunteering in our museums.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said that there is a perception that money can unduly influence the political process. Perhaps he should realize that his own personal schedule and his own legacy agenda are wrongfully manipulating the political process of the House.

There are some very important pieces of legislation before the House and in committee. Recent events in Toronto have focused the need for the creation of a national sex offender registry. Bill C-23 is the legislation that will create such a registry and is an issue that Canadians see as a priority.

Yet the Prime Minister does not see this as a priority. What does his own House leader put as a priority before the House? Bill C-24, the political financing act. He wants us to stay in the House until that legislation is passed, but he does not care about the sex offender registry.

The Prime Minister is more interested in pushing through vindictive legislation aimed at getting even with people within his own party, those who once referred to Bill C-24 as "dumb as a bag of hammers", than in doing what is best for Canadians. It is no secret that the financing bill has raised a storm of controversy, but we should be dealing with things that are important to Canadians in the House, not what is important to the Prime Minister.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, early yesterday morning RCMP responded to a report of shots fired in the Fraser Heights area of Surrey. A residence and parked vehicles had been struck by over 60 bullets.

No motive has yet been established and there is absolutely no suggestion that anything untoward was occurring at the residence, whose occupants are cooperating fully with the police. This was a drive-by shooting in a quiet neighbourhood, but the area does harbour a number of grow operations.

Oral Questions

It occurred only hours before I questioned the Solicitor General at the justice committee about his government's failure to address the marijuana grow op issue in Canada. It was little more than a month after the same Solicitor General visited Surrey to learn at first hand from the RCMP about the problem. It was about six months after the Solicitor General received and sat on an RCMP report informing him of the grow op epidemic, in their words.

Lax laws, lenient courts and under-resourced enforcement are the reasons why criminals come from all over the world to set up marijuana grow ops in Canada. This is about public safety. The citizens of Surrey want action now.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

• (1115)

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General said yesterday that the national sex offender registry could not be made retroactive “for very good reasons”. The trouble is, he will not tell anybody what those very good reasons are.

The Ontario sex offender registry is in fact retroactive. If a provincial sex offender registry can be retroactive, why can we not have one like that nationally?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are trying to get the legislation through the House. We are negotiating with Ontario at the moment to make it retroactive to the individuals that are on the Ontario sex offender registry system. That is what we are trying to do.

If we could get some cooperation from members on the other side of the House we might be able to get this legislation through and have it up and functioning.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it could be passed in a day if the member made it retroactive.

[Translation]

While the federal government has missed the boat, some provinces are going ahead with their own sexual offenders registries. The Ontario registry is retroactive. It includes the names and addresses of offenders who have been found guilty.

If a retroactive sex offender registry is possible at the provincial level, why is it not possible at the national level?

[English]

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, it could probably be passed in a day if we could get cooperation from members of the official opposition. Who is holding up the federal sex offender registry at the Canadian Alliance?

We introduced the bill on December 11. We have debated it on six separate days. On March 31 we had a motion from a member of that party, the member for Battlefords—Lloydminster, which said: “That this House declines to give second reading to Bill C-23...”. That is the bill that we want to get through, and that party is opposing it.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that is because if we get this bill in this form, it is absolutely useless.

Yesterday, the security minister from Ontario said the following about the government's actions:

It's absolutely mind-boggling—decriminalizing marijuana is more important to the federal government than the safety of innocent children

If the government were to make this registry retroactive it would be useful. Why would it pass a registry that is useless?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is off the mark again. We must start someplace. The government had the vision and foresight to go to the federal-provincial-territorial ministers meetings and received agreement from them to move ahead with this particular piece of legislation.

I have already said how this legislation would apply to the legislation that is in place in Ontario. This is just one tool of many in the tool box for police forces. We have already done many other things in terms of combating child porn and sex offenders, increasing maximum—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton North.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals say they have to start someplace. They have been dithering and delaying on so many important issues, the sex offender registry for one and marijuana is another.

Look at their stance on missile defence. It is also unclear. The cabinet is divided. The Prime Minister is equivocating and asleep at the switch again. The Americans are trying to figure out where we stand on this issue. The defence minister says it will be an “insurance policy”, but the government is not prepared and it cannot even figure out how to pay the premiums.

When will the government assure us and our closest ally that we will not leave them in the lurch again?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the problem with Alliance members is that they would like to have debates in the House of Commons so that the views of members can be fully canvassed. And then when we have one, as we did yesterday on this very issue, they complain that we did not come forward with a government position and a dictate as to what should be done.

We have been listening to the members of the House from all parties including the Alliance, and therefore, after yesterday's debate, we feel we are in a better position to consider these matters and to make a decision in due course.

Oral Questions

• (1120)

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in fact, the minister admits it. Maybe he is capable of walking and chewing gum at the same time. The government has been muddling around for months. At least the government now seems prepared to have discussions with the Americans.

The Americans plan on having the program up and running by 2004. That is just seven months away. Norad has been in place for six decades and if we do not get involved in missile defence, even Norad is at risk. That means if we lose that, we are wide open to air attack.

When will the government act on what we have been saying all along for years, that the best offence is a good defence?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may think she is able to walk and chew gum at the same time. What she is really asking us to do is make up our mind before we have heard parliamentarians and the Canadian public. We are working on that basis.

After some of her other representations, I am pleased to see that she has read the Prime Minister's comments in response to questions yesterday because she paraphrased some of those, and also the excellent work of the Minister of Foreign Affairs whose speech she also paraphrased in her comments a moment ago.

* * *

[Translation]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, because of inadequate federal assistance, the softwood lumber crisis has now made more victims. Tembec just told 300 sawmill workers in Béarn, Témiscamingue, that they are being temporarily laid off. To make matters worse, according to Marc Boutin, of the Conseil de l'industrie forestière du Québec, it is likely that other mills will also cease production.

Given this disaster, can the Minister for International Trade tell us why the government still refuses to provide loan guarantees that would allow the industry to get through this crisis?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are still making progress on the softwood lumber issue. We are still working very closely with the industry. Negotiations will be resumed, I hope. Right now, there is a good dialogue with the U.S. on this issue.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should ask the members of the Bloc Québécois to answer their own questions. They seem more interested in their own rhetoric, whereas we on this side of the House are truly interested in settling the softwood lumber dispute.

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as opposed to the minister, the industry is betting on international tribunals rather than on a resumption of talks with Washington. In fact, according to Carl Grenier, of CLÉ-Bois, the latest U.S. offer is worse than bait, it is a weight that could drag businesses and workers to the bottom.

Instead of settling for a sellout deal, will the government finally provide loan guarantees so that the whole industry can benefit from the upcoming WTO and NAFTA rulings at the end of the day?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have allocated \$110 million to help communities and workers and to make the forest industry more competitive. We have invested money and energy to help people in the transition toward a new economy and to help communities in their efforts to develop new economic activity. And we will continue to do so.

Mr. Marcel Gagnon (Champlain, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as in the Lac-Saint-Jean and North Shore regions, the shock wave from the softwood lumber crisis is being felt in Témiscamingue and in the Mauricie. The 27% surtax on softwood lumber is forcing the Crête mills, in my riding, to stop production for four weeks.

If the Minister for International Trade is so confident of victory before the WTO, why does he not suspend his negotiations with the Americans and immediately implement phase two of his aid package?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, two and a half years ago we adopted a two-part strategy that, in my opinion, has served our country well. For the first time, we have not grovelled before the Americans and there is hope that this issue will be settled in the long term.

I would point out to our hon. friends in the Bloc that even at the time, their head office—which got 33% of the vote in the recent election—supported us in this strategy. I understand that they feel a bit freer now, since the head office is disappearing from the map. But their own party approved the strategy of taking a two—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Champlain.

Mr. Marcel Gagnon (Champlain, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there are over 300 workers without any income because of the government's inaction. Therefore, I ask him this: is he going to work to get the employment insurance rules relaxed so as to help these workers get through this difficult time?

• (1125)

Hon. Claudette Bradshaw (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have made transfer payments of \$600 million to Quebec's manpower programs. But the important thing is that the ministers are going to get together and talk about transfers with respect to manpower all across the country.

The Bloc has reported many situations. Transfer payments for manpower have to be looked at in order to ensure that these people are going to find work. They do not want EI benefits; they want work. That is what we are going to do with the people of the province.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the acting foreign affairs minister.

Oral Questions

It concerns the desperate situation in Congo where so far 3.5 million people have died, four times as many as in the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. The UN stood by then despite the pleas of many, including Canadian General Roméo Dallaire.

Now that the Security Council seems to be focusing solely on Iraq and has not taken any effective action at all regarding Congo, is Canada prepared to show the same kind of leadership it showed in the run up to the war in Iraq where our ambassador floated a discussion paper, took leadership—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Secretary of State for Asia—Pacific.

Hon. David Kilgour (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for raising this very important issue.

About 3.5 million Congolese residents have died in the last five years during the civil war, most of them from disease. The problem is that the life of someone living in Congo has to be as important, as my colleague would agree, as the life of someone living anywhere else on the face of the earth. I very much hope that the Security Council will do more than issue a press release saying it regrets what is going on.

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister's personal hopes are not good enough. Canadians expect our government to show action on this humanitarian crisis.

Right now there are eight humanitarian workers in Congo. This is a disaster. Will Canada show leadership? Will Canada join with France and other countries in a coalition of the willing, a coalition of countries that are willing to do everything they can to save the lives of the people of Congo? Where is the Canadian leadership on this important issue?

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all share the concern of the member opposite. The French have been approached by the United Nations to send a force to Congo. Right now we have eight members of the United Nations mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

While we too have been approached by the United Nations, we have to study carefully the feasibility of such a request given our current commitments in Afghanistan and Bosnia, and in the war against terrorism. We are seriously considering the situation.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Fisheries Resource Conservation Council provides worthwhile, independent scientific information to the minister. At a recent meeting of the standing committee, the minister indicated that he might reconsider the future of the FRCC.

Will he tell the House whether he plans to eliminate the FRCC or otherwise interfere and downgrade that very worthwhile institution?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Farrah (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker, there is no such indication, and the department does not intend, at this time, to

eliminate the Fisheries Resource Conservation Council. It is doing an exceptional job.

When he met with the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, the minister indicated that he will perhaps consider how things have been done up to now and look too, with the stakeholders, at how this situation can be improved with regard to managing the resources and the role of science.

Currently, there are no plans to exclude the FRCC from consultations with the industry.

[*English*]

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, what an interesting phrase at this time.

It now appears that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will cut funding to the Canadian Responsible Fisheries Board. Briefing notes from the department indicate the impact for the ministry include: a departmental flip flop on responsible fisheries, and abandonment of the fishing communities of Canada, particularly after the impact of the cod announcement.

Can the minister confirm if his department is planning to abandon the code for responsible fishing? Has funding been cut to that program?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Farrah (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the department is looking at how to be more efficient given our current financial resources. A number of options are on the table. Currently, it is quite premature to give the hon. member a specific answer about this fund.

Absolutely, yes, there are a number of options being considered. However, right now, no cuts to this program are planned.

* * *

• (1130)

[*English*]

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in 1995 the Liberals closed CFB Chilliwack, sending over 1,000 families packing and leaving hundreds of acres of prime land and facilities empty. The City of Chilliwack and the provincial government have come up with an innovative plan to use the land for an education park with universities and technical schools lined up to make this exciting idea a reality. The one stumbling block appears to be foot dragging by the federal government, delays that have gone on far too long now.

Will the Government of Canada agree to transfer this land now so that British Columbia can start construction of a world class educational facility?

Oral Questions

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, on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of National Defence, I became aware of this issue just earlier today. I am advised that the minister is aware of the circumstances and he is prepared to work toward a constructive solution to this problem.

I hope it can be resolved in a way that is satisfactory to all concerned.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last night on the road to Halifax the member for LaSalle—Émard had an epiphany. He said his government must get new maritime helicopters “as quickly as possible and absolutely the best”. Petty politics will not let this government reorder the EH-101 as still the best value purchase. It will just not go there.

Will the member for LaSalle—Émard, as prime minister, be forced to cancel another helicopter replacement contract? Will he have to go there?

The Deputy Speaker: I regret that question is out of order. It is not directed to the government.

* * *

*[Translation]***GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS**

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister for International Trade accused Europe of renouncing its own scientific ideals by banning the import of GMOs. Yet a study by the United Kingdom's Food Standards Agency and an independent panel of 579 scientists has shown that GMOs might constitute a risk for human health.

Will the minister acknowledge that trade and health can go hand in hand and that we can engage in one while protecting the other?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we want to see happen in asking the European Union to lift its moratorium is for it to enforce its own laws. We want Canadian products to be let in. Europe can take whatever measures it wants, but it must comply with its own legislation. That is the aim of our consultations.

As far as scientific issues are concerned, the UK Royal Society and the French Academy of Sciences have reached conclusions diametrically opposed to what the member for Rosemont—Petite-Patrie has just stated in this House.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have to admit that this week's decision to challenge the European moratorium before the WTO sets Canada back 10 years as far as application of the precautionary principle to GMOs is concerned.

Before reaching his decision, might the minister not have been better off, as the Royal Society of Canada has suggested, to carry out independent studies in order to ensure that GMOs represent no

danger to health or the environment, before ignoring science as he did yesterday?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this could not be further from the truth. What we want is for science to be respected. Europe was responsible for bringing humankind into the modern age, some 350 years ago. With the modern age comes belief in progress, and progress is based on science. That is precisely the view of Canada. The French Academy and the UK Royal Society have taken exactly the same approach as the Canadian government.

* * *

*[English]***PUBLIC SERVICE**

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Treasury Board. Bill C-25 concerning public employees has now been completed at committee and will be tabled today. However the new definition of the merit principle has become a concern to the unions and many observers across the country.

What will the government do to ensure that Liberal supporters in the public service are no longer able to hire or promote just their Liberal friends and their favourites? How will the government truly defend the merit principle?

Mr. Tony Tirabassi (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and I thank him for his contribution at committee regarding Bill C-25.

There merit principle, which is the basis for all appointments in the public service, has never been defined in legislation. As a result, years of case law and precedent have resulted in a cumbersome process driven process that has provided an inability for the public service to recruit and to promote effectively.

Through Bill C-25 deputy head staffing authority will be delegated by the Public Service Commission in accordance with the PSC guidelines. This new approach—

● (1135)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Minister for International Trade has promised that he would not allow the Americans to further harm the Canadian softwood lumber industry.

We understand that an export tax as high as 33%, a full six points higher than the present punitive duty, is being proposed by the United States. We also hear that it wants two-thirds of the \$1.5 billion in duties collected to date to remain in American hands.

Oral Questions

It is clear that these proposals will only further harm workers in my riding and across the country. Will the government stand up for Canadians and refuse to cave in to these American demands?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with my colleague and I can say that we have absolutely no intention of going in the direction of what the American producers have proposed in the last few days. It is a no go as far as we are concerned. It is absolutely not the sort of solution that we are seeking with the Americans and that will benefit our Canadian softwood lumber producers.

* * *

[Translation]

TAXATION

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance paid a visit to his counterpart in Quebec, Yves Séguin, who, as members know, is the author of the report on the fiscal imbalance.

The Minister of Finance claims to want to work constructively with the Government of Quebec but, at the same time, and that is odd, he denies the existence of the fiscal imbalance and refers to it as a dogma. A dogma shared by the three parties at the National Assembly and the 10 provinces of Canada, looks much more like a certainty.

Does the Minister of Finance intend to respond favourably to the Premier of Quebec who emphasized, and he said so again just yesterday, that the fiscal imbalance remains our first priority?

[English]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance had a very productive and very useful meeting with his Quebec counterpart yesterday. It is nice to see that we can do that with the new government of Quebec.

I would point out that one of the ways the member across the way could help is to pass Bill C-28 so that needed funds to go to health care in Quebec could be passed. That member unfortunately talks on one side but does not act on the other. Let us get on with Bill C-28 to get that money to Quebec and other provinces.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Finance realize that, with his \$10.4 billion surplus—the exact amount the Bloc Quebec had forecast—he can afford to help the provinces and Quebec?

Will he finally open discussions on the use that is being made of the taxpayers' money, by providing the Government of Quebec with the tax room necessary to invest in the areas of jurisdiction where the needs are, that is, health, education and social housing?

[English]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again the budget implementation bill is before the House today. If the member is really that serious about this issue, he will get behind us and get the bill passed. Very needed moneys are in there for the province of Quebec and other provinces, but this member would rather stall than deal with the issue. Do not talk the line, act it.

Again, the Minister of Finance is prepared to work cooperatively with all ministers of finance in the provinces and territories, and we look forward to future discussions.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime has asked for modest financial support to help it with providing services to victims. It has been turned down by the government. The government continues to favour convicted criminals over their victims.

I would like to ask the Solicitor General why he gives over \$1 million per year in funding to criminal focus groups, such as prisoners' art foundation, but does not give a single penny to victims' focus groups.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Solicitor General gives funding to basically 14 organizations to ensure that both victims and offenders have the organizations to assist them, to improve their lives and, indeed, to put some pressure on myself as Solicitor General and the government in general in terms of ensuring that the justice system and the correctional services system work well. That is what we continue to do. I believe we are doing a good job in terms of funding organizations so that we have input from the community.

* * *

FIREARMS REGISTRY

Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Blackstrap, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the justice committee heard yesterday that the Liberals have spent more than \$29 million to advertise their gun registry fiasco. Yet the government could not see fit to renew a \$65,000 funding agreement with the Saskatchewan Association for Firearm Education.

Could the Solicitor General please explain why safety falls so far below advertising on his list of priorities?

• (1140)

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at this question in which she asks why safety falls so far below the horizon with the government.

First, on the money to Saskatchewan, that was a three year contract. The contract ended. As the commissioner for firearms answered yesterday at committee, it was explained how there were 500 firearms people in Saskatchewan working on training with communities, and that is going well.

On safety, the purpose of the Firearms Act is to make our communities safer and members opposite—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Haliburton—Victoria—Brock.

*Oral Questions***POLITICAL PARTY FINANCING**

Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-24, the election financing act, has been reported in the media with very contradictory statements. The claim that small franchises have more clout than large banks is one of the comments.

Could the House leader clarify the intent of Bill C-24 and give the House a clearer picture of the effect of Bill C-24?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a very important question.

Everyone knows, or should know, that corporate contributions to political parties, in Bill C-24, are not permitted. The only exception is an overall \$1,000 per year limit for the local candidates and party association.

A corporation or a union that has several branches, locals, addresses, outlets, wickets or even roadside stands, cannot do it more than once. It is \$1,000 for the total company period, no matter how many addresses the company or union has.

* * *

TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is clearly something wrong when a train bridge passes an inspection on Monday and collapses on Wednesday. This is what we get when the government relies on companies like CN, in this case, to inspect themselves rather than use independent government inspectors.

How many more Canadians have to be killed before the Liberal government will admit that self-regulation in transport safety is a failed policy? When will it quit cutting corners and stop relying on companies that are in conflicts of interest to do the government's job?

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to start with, the Government of Canada wishes to convey its prayers and thoughts for the families of those crew members missing in this tragic accident.

The Transportation Safety Board is the primary agency for investigation into railway accidents. Any safety deficiencies uncovered through the Transportation Safety Board's investigation to the department's compliance activities will of course be addressed immediately.

* * *

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have given their support to a trade challenge that would force the nations of Europe to accept GMOs. Europe does not want GMOs. That is also true of many Canadians, since the Liberals torpedoed a bill that would have made GMO labelling mandatory.

My question is for the Minister of Industry. Why is his government continuing to deny families the right to know what they are eating?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, let me to be very clear about what Canada is seeking. It is not what the hon. member has said. What Canada wants is very clear, and that is for the European Union to enforce its own laws on authorization of GMOs; we want the European mechanisms to allow approval or rejection of applications based on scientific evaluation establishing the safety of the products for humans, animals and the environment. We simply want them to enforce their own laws.

* * *

[English]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs whether the government considered itself bound by the Supreme Court opinion that when "one participant in Confederation...seek[s] an amendment to the Constitution" there is "an obligation on all parties to come to the negotiating table".

My question related of course to a resolution passed by the house of assembly, which mandates Newfoundland and Labrador to renegotiate the terms of union with Canada.

The minister evaded the question by talking about discussions. I ask him again. Does the government accept the Supreme Court's opinion that it has an obligation to come to the negotiating table on the resolution of Newfoundland and Labrador?

● (1145)

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must understand that there is no obligation to agree. There is an obligation to discuss obviously. We already have done that, and we will do that.

Let us say, for instance, that the Government of Canada decided that it would be good if education would be a federal jurisdiction. Is the hon. member suggesting that the provinces would be obliged to agree?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, the minister is not a professor any more. This is not an academic question. It is a real and growing issue.

Yesterday, a resolution was presented in Alberta to mandate that province to negotiate Senate reforms. Therefore, two different provinces on two different constitutional issues are following the court's advice.

The federal government actively sought the Supreme Court opinion in its reference. The court said, negotiate. It did not say, discuss. In the case of Newfoundland and Labrador, a formal resolution has been passed.

In this case, does the minister accept that Canada has a binding obligation, as the court says, to go to the negotiating table?

*Oral Questions***Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):**

Mr. Speaker, the point of view of the Government of Canada, supported today by the minister of fisheries of Prince Edward Island, is that it would be unfair and unproductive to have co-management with veto powers for provinces in Atlantic Canada for fisheries.

What is the point of view of the hon. member? Is he able once in his life not to be ambiguous?

* * *

AVIATION INDUSTRY

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Industry knows that there have been discussions with representatives of the aviation industry and others regarding the development of the aviation sector in British Columbia.

Could the Minister of Industry tell the House today how the federal government will participate in the training, research and development of the aviation sector in British Columbia and in Kelowna in particular?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member drawing attention to the involvement of Industry Canada in developing aerospace not only in British Columbia but across the country.

Canada is well known internationally as being among the top three or four countries in the world for the strength of our aerospace sector, not only in terms of the sale of our airplanes, but the development of technology and the training of people. We are among the world's leaders.

We have been looking at ways in which we can support aerospace in British Columbia, both in terms of technology partnerships Canada investments which that party has criticized so harshly and wrongly in the past, and also through regional development—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeland.

* * *

CANADIAN FORCES

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of National Defence insisted that sending Canadian soldiers into wartorn Afghanistan with no weapons to defend themselves was a non-issue. He said that he would do the paperwork necessary to arm our troops by August.

This week his office announced that the minister himself was going to Afghanistan with military bodyguards and lo and behold, the paperwork was done overnight. Why does this suddenly change from a non-issue when it comes to protecting our troops to an urgent issue when it comes to protecting the minister?

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 continues to travel old ground. The Minister of National Defence advised the House earlier this week that that matter has been entirely resolved.

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last November, the Minister of National Defence granted a \$15 million contract to Bennett Environmental so that 40,000 tonnes of contaminated waste and soil from the former radar station in Saglék could be processed at the Saint-Ambroise incinerator in the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean region.

Given that this company was found guilty of non-compliance with Quebec's environmental legislation, what process did the minister follow in granting this substantial contract? Did he communicate with Quebec's minister of the environment and inform the residents of Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean?

[English]

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 am advised that work is under way with respect to this matter. Quite frankly, I will need to pursue further facts and get back to the hon. member just as rapidly as possible. I appreciate her interest. We will respond conscientiously.

[Translation]

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the regional health board confirmed that the incinerator represented a significant source of toxic fumes.

When does the minister intend to provide, as demanded by the community, full and complete details on the composition of the contaminated products to be transported?

• (1150)

[English]

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 further elaboration. I will take the hon. member's question as a very strong representation. The government will reply at the earliest possible moment.

* * *

GRANTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Industry Canada grants billions of dollars to the Liberals' big business buddies, yet thousands of small businesses struggle to employ Canadians, struggle to make a profit and struggle to pay numerous Liberal taxes. It is truly shameful that the Liberal government uses these very tax dollars to support its pals.

In the spirit of the new proposed elections act will the provisional government, the interim government, stop subsidizing its big business pals?

Oral Questions

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should talk to his colleague just down the aisle who asked me the last question. His colleague wanted to know what we are going to do to support aerospace in his riding and the member now asks us to stop supporting Canadian business.

There is obviously a failure to communicate among the members of the Alliance Party. If they will not talk to each other, how do they expect to speak to Canadians?

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, a number of provinces are committed to the Amber alert program to rescue children. Amber alert uses radio, TV, electronic billboards and emergency broadcast systems to immediately alert the public about abducted children whose lives are in peril.

Unfortunately, provincial programs stop at provincial borders. Does the justice minister not agree that a truly effective program must be national and if so, why will he not show some leadership and establish one?

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, clearly children are a priority for this government and anything that we possibly can consider will be taken into consideration.

I am sure that the minister at the next federal, provincial and territorial meeting will raise this issue and see if there is some possibility that we might be able to implement something of that nature.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of concerns about some police forces using selective treatment of individuals based solely on their ethnic or racial characteristics. I would ask the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and the Status of Women to tell the House if anything can be done to work on these issues to ensure that all people are treated fairly.

Hon. Jean Augustine (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada considers the selective treatment of individuals based solely on their race or on their ethnic characteristics as unacceptable. Today in the newspapers we read that Kingston, Ontario police chief Bill Closs has shown some leadership in providing guidelines and setting light on the issue of racial profiling and I commend him for this.

The National Forum on Policing in a Multicultural Society was an important step that helped us to develop knowledge that exists on the issue of policing in a multicultural society.

* * *

TOURISM INDUSTRY

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for Rural Development knows that the Algonquin Park visitor centre plays an

important role in attracting tourists to Ontario. Its mission is more critical this year since tourist operators outside Toronto are bracing for a 35% to 50% drop in business due to SARS, West Nile virus and anti-American comments made by government MPs.

Why does the federal government always find ways to funnel money to voter rich cities instead of considering projects like the Friends of Algonquin Park's expansion for the visitor centre at the east gate?

Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, contrary to the statement of the hon. member, we have had discussions with the Friends of Algonquin Park. We want to work with them to see the type of development they are proposing. As the secretary of state for FedNor, we may be in a position where we can assist. FedNor has done substantive work in terms of creating a tourism industry in northern Ontario. We have done that in the past and we will continue to do it in the future.

* * *

HOMELESSNESS

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in Edmonton a subway station was opened because of emergency shelter shortage. Two street people died. Toronto homeless deaths are up four times.

This week, homeless dollars were spent on a conference for 300 people at a luxury hotel in Saskatoon while the homeless on the riverbank looked on in envy. As homeless numbers and deaths grow, conference goes wine and dine on homeless dollars, and homeless issues are not even on the agenda.

Why are luxury hotel conferences more important than basic emergency shelters? What is the minister's priority?

• (1155)

Hon. Claudette Bradshaw (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what rhetoric coming from that member.

The conference was an FAS/FAE conference. It is the biggest problem facing our country today, fetal alcohol syndrome, fetal alcohol effects; we have forgotten these people. We had community people there. We had doctors there. We had the academics there.

It shows the member has no understanding whatsoever of the needs of the homeless. His numbers are rhetoric. His community organizations work 24 hours a day, seven days a week for the homeless. He should be ashamed of himself.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

GASOLINE PRICE

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of the Competition Bureau as already said that he has done all he can under the law to investigate the behaviour of oil companies, while the Minister of Industry acknowledges that he has the power to demand a more in-depth investigation. The only thing that the minister is missing is the will to act.

Rather than hide behind the issue of provincial jurisdiction or investigations by the Conference Board, some of whose members come from the oil patch, what is the Minister of Industry waiting for to initiate a real investigation, as he is empowered to do under the law?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, the competition commissioner appeared before the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology to talk about this issue. He outlined his position. He said clearly that he had investigated the matter recently and that he concluded that there is no information supporting allegations that oil companies are engaged in anti-competitive behaviour. Retail gas pricing comes under provincial jurisdiction. We must let the provinces regulate retail pricing.

* * *

[English]

POLITICAL PARTY FINANCING

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the government House leader.

Bill C-24 does not treat corporations and unions in the same way. It allows for the thousands of individual franchises across the country, such as Tim Hortons, to each contribute \$1,000 to a political party, but each individual union local cannot do the same thing.

I want to know if the minister will change the bill and ban unions and corporations outright. There is a hole in the legislation and I am not talking about Timbits.

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is not much of a doughnut, let me tell the hon. member. The premise of his question is totally wrong. In fact I just finished answering an excellent question from a member on this side of the House about the exact same issue.

A corporation can only contribute once, no matter how many people it has. The hon. member is telling me that it is not an individual business if it sells a product manufactured by somebody else. It is an individual business and we respect small, independent businesses at least on this side of the House.

If the hon. member is equating a small independent business with a large one, a labour union or anything else, he can explain it to his constituents.

* * *

FOREST INDUSTRY

Mr. Rex Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled as to why the minister responsible for ACOA approved

funding in the amount of \$94,000 for a pilot project that would study the feasibility of using snowmobiles to harvest timber in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador when only last fall he pulled the plug on a pilot project of heli-logging, which is considered to be cost efficient and environmentally friendly.

Will the minister tell the House on what grounds he cancelled the worthwhile project of heli-logging?

Hon. Gerry Byrne (Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland and Labrador Lumber Producers Association had requested support to conduct the feasibility study on the benefits, the economic merits, of harvesting timber off steep slopes using helicopter technology.

The project was conducted. There was some slippage of funds. There was an additional amount granted to provide a full assessment. The feasibility study was not positive. What feasibility studies do is they assess the relative merits. In this particular case there was no merit to the project.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is a national disgrace that in this country there are over 200 communities where the water is undrinkable and they are all aboriginal. Over the next half decade the government will only address fewer than one in five of those 200 communities' water problems. Meanwhile in Manitoba it will spend \$50 million by throwing it at brand new segregated Black Sturgeon reserve. Meanwhile aboriginal kids are afraid to wet their toothbrushes or they will become seriously sick.

Why does the government not fix the problems it has instead of just throwing money at new problems?

● (1200)

Hon. Stephen Owen (Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Indian Affairs this week announced a detailed program to spend \$600 million extra over the next five years on top of the \$600 million that would be spent anyway to introduce a very structured plan to improve the situation of water and sewage systems in aboriginal communities.

This will deal with structural repair as well as new structures and training and monitoring of personnel, as well as specific guidelines for training to go ahead.

This is a quality of life issue that is top of mind for the government for aboriginal—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, 8,000 aboriginal people took to the streets of Kenora, in the riding of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, to voice their strong opposition to the governance bill.

Does the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development understand that he must scrap this bill immediately and return to the table with first nations, treating them as equals and respecting their fundamental human rights and their inherent right to self government?

[English]

Hon. Stephen Owen (Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, native people across the country have had opportunities to express their concerns, their support and protests against Bill C-7.

This is a normal legislative process. Hundreds of witnesses have been heard by the aboriginal affairs committee of the House. I think all of our congratulations and sympathies should go out to the members of that committee who have spent long hours night after night considering this extremely important legislation.

It will be passed in due course with amendments as suggested, as this House decides. Regulations will also be—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. This concludes question period for this day.

I have notice of a question of privilege from the hon. Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, further to my May 12 question of privilege, I wish to draw to the attention of the Chair an Ontario Superior Court ruling of May 14 regarding the matter of court decisions that affect parliamentary privilege.

The court, in its May 14 ruling, while confirming the parliamentary privilege of members from being compelled to participate in legal proceedings when Parliament is in session, asserted that this privilege should be limited to the period that Parliament is actually sitting and for 14 days after it adjourns. This was in reference to the Telezone case versus the MP for Ottawa South.

This again is an attack on the privileges of hon. members in the House.

I know the Speaker is already seized with another matter in this regard that I brought to the attention of the Chair only a few days ago. Of course, the decision in the Telezone case is even more serious, in terms of the intrusion by the courts in improperly attempting to define what is parliamentary privilege.

If members of the House were to decide at any point that the definition of privilege needed to be altered, if they were to lengthen what is today the 40-day period, shorten it, remove it or otherwise, that would be a decision which the House would make in relation to its own privileges. However, I do not believe that it is appropriate for a court to define what is parliamentary privilege in our country.

Routine Proceedings

I suggest that the Chair would want to take this case into consideration in ruling on the question of privilege that I raised on May 12 and possibly rule at that point that there is a bona fide case of privilege and then both matters could be referred to the parliamentary committee on procedure and house affairs.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. Minister of State for his intervention, adding to an already earlier intervention on a very important matter for Parliament. I would feel secure in saying to the House that I would think we could all expect that our Speaker will rule on this matter at the earliest possible time upon our return from the upcoming recess period.

* * *

● (1205)

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to provide some clarification on a response the Solicitor General made while answering a question from my colleague from Edmonton North. He seemed to say that single-handedly I had short-circuited Bill C-23, the sex offender registry.

In fact, it was an amendment to the motion. The reason that we were seeking to have the bill set aside was that the bill failed to provide retroactive registration of sex offenders.

The Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. member for Battlefords—Lloydminster anticipated the Chair's ruling, that in fact it would be a matter of clarification and not a point of order. That having been said, the matter is now on the public docket.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments made recently by the government.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 10 petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates.

Routine Proceedings

I am the vice-chair of that committee from the opposition side. I am standing today to demonstrate that the official opposition is constructive and does not oppose for opposing's sake and that our party will never play politics with the lives of public employees.

Pursuant to its order of reference on Thursday, February 20, the committee has considered Bill C-25, an act to modernize employment and labour relations in the public service and to amend the Financial Administration Act and the Canadian Centre for Management Development Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, and as agreed on Thursday, May 15, reports the bill with amendment.

* * *

CIVIL JUSTICE ACCESS ACT

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-438, an act to initiate cooperation among the provinces in order to achieve affordable and timely access to civil justice across Canada.

He said: Madam Speaker, this is a justice bill that considers a number of things in terms of greater coordination between the federal government and the provinces, and providing more assistance to people who need legal aid, particularly on the civil side.

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

* * *

PETITIONS**FIREARMS REGISTRY**

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions.

My first petition states that thousands of Canadians, through no fault of their own, now possess unregistered firearms and that any individual who now tries to register a firearm will be exposed to federal prosecution. There are conflicting statements from the Minister of Justice and the Canadian firearms centre regarding the threat of prosecution, and that is only adding to the confusion.

The petitioners recognize that 9 out of 10 provinces, as well as MPs, senators and the Auditor General of Canada all agree that the firearms registry is out of control.

They therefore call upon Parliament, the Department of Justice and the Government of Canada to call an immediate amnesty for all unregistered firearms or, in the absence of an amnesty, scrap the firearms registry completely.

• (1210)

MARRIAGE

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, the second petition states that: marriage is the best foundation for families in the raising of children; the definition of marriage between a man and a woman is being challenged; and this hon. House passed a motion in June 1999 that called for marriage to continue to be defined as the union of one man and woman to the exclusion of all others.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to pass legislation to recognize the institution of marriage in federal law as being a

lifelong union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others.

[*Translation*]

KOUCHIBOUGUAC NATIONAL PARK

Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this petition is from many citizens living near the Kouchibouguac national park.

Most of them sold their property when the park was created. This year, due to a shortage, Parks Canada has prohibited clam digging in the park.

The petitioners point out that they regard clam digging for personal use as a historic right and they ask that the restriction be lifted.

[*English*]

BILL C-250

Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the second petition is from a group that is very much opposed to Bill C-250. They petition the House that the bill not be passed.

FALUN GONG

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions.

The first petition is signed by constituents from Burnaby and elsewhere in British Columbia, and in particular Ms. Michelle Zhang, a UBC student, whose family has been suffering tremendously from the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners in China. The petitioners raise concern about the systematic escalation of attacks in China against Falun Gong practitioners. It has caused many deaths and severe hardship to innocent people. They point out that the crackdown violates China's own constitution as well as international human rights conventions.

The petitioners therefore call for an immediate end to the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners, the unconditional release of all Falun Gong practitioners who have gone to prison and in some cases to brainwashing classes, and for the unrestricted access into China of the United Nations rapporteur on torture to carry out independent, third party investigations of this persecution.

SPACE PRESERVATION TREATY

Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have the honour of presenting one other petition this morning, which again was signed by residents of British Columbia, and in particular through the work of End the Arms Race, as well as residents in Ontario.

The petitioners are very concerned about the importance of signing a space preservation treaty. They point to the impact of the termination of the ABM treaty in 2002 that may lead to the United States moving toward the weaponization of space. They raise grave concerns about the proposed use of nuclear tip missiles for the star wars system that currently is being debated both in Canada and elsewhere.

*Routine Proceedings***QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

They call upon Parliament to lead the world community by enacting legislation to immediately ratify the space preservation treaty, to deposit this treaty with the secretary-general of the United Nations, and immediately convene a treaty signing conference for the space preservation treaty to encourage the necessary 20 signatories to make the treaty go into full force and effect.

MARRIAGE

Mr. Tony Tirabassi (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of some residents of the Niagara Peninsula. The petitioners wish to draw to the attention of the House that marriage is the best foundation for families and the raising of children, and that the definition of marriage is between a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Rex Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls, PC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition today which calls upon Parliament to focus its legislative support on adult stem cell research to find cures and therapies necessary to treat the illnesses and diseases of suffering Canadians.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to present a petition on behalf of my constituents. This particular petition comes from individuals in the Kindersley area of my riding. 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. They would like that done yesterday.

• (1215)

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by a number of people in my riding of Regina—Qu'Appelle, many in the City of Regina. The petitioners call upon Parliament to protect our children by taking all the necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

MARRIAGE

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present today. The first is signed by 61 petitioners in my riding who state that because the definition of marriage is between a man and a woman as passed in a motion in the House in June 1999, they call upon Parliament to pass legislation to recognize the institution of marriage in federal law as being a lifelong union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, the second petition I wish to present today is signed by 764 constituents from around my riding. The petitioners are concerned and urge the Government of Canada to stand firmly for peace, to refuse all military and other involvement in support of the war in Iraq, and to use all of its influence to bring about a peaceful solution to the problems in the Middle East.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Question No. 180 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 180—**Mr. John Duncan:**

In the last five years, what is the breakdown of Canada-Iraq trade; specifically, what Canadian companies have done and are doing business with the Iraqi government?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): For a breakdown of Canada-Iraq trade for the last five years, the information is as follows:

In the previous five years there have been approximately 24 Canadian companies/organizations that have exported products to Iraq. Due to privacy laws the government is not in a position to release the names of these companies without their signed permission. The breakdown of companies is as follows:

18 oil and gas companies/equipment suppliers

4 trading houses

1 medical equipment supplier

1 wheat exporter

The following company has provided the government with written permission to release its name:

Group Marketing Co-Ordinates (1994) Ltd.

Routine Proceedings

World Trade Atlas Canada - Exports to Iraq, 1998-2002 January - December Millions of Canadian Dollars	HS	Description	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002						
	63	MISC TEXTILE ARTICLES						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.23
	72	IRON AND STEEL						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	73	IRON/STEEL PRODUCTS						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.40	
	84	MACHINERY						0.70	0.22	10.26	6.13	11.90	
	85	ELECTRICAL MACHINERY						0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.77	
	86	RAILWAY, TRF SIGN EQ						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.00	
	88	AIRCRAFT, SPACECRAFT						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	
	90	OPTIC, NT 8544, MED INSTR						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.01	
	94	FURNITURE AND BEDDING						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.23	
	98	SPECIAL OTHER						0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	
	99	O SPECL IMPR PROVISIONS						0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	
	32	TANNING, DYE, PAINT, PUTTY											
	39	PLASTIC											
	40	RUBBER											
	49	BOOKS & NEWSPAPER, MANUSCRIPT											
	63	MISC TEXTILE ARTICLES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.23						
	72	IRON AND STEEL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
	73	IRON/STEEL PRODUCTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.40						
	84	MACHINERY	0.70	0.22	10.26	6.13	11.90						
		TOTAL						3.034298	33.101277	78.099161	6.66931	13.657386	

Source of Data: Statistics Canada as cited in World Trade Atlas

							<i>Routine Proceedings</i>					
World Trade Atlas Canada - Imports from Iraq, 1998-2002 January - December Millions of Canadian Dollars	HS	Description	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002					
	84	MACHINERY	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	84	MACHINERY	0.00	0.00	0.00
	85	EDIBLE FRUIT AND NUTS	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	85	ELECTRICAL MACHINERY	0.00	0.00	0.00
	90	SPICES, COFFEE AND TEA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	90	OPTIC, NT 8544, MED INSTR	0.00	0.00	0.00
	27	MINERAL FUEL, OIL ETC	81.91	163.59	684.30	874.06	1089.67	95	TOYS AND SPORTS EQUIPMENT	0.00	0.00	0.00
	57	TEXTILE FLOOR COVERINGS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	97	ART AND ANTIQUES	0.00	0.00	0.00
	61	KNIT APPAREL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	99	O SPECT IMPR PROVISIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00
	62	WOVEN APPAREL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		TOTAL	81.98	163.62	684.30
	65	HEADGEAR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					874.06
	71	PRECIOUS STONES, METALS	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					1089.67
	83	MISC ART OF BASE METAL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
	84	MACHINERY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
	85	ELECTRICAL MACHINERY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
	90	OPTIC, NT 8544, MED INSTR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
	95	TOYS AND SPORTS EQUIPMENT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
	97	ART AND ANTIQUES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
	99	O SPECT IMPR PROVISIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					

Source of Data: Statistics Canada as cited in World Trade Atlas
* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if Question No. 194 could be made an order for return, the return would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 194—**Mr. Jay Hill:**

With respect to the Canadian Firearms Program, what is the total amount spent by each of the following departments and agencies since April 1, 1994 but not reimbursed by the Department of Justice: (a) Solicitor General of Canada; (b) Correctional Services Canada; (c) Human Resources Development Canada; (d) Office of the Information Commissioner; (e) Office of the Privacy Commissioner; (f) National Parole Board; (g) Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade; (h) Public Works and Government Services Canada; (i) Canadian Customs and Revenue Agency; (j) Treasury Board Secretariat; and (k) Indian Affairs and Northern development?

(Return tabled.)

[English]

Mr. Rodger Cuzner: Madam Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2003

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-28, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 18, 2003, be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to say a few words in the debate before the House today on the bill to implement the budget. Of course the budget came down a couple of months ago and now we have the bill to implement the budget. It gives parliamentarians a chance to raise concerns about the budget before us today.

I want to highlight a number of issues that I think are important. What we have now in the country is a budget that has a surplus and every year the Minister of Finance automatically puts the surplus at March 31, the end of the fiscal year, to the national debt.

I believed for a long time and still believe that it is important to pay down our national debt. Let me say that in coming from Saskatchewan and representing the New Democratic Party, I know that it has been a long legacy of the NDP in Saskatchewan to have a government that is fiscally responsible, quite the opposite of what we see from the right wing Conservative-Alliance-Reform types, where in Saskatchewan under Grant Devine, a Conservative premier, they ran up a huge deficit and a huge debt which really made things very difficult for the people of the province.

Having said that, I also have a private member's motion before the House that would allow Parliament to have flexibility as to where the surplus would be spent. I have a private member's bill that would set up what is called a fiscal stabilization fund. We have this in Saskatchewan and in some of the other provinces as well. The surplus would go into the fiscal stabilization fund and Parliament itself would decide where the surplus would go; it would not automatically go to the national debt. We might put part of it on the debt, part of it into program spending and part of it on tax cuts or whatever the priorities of Parliament or the government of the day would be.

Today we do not have that option. Under our laws in the federal House of Commons, it is automatic that every single penny of the national surplus goes automatically to the national debt.

As I recall, a couple of years ago the surplus was around \$17 billion. It went automatically to the national debt. I think that if we had properly reflected the priorities of the Canadian people the majority of that \$17 billion would not have gone to the national debt. The majority of that \$17 billion would have gone into program spending, particularly in health care in Canada.

We have in the country now a real crisis in terms of the funding of health care by the federal government. The federal government on a cash transfer basis transfers only about 14% of the cost of health care to the provinces. That is on a cash basis. The other 86% of the cost is paid for by the provinces. When medicare first came into operation in this country and became a reality, it was cost shared on a fifty-fifty basis by the federal government and the provinces. The federal government put up 50% of the cost and the provinces put 50% of the

cost. Today it is 86% from the provinces and about 14% from the federal government.

The problem is that when we have a huge surplus that could be going in large part to health care or many other priorities it is going instead entirely to the national debt. I think that is one change that should be made. A chance to raise that comes today when we are speaking about how budgets are implemented. One of the problems we have is that we do not have any flexibility. Parliament does not have any flexibility at all, because once we hit March 31, the national debt goes down by whatever the surplus is.

I also want to raise a couple of other issues that I think are very important in terms of implementing the budget. We have in our country a very large social deficit. I am talking about health care. The Romanow report has identified a deficit in terms of federal funding on health care and where that money should be going.

What we need is a transfer of several billion dollars extra per year to the provinces to make sure we have national health care that is accessible to each and every Canadian. I do not want to see the day in Canada when we have private health care competing with the public sector. The Canadian people want a very strong public health care system from one coast to the other. It has to be well funded. There has to be equal accessibility for all Canadians no matter what province they live in, no matter what part of the country they happen to come from. That is why the federal government has to be the institution, the government in the country, that provides around 50% of the funding eventually to make sure there is equality of access, equality of service and equality of treatment for each and every Canadian.

● (1220)

We could get that if we had more of the federal surplus and more federal government priorities going to health care in Canada. I believe that is very important. It is something I would certainly like to see.

In terms of the social deficit, for a long time the Liberal Party has promised a national child care program. Again we do not have any action in terms of national child care in Canada. That is another priority in terms of spending that the federal government should be looking at very seriously. If more money were put into child care and health in this country it would also stimulate the economy and create jobs, which in turn would create more economic activity, and more money would come back to the coffers of the federal government, the provinces and municipalities. It would be a win-win situation for the Canadian people.

The other thing I want to mention very briefly in terms of spending is that there is a huge infrastructure deficit in Canada. I think it was the mayor of Winnipeg who pointed out recently that this is one of the great shortfalls of the budget before the House. He was talking about the \$57 billion infrastructure deficit in Canada. That is \$57 billion and in the budget only a few million dollars were put into the infrastructure of Canada. These funds, if we had an adequately funded infrastructure program, are needed right across the country for cleaning up our water supply, for municipal sewer and water projects, for roads, for bridges and for many other projects in my city of Regina or in any other city or town across the country.

Government Orders

I think the need in Regina in terms of infrastructure, as well as for some small towns in my riding, is in terms of the safe treatment of water facilities. In my riding, for example, there are 12 different Indian reserves and first nations bands and some of them need extra help in terms of safe water.

These are some of the areas that we have to put more money into. Again that should have happened in the budget that is before the House. That is why I vote non-confidence in that federal budget and vote against it.

In addition to infrastructure, health and national day care, we need more federal money transferred into education. Education in Canada is a jurisdiction shared by the provinces and the federal government, but the federal government has a responsibility to provide more money and more funding to post-secondary education so that everyone, again regardless of where one lives, has equal access to education. That is not the case today. There are many universities in many provinces where the tuition fees are much too high for the average Canadian family to send their children to university. Without universal accessibility to higher education, we are creating a two tier system for Canadians in terms of financial discrimination. Part of that solution would be if the federal government were to transfer more money for post-secondary education.

The other area is agriculture. We have a farm crisis. Farmers are underfunded in terms of cash. We are fighting the American farm bill. We are fighting against the European farm program. In fact, these programs in Europe and the United States are so massively funded that many Canadian farmers are going under because of them. I know that our treasury cannot compete fully against the treasury of Brussels or the treasury of Washington. Some of these subsidies are massive.

I do not have all the information with me today, but when a Canadian farmer in Saskatchewan or Manitoba sells grain, only about 10¢ on the dollar for the grain that is sold comes from the federal government. If that farmer were in Montana or North Dakota, instead of 10¢ on the dollar I think it would be 50¢ or 60¢ on the dollar coming in a subsidy from Washington. We have this tremendous discrepancy between what the American farmer receives from Washington and what the Canadian farmer receives from Ottawa.

If we had a national farm program that had some reflection of the cost of living and the cost of production built into it, we would have a stronger farm economy. If the stronger farm economy is there, then the farmers are better off, the small towns are better off, the cities are better off and all of Canada is better off.

•(1225)

These are some of the priorities that I think the federal government should take a look at in terms of its budgeting process. Some may say that I am talking about spend, spend, spend, but I am really talking about investing, investing, investing in very key social and economic sectors of our economy. At the same time, we have to bring down the national debt. We can bring down the national debt by putting a smaller amount toward the national debt. I am also talking about budgeting in the reality of having a balanced budget. I do not want to go back into debt and have deficits in this country. We do not need that, but with a smaller amount going to the national

debt every year we would have more money to invest in important social programs and agriculture.

The other way of getting more money for the social deficit, first nations people, agriculture, social housing and all the programs we need is by investing more money in these areas. Through it we would stimulate the economy. We would create more economic activity and more money would come back to the federal government in terms of national revenue through the provinces or municipalities. Part of it pays for itself just by the fact that we would be investing money in areas of need. That stimulates the economy and creates jobs.

As well, I do believe that the \$100 billion tax cut announced by the federal government on the eve of the election in 2000 was a tax cut that went too far in terms of bringing down taxes too rapidly for wealthy Canadians. Part of that \$100 billion over five years could have been spent more wisely in terms of putting money into education, health care and other important needs in the country.

These are things that are important. When I am in my riding and talking to people, the most important issue is not cutting taxes for a wealthy millionaire. The most important issues are making sure that we have a very strong health care system, a good education system and affordable housing for each and every Canadian.

I want to also mention that the budget did make some changes in terms of the airline industry. A while back, in response to security issues after 9/11, the federal government brought in a security tax of \$12 for a one-way domestic flight in Canada, or \$24 return. If we look at the revenues the security tax brings in, we find it brings in much more revenue than is needed for enhanced or additional security at any airport in the country; in fact it brings in two, three, four and five times as much or more at many airports in Canada.

What happened after a great deal of protest by the Canadian people, by passengers of airlines and by members of Parliament, is that the budget cut the airport security fee in half, from \$24 to \$12 on domestic flights. My point is that at \$12 for a return flight, it is still higher than what we see in the United States and many other countries. It is becoming a way for the federal government to raise money by a special user fee for people who fly in Canada.

Flying has become more expensive. In fact, the Nav Canada charges are going up again with another fee increase of 6.9%. We have airlines in trouble, such as Air Canada. We get hit with the airport security tax, a special fuel tax, Nav Canada tax, and the goods and services tax, so the price of the ticket keeps going up and that makes it more difficult for people. That again is an issue in terms of keeping a national airline. We have to do what we can to make sure that Air Canada remains solvent. I believe that we should not have privatized Air Canada in the first place. I think the federal government now should look at taking a huge equity share or part of Air Canada to make sure we preserve a national airline.

These are some of the issues that are really important.

Government Orders

•(1230)

[*Translation*]

I would like to mention something else. A few days ago, I read some statistics in the newspapers about the income of Canadians. There is now a great gap between the rich and poor in Canada, and it is more serious now than 5, 10 or 20 years ago. If I remember correctly, there has been a 12% or 13% increase for the richest people in Canada over the past 10 years, but the poorest have stayed at about the same level of income as 10 years ago, with perhaps a 2% or 3% increase.

We should do more as a nation and as a parliament. There must be more equality between the rich and the poor. I know that the Canadian Alliance has done a lot of lobbying in order to get tax cuts for the richest people in our country, for our country's biggest corporations. The Canadian Alliance's lobbying convinced the former finance minister to provide big tax cuts for the wealthy.

There have been tax cuts for the wealthy and big corporations, but the poor have had the opposite treatment. I represent a riding where there are many poor people. According to Statistics Canada, my riding is the second or third poorest in Saskatchewan.

[*English*]

A big tax cut, where wealthy people get thousands of dollars less on their taxes, does not do very much for a poor person living in north central Regina, or a poor person living in a first nation band, or some poor person living in a small village, be it in Saskatchewan, Quebec or anywhere else in the country.

The time has come that we turn our attention to the issues of poverty. I could not help but notice an article in the *Hill Times* on a survey done a while ago. It talked about the sexiest MP, and I am not talking about the minister responsible for Canada Post or my good friend from Brandon—Souris, even though he is very high on the list. I am talking about another question that was asked. What is the area that has been most overlooked by parliamentarians? It turned out to be child poverty and kids living in poverty.

It is a real crime that over the last decade when the economy started to improve, after about 10 years of Conservative rule when the economy was going downhill, that the issue of child poverty and poverty in general was not addressed by Parliament. That is a real challenge.

[*Translation*]

It is a real challenge for Canada's Parliament to intervene with regard to poverty, not just child poverty, but poverty affecting all Canadians in this country.

[*English*]

Those are some of the issues that are really important.

We have a great country. We have tremendous potential. We have wonderful resources. We can produce the most food of any country in the world and we have a small population, a population that is well trained and well skilled. More money should be put into training, education, research and development to become better skilled. With these resources, we can be second to none in the years that lie ahead.

It is important, as we go ahead and make progress and develop economically, that we ensure it benefits all Canadians, not just those who are in the top 20%, but all Canadians no matter where we live.

•(1235)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle. Although we sometimes disagree, I think that our assessment of this budget is much the same.

I have two questions for him. The first concerns the consultation process launched by the Minister of Finance regarding mechanisms for setting employment insurance premium rates. We know that \$45 billion has been misappropriated for something other than employment insurance.

Does the hon. member have faith in this consultation process announced in the February 18 budget and implemented by the Minister of Finance? Does he think that the federal government should repay the \$45 billion to the unemployed and contributors, in other words, to the workers and the employers? That was my first question.

My second question concerns the infrastructure expenditures announced in the budget. As the hon. member is aware, the Minister of Finance announced \$1 billion, which seems like a lot, but over a 10-year period. This means barely \$100 million per year for infrastructure that, in most cases, is in terrible shape.

Quebec, for example, would get \$25 million per year. With 25 kilometres of roads, our needs are much greater than that. This would not be a lot for Saskatchewan either. I would like his comments on this ridiculous amount of one billion over 10 years announced by the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom: Madam Speaker, I will start with the employment insurance fund. There is now a surplus of \$47 billion in this fund. This is Canadian workers' money. It is their money, and the government has used it to eliminate the Canadian deficit. This is unfair, because this money is supposed to go to Canadian workers.

Second, there is the infrastructure issue in Canada. According to the mayor of Winnipeg, there is now a deficit of some \$57 billion in the infrastructure of our country. If I remember correctly, the Minister of Finance has announced approximately \$100 billion over 10 years.

An hon. member: It is \$1 billion.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom: I am sorry, it is indeed \$1 billion over 10 years. So it is \$100 million a year. This is not enough at all to solve the Canadian problem. There is \$1 billion over 10 years, but the Canadian deficit is at \$57 billion. There is a big difference between the two.

If there were investments in the infrastructure in Canada, this would also be a stimulus for the Canadian economy. This would be good for job creation and for better equality in our country.

We have great needs in my province of Saskatchewan, in Regina, Saskatoon, in the other towns and villages and on Indian reserves. It is exactly the same thing in Quebec. We greatly need federal money to invest in the infrastructure. The way to build the economy is to invest everywhere in Canada, to stimulate the economy and to create jobs. It would be good to have more money to invest to solve the social deficit and to invest in health insurance. So I agree with the Bloc Quebecois member.

[English]

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Madam Speaker, I knew there were questions and comments. I just did not think anyone would want to ask a question or make a comment on the speech of the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle.

It is my pleasure to stand in the House and resume debate. It has been a long week, I can appreciate that. It has been a very exciting week for myself and my party with the byelection results on Monday evening. I know the weeks to come will be equally as exciting, particularly with the government trying to defend its budget when it comes to not just simply a byelection, but a general election. It is not only their budget the Liberals have to try to defend, but the mismanagement that has taken place by this government over the last 10 years.

The member for Regina—Qu'Appelle had indicated that it seemed the economy changed in 1993 when the Liberal government was elected. I know the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle would have to give credit where credit is certainly due, in that the policies that were put into place prior to 1993 were the policies that this government is now living on.

The policy of the GST, where we took the manufacturing tax off and put it on to a goods and services tax, I appreciate is not a tax that Canadians appreciate all that much. However when it was brought forward in 1993, it was with the understanding that it would be a tax that would reduce the deficit, which Liberals always talks about, the \$42 billion deficit prior to 1993. It was that particular improvement which helped us find ourselves in the economy we have today.

It is the same government that will throw up its arms and say that the Tories left it with a \$42 billion deficit, but it does not seem to always take the other highroad and mention the free trade agreement which was negotiated with our American friends at that time because we did have a relationship with our American friends. This is something the government does not have at this time. We were able to sit down at the table and negotiate a free trade agreement that allows us to flourish in the economy we have today.

I know the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle did not mean it when he said there were terrible economic times prior to 1993 and immediately when the government took office those economic times changed, because it did not happen that way. It certainly did not happen in this government. As a matter of fact, in spite of themselves, the Liberals have taken our initiatives and allowed themselves to balance those budgets that we would have had balanced certainly long before they did.

The budget which has been tabled today is only a reflection of what has gone on in years past with Liberal governments. It gives us the understanding of the old 1970s Liberal philosophy of spend, spend, spend. It is a legacy, and we keep hearing that word all the

Government Orders

time, of a tired government and a tired Prime Minister telling us that they will shotgun this budget, that they will please just about everybody they have in their political pockets and that wherever the economy goes from here, it really does not matter.

We have returned to an era where the Prime Minister of the day was the previous finance minister. We have returned to an era of the Pierre Trudeau spend, spend, spend philosophy of the Liberal government. Canadians are not terribly pleased about returning to that. It is a shotgun approach.

Bill C-28 is the budget implementation bill that puts into place the budget the Liberals have tabled in the House. This is really an unfortunate happening for Canadians because the Liberals have now increased program spending in this budget alone, which means spending that was there for programs prior to the 2003-04 budget, by 7.3%. That is substantial. I do not think Canadian households have the ability to spend an additional 7.3% this year than they did last year. That 7.3% program spending increase is taking out of this budget the health care and the military expenditures, which by the way were absolutely required.

● (1240)

When we take out those extraordinary costs of health care and defence and the military, there is still a 7.3% increase in program spending. It is shotgun program spending, I might add. The Prime Minister probably had a dartboard somewhere in his office or maybe a putting green and he kept putting into different areas to decide which programs he was going to spend on. That is what it seems like. There was no logic to this; it was simply an ad hoc, shotgun approach to the budget.

There is a 7.3% increase in program spending. However, the finance minister of the day, who is up against that other guy from LaSalle—Émard for the leadership, says that the Liberals are going to find \$1 billion somewhere in this morass of government bureaucracy that they are going to put back in that area of program spending and they are going to save \$1 billion.

I will tell members how the government has saved \$1 billion. It got involved in a gun registry that has cost Canadians about \$1 billion over the life of that registry. It is not gun control, it is gun registry. The Liberals are going to save money in other areas to put it back into program spending, so maybe they will save money in different areas to go back into this black hole of the gun registry. From where are they going to spend some of this money? They are going to find some efficiencies in the military, the same area that Canadians and our own Auditor General have said is sadly and sorely lacking for resources.

Government Orders

We were supposed to put about \$1 billion or \$1.3 billion back into the military for this year just so it could continue in its operations. We did not. I think the military received \$800 million in this budget. Not only did it get less than what was necessary as the Auditor General indicated, now it has to find \$200 million in its operations to give to the finance minister to spend on the gun registry.

An hon. member: It is idiotic.

Mr. Rick Borotsik: It gets beyond idiotic. This is how bad it is. There are members of our military in Afghanistan, and I can put faces on these people because there is a base in my riding, who are very dedicated, very professional people.

The Minister of National Defence has sent our people over to Afghanistan and said "By the way guys, you cannot have guns". The government on the other side of the House messed up so badly that we put our guys in danger without their being able to have guns in Kabul. That is possibly the most dangerous, if not the most dangerous place on this globe and we put our guys in danger.

What are they supposed to do? When they run into a situation over there, our guys are supposed to put out their arm, point a finger and say "Stop, bang". It is ridiculous. What kind of management is that? What kind of minister is it who would put our people in danger?

Not only that, we are supposed to find \$200 million in that department so we can pay for the gun registry. Maybe they took their guns away. Maybe the people in the military did not register their guns and they cannot take them over there because of that.

We could talk about the Sea King helicopters. Do we want to talk about the budget? Let us talk about the budget. Let us talk about mismanagement. The parliamentary secretary is going to stand and say that there was \$42 billion worth of deficit. That was 10 years ago and the mismanagement by that government of that department is absolutely renowned.

A helicopter, the EH-101 was approved in 1992. We would have had the helicopters in place flying right now with our military in safe equipment but what happened? The Prime Minister said "We say no to helicopters". What was the cost of that political statement? It was \$1 billion, the same amount it would have cost to buy the helicopters in the first place. It took \$500 million to pay for the cancellation of the contract and another \$500 million to fix the helicopters over the last 10 or 12 years. That is mismanagement and it is reflected everywhere in the budget.

• (1245)

More mismanagement and what is not reflected in this budget? Agriculture. I come from an area whose whole economic engine is driven by agriculture. And we will get to fisheries. My friend from St. John's is here and we could talk fisheries when we talk about mismanagement.

An hon. member: They didn't mention it.

Mr. Rick Borotsik: And agriculture was not mentioned. My community is certainly dependent upon agriculture.

The Minister of Agriculture stood in the House and said to me that we would have in place a risk management program in his APF, the agricultural policy framework, by April 1, 2003, the year the new

budget was to start. A budget was put in place. Dollars were put in place. The government has announced 75 times a contribution to agriculture of \$5.2 billion over the next six years, not just this budget year. We have less money in this budget year than we had in the last budget year for agriculture, and we have substantially more difficulties in the industry.

My good friend the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle mentioned the U.S. farm bill. He also mentioned the U.S. subsidies and the European subsidization of agriculture. Our industry is not competing on a level playing field right now. It is competing way out of its league. We do not have the same fallback positions that the Europeans and Americans have.

There are two issues. One is we do not have the plan in place which the minister promised us by April 1. We do not have money for our farmers. They are out in the fields right now without any understanding at all as to how there is going to be any kind of business risk management fallback for them. This could be their last year farming because the minister has mismanaged everything he has touched.

I would like to talk about 1993 and the deficit. Ever since the Liberals put their agricultural policy in place everything has turned downward. There has not been a positive year in agriculture since they touched the file. They have to get out of the way. They should not touch the file. We would be better off if the government did not have a minister of agriculture than what we have right now.

There is no money in the industry. There is no planning for the industry. We have no relationship with our major trading partner, the United States. Fifty per cent of what is produced in agriculture is sent to the United States. The Minister of Agriculture probably does not know the name of the United States secretary of agriculture. The government is depending on the American Republicans and the American industry to stop what is known as the country of origin labelling requirements contained in the U.S. farm bill. We have to depend on the Americans to fight our battles. The point is the government should get out of the way and let somebody else take on the file.

Let me speak about the budget.

Mr. Loyola Hearn: It did not mention fisheries.

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Fisheries I have to admit is not really my field of expertise, but it demonstrates the government's mismanagement.

We talked about gun registration. We talked about the government's inability to deal with agriculture. We talked about its inability to deal with fisheries. At any level, the government has destroyed pretty much everything that was left in the fisheries. The Liberals stick their heads in the sand and do not want to take responsibility for it. The government has destroyed the softwood lumber industry. It is gone.

An hon. member: Health care.

Mr. Rick Borotsik: They have destroyed health care as my good colleague has said.

Government Orders

In the post-1993 election, the Liberals arbitrarily gutted health care. Now all of a sudden in this budget, money has been put back into health care. Unfortunately, it just takes us back to the 1995 levels. What the government did, and this is really deplorable, is it arbitrarily took cash away from the provinces and put the blame for health care on them.

There is a term cooperative federalism. The government does not understand cooperative federalism. It does not understand cooperation in just about anything. It is arbitrary and unfortunately the Liberals have to pay for it. The Liberals paid for it on Monday night and they will certainly pay for it in elections to come.

Madam Speaker, I am sure you would much rather be outside in the sunshine than in here listening to me rant on the budget, but my time will be up very shortly and I am just beginning to roll.

• (1250)

We can talk about what the Liberals did not touch in the budget. They used the shotgun approach. They made all of these wonderful expenditures where the Prime Minister is trying to pay off all of his little debts before he leaves. What they did not do was talk about the real vision of what was required.

In my previous life before coming to the House, I found that it was always better to keep money in the pockets of the people who pay the taxes. This is really a simple philosophy. The member for Regina—Qu'Appelle probably will not share this philosophy with me, but it is better to keep the money in the pockets of the people who pay the taxes. They know how to spend the money better.

The finance minister has stood in the House and I think he used the term “northern tiger”. That was probably one of the biggest heights of hypocrisy I have ever heard, calling us the northern tiger, because he has never implemented any policies on tax reform that would give any indication that we are heading in the direction of being a northern tiger. The real tigers are the economies of Ireland and Hong Kong. Those are the economies that have used tax deductions and tax reductions to the benefit of the consumer, to the benefit of their citizens, to develop those economies that can be referred to as tigers.

We would be better referred to as the economy of the pussycats. We have effectively no tax reduction. We have absolutely no understanding as to how this economy could be better served by the Liberals not spending the money on HRDC, not spending the money on the gun registry, not spending the money on all of those black holes that the Prime Minister has put into place. It is better to make tax reductions, tax rebates and tax cuts, not only to Canadian consumers and taxpayers but to the corporations. Then we could develop a thing called a positive business environment that certainly would attract people to this country.

There are a couple of things. Let us reduce those taxes. Let us reduce the capital gains tax. Let us reduce the levels of taxation. In Canada the highest margin of taxes is at \$100,000. In the United States it is at \$400,000. We already are dealing in a deficit. Our Canadian children who have talent are going to go to other places rather than stay in this country which is deplorable, but the government is forcing them to leave. That in itself is deplorable.

Let us make some changes and reforms to the taxation system. What would the Liberals rather do? They would rather play with a piece of legislation that is going to deal with political financing because that is the Prime Minister's agenda, not making it better for Canadians with tax reductions. Why is the Prime Minister's agenda on political funding? Because he is vindictive enough to try to get the people on the back benches, to get the people on his own front benches who are running for leadership. That is why he has that agenda and not the agenda that is best for Canadians, not whether there will be tax cuts, not the situation with the sex offenders act, not the priorities of Canadians in general. That is deplorable.

I am going to sit down right now and let the parliamentary secretary speak. No applause yet. I know the parliamentary secretary is going to talk about the \$42 billion deficit but he is not going to defend his government's mismanagement of every other thing that I have said here today. I want him to stand and tell me how he can defend the gun registry, how the health minister could stick her head in the sand when the SARS issue was prevalent in Ontario, how the Liberals could stick their heads in the sand while they destroyed the health care system, how they could stick their heads in the sand while they destroyed the softwood lumber industry, and how they could stick their heads in the sand when they destroyed agriculture. I want to hear those answers from the parliamentary secretary.

This has been a great week. Congratulations to Gary Schellenberger and congratulations to the citizens of Perth—Middlesex who have made the very wise choice to send a Progressive Conservative to the House. I can assure members that he will be on that side of the bench in the not too distant future. I do hope that the Liberals have the intestinal fortitude to call an election this spring with the current Prime Minister. We would love to go to the polls.

• (1255)

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I guess we are replaying the movie *The Invasion of the Body Snatchers* in here today, because I remember the days when my friend there and I worked together, when we were complaining about the government of the day, the Tory government, because it did not make the crucial investments that this member is now seeing happening across the country.

However, I would point out to the hon. member that spending in 2000-01 was 11% of GDP. This year it was 12.2%, the lowest since 1950. Why? Because of good fiscal management.

We have an increase of \$5.1 billion this year because of health care. He talks about gutting the health care system. It is run by the provinces and 75% of the health care this year for the Province of Ontario comes from federal transfers, not from the province. I can repeat that across with other provinces. The fact is that it has been the mismanagement of some of the provinces on health care; they are more interested in tax cuts than dealing with the sick. They would rather deal with tax cuts. He knows that and we know that.

Also, I would point out that as far as this budget is concerned, he says it is a machine gun approach, all over the place, but the reality is—

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Government Orders

Mr. Bryon Wilfert: Shotgun. Oh yes, he is the expert on guns. I forgot.

The fact is that when it comes to this budget the major increase is in health care because that is what Canadians said they wanted to see.

I am badly disappointed that he does not recognize that the OECD and the IMF said that in terms of economic output we are leading again. We are the leaders in the G-7 this year and we are going to be the leaders next year. He does not mention the significant reduction in the national debt, down to 44.5% from just six years ago at 71.5%. In real terms economic growth is at 3.2% this year and will be at 3.5% next year.

These are things that of course Conservatives would not recognize because they have always been dealing with deficits. I am not going to mention the big deficit they left, because of course that is the kind of thing they are more used to.

Of course our Alliance friends here are no better. In fact what I get tired about with the Alliance, particularly some members over there, is that they talk the line. One day they say to spend \$3 billion and the next day they say to save \$3 billion. If we had that approach we would really be in a deficit and we would have a massive debt.

I would like the member to deal with the real figures, the real issues, with health care, investing in families and the hundred billion dollar tax cut. I would like him to say when the last time was we saw those kinds of investments. I will not go into infrastructure because he knows that is a dangerous thing for him to talk about.

Those are the kinds of things Canadians asked for and we have delivered. Are there any comments from my hon. friend in the corner?

• (1300)

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Madam Speaker, I heard one of his colleagues say great job. I guess if that is all they can see as being an example of a great job, then I understand why they are floundering as badly as they are currently. The government the Liberals have is obviously entrenched in this mismanagement philosophy and that just exacerbates it right there.

I find it interesting, however, that when the parliamentary secretary stood up one of the first things he did was obviously to blame us as the previous government prior to 1993, which was 10 years ago, so let us always use a decade ago and let us not take any responsibility.

What really hurt me the most is when he stood and he blamed the provinces for their health care woes. That is sort of like the Prime Minister blaming the previous member for Perth—Middlesex for losing the election. I think that probably is part of their speaking notes they receive every morning: "When you get hammered on something, blame someone else". They point the finger of blame somewhere else, as they did with SARS, with agriculture and with every other of those mismanaged areas I talked about.

The member did have one legitimate comment to make when he talked about the reduction of spending versus GDP. It is true that they now have it at 12% of GDP. We must also appreciate the fact that the spending on programs has increased by 7.3%. Spending on

those faulty programs they have, including the gun registry, has increased by 7.3%, but yes, it has reduced it as its proportionate share of GDP. However, the reason for this is that our GDP has increased because of the free trade agreement we signed. We have an economy that is very strong because we can sell our goods and services. We can sell our goods and services because we have rules based trade agreements with our largest trading partner, the United States.

It does not take a rocket scientist. In fact, it does not take really much logical thinking at all, but that is maybe stretching it a bit and asking these people to understand that. What it means is that we have a larger economy. We have a larger economy because of all the free trade agreements, the GST that was put into place and the financing arrangements that we had prior to 1993. I wish the Liberals would recognize that and at least give some credit where credit is due.

Yes, it has decreased because the economy has increased, but that does not just happen automatically. It does not happen on the day that the electorate goes to the polls and we get these, no, I cannot use the term, we get this government in place and then all of a sudden the skies are all clear. It does not happen. Those programs were in place prior to 1993. They are programs that the government is taking advantage of right now.

Unfortunately, when it turns, and it will, because they have no vision, no understanding of how to handle anything and manage anything, then the Liberals will be responsible. They will be held responsible.

By the way, the member never did talk about this. Why do we not go with this budget to the people and let them decide as to whether or not it is a good budget? Maybe he would like to answer that question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member a question. The parliamentary secretary is still boasting about good Liberal government. I must admit, I do not know what kind of a bubble he is living in.

When there is a \$70 billion surplus that was not forecast, over the past five or six years, there is a problem. When the government is unable to tell us exactly what is up with public funds, when it systematically underestimates its surplus and then puts the \$70 billion in question out of the realm of public debate, there is a problem.

When \$45 billion has been diverted from the EI fund for purposes other than the one for which workers and employers pay into it, thereby penalizing the unemployed, it seems to me that we have a problem.

I would like to know whether the hon. member shares my point of view, which is that this government's way of managing public funds—in particular in the February 18 budget—is totally devoid of transparency.

Before letting him answer, I will moreover conclude by reading a brief passage from a letter from Yves Séguin, now the Quebec minister of finance, in which he said:

Government Orders

Accountability, as far as public funds are concerned, requires a government to bring down a budget, get votes passed, and levy taxes accordingly. To systematically announce in advance surpluses which the government has not clearly indicated will be forthcoming raises a serious problem of transparency and is, of course, contrary to the interest of the taxpayers, who are the ones who have to pay.

I would like to know if the hon. member shares the point of view of the new finance minister of Quebec?

• (1305)

[English]

Mr. Rick Borotsik: Madam Speaker, what a great question. I thank my colleague for it. That is one area I have not had the opportunity of talking about in my 20 minute dissertation.

Absolutely: How can we have any faith and how can there be any credibility in a finance minister or a finance department that year after year underestimates the surplus, not by dollars but by billions and tens of billions of dollars? There is no credibility left.

I think the reason why the previous finance minister, the leadership candidate from LaSalle—Émard, did it was that he wanted to keep it out of the sticky fingers of the backbenchers over there, who probably wanted to spend it on that shotgun approach that I talked about. So yes, it loses credibility in the management of the department.

It is not the bureaucrats. It is not those people. I blame this on the political masters who have tried to hide this whole transparency of the budgetary process and the surpluses that were generated. Then what did they do? They put it into the deficit and that is fine, but let us be honest. Of those surpluses, had they been honest with Canadians they could have given some of those surpluses back, not only in tax reductions to the Canadian taxpayer, but they could have reduced the EI payments that we are talking about right now. They could have put that back to the employers and the employees and not have them pay those exorbitant premiums in EI. Any of the surplus in the EI, which is a different pool of funding, goes into general revenues now, which again, I am convinced, is totally illegal but is happening.

The problem is the government has lost its credibility. It has lost its ability to say it is a good manager. After its 10 years in power, even the Canadian public is recognizing that this is a government totally out of control.

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to join my colleagues in this third reading debate on the budget. The government has to put its budget in play to start paying the bills for this fiscal year. However it has already done that, so it is kind of a moot point to debate what it should and should not do when the race has already begun. The spending is out of control already.

I read an article in the newspaper this morning saying that the Rolling Stones may consider coming to Toronto. They will not charge their regular rate, but for a small \$10 million fee they will put on a concert. What a bargain. I guess I would be all for it as long as they start and finish their presentation with the Canadian taxpayers' lament, that good old song they wrote, "I can't get no satisfaction". That would be worth the \$10 million, if they dedicated that to the taxpayers of this great country. It would be well worth the price of admission and well worth the \$10 million. We foolishly spend a lot

more than that on any given day here in this place. I am sure the Liberals will take that into account when they invite them to come, and ensure that they play that particular tune.

We are talking about budget 2003. We had a rookie minister who gave it his best shot and he came up short. No one across the country felt or saw that this was a good budget. It did not please anyone. My colleague from Brandon—Souris talked about the shotgun approach. I do not disagree with that. Of course the parliamentary secretary talked about a machine gun approach. I guess that is why the registry for firearms has gone so far off the rails; the parliamentary secretary does not know a shotgun from a machine gun. It really was.

An hon. member: A soldering gun.

Mr. Gerry Ritz: A soldering gun, Black & Decker.

The government took a little for everyone, tried to please everyone with a little and no one was pleased at the end of the day. We see money thrown into every pigeonhole it could find. I did not happen to see any new reallocation for the pigeon shoosers this year. Perhaps they are out of work or the pigeons have moved south. We are not sure. There was that April Fool's joke that there would be a new statute of Pierre Trudeau and I am sure that would have brought all the pigeons back. I know the ones from the west certainly would have rallied around.

The finance minister has challenged the departments of the government with this budget. He is spending \$178 billion or \$180 billion. He is challenging his departments to find a billion dollars in reallocation money. One-half of one per cent is as tight as he can get, saying that is how accurate the Liberals are with their forecasts and budgeting.

The Auditor General, who has been doing it for a little longer than the finance minister, says that there are \$16 billion that could easily be found. She says to trim the fat. He is looking for one-sixteenth of what she says is already there. It just flies in the face of logic that a billion dollars would somehow make a difference in \$180 billion of spending. There are so many places that it could go.

It has really been an education in this last session. In the almost six years that I have been here, although some days it seems longer and some days it seems shorter the way things work around here, we seem to be pushing everything uphill. We are in the midst now of the Liberal leadership, and of course we have a frontrunner that no one can catch. It is just not going to happen. Now we have a provisional government.

I have heard members from all parties talk about this interim governing body that is allowed to operate as long as the member for LaSalle—Émard says that is where he wants to go when he becomes prime minister. I guess that is fair enough because no one wants to carry the present Prime Minister's baggage. It just weighs too damn much. I can certainly understand why the member for LaSalle—Émard wants to hold back on certain bills that he feels are being patterned after the logic and the practices of the current Prime Minister. I can see where he would want to make a clean cut with that.

Government Orders

The member for LaSalle—Émard, as finance minister, talked about and initiated under his rule the single largest tax cut in Canadian history. Where the heck is it? Everyone in my riding called me up and asked, “When does thing kick in?” In year four we were supposed to start to see some numbers shrinking in what we had to send in to the federal government. This is year four. It has not happened. Perhaps it will happen closer to the end of the year as we ramp up toward an election. That would be a curious thing if that was to happen, and I am sure we will see it.

We are finally seeing some increases in our dollar. For so long we saw our dollar mired in the 65¢ or 66¢ range and the Prime Minister said that it was good news, that a low dollar was good for trade. It turns out it is good for trade actions. Every time the Americans lob something across our bow, the softwood lumber thing and now another one on the Canadian Wheat Board, it always seems to bring our dollar back to par. That is what they seem to be doing with their trade actions.

●(1310)

Is a low dollar good for trade? No, it has been good for trade actions. We faced a myriad of them and the government has been dismal in its handling of some of those actions. They are dragging on and on.

The government says that it is working on these files. People are losing their jobs while it is working on those files. Where is the interim money? The HRDC minister faced a question here yesterday about the softwood lumber folks in B.C. who have been waiting 18 months for the \$110 million which has been promised. I guess the carrier pigeons could not get it out there fast enough. It just has not shown up in their post office boxes.

All these promises come forward and it is always big dollars, always throwing money at a problem. We have seen that with SARS. The government is throwing money at it but it is too late. The damage has already been done. On softwood lumber, it is too late. The damage has already been done. However the money is there. Supposedly fiscally we have the capacity.

I see that in my own riding to the nth degree with agriculture. We have been five years struggling with the agriculture minister trying to get some sort of a program that will stabilize primary agricultural production. Notice I say primary because the rest of the agricultural world, the value added, the processing, the distribution systems and transportation are doing very well. However the primary producers, the guy and his family taking all the risks on the land, are not doing so well.

There is a reason for that. We do not take agriculture seriously in this country. We have never been hungry. We have never faced shortages or restrictions at a grocery store. When we talk to people in a lot of centres now, they are so far withdrawn from the land, where their pioneering grandparents generally were based, that they think milk comes off a shelf at Safeway. It does not. Someone has to raise and milk the cow. That is how it gets there. It does not come in that jug on the Safeway shelf.

It is the same thing with a loaf of bread. Someone has to grow the grain, transport it, mill it, package it, make it into bread and set it on the shelf. There are many steps in between. The steps in between

seem to be doing okay but the guy taking the risks on the land is not and has not been for a number of years. Farmers are barely getting by and are farming away the equity that they have built up in their farms: machinery costs, input costs, fuel, fertilizer, chemicals, taxes. Everything has gone through the roof.

Again, it goes back to our low dollar. Everything we do in the primary production of agriculture is based on American money: our fuel, fertilizer, chemicals, machinery, machine parts. Everything is based on American dollars because that is from where we import. We do not do that here anymore. Even the fuel that we did out of the ground here is still based on Texas crude.

We faced a huge hurdle in western Canada with that low dollar on our input side. Then we had it compounded when the Crow rate disappeared.

There was a huge debate at that time. I was one of the folks who said that maybe it was time for that to go that way because now we would have access to the value added sector. That means I can take my durum and grind it into pasta flour, export it that way and get one step up the food chain. We are not allowed to do that. That was the second half of the Crow rate reduction. It was a cash payout for a number of years of freight balance and then the ability and the right to look after my product and do with it as I saw fit.

The government forgot that half of the equation. That is why the pulling back of the Crow rate has been such a huge economic factor in western Canada. Each farmer lost on average about \$25,000 to \$30,000 a year, right off the top, because of the increase in transportation costs that the Crow rate stabilized. We have lost timely access to markets and things like that because we can no longer control it.

We have seen the Liberals in the Ottawa bubble here try to come with transportation and agricultural policies to fit a western Canadian problem about which they know nothing. The minister and some of his cohorts may travel out there but the bureaucrats that design and develop this stuff do not. They are still here in the bubble. They crunch numbers, they crunch percentages and say, “There you go”, but it does not work in actual fact and it does not work in the true application.

We have pointed this out again and again to the minister. We are not allowed to speak to the bureaucrats because they are faceless and nameless. We can never get access to them. However the minister says that he will get right on that but it does not happen.

Government Orders

We still do not have the rules in place for CFIP for 2002. The members can check their watches. What is the date today? It is 2003. My farmers are on the ground. They are seeding. The government still does not have the rules in place to make the payouts work for 2002. That is shameful.

● (1315)

The government is sending out a portion of what our guys need 100% of, and they may get the balance in December 2003. That is after the next crop year. That is ridiculous. The money has been pigeonholed. It is in play according to the minister. Where the heck is it? We cannot trigger it.

Now he is screwing around with our NISA accounts, the only part of the safety net that ever was worthwhile. Now he will take that and start to funnel programs through there. He is ripping it apart and there is nothing to be gained. There is not a farm group or a business group in the country that agrees with the APF. No one says that there is any basis in here to build a good solid foundation on and we will be stuck with that sucker for five to six years because that is the lifetime that it is supposed to run.

We have been two years trying to get it in play so I guess it is like the helicopter deal. As long as it is being talked about, somehow they think we have new helicopters. We do not. We just have not got it right.

Little things like that drive people crazy. We see the money and numbers tossed around. Everybody is supposed to feel better about their lack of progress on these files because they are talking about money that is in play. It is not getting anywhere and that has been the problem with the budget, a little bit to a lot of places. Nothing ever gets there.

On balanced budgets, the member for LaSalle—Émard, as finance minister, made a big thing out of balancing the books, and the Liberals were talking about it again today. How did he do it? Taxes went up. There are more people paying more and more.

The Liberals talk about the job numbers being great, that they have created 462,000 jobs. There is a reason for that, everybody has two or three part time jobs. There is no such thing as a big full time job anymore. They have it watered down to the point where nobody has a good full time job, something to build a future on, and they do not seem to like that point.

Anybody could balance the budget by taking the \$40 billion surplus out of the EI fund and applying it to whatever the person wants. Take the \$30 billion surplus out of the civil servants' pension plan, take the \$25 billion that was cancelled out of the CHST and lump all that together. It does not take a great mathematician to say that we could finally balance the books. There would be an extra \$100 billion to use as a slush fund to make it happen. That is exactly what did happen. It was not done on fiscal prudence. It was done on the capacity to rob every column possible and make creative accounting work.

We saw that happen but it is unfunded liabilities like this that will come back to bite us right where we sit, and it is going to happen, whether it is this term or the next. It is going to come back to haunt folks.

We see all the moneys piled up. We had the other contender from Hamilton in the leadership race, visit my home community of the Battlefords a week ago or whatever. In her zealotness to become leader, she has been scattering \$100 million across the country, a few bucks here and there, kind of a calling card, so they would recognize who she was and maybe remember her when she left.

In the Battlefords we have the seat of the old government for the Northwest Territories as it was called at that time. We governed more of Canada from Battleford, Saskatchewan, than Ottawa does now. We had the whole north end and everything, other than Upper and Lower Canada and parts of Manitoba. British Columbia did its own thing. We had it all. We cannot get 5¢ of funding out of the heritage minister to attach that government house to the our national park, the old Fort Battleford. We cannot get 5¢ of funding to maintain that government house and make it the tourist attraction that it could be.

We have groups from Alberta who want to disassemble it, move it out by taking private money to do it, and set it up again, but they were not the capital, we were. The grounds are still there. The graveyards are there along with the land registry building and government house. All those things are there and there is no money.

If that sucker was built in Quebec, Ontario or even the Atlantic provinces, guess what? There would be no problem getting money. I have been to a lot of those historical sites. Some of course have some significance like ours and some do not, yet there is no problem getting funding to put them on the map and make them a tourist attraction. What is wrong with us? I guess we did not vote Liberal but I can say that my folks out there will never make that trade.

● (1320)

An hon. member: They never will.

Mr. Gerry Ritz: They never will because they have been promised and denied so many times. They remember little things like the gun registry, the invasion on their civil liberties, and their rights and freedoms. They look at things like the national energy program. They remember things like the payout on the home heating fuel that went to prisoners and people who did not even live in the country. They look at these guys as poor fiscal managers. That point is getting nailed home.

I look at polls and they show the Liberals at 38% in Saskatchewan. That means that all three people voted because that is how many people in Saskatchewan get called when they do a sample of the country. I guess all of them were Liberals, but in my riding we would be hard-pressed to find anybody who would stand and say "I am a Liberal and I like it", because the family is under attack, the sex offender registry does not go anywhere because the Liberals will not make it retroactive and it does not protect our kids.

Government Orders

The DNA database that the police are crying for is not retroactive and never will be, so we have a bunch of blank sheets of paper. What good is that? We have Police Chief Julian Fantino from Toronto saying to take the money from the gun registry, put it into a sex offender registry, and make it work. He runs the largest police force in the country. He just had a huge tragedy in his area and he realizes what needs to be done. We have to get it done. A majority government can do these things.

The Solicitor General stood up in reply to a question in the House today and said that a motion I introduced totally scuttled Bill C-23, the sex offender registry. That is a David and Goliath story if I ever heard one. As if I took down a majority Liberal government. I would like to pass a couple of other motions on a few other things if it were that effective. However, he did not read the other half of the motion which said that Bill C-23 should be withdrawn until it is made retroactive. It is useless until we have some names in the registry.

Even when the government does implement the half measures it is talking about, the offenders can still apply to a judge and say that they cannot have their names there because it is not in their interests. Well of course it is not. It is in the interest of the poor victims out there who suffer again and again at the hands of these perverts. These guys just cannot help themselves.

We took many years to make a few changes to the Young Offenders Act and then it was softened because one province said it was too strict. The other nine said it was not strict enough, so the majority did not rule. Democracy does not count for a darn thing in this place at times. It is political will.

We see that in the helicopter replacement procedure. The government keeps crying that there is no politics in this replacement procedure. History shows that it was politics that cancelled it, it was politics that debundled it, and it was politics that bundled it again once the government saw a consortium coming together that it wanted. Now it is politics that says the specifications are all watered down.

During the late show last night I presented all of the things that have been changed, such as payload requirements and the potential for crash landings. The Liberals can lose the aircraft and nobody is concerned because that is how they have dumbed down the specifications. That is not good government. That is not good practice at any level in the private sector or government organization. We cannot do that. We cannot play politics with major procurement systems like that. We cannot play politics with sponsorship programs or job creation funds. They all hit the proverbial fan.

People in Canada are finally starting to keep a scorecard, saying "This is where it went off the rails. This is where it went wrong. This is why we have to hold these guys accountable". That has to be done and there is a political price to pay for all of this tap dancing that we see around the edges.

An hon. member: They lost the byelection.

Mr. Gerry Ritz: Yes, it cost them a byelection. It really did. People are starting to pay attention. It just flies in the face of everything we talk about.

Another thing out west that has people really upset is this whole Kyoto protocol that we ratified. Where is it now? We were in such a rush to put this in play, however I do not see a thing on the agenda that even speaks to that issue anymore, and rightly so. We do not need it. Canada contributes 2% to the global problem. We could clean everything up within an inch of its life and it would not make a difference globally.

We did this for the public relations spin and for the politics of the issue. As people became aware of the costs attached and what the targets would and would not be, they moved away from it. Western Canadians were enraged when they saw the auto sector get an exemption. It will save 40,000 to 50,000 jobs in Liberal Ontario, but it will put 40,000 to 50,000 jobs in Alberta and Saskatchewan at risk because the Liberals do not represent them.

Well we do and we will not stand still for that type of action from the government. We will never tolerate it and these folks will never elect Liberal members in my part of the world because of the way they handle these files.

• (1325)

There is no consultation. Liberals do not talk to the folks that need to be involved. They ignore them and say that they are smarter. They say they are from Ottawa and they will make the rules. Canadians should just abide by them and pay their darn taxes and keep them coming. It is an atrocious way to run a country.

Hon. Paul DeVillers (Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I heard the hon. member's comments regarding the job creation record in the last few years. I also heard his explanation for those impressive numbers. He said that these were all part time jobs and that we all had several jobs, or words to that effect.

I know the hon. member would not stand in the House and make up these allegations. I definitely know he has done much research to be able to stand in the House and make that type of allegation.

Would the member share with the House the statistics supporting his comment that the reason the job numbers were so impressive was because we all had several jobs?

Mr. Gerry Ritz: Madam Speaker, let us talk about the folks who have multiple jobs. All my constituents must have jobs outside the farm and so on to support their farming habit. I am told that 75% of the farms in western Canada are viable because of off farm income.

I talk with my constituents all the time. They complain that the major employers in this country, the Wal-Marts and so on, do not offer a full week of employment. My daughter is working part time for Sears as she finishes university. There is no such thing as full time employment.

While the Secretary of State for Amateur Sport was on his feet, I would have welcomed his comments on what the government did to junior hockey in Saskatchewan. We have written him letters about how these junior teams have been taxed as though they were employees. There is no such provision in the tax code to do this. The government made a horrendous example—

Private Members' Business

●(1330)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Order, please. The hon. member will have nine minutes remaining at the next sitting of the House.

[*Translation*]

It being 1.30 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

ETHICS COUNSELLOR

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC) moved:

That an Order of the House do issue for the production of copies of all reports of the Ethics Counsellor concerning the former Solicitor General.

He said: Madam Speaker, you have read the order to which I am addressing my remarks. The solicitor general and cabinet minister in question who was required to resign is now the member for Cardigan.

First, I want to deal with some questions of procedure and then I want to deal with questions of substance. It is important to understand that on issues with regard to the presentation of documents, the only limits upon Parliament are the limits that Parliament imposes itself. Parliament has imposed no limits on the papers or the documents which we are entitled to see and receive. Beauchesne's citation 447 states this in a rather negative way but makes the principle clear. It states:

The House itself has not laid down any criteria for Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers. Any determination of what constitutes "confidential documents" is not a matter for the Speaker to determine. It is up to the government to determine whether any "letters, papers, and studies" are of a confidential nature...

The government has the power to hide documents from Parliament, but the government has no right to hide those documents, and no right to decide what Parliament and the public will see.

The government has set out its own version of the so-called general principles it follows in trying to keep things secret. They are recorded in Beauchesne's citation 446 and I will review those so-called principles. But let it be clear, those are the government's rules for Parliament. They do not bind Parliament. We have the authority to decide by a vote here.

On October 22, 2002, the member for Cardigan, the then solicitor general, submitted his resignation from cabinet. In his letter to the Prime Minister, he said, among other things:

I met with the ethics counsellor and I have learned that he has found me in breach of some obligations.

It is important to remember and to underline that the member for Cardigan, the former solicitor general, disagreed with the finding of the ethics counsellor, at least so he said, but apparently the Prime Minister forced his resignation in any event.

If the member for Cardigan believed that he was wrongly judged, then it would be in his interest to have these documents published

and to have the facts known, and certainly it would be in the public interest.

If we are to have rules, we need to know what they are. We need to know why a minister has been found in breach in a particular case and we need to know whether a resignation was triggered by a breach of the rules or by something else. In other words, was the member for Cardigan fired for a real breach of the rules? And, for that matter, was the member for York Centre, the former minister of defence, fired for a real breach of the rules? Or was it for something else, something unknown, and something the public should know?

The only way to know is for Parliament to see the actual documents. Documents that, I remind the House and the public, were prepared by a public official, the ethics counsellor, who is paid and maintained at public expense and whose clear duty is to investigate potential breaches of the code of conduct for ministers and secretaries of state.

What makes this matter so important, more important than simply the documents I am seeking today, is that we are not speaking here of just isolated individual behaviour. There is a pattern of abuse with the government. The tip of the iceberg that we see is the number of resignations or changes in portfolio. The present ambassador to Denmark was chased out of the House and out of the country. The current House leader was forced to change his portfolio. The members for Cardigan and York Centre were forced to resign. There was probably a breach with respect to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, but we have not seen the files. Certainly the Prime Minister was in breach in Shawinigate and it would be interesting to see those files. And we do not know what other ministers were involved because we do not know what the government has not told us.

●(1335)

But we do know that the government on its way to office in 1993 promised a much more independent watchdog than it delivered. Instead of the independent official it proposed, it created a mere illusion of independence by breaking its promise to have that officer report to Parliament and by making that officer subject instead to the Prime Minister. That can only feed the impression that the government seeks systematically to keep secret behaviour and information that should be public.

There is a related issue. Since the government relies regularly on the reports of the ethics counsellor, this Parliament has the right to know what that counsellor reports and we have the right to know what the Prime Minister does with those reports. Does he read them? Does he pay any attention to them? That is not just a question in the air, because the Prime Minister of Canada has a clear obligation, spelled out in his own guide for ministers and secretaries of state; he is the person, the Prime Minister is the officer who is obliged by his own guidelines to ensure that his own ministers follow the rules.

Private Members' Business

That means that he needs to know what they are doing. The ethics counsellor has the duty to tell the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister has the duty to read and to heed the evidence the counsellor provides. Why is that germane? Because, and I will come to it in a moment, of the blind management trust arrangement that this government introduced despite the fact that it has never been part of any conflict of interest regime before. We have always before had absolutely blind trusts until this government, accommodating some of its richer ministers, decided it would change the rules for this regime. But even under these rules, the Prime Minister is required to come to his own decision about the conduct of his ministers. That is the clear responsibility of the Prime Minister of Canada.

I want to speak a little bit about the blind management trust. What we know about the blind management trust is that the member for LaSalle—Émard, the former minister of finance, was briefed 12 times on his private business affairs while he served as minister of finance. The Prime Minister refuses to answer, whether he, the Prime Minister, with a clear obligation under his own guidelines, has carried out his personal responsibility to find out whether his then minister of finance was acting improperly. One way to ensure that the Prime Minister reads the documents prepared by the ethics counsellor, one way to ensure that the Prime Minister acts on these documents, is to make them public in Parliament, because if we can read them, he will be required to read them.

If I may, I want to go through the arguments that may be used from Beauchesne's to defend secrecy on the part of the government. I want to go through point by point the elements in citation 446. Let me read those elements:

To enable Members of Parliament to secure factual information about the operations of Government to carry out their parliamentary duties and to make public as much factual information as possible—

Here are the “criteria to be applied in determining if the government papers or documents should be exempt from production”: first, “legal opinions or [legal] advice provided for the use of the government” would render a document secret. That is not the case with the matters here. There is no legal advice. There is no legal opinion. Second are papers “which would be detrimental to the security of the state”. There is no challenge to the security of the state to tell people what went on with the member for Cardigan when he was solicitor general. The third prohibition deals with “papers dealing with international relations”. That clearly does not apply in this case. The fourth relates to papers “received from the provinces”. That clearly does not apply in this case. The next item, (e), relates to “papers containing information, the release of which could allow or result in direct personal financial gain or loss by a person or a group of persons”.

● (1340)

All I can say is that I hope that is not the case. I hope the government is not keeping these documents secret to protect the financial position of some person unknown. If it is, it has an obligation to tell us who it is protecting by this secrecy. If it is going to cite that defence, it must make that information known.

The next exemption relates to “papers reflecting on the personal competence or character” of individuals. I think it is important to deal with that precise language. The word “reflecting”, I assume, was chosen with care. The language does not say “reporting facts

which might lead third parties to conclusions about competence or character”. The only reasonable interpretation of the word “reflecting” would be that the documents contained a commentary that was a reflection on competence or character. What is intended here is a limitation upon publishing characterizations in documents, not a limitation upon publishing facts in a document.

The exception (g) is “papers of a voluminous character”. If there were such papers, that might be one reason why the Prime Minister had not read them, but there is no reason to believe that the documents prepared by the ethics counsellor were of voluminous character. The next exception is related to documents “relating to the business of the Senate”. There is no reason to believe that exemption applies.

The next exemption says that nothing can be released “which would be personally embarrassing to Her Majesty or the Royal Family”. I doubt strongly that there is anything in these documents that would be embarrassing to Her Majesty or to the royal family.

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: A member opposite from the Liberal Party is casting doubts about Her Majesty the Queen, but I will let that pass.

The next exemption relates to “papers relating to negotiations leading up to a contract until the contract has been executed or the negotiations have been concluded”. The contracts in this case with Holland College were executed and have been concluded, so that exception does not apply in this case.

Again there is an exception for “papers that are excluded from disclosure by statute”. These papers are not so excluded by statute.

But then there is item (l): “Cabinet documents and those documents which include a Privy Council confidence”. All we can say is, there must be the reason. A privy council confidence is what the Prime Minister determines it is. If he wants to keep something secret under this rule, that is the loophole through which he can drive his Mack truck. I would hope that the government, if it is going to claim that there is a legitimate privy council secret here, spells out precisely what that is and what damage would be done to the Canadian public interest if there were to be a release or an exemption under this rule.

The next exception relates to “any proceedings before a court of justice or a judicial inquiry of any sort”. That is not the case and no one could argue that the ethics counsellor is comparable in any way to either a court of justice or a judicial inquiry.

The next exception relates to “papers that are private or confidential and not of a public or official character”. These papers are of an official character. They relate to public business; they are of a public character.

There is then a prohibition against the release of “internal departmental memoranda”. Surely no one would say that the report of the ethics counsellor to the Prime Minister relating to whether or not the conflict of interest guidelines are respected is merely a memorandum. Of course it is not.

Private Members' Business

Finally, there are “papers requested, submitted or received in confidence by the Government from sources outside the Government”. That also does not apply in this case.

There is then a large exemption here, and I note that I have but a minute left, which has to do with consultant studies. That does not apply in this case.

The reason I went through this in detail is that the only possible grounds that the government could use to defend keeping this secret is that long list of exemptions that I have related. None of those exemptions apply. The government's own rules do not justify its keeping these documents secret.

● (1345)

And our rules are clear. We decide. Parliament has the power to decide what will be secret and what will be public. We can compel, by a vote in this House, this government to make public the documents named in my request for production of papers. That is our power and I very much urge this House to exercise that power in the name of democracy, in the name of transparency, and in the name of the integrity of our country and our reputation.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank the House for the chance to speak to this motion, which calls for the government to release any reports by the ethics counsellor concerning the former solicitor general. It is particularly gratifying since it allows me to speak in support of two important principles which are important to all Canadians: first, the need for transparency and openness in government, and second, the need to protect the confidentiality rights of all citizens.

As all members are aware, these two principles can seem contradictory at times. I want to emphasize my own personal commitment to making sure Canadians have access to as much information on the workings of government as possible, for transparency and openness are vital to involving citizens in the important issues of the day and enhancing confidence in the institution of Parliament.

The government's handling of this issue to date underlines its commitment to this principle as well, for a number of documents relating to this motion already have been released. These include letters exchanged by the ethics counsellor and the former solicitor general in 1999 as well as those exchanged by the former solicitor general and the Prime Minister in October 2002. This second set of letters has since been published on the Prime Minister's website, which is about as public as one can get.

Then too, information collected during the ethics counsellor's investigation of the conduct of the former solicitor general has also been released under the Access to Information Act, which means this material is not a secret either.

Also, the ethics counsellor has posted on his website a number of reports concerning other members of the government, material prepared in response to requests by parliamentarians and other interested parties.

But while transparency and openness are important principles, they do not trump all other rights, such as the right to privacy, such

as the right to cabinet confidentiality and the discretion required by the Prime Minister to fulfill his responsibility for the conduct of government.

And so over the years, successive generations of parliamentarians have decided, quite rightly, that some documents should not be released, such as confidential advice to a member of Parliament from a parliamentary ethics adviser on a conflict of interest matter, or confidential advice to the Prime Minister on the conduct of ministers, secretaries of state and parliamentary secretaries who serve in his government.

Of course this makes eminent good sense. Parliamentarians should be able to request confidential advice on conflict of interest issues so they can properly arrange their affairs.

And the Prime Minister should be able to request confidential advice on ministerial ethics since the Prime Minister bears ultimate responsibility to Parliament and to Canadians for the conduct of ministers.

It is the Prime Minister who establishes the standards of conduct they must follow and acts to remove them if they are in serious breach of these principles. It is the Prime Minister who is accountable to the House, and indeed to all Canadians, for their conduct. This means that the Prime Minister must be certain that the advice he receives in confidence today does not become tomorrow's front page news. Because of this, reports concerning the conduct of senior members of government prepared as advice to the Prime Minister are released only at his discretion. This is also the practice in other mature democracies like the United Kingdom and Australia.

Of course, such documents may be released occasionally with the Prime Minister's approval, as in the case of the report on the former minister of finance in relation to the Canadian Development Corporation and the tainted blood scandal after a commitment by the Prime Minister to make this information public. But in general, this is not a common practice. As the sponsor of this motion, a former prime minister must surely know this.

So it is not surprising that the government should oppose this motion which seeks release of the ethics counsellor's confidential advice to the Prime Minister, particularly since the code of conduct for MPs developed by the Milliken-Oliver committee, currently under study by the procedure and House affairs committee, also proposes to keep some information confidential when it involves MPs' enquires to the proposed ethics commissioner.

● (1350)

This being said, the government nevertheless is committed to greater transparency and higher ethical standards in the conduct of public affairs, as shown by the Prime Minister's eight point plan on ethics in government announced last June, and by the introduction of Bill C-34, which seeks to strengthen ethical conduct in government and enhance public confidence in our system of government through the appointment of an ethics commissioner reporting to the House of Commons, and a Senate ethics officer reporting to Senate.

Private Members' Business

The ethics commissioner and the Senate ethics officer would administer conflict of interest provisions for members and senators and would assist in the administration of the Prime Minister's code of ethics for ministers and other senior public officials. Even here there would be respect for the right of the Prime Minister to receive confidential information, for while the ethics commissioner would table an annual report on his administration of the Prime Minister's code in both the House and the Senate, it would not include confidential information.

In conclusion, the information requested in the motion clearly falls into the category of confidential advice provided to the Prime Minister which can only be made public at his discretion. Releasing such information would fly in the face of established parliamentary traditions not only in Canada but also in many other mature parliamentary democracies. It would also set a very bad precedent and would undermine the ability of this and subsequent prime ministers to successfully perform their duties, all of which would cause long term damage to our system of parliamentary democracy.

For this reason, I will be voting against this motion. I would urge all other members to do likewise.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, the Canadian Alliance supports this motion for the production of copies of all reports of the ethics counsellor concerning the former solicitor general. It is important that details of this conflict of interest be open and transparent, as well as many others that have been raised in the House today. The Government of Canada has a duty to tell the people why the former solicitor general was forced to resign. They have the right to know.

Over and over we see the government's complete lack of will to provide openness and transparency. The promise by the government to establish new standards of ethics has taken over a decade to surface and even then it is only just barely popping its head up. We have seen scandal after scandal with the government and each time the government promises to be open and more transparent. Yet each time that a scandal erupts, the government does damage control and then tries to cover up the wrongdoing of the minister.

This is not just limited to the former solicitor general. We are also talking about the former minister of public works, Alfonso Gagliano; the former minister of national defence; the House leader of the Liberal Party in his role as minister of public works; the minister of industry; and even now there is one that is still ongoing where medical studies on aboriginal health were done by an auto restoration firm; and of course, the Prime Minister himself. The government has existed on excuses and when it cannot come up with excuses in the existing conflict of interest guidelines, it manipulates the guidelines to encompass a whole set of brand new excuses.

The Liberal standard has fallen to a new all-time low. The government need only review the words of former Prime Minister John Turner who said in Parliament on May 12, 1986:

In public administration a minister has the burden of proof, the duty to show that what he is doing is beyond reproach. The burden of proof is not on Parliament. It is not on the opposition, nor the media. The burden of proof is on the minister.

If the minister failed this test put forward by the Prime Minister through the ethics counsellor, then Parliament and Canadians have a right to know what was so compelling as to require his resignation.

In October 1993 the Liberal Party of Canada published its election promises book known as red book I. One of the promises in it stated:

A Liberal Government will appoint an independent Ethics Counsellor to advise both public officials and lobbyists in the day-to-day application of the Code of Conduct for Public Officials. The Ethics Counsellor will be appointed after consultation with the leaders of all parties in the House of Commons and will report directly to Parliament.

An ethics counsellor was indeed appointed, but without any consultation and reporting directly to the Prime Minister.

Let us fast forward to February 2001. The Canadian Alliance brought forward a supply day motion quoting word for word from the 1993 Liberal red book promise. The motion asked the House of Commons to adopt a policy to appoint an ethics counsellor who would report directly to Parliament and asked the government to implement that policy. It was defeated by a vote of 145 to 122 with all opposition members voting in favour. Once again the Liberal government failed to live up to its promises.

In Bill C-34 it is proposed that the new ethics counsellor will report to the House. If that is good enough now, then why not table the reports regarding the solicitor general today? Why wait and why create a double standard?

There were many unanswered questions surrounding the dealings of the former solicitor general. The government parades itself as being responsible and ethical. If this is so, then the government has a responsibility to table the ethics counsellor report in the House of Commons.

The government has taken 10 years and has made many attempts at striving for ethical standards. It should prove to the people that it is serious in making sure that parliamentarians work under ethical standards. A step in that direction would be to table the documents and show by action what, in essence, the Liberal government says it really means. If this is not done, the government will have let Canadians know that its decade old attempt at coming up with an ethical standard is just another empty promise.

•(1355)

Canadians need the government to be candid, something it has not been. The government has continually attempted to set rules for its members to follow. When they cannot follow the rules, it simply sets up new rules.

We need to assure Canadians that rules have been followed and can be followed and when they are not, that the government will be forthright with Canadians as to what went wrong.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I will start by saying that the Bloc Québécois will support the motion of the hon. member for Calgary Centre, which reads as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for the production of copies of all reports of the Ethics Counsellor concerning the former Solicitor General.

In order to fully appreciate the motion before us, I think it is important to give a little background.

Private Members' Business

We will recall that the former Solicitor General had to resign on October 23, 2002, after a report by the government's ethic counsellor, Mr. Wilson, concluded that the Solicitor General should not have intervened with the RCMP commissioner with respect to a grant for Holland College, on Prince Edward Island, a college that was run by his brother.

Mr. Wilson began his investigation on October 4, 2002, after allegations of patronage were made against the former Solicitor General in connection with a \$100,000 contract awarded to a firm in which his official agent, Everett Roche, had a financial interest.

The Prime Minister explained that Mr. Wilson had cleared the former Solicitor General of any breach of ethics in the matter I just referred to. The Prime Minister added, and I quote, "In the case of a public institution owned by the provincial government, the ethics counsellor said that he should not have intervened".

In his letter of resignation to the Prime Minister, the former Solicitor General railed against Mr. Wilson's conclusions regarding lobbying he purportedly did for Holland College, and said that he believed that the ethics commissioner made an outright mistake in his advice on this whole issue.

Members will recall that Mr. Wilson had written to the Solicitor General in 1999 to tell him that he could not have anything to do with Holland College. The former Solicitor General maintains that his work on behalf of the project did not constitute "preferential treatment", because the project had been recommended by the Atlantic innovation fund, a fund that did not come under his responsibilities.

The former Solicitor General therefore claimed his innocence by stating that he was resigning to defend his honour. In his letter to the Prime Minister he said that, in this age of political correctness, if he were to stay in cabinet, he would give the impression that he was fighting for my job, instead of his honour.

To the surprise of many, the Prime Minister accepted his former minister and faithful supporter's defence, saying that he had done nothing wrong.

The Prime Minister mentioned that all the minister did was defend the interests of the people of his small province.

The Prime Minister added that he had been an excellent minister and that he was proud that he had served in his cabinet.

Obviously, after the new Solicitor General was sworn in at Rideau Hall, the Prime Minister once again explained that the former Solicitor General had left the cabinet gracefully in order to allow the government to concentrate solely on government business.

The Prime Minister explained that he had accepted his resignation, even though the former Solicitor General had done nothing wrong. The Prime Minister added that if he had not resigned, he would have continued to defend him.

Clearly we are dealing here with a great number of indirect assessments, from the former Solicitor General, from the Ethics Counsellor and from the Prime Minister himself.

We know that the commissioner's report to the Prime Minister has remained confidential. The Prime Minister said that it contained privileged information that was no business of the public's. We do not agree with him on that.

According to the Prime Minister's summary, Mr. Wilson concluded that the former Solicitor General had respected the code of conduct in the case of a contract awarded to the accounting office of his official agent. I have already mentioned that. On the other hand, he may have contravened the rules of ethics by intervening with the RCMP and the Correctional Service in favour of a project led by the community college—Holland College—headed by his brother.

A number of questions remain unanswered. On what grounds did the ethics counsellor, Mr. Wilson, absolve the former Solicitor General in the case of the contract with his official agent? Another question would be about the discoveries made by the ethics counsellor in the second case, which might mean that the counsellor's report should be passed on to the RCMP so that the rules of proper public management are followed.

It will be remembered that the ethics counsellor's only mandate was to examine whether the former Solicitor General's actions were in accordance with the code of ethics.

We support Motion P-15 in principle, because it seems to us that more transparency is needed in order to bring this entire situation out into the open.

• (1400)

We must remember that in the last 10 years there have been many scandals that have not yet seen the light of day. It has been a recurring theme of the Liberal reign ever since they came back into government. To mention only the most important ones, there was the Aubeige Grand-Mère, the HRDC scandal, and the sponsorship program.

We know that, in the end, after many years of promises, the Liberals have finally tabled a certain number of documents in this House. The measures taken for the future will not cleanse the past and it is clear that, over the past 10 years, the government's ethics counsellor, Mr. Wilson, has acted more as a political adviser to the government than as a guarantor of ethics in government.

At the time of the events I referred to at the beginning of my speech, the Bloc Québécois was demanding not only the publication of the ethics counsellor's report, but also a more thorough investigation. The leader of the Bloc Québécois—you will remember him—said that he found it very odd that someone would resign if he had nothing to be ashamed of. His remark is still relevant.

Improving the system requires some good will but sometimes this good will needs a hand, especially when we see that some ministers continued to support the former Solicitor General after the ethics commissioner produced a damning report.

Private Members' Business

I can, for example, mention the case of the new Solicitor General, who condemned the witch hunt by opposition members that forced his predecessor out. The Minister of Canadian Heritage—currently a Liberal leadership candidate—described her colleague as probably one of the most honest people in Parliament, adding that he was only doing his job, that all the parties on the island support him, that he did not seek profit for himself or his family, that his brother works in a public institution, not in private enterprise.

Even after the former Solicitor General stepped down, the Prime Minister said that he had done absolutely nothing wrong and that he had defended the interests of people on Prince Edward Island. So, there he is, among the Liberal members, and they had to agree to this rather surprising resignation if, in fact, the former Solicitor General is beyond all reproach.

In this regard, it is in everyone's interests for the ethics commissioner, Mr. Wilson, to table his reports in their entirety, so that the public can really see what the truth is.

It would be difficult to understand why the government would be scared of the truth if, in fact, the former Solicitor General is beyond all reproach. If, as the Prime Minister says, he was only doing his job, it seems that it is in the Liberals' interests for the ethics commissioner to table all the documents in this House.

I therefore invite all the members of this House, including the Liberals, to support the motion by the hon. member for Calgary Centre.

• (1405)

[*English*]

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will be very brief in the debate today and indicate I want to support the motion put forth by the leader of the Conservative Party.

I believe it is very important to have transparency in politics. I believe that the reports of the ethics commissioner, Mr. Wilson, should be made public and to their fullest extent possible. It is not a reflection on the former solicitor general. It is just a comment on the process.

The Canadian people expect total and complete transparency and openness by the parliamentarians whom they elect. There is a great deal of cynicism by a lot of people about our political process. If they do not divulge all the information when there is an investigation by the ethics commissioner, it hurts the whole process.

I wanted to make that brief comment and to say that I support the motion before the House today.

I hope that members across the way on the Liberal side will vote freely and independently on this as well. Too often we have votes in the House that do not reflect on how an individual member really feels. We have too many confidence votes and too few free votes. We are probably one of the most handcuffed parliaments in the world in terms of the power of the whips.

In the British Parliament at the height of her popularity Margaret Thatcher, and at the height of his popularity Tony Blair, both lost many votes in the House of Commons but their governments

continued. They did not lose a confidence vote and they were re-elected in both cases.

In this House we almost always deem it a party line vote. This is one case where it does not have to apply. There is no reason a member of the government or the opposition cannot freely vote in accordance with his or her own wishes in terms of the substance of the motion by the member for Calgary Centre.

I just wanted to say that and hope that the House will agree with the motion and that the ethics commissioner's report will be fully, absolutely and totally available, that there will be total and complete transparency. That is what is needed in this case.

If I were the former solicitor general, I would be the first person in the House to get up and vote in favour of total and complete transparency in making public all the documentation.

• (1410)

Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate on Motion No. P-15 proposed by the member for Calgary Centre.

The member for Calgary Centre seems to have a way to get so low in the way he presents things, the old Conservative let us see how low we can go routine: if we get low enough we could probably crawl under a rattlesnake with a high hat on.

An hon. member: Tell the truth.

Mr. John O'Reilly: I know it is lonely in the gutter, but I am sure you must enjoy it there.

The Prime Minister has already released this information. It is something that I had hoped would never enter Parliament, but I know that the member, being a former prime minister, had ministers who could not count and he lost an election. He called an election because one of his ministers forgot to count the House: "Oh, golly, I guess I am not the Prime Minister anymore", and then he lost the government. The Conservatives were so bad they were down to two people, one of which was not him, one of which I thought maybe even became bright enough to become a Liberal and now is a premier of a province. There is a certain amount of this that goes a long way.

I went to the riding of the member for Cardigan, to the Tea Hill Park social, a great strawberry social. I never met so many people who felt that the member had been so slighted by the Tories, by the people trying to drag him down and make him something that he is not. He is a fine upstanding gentleman. He has a lovely family. He works hard for the people of his riding. And for that he has to be dragged through the mud by a former prime minister who had a minister who could not count.

It is with regret that the Prime Minister had to accept the honourable resignation of his minister. He made public the letter of resignation that was sent to him by the former solicitor general and his reply to him. In addition, the text of the letters exchanged between the ethics counsellor and the former solicitor general have also been made public. That is not good enough for the ex-prime minister who could not count. He wants to drag someone through the mud. Personal denigration seems to be the order of the day for a dying party sitting on the other side, lost in the corner.

Private Members' Business

I should not really talk about that because I am kind of lost in this corner.

The ethics counsellor's report requested by the member for Calgary Centre was provided to the Prime Minister as confidential advice from his counsellor. When the ethics counsellor provides advice to the Prime Minister, these communications are privileged between the ethics counsellor and the Prime Minister. Not having been a prime minister for very long, I guess the member did not learn the rules back then before he became the member for Calgary Centre.

The particular report contains information and advice to the Prime Minister that I do not feel should be released. It is based on client privilege. Is it not something that due process of the law has been served and that the case is over? Oh no, let us drag people through the mud; let us see how low we can go, the old Tory thing: let us tear someone apart and boy, will we feel good when we get someone down there in the mud with us tearing them apart.

On the standards for the conduct of ministers, all considerable breaches of standards, when the need arises appropriate action is taken. The hon. member resigned. He felt that his honour was at stake. He did not want to take his family through the muck raking that would happen which is happening now anyway. I guess maybe he should have stayed.

The Prime Minister is accountable to the House and to all Canadians for the conduct of ministers. Members of course can question the government on its decisions and its actions. The Prime Minister provided very good answers when questions were asked in the House on this issue. That is the way Parliament works.

The government is committed to open transparency and is actively engaged in initiatives in this area. It is on the record. The members hate to hear it over there. Listen to them heckling like a little bunch of hens.

Last June the Prime Minister announced an eight point plan of action on ethics in government and included a commitment to the new appointment procedure for the ethics counsellor. That is not good enough for the former prime minister who could not count.

The government introduced Bill C-34 which implements the recommendations of a procedure and House affairs committee report regarding the creation of an independent ethics commissioner reporting to Parliament.

• (1415)

The ethics commissioner would have two functions: to administer conflict of interest provisions for members of the House; and to administer any principles, rules or obligations established in the Prime Minister's code for his ministers and other public office holders.

It is very important that the Prime Minister be able to request confidential advice on the conduct of his ministers. The Prime Minister has the responsibility for deciding who will serve in his cabinet and be questioned by Parliament and by Canadians on those decisions. The Prime Minister always makes that very clear. This approach is shared. We talk about the Westminster model. It is the

same approach that the United Kingdom has. It is the same approach that Australia has.

The principle that the Prime Minister can request confidential advice is reflected in Bill C-34, but at the same time, parliamentarians would be able to request the ethics commissioner to examine the actions of a minister as they relate to the provisions of the Prime Minister's code of conduct. Under Bill C-34 the ethics commissioner would be required to examine such requests and then provide a report to parliamentarians who made the request to the Prime Minister, to the person who was the subject of the complaint, and to the public, all at the same time.

In addition, under Bill C-34 the ethics commissioner would be required to table an annual report on his administration of the Prime Minister's code in both the House and the Senate. Bill C-34 also requires that the ethics commissioner not include in the report any information that he or she requires to keep confidential.

With respect to the former solicitor general, the report sought by the member for Calgary Centre contains confidential information and was provided by the ethics counsellor to the Prime Minister as confidential advice.

I ask that the House not sink to the level of the former prime minister for a short time because his ministers could not count, to rely on the good honour of the ethics counsellor, to vote for Bill C-34 and to turn down this dilatory motion by the member for Calgary Centre.

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think all members in the House are very concerned about ethics. Members are working so that all members of Parliament are respected. The Prime Minister's ethics package will go a long way to ensuring that does occur.

Bill C-34, which is presently before a committee, is an important piece of legislation. I would urge the hon. member opposite to support the bill.

Obviously, we need ensure that confidentiality is respected when these reports are drawn up. The current ethics counsellor writes reports as an advisor to the Prime Minister that include confidential and other information. The people who give that information have every right and expectation of privacy.

In the new bill the reports will be quite a bit different. There will be an opportunity for all those reports to be made public. That is an important aspect to ensuring that people do understand how ethics work and what the process is for members of Parliament. It will be an important opportunity for people to clear their names very convincingly with the public.

One of the problems we have now is people are accused of things. There is a report and people do not always get to be fully convinced that the person was in fact in the right. The improvements are something that the member opposite should be supporting. I would encourage him and his party to support those.

Private Members' Business

The issue of confidentiality and giving of advice to the Prime Minister is important. I know that on occasion, when I was unsure about how to act on an issue, I was able to contact the ethics counsellor as a backbench MP and receive some advice. It was important to know that before I acted there was a way to check and balance with someone, especially as a new member. I see there are some new members opposite over there who may want to avail themselves of that opportunity. This is something that we can all do.

As well, the reports that the ethics counsellor has put on the website, which describe what a certain situation was and what his findings were, are very instructive to the general public. They are very instructive to other members of Parliament and ministers so they are ensuring that they are conducting themselves in the most appropriate way possible.

I cannot support the motion by the right hon. member for Calgary Centre. I encourage him to look at Bill C-34 and to put his full support behind it. I encourage him to ensure that we enhance with the general public its expectations from members of Parliament and its confidence in members of Parliament from all parties.

One thing that is very stressful for me is seeing members denigrated and hearing accusations made against people in an irresponsible manner. The front page is always the place for accusations. Unfortunately, the back page sometimes is where the clarifications are issued. I know other people of high public standing are faced with that affliction as well.

Bill C-34 will ensure that there is a better process and that there is clarity. It is an important piece of legislation, and the motion from the member opposite does not enhance the process at this time. We need to ensure that we move forward in a very progressive way. The Prime Minister has demonstrated great leadership on moving forward.

I encourage all members of Parliament from all parties to support the Prime Minister's initiative going forward. I have always had every reason to have confidence in the government and many times in other members of Parliament from other parties. I am sure the member opposite can remember when members of Parliament were not held in very high repute. Certainly some of those years were very difficult prior to the present government coming into office.

There is a need for people to have confidence. The ethics package that the Prime Minister is moving forward with, and that the Liberal Party will be moving forward with, is an important part of that process because people need to have confidence. People have a right to have confidence in their members of Parliament. We can do everything to ensure that they have that respect.

I will not be supporting the motion of the member opposite. I encourage him to support the government's bill, Bill C-34.

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude Duplain (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to touch on the topic of discussion this afternoon, but I think that everything that has been said needs to be repeated over and over.

In assessing the situation, several documents relating to the ethics counsellor's investigation into the activities of the former Solicitor General have already been made public, including a copy of the correspondence between the former Solicitor General and the ethics counsellor in 1999. The October 2002 correspondence between the Prime Minister and the former Solicitor General can also be found on the Prime Minister's website. This means that anyone can easily have access to all the documents on the website.

Information collected as part of the investigation by the ethics counsellor and released under a request for access to information can also be found there. The final report concerning the former Solicitor General has not been released.

The ethics counsellor is in the process of posting a number of his reports concerning other cabinet ministers on his website. These reports have been produced at the request of parliamentarians or other interested parties. However, reports on the conduct of members of cabinet, prepared to advise the Prime Minister, are only released at his discretion. One of these reports has been released. Indeed, the report of the ethics counsellor on the former Minister of Finance in respect of his involvement with the Canada Development Corporation and the tainted blood scandal was made public to follow up on a commitment made by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons on May 31, 1999.

In his capacity as the leader of the government, the Prime Minister has this discretion in order to fulfill his responsibility for government and ministerial conduct. It is important that the Prime Minister be able to rely on confidential advice on the conduct of his ministers, secretaries of state and parliamentary secretaries.

The Prime Minister himself, and he alone, decides the make-up of his cabinet, and he is accountable for his decisions both to Parliament and to the people of Canada. A similar system is in place in other countries, such as the United Kingdom and Australia.

These are certainly not procedures unique to us or which can be described as irresponsible.

With Bill C-34, which establishes the positions of Ethics Commissioner and Senatorial Ethics Advisor, the Prime Minister, who is ultimately responsible for the conduct of his ministers, will be able to continue to obtain confidential advice from the commissioner. Although the bill does not say so, the Prime Minister will continue to have the discretionary power to make or not to make public the advice obtained in this confidential manner.

Parliamentarians will also be able to request an investigation by the commissioner into the conduct of a minister, a secretary of state or a parliamentary secretary under the Prime Minister's code of ethics. The member who requested the investigation will receive a report setting out the facts, analysis and conclusions, as will the Prime Minister and the individual who has been the subject of the request, and the report will be made public at the same time. The bill stipulates that the ethics commissioner may not include in his report anything he is required to keep confidential.

Private Members' Business

The report on the former Solicitor General that Mr. Clark wants to obtain contains confidential information and was provided to the Prime Minister—pardon me for having used the member's name instead of his riding—by the ethics counsellor on a confidential basis. The decision to not comply with the hon. member's request is in keeping with the arrangements proposed in Bill C-34.

Since a number of the ethics commissioner's documents relating to the inquiry into the activities of the former Solicitor General have already been made public, they may be consulted on the web site. The site is there to be visited, or application can be made and the required procedure followed.

• (1425)

[*English*]

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to participate in the debate this afternoon. What some of this relates to, in dealing with the ethics counsellor, is obviously the ethics of the government and the question of ethics in public service in general.

From that standpoint, the debate this afternoon has not really addressed some the broader issues that we in government face in terms of ethics. If we go back, for instance to the beginnings of this government in 1993, what we saw was an honest commitment to correct the errors of the past. God knows, we had a number of errors in the past in terms of ethics in government from the previous Conservative government of Brian Mulroney. Books have been written about the issue of ethics in the previous Mulroney government.

I was around here working as an assistant at the time of the first Mulroney parliament, from 1984 to 1988. What I witnessed, and some of the files that I worked on at that time, was absolutely astounding. I think back for instance to the case of Robert Coates, the former defence minister, who was discovered in a strip club in Germany with secret NATO documents in briefcases with him. Of

course he was called upon to resign, and once it was discovered what he was up to, he did in fact resign.

However what bothered some of us at the time was the fact that the Mulroney government just had no idea as to what the concepts of ethics were, what they meant in terms of public confidence and what they meant in terms of the larger issue of the consent of the governed. It is absolutely essential to establish in the public mind some competency, some sensitivity to issues of cleanliness in government, if I can put it that way.

I think back to the case of the former solicitor general Elmer MacKay who by all accounts was an honest individual but who was drawn into a situation with the former premier of New Brunswick, Richard Hatfield, in connection with an investigation relating to marijuana in 1985. I remember that very well, and the result it had on people's confidence in government, the fact that there were these secret meetings between the former solicitor general and the premier of New Brunswick related to an RCMP investigation.

The impact that had, certainly on the people to whom I spoke, was very profound and it resulted eventually in a repudiation of the government of—

• (1430)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The hon. member will have six minutes and 30 seconds when we resume debate on this motion.

The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

[*Translation*]

It being 2:30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, May 26, at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

HON. DON BOUDRIA

MR. LOYOLA HEARN

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hinton, Betty	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	CA
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	CA
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CA
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	CA
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	CA
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	CA
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	CA
Moore, James	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	CA
Owen, Hon. Stephen, Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Peschisolido, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Richmond	Lib.
Reynolds, John, West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	CA
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	CA
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	CA
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	CA
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	CA

MANITOBA (13)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Harvard, John	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	CA
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	PC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Hon. Rey, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	CA
Simard, Raymond	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Toews, Vic	Provencher	CA
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
Castonguay, Jeannot, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Madawaska—Restigouche	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Miramichi	Lib.
LeBlanc, Dominic, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	Lib.
Savoy, Andy	Tobique—Mactaquac	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	PC
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (4)

Barnes, Rex	Gander—Grand Falls	PC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Efford, R. John	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	PC
Matthews, Bill	Burin—St. George's	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Lib.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)

Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
---	----------------	------

NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Brisson, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Cuzner, Rodger, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Lib.
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	West Nova	Lib.

NUNAVUT (1)

Karetak-Lindell, Nancy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Nunavut	Lib.
--	---------	------

ONTARIO (101)

Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Hon. Jean, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald, The Acting Speaker	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Lib.
QUEBEC (69)		
Allard, Carole-Marie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Lib. Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Portneuf	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Frulla, Liza	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	BQ
Gagnon, Sébastien	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	BQ
Gaudet, Roger	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada.....	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario.....	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine.....	Mercier	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay.....	BQ
Lebel, Ghislain.....	Chambly	Ind.
Lincoln, Clifford.....	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan.....	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard.....	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier.....	BQ
Marciil, Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry.....	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Lib.
Martin, Hon. Paul	LaSalle—Émard.....	Lib.
Ménard, Réal.....	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve.....	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert.....	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny— L'Islet	Lib.
Pacetti, Massimo.....	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)	Brome—Missisquoi.....	Lib.
Patry, Bernard.....	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.....	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister for International Trade.....	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Price, David.....	Compton—Stanstead.....	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport.....	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board.....	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves.....	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît.....	Repentigny	BQ
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil.....	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Shefford	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy.....	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik.....	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande.....	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis.....	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert.....	Ind. BQ
VACANCY	Lévis-et-Chute-de-la-Chaudière	
VACANCY	Témiscamingue	
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Anderson, David.....	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CA
Bailey, Roy.....	Souris—Moose Mountain	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CA
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians.....	Wascana	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River.....	Lib.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne.....	Regina—Qu'Appelle	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Ind.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CA
Skelton, Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	CA
Spencer, Larry	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	CA
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	CA
Yelich, Lynne	Blackstrap	CA
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Larry	Yukon	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of May 16, 2003 — 2nd Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:	Raymond Bonin	Vice-Chairs:	Nancy Karetak-Lindell Maurice Vellacott	
Gérard Binet	John Godfrey	Inky Mark	Brian Pallister	(16)
Serge Cardin	Charles Hubbard	Pat Martin	Julian Reed	
David Chatters	Yvan Loubier	Anita Neville	Benoît Serré	
Stan Dromisky				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Cummins	Jay Hill	Gilles-A. Perron
Diane Ablonczy	Stockwell Day	Howard Hilstrom	James Rajotte
Rob Anders	Bev Desjarlais	Betty Hinton	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Norman Doyle	Rahim Jaffer	John Reynolds
Gérard Asselin	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Jean-Yves Roy
Claude Bachand	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Robert Lanctôt	Carol Skelton
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Ghislain Fournier	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Stéphane Bergeron	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Larry Spencer
Bernard Bigras	Yvon Godin	Richard Marceau	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitkreuz	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Elsie Wayne
Bill Casey	Stephen Harper	Bob Mills	Randy White
Rick Casson	Richard Harris	James Moore	Ted White
Joe Clark	Loyola Hearn	Lorne Nystrom	John Williams
Joe Comartin	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Lynne Yelich
Paul Crête	Grant Hill	Charlie Penson	

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairs:

Jim Abbott
Paul Bonwick

Carole-Marie Allard
Sarmite Bulte
R. John Efford
Liza Frulla

Christiane Gagnon
John Harvard
Loyola Hearn

Wendy Lill
James Lunney
Dennis Mills

Alex Shepherd
Caroline St-Hilaire
Chuck Strahl

(16)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins

Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton

Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Dick Proctor
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair:	Joe Fontana	Vice-Chairs:	Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Jerry Pickard	
Diane Ablonczy	Libby Davies	Grant McNally	David Price	(16)
Sarkis Assadourian	Sophia Leung	John O'Reilly	Yves Rocheleau	
John Bryden	Inky Mark	Massimo Pacetti	Lynne Yelich	
Yvon Charbonneau				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Dale Johnston	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Jim Karygiannis	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Francine Lalonde	Carol Skelton
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	Yvan Loubier	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Gary Lunn	Kevin Sorenson
Bernard Bigras	Peter Goldring	James Lunney	Larry Spencer
Bill Blaikie	Jim Gouk	Peter MacKay	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Gurmant Grewal	Keith Martin	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitzkreuz	Deborah Grey	Brian Masse	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Art Hanger	Philip Mayfield	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
Serge Cardin	Loyola Hearn	Bob Mills	Joseph Volpe
Bill Casey	John Herron	James Moore	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Rick Casson	Grant Hill	Anita Neville	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	Jay Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Joe Clark	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Ted White
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte	

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Charles Caccia	Vice-Chair:	John Herron	
Mark Assad	Sébastien Gagnon	Bob Mills	Hélène Scherrer	(16)
Roy Bailey	Joe Jordan	Julian Reed	Paul Szabo	
Bernard Bigras	Rick Laliberte	Andy Savoy	Alan Tonks	
Joe Comartin	Gary Lunn			

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Bev Desjarlais	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
Peter Adams	Norman Doyle	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Jason Kenney	Svend Robinson
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Robert Lanctôt	Werner Schmidt
André Bachand	Ken Epp	Clifford Lincoln	Carol Skelton
Rex Barnes	Brian Fitzpatrick	Yvan Loubier	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Paul Forseth	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Stéphane Bergeron	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Jim Gouk	Keith Martin	Peter Stoffer
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Pat Martin	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Myron Thompson
Serge Cardin	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Joe Clark	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Ted White
Paul Crête	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	John Williams
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich

FINANCE**Chair:**

Sue Barnes

Vice-Chairs:Nick Discepola
Richard HarrisScott Brison
Rick Casson
Roy Cullen
Albina GuarnieriRahim Jaffer
Sophia Leung
Maria Minna
Shawn MurphyPierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Pauline Picard
Gary PillitteriTony Valeri
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Bryon Wilfert

(18)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine DubéJohn Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Gilles-A. Perron
Joe PeschisolidoJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Judy Sgro
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Bob Wood
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair:

Tom Wappel

Vice-Chairs:
Bill Matthews
Peter Stoffer

Andy Burton
John Cummins
Rodger Cuzner
R. John Efford

Reed Elley
Georges Farrah
Ghislain Fournier

Loyola Hearn
Dominic LeBlanc
Joe Peschisolido

Carmen Provenzano
Jean-Yves Roy
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
G rard Asselin
Andr  Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle

John Duncan
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Marcel Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer

Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds

Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
Yves Rocheleau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:	Bernard Patry	Vice-Chairs:	Stockwell Day Diane Marleau	
Stéphane Bergeron	Irwin Cotler	John Harvard	Alexa McDonough	(18)
Murray Calder	John Duncan	André Harvey	Deepak Obhrai	
Aileen Carroll	Art Eggleton	Francine Lalonde	Karen Redman	
Bill Casey	Mark Eyking	Keith Martin		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Ken Epp	Yvan Loubier	Gerry Ritz
Diane Ablonczy	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn	Svend Robinson
Rob Anders	Raymonde Folco	James Lunney	Yves Rocheleau
David Anderson	Paul Forseth	Peter MacKay	Benoît Sauvageau
André Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Gurbax Malhi	Werner Schmidt
Claude Bachand	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Jim Gouk	Pat Martin	Monte Solberg
Sue Barnes	Gurmant Grewal	Brian Masse	Kevin Sorenson
Colleen Beaumier	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Bob Speller
Leon Benoit	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Bernard Bigras	Mac Harb	Val Meredith	Darrel Stinson
Bill Blaikie	Stephen Harper	Rob Merrifield	Peter Stoffer
Rick Borotsik	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitkreuz	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	John Herron	Shawn Murphy	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Grant Hill	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	Jay Hill	Pat O'Brien	Tony Valeri
Rick Casson	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	Pierre Paquette	Joseph Volpe
Joe Clark	Rahim Jaffer	Charlie Penson	Elsie Wayne
Paul Crête	Dale Johnston	Beth Phinney	Randy White
John Cummins	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte	Ted White
Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid	John Williams
Antoine Dubé	Karen Kraft Sloan	John Reynolds	Lynne Yelich
Reed Elley			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair:	Mac Harb	Vice-Chairs:	Stéphane Bergeron Mark Eyking	
Bill Blaikie	Rick Casson	Bob Speller	Tony Valeri	(9)
Bill Casey	Pat O'Brien			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Irwin Cotler	Vice-Chairs:	Colleen Beaumier Deepak Obhrai	
Bill Casey	Gurbax Malhi	Svend Robinson	Yves Rocheleau	(9)
Karen Kraft Sloan	Beth Phinney			

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:	Reg Alcock	Vice-Chairs:	Paul Forseth Tony Valeri	
Carolyn Bennett	Raymonde Folco	Pat Martin	Judy Sgro	(16)
Scott Brison	Robert Lanctôt	Gilles-A. Perron	Paul Szabo	
Roy Cullen	Steve Mahoney	Gerry Ritz	Tony Tirabassi	
Ken Epp				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Betty Hinton	Charlie Penson
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	Rahim Jaffer	Dick Proctor
Rob Anders	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Liza Frulla	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
André Bachand	Christiane Gagnon	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds
Roy Bailey	Cheryl Gallant	Gary Lunn	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	James Lunney	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Yvon Godin	Peter MacKay	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitkreuz	Jim Gouk	Keith Martin	Larry Spencer
Andy Burton	Gurmant Grewal	Brian Masse	Darrel Stinson
Chuck Cadman	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Chuck Strahl
Bill Casey	Monique Guay	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Rick Casson	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
David Chatters	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Joe Clark	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
Paul Crête	Loyola Hearn	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
John Cummins	John Herron	James Moore	Randy White
Stockwell Day	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Ted White
Odina Desrochers	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	John Williams
Norman Doyle	Howard Hilstrom	Pierre Paquette	Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES PROCESS

Chairs:	Gerry Ritz Tony Valeri	Vice-Chair:		
Gilles-A. Perron	Paul Szabo	Tony Tirabassi		(5)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE RENEWAL

Chairs:	Roy Cullen Paul Forseth	Vice-Chair:		
Carolyn Bennett	Monique Guay	Pat Martin	Judy Sgro	(6)

HEALTH**Chair:** Bonnie Brown**Vice-Chairs:**Stan Dromisky
Réal MénardCarolyn Bennett
Diane Bourgeois
Jeannot Castonguay
Brenda ChamberlainRaymonde Folco
Hedy Fry
Betty HintonRob Merrifield
Svend Robinson
Hélène ScherrerCarol Skelton
Yolande Thibeault
Greg Thompson

(16)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Madeleine Dalphond-GuiralLibby Davies
Stockwell Day
Bev Desjarlais
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant HillJay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
John Maloney
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian PallisterCharlie Penson
Pauline Picard
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Judi Longfield	Vice-Chairs:	Eugène Bellemare Monte Solberg	
Peter Adams	Peter Goldring	Ovid Jackson	Larry Spencer	(18)
Libby Davies	Jim Gouk	Gurbax Malhi	Diane St-Jacques	
Norman Doyle	Monique Guay	Larry McCormick	Suzanne Tremblay	
John Finlay	Tony Ianno	Raymond Simard		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Bev Desjarlais	Rahim Jaffer	Charlie Penson
Diane Ablonczy	Antoine Dubé	Dale Johnston	Dick Proctor
Peter Adams	John Duncan	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	James Rajotte
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Robert Lanctôt	Gerry Ritz
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Wendy Lill	Jean-Yves Roy
Rex Barnes	Christiane Gagnon	Yvan Loubier	Werner Schmidt
Mauril Bélanger	Marcel Gagnon	Gary Lunn	Carol Skelton
Carolyn Bennett	Sébastien Gagnon	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Inky Mark	Chuck Strahl
Diane Bourgeois	John Godfrey	Keith Martin	Greg Thompson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Yvon Godin	Pat Martin	Myron Thompson
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Philip Mayfield	Tony Tirabassi
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Alan Tonks
Bill Casey	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
David Chatters	Loyola Hearn	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	John Herron	James Moore	Randy White
Paul Crête	Grant Hill	Anita Neville	Ted White
John Cummins	Jay Hill	Deepak Obhrai	John Williams
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Lynne Yelich
Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton		

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

Chair:	John Godfrey	Vice-Chair:		
Sébastien Gagnon	Wendy Lill	Larry Spencer	Tony Tirabassi	(9)
Loyola Hearn	Anita Neville	Diane St-Jacques	Alan Tonks	

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:

Walt Lastewka

Vice-Chairs:
Dan McTeague
James RajotteAndré Bachand
Larry Bagnell
Paul Crête
Brian FitzpatrickCheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Serge MarcilBrian Masse
Gilbert Normand
Andy SavoyBrent St. Denis
Paddy Torsney
Joseph Volpe

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Eugène Bellemare
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Gérard Binet
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell DayBev Desjarlais
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty HintonRahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Joe McGuire
Grant McNally
Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian PallisterPierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Dick Proctor
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Andy Scott	Vice-Chairs:	Chuck Cadman John McKay	
Garry Breitkreuz	Robert Lanctôt	John Maloney	Joe Peschisolido	(18)
Irwin Cotler	Derek Lee	Richard Marceau	Kevin Sorenson	
Hedy Fry	Peter MacKay	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews	
Marlene Jennings	Paul Harold Macklin	Pat O'Brien		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Bev Desjarlais	Dale Johnston	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Norman Doyle	Gerald Keddy	John Reynolds
David Anderson	John Duncan	Jason Kenney	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Reed Elley	Yvan Loubier	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	James Lunney	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Larry Spencer
Bill Blaikie	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Gurmant Grewal	Alexa McDonough	Chuck Strahl
Diane Bourgeois	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Maurice Vellacott
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	John Herron	Lynn Myers	Randy White
Joe Clark	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Ted White
Joe Comartin	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	John Williams
John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	Lynne Yelich
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Betty Hinton	Dick Proctor	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOLICITATION LAWS

Chair: _____ **Vice-Chair:** _____

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:	Derek Lee	Vice-Chairs:	Marlene Jennings Kevin Sorenson	
Robert Lanctôt	John McKay	Lorne Nystrom	Geoff Regan	(11)
Peter MacKay	Lynn Myers	David Pratt	Vic Toews	

LIAISON

Chair:	Walt Lastewka	Vice-Chair:	Judi Longfield	
Peter Adams	Raymond Bonin	Gurmant Grewal	Andy Scott	(20)
Reg Alcock	Bonnie Brown	Clifford Lincoln	Paul Steckle	
Sue Barnes	Charles Caccia	Bernard Patry	Tom Wappel	
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Comuzzi	David Pratt	John Williams	
Carolyn Bennett	Joe Fontana			

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Yvon Godin	Bill Matthews	James Rajotte
Eugène Bellemare	Mac Harb	John McKay	Benoît Sauvageau
Paul Bonwick	Richard Harris	Dan McTeague	Monte Solberg
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Réal Ménard	Peter Stoffer
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Howard Hilstrom	James Moore	Yolande Thibeault
Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston	Carolyn Parrish	Rose-Marie Ur
Nick Discepola	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Beth Phinney	Tony Valeri
Stan Dromisky	Derek Lee	Jerry Pickard	Maurice Vellacott
Paul Forseth	Diane Marleau	David Price	Elsie Wayne

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Peter Adams	Gurmant Grewal	Judi Longfield	John Williams	(6)
Mauril Bélanger	Walt Lastewka			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Walt Lastewka	Vice-Chair:		
Reg Alcock	Bonnie Brown	Judi Longfield	Tom Wappel	(9)
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Andy Scott	John Williams	

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair: David Pratt

Vice-Chairs: David Price
Elsie Wayne

Rob Anders	Bill Blaikie	Dominic LeBlanc	Lawrence O'Brien	(16)
Claude Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Joe McGuire	Janko Peric	
Leon Benoit	Ivan Grose	Anita Neville	Louis Plamondon	
Robert Bertrand				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Brian Fitzpatrick	Yvan Loubier	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Peter Goldring	James Lunney	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Jim Gouk	Peter MacKay	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Gurmant Grewal	John Maloney	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Deborah Grey	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Stéphane Bergeron	Monique Guay	Keith Martin	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Art Hanger	Pat Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Stephen Harper	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Alexa McDonough	Darrel Stinson
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	Grant McNally	Peter Stoffer
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Dan McTeague	Chuck Strahl
Bill Casey	Grant Hill	Val Meredith	Greg Thompson
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Marlene Catterall	Howard Hilstrom	Bob Mills	Vic Toews
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	James Moore	Rose-Marie Ur
Joe Clark	Rahim Jaffer	John O'Reilly	Maurice Vellacott
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Stockwell Day	Gerald Keddy	Brian Pallister	Ted White
Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Stan Dromisky	Francine Lalonde	Carmen Provenzano	Bob Wood
John Duncan	Wendy Lill	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Reed Elley			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair: Bob Wood

Vice-Chair:

Roy Bailey	Ivan Grose	Louis Plamondon	Rose-Marie Ur	(9)
Bill Blaikie	Dan McTeague	Carmen Provenzano	Elsie Wayne	

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:	Mauril Bélanger	Vice-Chairs:	Yvon Godin Yolande Thibeault	
Carole-Marie Allard Mark Assad Eugène Bellemare John Bryden	Jeannot Castonguay Christiane Gagnon John Herron	Rahim Jaffer Jason Kenney Dan McTeague	Scott Reid Benoît Sauvageau Raymond Simard	(16)

Associate Members

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

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Peter Adams	Vice-Chairs:	Dale Johnston Carolyn Parrish	
Rick Borotsik Marlene Catterall Rodger Cuzner Yvon Godin	Michel Guimond Joe Jordan Lynn Myers	Geoff Regan John Reynolds Jacques Saada	Benoît Sauvageau Werner Schmidt Guy St-Julien	(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson André Bachand Roy Bailey Rex Barnes Leon Benoit Stéphane Bergeron Bill Blaikie Garry Breitreuz Scott Brison Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters Joe Clark John Cummins Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Libby Davies Stockwell Day	Norman Doyle John Duncan Reed Elley Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Paul Forseth Cheryl Gallant John Godfrey Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Stephen Harper Richard Harris John Harvard Loyola Hearn John Herron Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton	Rahim Jaffer Gerald Keddy Jason Kenney Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Inky Mark Keith Martin Philip Mayfield Larry McCormick Grant McNally Réal Ménard Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Lorne Nystrom Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Charlie Penson David Price Dick Proctor	Marcel Proulx James Rajotte Scott Reid Gerry Ritz Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Caroline St-Hilaire Darrel Stinson Chuck Strahl Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Vic Toews Paddy Torsney Maurice Vellacott Elsie Wayne Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich	
---	---	--	--	--

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Carolyn Parrish	Vice-Chair:		
Rick Borotsik Yvon Godin	Lynn Myers David Price	Benoît Sauvageau	Chuck Strahl	(7)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT

Chair:	Paddy Torsney	Vice-Chair:		
Rick Borotsik Yvon Godin	Michel Guimond	Marcel Proulx	Scott Reid	(6)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

John Williams

Vice-Chairs:Mac Harb
Beth PhinneyColleen Beaumier
Odina Desrochers
John Finlay
Paul ForsethRoger Gaudet
Gerald Keddy
Sophia Leung
Steve MahoneyPhilip Mayfield
Val Meredith
Shawn MurphyMassimo Pacetti
Tony Tirabassi
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(17)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Bev DesjarlaisNorman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim JafferDale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Grant McNally
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John ReynoldsGerry Ritz
Jacques Saada
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Joseph Volpe
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
Lynne Yelich

TRANSPORT

Chair:	Joe Comuzzi	Vice-Chairs:	John Cannis James Moore	
Larry Bagnell	Roger Gallaway	Stan Keyes	Pat O'Brien	(16)
Rex Barnes	Jim Gouk	Mario Laframboise	Marcel Proulx	
Bev Desjarlais	Ovid Jackson	Robert Lanctôt	Lynne Yelich	
Liza Frulla				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Howard Hilstrom	Dick Proctor
Diane Ablonczy	Antoine Dubé	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
Gérard Asselin	Ken Epp	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Jason Kenney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Yvan Loubier	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Ghislain Fournier	Gary Lunn	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Christiane Gagnon	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Paul Bonwick	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Roger Gaudet	Inky Mark	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitreuz	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Keith Martin	Peter Stoffer
Scott Brison	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Deborah Grey	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Art Hanger	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Stephen Harper	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Loyola Hearn	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Paul Crête	John Herron	Brian Pallister	Ted White
John Cummins	Grant Hill	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Jay Hill		

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION

Chair:	Roger Gallaway	Vice-Chair:		
Rex Barnes	John Cannis	Bev Desjarlais	Roger Gaudet	(9)
Andy Burton	Joe Comuzzi	Liza Frulla	Stan Keyes	

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROCEDURES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Chair:	Bob Kilger	Vice-Chairs:	Don Boudria John Reynolds	
Libby Davies Norman Doyle	Michel Gauthier Monique Guay	Loyola Hearn Stan Keyes	Dick Proctor Werner Schmidt	(11)

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs:	Carolyn Bennett Yves Morin	Joint Vice-Chair:	Deborah Grey
----------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc Michael J. Forrestall	Jean Lapointe Vivienne Poy	Mauril Bélanger Robert Bertrand Rick Borotsik Marlene Catterall Marcel Gagnon Grant Hill Jim Karygiannis	Wendy Lill Jerry Pickard Louis Plamondon Jacques Saada Guy St-Julien Darrel Stinson Andrew Telegdi	(21)
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	--	------

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson André Bachand Roy Bailey Rex Barnes Leon Benoit Garry Breitkreuz Scott Brison Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters Joe Clark John Cummins Libby Davies Stockwell Day	Norman Doyle John Duncan Reed Elley Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Paul Forseth Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Art Hanger Stephen Harper Richard Harris Loyola Hearn John Herron Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton Rahim Jaffer	Dale Johnston Gerald Keddy Jason Kenney Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Inky Mark Keith Martin Philip Mayfield Grant McNally Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Charlie Penson James Rajotte Scott Reid	John Reynolds Gerry Ritz Benoît Sauvageau Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Chuck Strahl Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Vic Toews Maurice Vellacott Elsie Wayne Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich
--	---	--	---

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Gurmant Grewal
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair: Derek Lee

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron
James Kelleher
Pana Merchant

Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin
Gérard Phalen

Paul Bonwick
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Liza Frulla
Michel Guimond
Paul Harold Macklin
John Maloney
Pat Martin

John McKay
Lynn Myers
Caroline St-Hilaire
Greg Thompson
Maurice Vellacott
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(24)

Associate Members

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

John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer

Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILL C-17, PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

Chair: Bob Kilger

Vice-Chair:

Sarkis Assadourian
Claude Bachand
Rex Barnes
Garry Breitkreuz

Bev Desjarlais
Mac Harb
Mario Laframboise
Gary Lunn

John Maloney
James Moore
John O'Reilly
Beth Phinney

Marcel Proulx
Andy Savoy
Paddy Torsney

(16)

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
Hon. David Collenette	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. John Manley	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance
Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Health
Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Industry
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
Hon. Don Boudria	Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
Hon. Robert Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Denis Coderre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Robert Thibault	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
Hon. Susan Whelan	Minister for International Cooperation
Hon. Bill Graham	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Gerry Byrne	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. John McCallum	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Wayne Easter	Solicitor General of Canada
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
Hon. Paul DeVillers	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Gar Knutson	Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)
Hon. Denis Paradis	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)
Hon. Claude Drouin	Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Stephen Owen	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)
Hon. Jean Augustine	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
Hon. Steve Mahoney	Secretary of State (Selected Crown Corporations)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Rodger Cuzner	to the Prime Minister
Mr. Marcel Proulx	to the Minister of Transport
Mr. Alan Tonks	to the Minister of the Environment
Ms. Judy Sgro	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Ms. Carole-Marie Allard	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Bryon Wilfert	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of Industry
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Tony Tirabassi	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Paul Harold Macklin	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Ms. Diane St-Jacques	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Joe Peschisolido	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Murray Calder	to the Minister for International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Claude Duplain	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. Charles Hubbard	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Ms. Colleen Beaumier	to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Sarkis Assadourian	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Ivan Grose	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. André Harvey	to the Minister of International Cooperation
Mr. Dominic LeBlanc	to the Minister of National Defence

CONTENTS

Friday, May 16, 2003

Business of the House

The Deputy Speaker 6359

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2003

Bill C-28. Third reading 6359
 Mr. Loubier 6359
 Mr. Elley 6362
 Mr. Paquette 6363
 Mr. Cadman 6364
 Ms. Girard-Bujold 6365
 Mr. Schmidt 6366

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Olympics and Paralympics

Mr. Macklin 6366

Hockey

Mr. Schmidt 6366

Foreign Ownership

Mr. Wilfert 6367

Wheels in Motion

Mr. Tirabassi 6367

Commonwealth War Graves Commission

Mr. Pratt 6367

National Mining Week

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 6367

Aboriginal Awareness Week

Ms. Karetak-Lindell 6368

Journée nationale des Patriotes

Mr. Perron 6368

Official Visit by Prime Minister of France

Mr. Farrah 6368

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Pallister 6368

World Telecommunications Day

Ms. Torsney 6368

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Comartin 6369

Salon du livre ancien et du livre d'histoire

Mr. Paquette 6369

International Museums Day

Ms. Allard 6369

Justice

Mr. Borotsik 6369

Justice

Mr. Cadman 6369

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Justice

Mr. Hill (MacLeod) 6370
 Mr. Easter 6370
 Mr. Hill (MacLeod) 6370
 Mr. Easter 6370
 Mr. Hill (MacLeod) 6370
 Mr. Easter 6370

Foreign Affairs

Miss Grey 6370
 Mr. Anderson (Victoria) 6370
 Miss Grey 6371
 Mr. Anderson (Victoria) 6371

Softwood Lumber

Ms. St-Hilaire 6371
 Mr. Pettigrew 6371
 Ms. St-Hilaire 6371
 Mr. Rock 6371
 Mr. Gagnon (Champlain) 6371
 Mr. Pettigrew 6371
 Mr. Gagnon (Champlain) 6371
 Ms. Bradshaw 6371

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Robinson 6371
 Mr. Kilgour 6372
 Mr. Robinson 6372
 Ms. Carroll 6372

Fisheries

Mr. Hearn 6372
 Mr. Farrah 6372
 Mr. Hearn 6372
 Mr. Farrah 6372

Public Works

Mr. Strahl 6372
 Mr. Goodale 6373

National Defence

Mr. Ritz 6373

Genetically Modified Organisms

Mr. Bigras 6373
 Mr. Pettigrew 6373
 Mr. Bigras 6373
 Mr. Pettigrew 6373

Public Service

Mr. Forseth 6373
 Mr. Tirabassi 6373

Softwood Lumber

Mr. Elley 6373
 Mr. Pettigrew 6374

Taxation	
Mr. Paquette	6374
Mr. Wilfert	6374
Mr. Paquette	6374
Mr. Wilfert	6374
Justice	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	6374
Mr. Easter	6374
Firearms Registry	
Mrs. Yelich	6374
Mr. Easter	6374
Political Party Financing	
Mr. O'Reilly	6375
Mr. Boudria	6375
Transportation	
Mrs. Desjarlais	6375
Mr. Proulx	6375
Agriculture	
Mr. Comartin	6375
Mr. Pettigrew	6375
Intergovernmental Affairs	
Mr. Clark	6375
Mr. Dion	6375
Mr. Clark	6375
Mr. Dion	6376
Aviation Industry	
Mr. Schmidt	6376
Mr. Rock	6376
Canadian Forces	
Mr. Benoit	6376
Mr. Goodale	6376
The Environment	
Ms. Girard-Bujold	6376
Mr. Goodale	6376
Ms. Girard-Bujold	6376
Mr. Goodale	6376
Grants and Contributions	
Mr. Fitzpatrick	6376
Mr. Rock	6377
Justice	
Mr. Cadman	6377
Mr. Macklin	6377
Multiculturalism	
Ms. Torsney	6377
Ms. Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore)	6377
Tourism Industry	
Mrs. Gallant	6377
Mr. Mitchell	6377
Homelessness	
Mr. Goldring	6377
Ms. Bradshaw	6377

Gasoline Price	
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	6378
Mr. Rock	6378
Political Party Financing	
Mr. Nystrom	6378
Mr. Boudria	6378
Forest Industry	
Mr. Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	6378
Mr. Byrne (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte)	6378
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Pallister	6378
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra)	6378
Mr. Loubier	6378
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra)	6379
Privilege	
Parliamentary Privilege	
Mr. Boudria	6379
Points of Order	
Oral Question Period	
Mr. Ritz	6379

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Order in Council Appointments	
Mr. Cuzner	6379
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Cuzner	6379
Committees of the House	
Government Operations and Estimates	
Mr. Forseth	6379
Civil Justice Access Act	
Mr. Nystrom	6380
Bill C-438. Introduction and first reading	6380
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	6380
Petitions	
Firearms Registry	
Mrs. Gallant	6380
Marriage	
Mrs. Gallant	6380
Kouchibouguac National Park	
Mr. Hubbard	6380
Bill C-250	
Mr. Hubbard	6380
Falun Gong	
Mr. Robinson	6380
Space Preservation Treaty	
Mr. Robinson	6380
Marriage	
Mr. Tirabassi	6381
Stem Cell Research	
Mr. Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	6381
Child Pornography	
Mr. Ritz	6381
Mr. Nystrom	6381

Marriage	
Mr. Elley	6381
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Elley	6381
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Cuzner	6381
Questions passed as Orders for Return	
Mr. Cuzner	6383

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2003	
Bill C-28. Third reading	6384
Mr. Nystrom	6384
Mr. Paquette	6386
Mr. Borotsik	6387
Mr. Wilfert	6389
Mr. Paquette	6390

Mr. Ritz	6391
Mr. DeVillers (Simcoe North)	6394

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Ethics Counsellor	
Mr. Clark	6395
Motion	6395
Mr. Cuzner	6397
Mr. Gouk	6398
Mr. Paquette	6398
Mr. Nystrom	6400
Mr. O'Reilly	6400
Ms. Torsney	6401
Mr. Duplain	6402
Mr. Pratt	6403

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5
Internet: <http://publications.gc.ca>
1-800-635-7943 or Local 613-941-5995

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Internet: <http://publications.gc.ca>
1-800-635-7943 ou appel local (613) 941-5995

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 Publishing and Depository Services, PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt, TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5**