



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 005 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, October 4, 2002

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 4, 2002

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

• (1000)

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS NO. 2—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: Before I call orders of the day I wish to indicate to the House that I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised yesterday morning by the hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar concerning Motion No. 2 on the order paper standing in the name of the Minister of State and the Leader of the Government in the House, relating to the reinstatement of business from the 1st session of the 37th Parliament.

I wish to thank the hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar for raising the matter and the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader, the hon. member for Fraser Valley, the hon. member for Lakeland and the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley for their comments and the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough for his submission on this matter.

The hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, in raising the matter, argued that this motion for reinstatement of business contains four separate and distinct parts. She objected to the fact of having only one debate and one vote when the House is being asked to decide on four subjects and she asked the Speaker to divide the motion to permit separate decisions to be taken on each subject.

• (1005)

The government House leader pointed out through his parliamentary secretary that the unifying principle of the motion was to allow several matters to be taken up in this session at the point they had reached at the conclusion of the previous session.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar cited page 478 of Marleau and Montpetit which states:

When a complicated motion comes before the House (for example, a motion containing two or more parts each capable of standing on its own), the Speaker has the authority to modify it and thereby facilitate decision-making for the House.

[*English*]

The passage goes on to state that any member may object to a motion that contains two or more distinct propositions and he or she may request that the motion be divided and that each proposition be debated and voted on separately. Ultimately it is the Chair who must make the determination with a view to ensuring an orderly debate on the subject matter before the House.

The matter of dividing a complicated motion has previously arisen in the House. On June 15, 1964, Mr. Speaker MacNaughton, ruled on a request to divide a government motion regarding a new Canadian flag. After an erudite review of the precedents in British and Canadian parliamentary practice, the Speaker stated the following:

I must come to the conclusion that the motion before the House contains two propositions and since strong objections have been made to the effect that these two propositions should not be considered together, it is my duty to divide them.

I cite the Journals for Monday, June 15, 1964, at page 431.

On April 10, 1991, Mr. Speaker Fraser took a somewhat different approach when ruling on a request to divide a government motion to amend the standing orders of the House. Rather than intervening to divide the motion, he ruled that a single debate would be held on the motion, and its components would be separated into three questions for voting purposes.

Research into Canadian practice reveals few instances where a Speaker has moved to divide a motion. In my view, this indicates that the Chair must exercise every caution before intervening in the deliberations of the House in the manner requested in this instance.

[*Translation*]

After having carefully examined the precedents and after having reviewed the arguments on both sides of the question, I am inclined to agree that Government Business Item No. 2 does, indeed, present an instance where the Chair is justified in taking some action.

[*English*]

In light of the complex nature of Motion No. 2, it is my ruling that the issues related to the reinstatement of business from the first session to the second session will be debated together but will be the subject of two separate votes.

Government Orders

Specifically, one vote will be held on the matters of the laying on the table of evidence adduced by standing and special committees and the proposal for the reinstatement of government bills; and one vote will be held on matters related to the reappointment of the Special Committee on the Non-Medical Use of Drugs in Canada, the terms of its membership, its powers and its reporting date.

Finally, there is the matter of empowering the finance committee to travel in consideration of the prebudget consultations set out in Standing Order 83(1). In the view of the Chair, this motion is not, strictly speaking, a matter of reinstating unfinished business. Rather it is a motion to consider a sessional order relating to the work of a standing committee whose members have yet to be determined and which has yet to be organized. Our usual practice is to adopt travel motions on a case-by-case basis. I believe that this practice should apply in this case. The motion will therefore constitute a stand-alone motion to be debated and voted on separately.

I hope this ruling will permit the House to debate the matters raised originally in Motion No. 2 in an orderly fashion, to propose amendments, if members wish to do so, and to take decisions that reflect hon. members' differences on these topics.

• (1010)

[*Translation*]

I thank all hon. members for their attention and their assistance in this matter.

[*English*]

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all the work you did. Seeing that we have a new proposal on the table, does it not require 48 hours on the table so we can draft our amendments to the motion?

The Speaker: I think all I have done is sever the motion. Members, of course, were free to move amendments to what was there. I have divided the motion in two. I think the practical effect of my ruling, as the hon. member will see, is to take the last paragraph out of the motion. Everything else is there but we will have the opportunity to have two different votes, as I indicated in the ruling. When the matter comes to a vote, whenever the debate concludes, instead of just one division there will be two. It is a bonanza.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering, at the start of your presentation on your ruling, was that an erudite review that was conducted to come to that conclusion?

The Speaker: That is for the House to decide not for the Speaker.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND REINSTATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT BILLS

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That, in order to provide for the resumption and continuation of the business of the House begun in the previous Session of Parliament it is ordered:

1. That any evidence adduced by any Standing or Special Committee on any matter not reported upon in the previous Session shall be deemed to have been laid upon the Table in the present Session;

2. That during the first thirty sitting days of the present Session of Parliament, whenever a Minister of the Crown, when proposing a motion for first reading of a public bill, states that the said bill is in the same form as a bill introduced by a Minister of the Crown in the previous Session, if the Speaker is satisfied that the said bill is in the same form as at prorogation, notwithstanding Standing Order 71, the said bill shall be deemed in the current Session to have been considered and approved at all stages completed at the time of prorogation of the previous Session.

That, in order to provide for the resumption and continuation of the business of the House begun in the previous Session of Parliament it is ordered:

That a special committee of the House be appointed to consider the factors underlying or relating to the non-medical use of drugs in Canada and make recommendations with respect to the ways and means by which the government can act, alone or in its relations with governments at other levels, in the reduction of the dimensions of the problems involved in such use;

That the membership of the committee be the same as the membership of the Special Committee on the Non-Medical Use of Drugs at the time of prorogation of the First Session of the present Parliament, provided that substitutions may be made from time to time, if required, in the manner provided for in Standing Order 114 (2);

That the committee shall have all of the powers granted to Standing Committees in Standing Order 108; and

That the committee shall present its final report no later than November 22, 2002.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to government Motion No. 2 which states, as you have indicated, a number of issues. I will not repeat them all but I will quote selectively from the motion to indicate its purpose.

The first component of course is to reinstate the bills as they were in the last session, or at least at the conclusion of the preceding stage. I will describe later how this has been done for many years and in many cases was not even subject to a division vote.

The second component is that a special committee of the House be appointed to look at the issue of the non-medical use of drugs. As a matter of fact this proposal was initially brought by an opposition member, to whom I pay tribute because he has been giving a lot of time to this issue, as of course have members on all sides of the House. Presumably then, reinstating that which was a good idea in the beginning must be, similarly, a good idea.

The third component is to empower the finance committee to travel and to hear the views of Canadians on what should be in the upcoming budget. Again, members from across the way have been clamouring for a budget. Presumably, getting the input from Canadians as quickly as possible in order to prepare a budget that reflects the views of Canadians must be a good idea, otherwise people would be left with the conclusion that there was a little less than total sincerity on the other side of the House when this was asked for. That would be a shocking thing, because it has not happened yet in the last 10 minutes, but is one that Canadians will associate with over the longer run I am sure. We will see later, when the time comes to vote on this. In a way I am pleased to see that this is subject to a separate vote because we will see if in fact the people across the way who said they wanted a budget really want one and, secondly, whether they care about if Canadians can contribute to the process. We will see. The vote will come and then of course we will be able to judge all that at the time.

Government Orders

Why is this motion needed? It is needed to expedite the business of the House at the beginning of the new session of Parliament. Under this procedure, bills and committee business on which valuable House time and energy have been expended in the last session may be proceeded with in the new session, the one we have just started, the second session of the 37th Parliament, without the duplication of work and the resultant waste of time and money.

Specifically, the purpose of the motion is to avoid wasting the time of parliamentarians on things that already have been considered. In other words, we have already done the work. Our work is precious and people across the way say they are in favour of modernization, so obviously doing the same work twice can hardly be considered modern.

An hon. member: Why did you prorogue?

Hon. Don Boudria: I am sure, then, that the people across the way, even the ones who are interrupting, must be in favour of modernization unless they are in favour of things being more Jurassic, but we will see.

The other purpose of course is to avoid wasting the time of members of the public who otherwise would have to return to the committees in order to present their briefs all over again.

Let me give a case in point: Bill C-15B. Over the last two days I have received 300 letters of support asking us to reinstate that bill. So let us see whether the people across the way take into account the views of Canadians. What about the environment, in which some people across say they are interested? What about getting Bill C-5, the species at risk bill from the last Parliament, back to the Senate and adopting it for the benefit of all Canadians? Also, of course, what about the taxpayers' money? Why repeat exactly the same debate and of course the committee hearings that already have taken place? But of course all that will be determined soon.

• (1015)

I should not generalize my statements by saying that all members across were against reinstatement. As a matter of fact, a number were quite cooperative and I want to pay tribute to them. Of course negotiations are held privately so I am not going to name individual political parties here, but a number of people had indicated their willingness to support it providing that there were concessions in the motion, many of which were put in, that were of benefit to both sides and so on. All of these things were taken care of very carefully. I do thank my very competent staff who assisted me in preparing all of this.

[*Translation*]

Now, about the procedure with bills. With adoption of this motion, which will be coming up shortly I trust—and could follow immediately on my speech if the hon. members opposite were in agreement—a minister introducing a bill exactly like a bill introduced in the last session, will, within the first 30 days of the new session, be able to make use of the right to ask that it be reinstated at the stage reached at the time of prorogation of the previous session, provided it had attained at least the stage of being referred to a committee.

It would seem to me that we could all agree on such a point. There is no crowd outside this morning protesting against this. If the Speaker deems it to be identical in form, the bill will be declared reinstated at the stage it had reached.

This procedure does not force a minister to reintroduce a bill. In other words, it is optional. It merely offers the possibility of doing so, within a given timeframe. After all, to be completely fair, parliamentarians are entitled to assume that, if a minister has not reintroduced his bill within a certain number of days, it is because that minister no longer wants to do so. That is why there is the 30-day deadline, a procedure that has been used for a long time.

When Parliament was prorogued, here is where we were at in connection with the government bills on the order paper: five had been passed by the House and were being examined in the Senate. For these, the House had already made its decision; the work was done. We have to respect the fact that this was the decision taken.

Four other bills had been referred to a standing House committee. Three more were awaiting second reading. Of course, for those that had reached second reading stage, we start all over again.

Consequently, according to the motion being moved, the five bills that had already gone through the House can to be reinstated and the Senate can begin immediately to deal with them. All of us want the Senate to be able to work as effectively and efficiently as the House. Moreover, the members opposite and the media have been known to say that the Senate does not do as much as the House. I do not agree, for the Senate does a good job. Be that as it may, the Senate could get down to work right away.

These bills include the one on species at risk, which I mentioned earlier, and the cruelty to animals bill. Speaking of the latter, I have received hundreds of letters about it. Maybe Canadians could phone their members this weekend, particularly the members of the Canadian Alliance, to tell them to stop dragging their feet on this issue, to move forward and resume work on it. We will see if they can.

It would be a real waste of time if parliamentarians had to repeat a debate that had already been finished, consultations that had already been done and votes that had already been taken. We agreed on that.

According to the my motion, the four bills that had been referred to committee could immediately be referred to the same committees for this session. In other words, if second reading had been completed, we would not do it again, because it had already been done. It is not really that complicated. As I mentioned, there are not many protesters outside this morning who are against this.

This group includes the bill to amend the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. I think that there are a number of us who support this. It was considered and referred to a parliamentary committee. Obviously, not everyone is happy with it. There are some who are complaining.

If the information I have is accurate, the committee had finished with its consultations on the bill, had heard from witnesses and was about to begin the clause-by-clause review. Why would we make Canadians from across the country come back to appear before a committee that had finished its work?

Government Orders

The other aspect of my motion this morning would make the evidence already given by Canadians available to committees, even though it was from the previous session and we have just begun a new session.

● (1020)

It also includes the bill on assisted human reproduction. Once again, this is an important issue, a very controversial one, of course—as we all know—but whatever one thinks of the specific details, Canadians and parliamentarians are nonetheless entitled to express their views on something this important.

These bills will of course be returned to the House for comprehensive debate at report stage and third reading. There will be recorded divisions at that time, if they are requested. Naturally, the rights of parliamentarians will be fully respected.

The motion I am moving will allow House committees to concentrate on new issues. Rather than doing the same work twice, we will do it once and concentrate on the work that has not been done, because we still have work ahead of us.

We on the government side have just proposed a very comprehensive agenda, including all sorts of good things for Canadians. We do not want to redo work already done. We want to move ahead, and there is much to do. The Prime Minister has laid out a very important agenda in the excellent Speech from the Throne read earlier this week.

An hon. member: It is fantastic.

Hon. Don Boudria: Yes, there are some who agree that the Speech from the Throne is excellent. Incidentally, I thank the hon. member opposite for supporting the Prime Minister and the Speech from the Throne.

The fact is that the House expressed its opinion on that speech. We had a vote on the amendment to the amendment, and parliamentarians expressed strong support.

The motion will allow House committees to focus on new issues, rather than on legislation they have already reviewed. For example, the Standing Committee on Justice may want to examine the sensitive issue of marriage or conjugal relationship—whatever people may want to call it—involving persons of the same sex. We know that a court ruling was issued. We also know that it was appealed and that the Minister of Justice has sought the advice of his colleagues, who were duly elected by Canadians. This is an important issue.

This is of course a controversial issue. But the fact remains that such a controversial issue should be discussed by parliamentarians. This is what the Minister of Justice is asking us to do, instead of redoing the work that has already been done, and he is right about that.

Finally, my motion will not have any effect on the three bills that are awaiting third reading. The ministers responsible could decide to reintroduce these bills, to amend them or to not reintroduce them at all since, as I indicated earlier, we are starting all over in such cases.

● (1025)

[*English*]

Let us discuss for a moment the effect of the motion on committee business. The proposed motion will ensure that valuable work the committees began but did not complete can be continued in an expedited manner. It will be important for many committees. The environment and health committees had begun consultation on legislation that was before them when Parliament was prorogued. Under this motion they could resume their work, continue to consider the legislation and the evidence adduced before the committee at that time would be deemed to be before the committee at this time. That is very reasonable.

I know now that this could be part of the other component of the motion dealt with separately, which is okay, but the finance committee had already begun its annual prebudget consultation. If carried, the motion will ensure that the consultation that has taken place and the evidence thereto is adduced and forms part of the public record of the good work that the committee has done.

The public accounts committee, and this is request that came from the opposition, had been investigating the administration of certain contracts under the sponsorship programs. After the House prorogued, it demanded that the work which had been done not be stopped and that it continue. The motion that I propose does just that, that the evidence adduced before that committee continue for the purpose of reporting. Hon. members can see that I incorporated that in the motion after hearing through the media that that was a concern of an opposition member, the chairman of the committee, whom I congratulate for having raised this issue.

The Special Committee on Non-medical Use of Drugs spent a year gathering evidence on Canada's drug policy. I have to admit that this committee is the brainchild of one of my colleagues, the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford, and I also thank him. We are reinstating this committee under this motion along with the evidence that he has asked us to hear. That sounds pretty reasonable to me.

Just in case someone mistakenly thinks that I am creating a precedent here, I want to indicate to the members that in October 1999, when the second session of the 36th Parliament began, the House adopted a motion that was very similar to the one before the House today. That motion was adopted without debate three years ago, although some members expressed the opinion that they wanted to vote on it. There was a vote but there was no debate.

In March 1996 when the second session of the 35th Parliament began, the House adopted an almost identical motion again. In previous Parliaments similar motions have been adopted since 1991. Our party was not the government in 1991. Of course, the right hon. leader of the Progressive Conservative Party was a cabinet minister in the government that moved a virtually identical motion in 1991.

Further, Marleau and Montpetit says, at page 330 of our procedural manual, that following a prorogation this has been used in 1970, 1972, 1974 and 1986. That is in addition to the examples I raised of 1991, 1996 and 1999.

Government Orders

In 1977 and 1982 the House adopted amendments to the Standing Orders to carry over legislation to the next session. That particular measure lapsed eventually, but at one point we even had a measure right in our Standing Orders to do precisely this. The House unanimously agreed to Standing Order 86.1 which permitted us to do this for the private members' bills, as you very well know, Madam Speaker, because you are intimately familiar with the rules. The previous parliament adopted that exact measure for private members' bills under what we call Standing Order 81.

Surely the practice is longstanding. As I have said, we have done this for private members' bills and, of course, public bills. The procedure we propose in the motion is almost identical to the one that exists for private members' hour.

• (1030)

Therefore what is proposed is not unusual. I know if the hon. member across the tries very hard to think about modernization for just a moment, he will find that this is a very modern thing.

If we want to speak about modernization, we had a unanimous modernization committee report two years ago setting out 26 different amendments. I could read from it. I just happen to have a copy of it in front of me. It sets out all the modernization we have had and the ones which I want to propose to the House in the future. Let us see who is in favour of things more modern and let us see who the Jurassic ones are around here.

The procedure we are discussing today would simply allow ministers and committees to continue their work, the work left unfinished at the time of prorogation. The motion is fair, it is reasonable and it has been the practice of the House for over 30 years. It is identical, to the procedure for private members' hour. Furthermore, it is consistent with the rule changes proposed for adoption in the United Kingdom House of Commons.

The motion promotes the interest of the House. It promotes the interest of the opposition in many cases. It promotes the interest of members of Parliament and, of course, the Canadian public by not wasting the time of parliamentarians and taxpayer money. The motion would allow the House and its committees to move forward on important issues of the day, such as Kyoto and everything else, instead of stalling on things that have already been decided.

For this reason, I ask for the support of all hon. members. Perhaps today, if we can come to an agreement, we will not even have to vote on it. Let us come to an agreement. Let us support the measure, which has been supported many times by all parties in the House, in this procedural motion. Let us do so in a way that protects the interest of taxpayers, the House of Commons, and let us concentrate on the issues facing Canadians today.

• (1035)

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I listened to the comments of the House leader with interest. I noted a couple of glowing tributes to members of the Alliance Party. That is not all that common coming from a Liberal member. I would like to thank him for his candour. The members for Langley—Abbotsford and St. Albert are two members to whom he paid specific tribute.

I look upon a motion like this as though I were not a part of the Parliament of Canada. I look upon this as though I were a citizen

simply reviewing this. Motion No. 2, which would return bills at the same stage that they were at the in previous Parliament before prorogation, makes pretty reasonable sense. Reinstating the committee on the non-medical use of drugs, an issue that I am personally interested in, makes sense. Re-establishing prebudget consultation by the finance committee makes sense.

I would like to say to the House leader that this debate would not be necessary if this place were more democratic. I would like him to listen to this portion. He can depart if he wants, but this is the part of this debate that would be sterile if this place were more democratic. Liberal members across have come to me and said, "I have disquiet about a particular bill because I was forced to vote on it by a somewhat autocratic process". I choose those words in a gentle sense: a somewhat autocratic process. I have had Liberals say to me, "I cannot vote my constituents' wishes on this bill. I am in fact forced to vote otherwise".

Let me mention two things that would make this place more democratic, and the House leader knows that this is not a debate on everything, if we had free votes in the House of Commons on issues that were not campaign platform issues for the Liberals. If we had an elected Senate, the Senate would be more accountable to the public.

Hon. Don Boudria: What does that have to do with reinstatement?

Mr. Grant Hill: The House leader asks what that has to do with reinstatement. I am trying to explain to him why my party and I have disquiet about reinstating specific bills. I will move toward the specific bill that I personally want to focus on today and why I have disquiet toward that specific bill.

The re-introduction of Bill C-5, the species at risk bill at the stage where it is at gives me disquiet and, more important, gives my constituents disquiet. Effectively, prorogation results in that bill being stopped. My constituents say, "Please stop it where it is at. Please listen to our concerns about this bill."

From the perspective of someone who loves the environment, species at risk is important. It is a broad societal goal. Diversity of species is important and is a broad societal goal. The trouble with this bill is that species at risk are not being looked after by society as a whole. They are being looked after by certain specific individuals. When I say looked after, I mean economically.

• (1040)

Genuine diversity has enormous benefit. I think of tourism. I think of people coming to visit our country specifically because of grizzlies in a wild state in our mountains. It is an indication of how man-made activity affects the planet. We can make a change in that regard. Man-made activity does affect the planet. We can have an impact in that regard.

Government Orders

I think of the success story of the whooping crane, a bird that Canadians decided to look after, to protect. It was almost extinct. What a wonderful success story that was; protecting them, finding out more information, tracking them, raising whooping cranes in a tame environment, releasing them to an external environment. We now have a population of whooping cranes that is much more likely to survive. For these reasons and more, I support protection of and action on species at risk and their habitat.

If this is a broad societal benefit, it should be paid for by society in the broadest sense. I believe that Bill C-5 will be a failure because society as a whole is not taking the responsibility. One group in our country will be asked to inordinately bear the burden. That group is the landowners.

I listened to the Prime Minister talk about establishing new national parks. I know that in some cases those new national parks are going to take in land where there was previously private interests, forestry interests. Forestry companies went in, explored, spent money putting in roads and had started to harvest timber. There is an economic interest in that area. What will the government do as it takes away those interests in establishing a brand new national park? It will extinguish that right of the timber company and it will pay for it. It will pay back the lumber company for that interest. What would happen in the instance of a species at risk where there was an economic interest? There is no provision for compensation.

• (1045)

I think of another example of a landowner who buys a property on a beautiful habitat by a river to build a senior citizens home. He goes to the architect, goes to the municipality, gets approval for all those things and is ready to build. Suddenly it is found that there is a special habitat in that area and the process cannot proceed. It is reasonable in my view if there is a societal benefit to protecting that habitat, to give that landowner fair compensation for the purchase of the property, the architectural design, the municipal process, and the time and effort expended in that process. In the bill there is no provision for that to take place.

In the bill there is no provision, and I will say this as plainly as I can so that everybody—

Mr. Peter Adams: Compensation is in the bill.

Mr. Gerry Ritz: It is not market value, Peter.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): I am sorry, but it is very hard to hear the hon. member when there is shouting across the aisle. I would appreciate, if the hon. members have anything to say to each other, that they take it outside.

Mr. Grant Hill: Madam Speaker, for the benefit of those who could not hear what the comment was, it was that compensation is going to be put in the regulations. That is not fair market compensation. This would be so easy to fix with the phrase “there will be fair market compensation if there is a withdrawal of proper use”. The member opposite knows how easy that would be and my disquiet on the bill would evaporate.

Let me move to probably the most significant area where land is likely to be taken out of use. That is for my rancher. I represent a very large ranching community and my rancher—

Mr. Peter Adams: Self-interest.

Mr. Reed Elley: That is what is wrong with the government.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Have hon. members had enough? I would appreciate the opportunity to hear the hon. member and his comments.

• (1050)

Mr. Grant Hill: Madam Speaker, I will say to the member opposite as directly as I can that representing my constituents is not self-interest.

Let me go to the specific rancher who has 30,000 acres. That sounds like a lot of property to someone who comes from an urban environment. Thirty thousand acres of dry land. This is a specifically large ranch. On that ranch he is able to run one cow for 300 acres. It is a very dry ranch with not much feed. Someone comes along and says, “Society needs to protect the habitat that happens to be on your 30,000 acre ranch and it will mean taking out of production 4,500 acres”. Could it happen? It has happened. The impact on that ranch might make it economically impossible to operate.

I ask members opposite, should not Canadian society as a whole take the responsibility for that economic impact? As long as that rancher does not have the assurance that will take place, he will not support Bill C-5. It is profoundly important that he do support Bill C-5 for the advantages that I spoke of before, for the broad advantages of having diverse species. Until that happens, the bill will fail.

It does not matter how many times the Senate looks at it, this specific issue must be addressed by the Liberal government. I wish it were.

This raises the broader issue of property rights in this country that are not enshrined in our Constitution and should be. That is something the Alliance would be very quick to look at when we form the government.

I mentioned the issue that human activity has an impact on the environment. I noted that a couple of my colleagues who I consider to be very keen on the environment were nodding their heads when I said that. Let me give a couple of examples.

A delegation came to Parliament this week and showed that lamprey had a profound effect on the Great Lakes fishing environment. This was an imported species that came from the ocean. It was imported because of the canals that we had built as humans, from boats that we had brought in and the discharge of water. So here we have a species that was not normally in the Great Lakes.

That species, because there was no natural enemy, literally destroyed the wonderful fishery in our Great Lakes. We have taken action against the lamprey, we have actually found where they reproduce and had an impact there, and the fishery has returned. That is an example of human activity having a negative effect on the environment and then a positive effect.

I had an opportunity to be at a lecture by a scientist who looked at botanical indications of human activity. It is interesting to note that downwind of Toronto the lichens, the strange-looking crusty things that grow on trees, are almost non-existent. They do not end up flourishing until almost at Ottawa. It is a huge area downwind. Upwind of Toronto, the lichen population is very healthy. It is another indication of human activity having an impact on the environment.

There is a great interest in wild horses. People love the idea that horses have broken free of man and are roaming the wild. Wild horses are not natural to the environment in some places where they are involved. It is an emotional issue but human activity, releasing those horses into the wild, has had an impact on the environment.

If Bill C-5 had fair market compensation in it, this member of Parliament would have no disquiet whatever.

I am thankful for the opportunity to explain why I am not in favour of Motion No. 2 as it relates to reintroduction of Bill C-5 at the stage it was at.

I move:

That the motion be amended by adding after the words "prorogation of the previous session" the words "provided that Bills C-15B and C-5, introduced in the previous session, be excluded from this process".

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The amendment is in order.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, first I want to say a word tangentially about the ruling of the Chair with respect to Motion No. 2 and welcome the judgment of the Chair with respect to this motion. It seems to me that the point of order the other day was certainly a good one. That has been recognized by the Chair in that we now have an opportunity to deal with elements of what was an omnibus motion in a more appropriate way by voting separately on two different dimensions of what remains of the motion, and of course, by having to have an entirely new motion with respect to the finance committee.

I listened to the government House leader who talked about the fact that it is quite common for there to be a motion like this before the House after prorogation by which legislation is reinstated in the new session at the stage it was at in the last session. I agree with the government House leader that this has certainly been common practice. However, he will have to accept that this time around that was not possible.

We have just seen from members of the official opposition that there were at least two bills which they were not willing to cooperate in reinstating, Bill C-5 and Bill C-15B. Although that is not the case with the NDP, we felt similarly about other legislation that would have been reinstated through this motion.

We were particularly concerned not to cooperate in the reinstatement of that legislation which proposed a new regime for first nations governance in this country. We do this out of agreement with the position of the leadership of first nations that what the government has in mind here is inappropriate and is being imposed on them in a way that gives the lie, if you like, to the notion of first nations governance. It is really just another amendment to the Indian

Government Orders

Act imposed on the aboriginal community by the federal Government of Canada.

I indicated to the government House leader when he first proposed to me the idea of reinstating all the legislation in the rather easy way that we have done so before, that the NDP would not be able to cooperate in the way that we have in the past. I indicated that we would seek an opportunity to vote against reinstating all the legislation as the only way available to us to indicate our non-support for the reinstatement of the first nations governance legislation.

Of course, the members of the official opposition have chosen not to single out that piece of legislation for opposition. They have singled out other pieces of legislation: Bill C-5, the species at risk legislation; and Bill C-15B, which is the amendments to the Criminal Code having to do with cruelty to animals.

It seems to me that there is not a great need for the House to consume itself with this particular motion. We have had a remedy proposed by the Chair whereby we could vote separately on certain items.

Certainly we are in favour of reinstating the Special Committee on the Non-medical Use of Drugs. This is a committee that has done a lot of good work. We look forward to a Commons report as a complement to the report that has already come out of the Senate on a similar topic. We hope that after both these reports are available and have been studied by members and by the government that we might actually see some action on the part of the government with respect to the non-medical use of drugs, particularly with respect to the continuing inadequacies in the policy for the provision of medical marijuana, the need for some action with respect to the decriminalization of marijuana and whatever else the government has in mind.

●(1055)

It signalled in the throne speech that it is considering action in this direction. We would not want it to act until such time as the work of this committee was completed. We are happy to co-operate and vote for the motion which reinstates that committee.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I appreciate what the member had to say. What concerns me about the reinstatement, speaking generally and not about any particular bill, is the process used by the government. It brings in legislation and more frequently than any other government uses time allocation. It whips its members to vote for the legislation and it gets through one stage at a time of course.

As a result of prorogation we are faced with the prospect of the same whip whipping the Liberal members to vote for the legislation. It seems to me that there is a juggernaut process that denies the democratic process.

I find it objectionable that bills, whether we agree with them or not, are put through in such a fashion that limits debate and limits representation from constituents. In the end it is not a democratic process that puts legislation through but the will of whoever is leading the government. I would like to have the hon. member's comments on that to see if I am on the right track.

S. O. 31

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Madam Speaker, the member's comments reminded me of something else I intended to say about this. The reinstatement process does permit the government to get away with all the drama of a new throne speech while not losing anything legislatively. The member makes another good point about closure.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Madam Speaker, on September 26 a citizenship ceremony was held in Mill Cove, Nova Scotia. Forty-seven people, who originally came from 20 different countries, took the oath of citizenship at Apostogan Consolidated Elementary School. They did so in the presence of the school's 100 students who greeted them wearing the red and white of the Canadian flag.

Every year Canada welcomes more than 150,000 new citizens in ceremonies that provide a source of precious memories for all who attend. For Canadian children these ceremonies are an excellent opportunity for them to open themselves to the world and to be introduced to the importance of citizenship. Children discover, in a way that cannot be taught by books or by television, the profound sense of belonging that real people of different backgrounds feel with regard to our country.

I wish to congratulate the school and the young people for having organized that type of educational activity.

* * *

CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize our Queen's arrival today for Her official cross-Canada tour. On the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee I was pleased to receive community nominations from my riding and honour them with the Queen's Jubilee Medal for exemplary citizenship.

The following list of great Canadians have made Canada a better place. They are: Edna Anderson, Hilda Cliffe, Bill Drinkwater, Gordon Fulton, Alexandra Haussmann, Freda Hogg, Herb James, Alec Janyk, Douglas LaRoy, Peter Legge, J. Morrisison McVea, Archie Miller, Noreen O'Neil, Antonio Paré, Baj Puri, Nancy Puri, Brian Smith, Gerda Suess, John Tompson, Ted Usher, Jean Buchan and F. John Blatherwick. I was honoured, on behalf of my Queen, to present the medals to many who do not usually receive recognition for making Canada the success that it is today.

We also wish to thank the Queen this day for exemplary duty in Her office that has given protection for us all.

* * *

● (1100)

FIRE PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today and inform the House and all honourable members that next week will be fire

prevention week. This year's theme is "Team up for Safety". The focus will be fire prevention practices and safety procedures to make our country fire safe. On average fire kills eight people each week and injures many more. Let us work together to achieve better success in prevention and fire safety.

We are pleased to work in partnership with Fire Prevention Canada. In appreciation of the many services provided by the Canadian fire services, Saturday, October 12 is fire service recognition day. Let us all continue to work together in promoting fire safety this week and throughout the year.

* * *

[Translation]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Gilbert Bossé, a financier from Val-d'Or, wants to create a mini investment fund in the Abitibi-Témiscamingue to channel regional savings of \$750 million into a local business start-up or development investment fund.

Project Frontenac, which Mr. Bossé hopes will be in operation in January, with an initial capital of \$25 to \$30 million, is designed to compensate for the imbalance that gives the five resource regions that make up 16% of the population less than 10% of start-up capital in Quebec.

The project is one of nine initiatives to promote economic development in resource regions that were presented at the Sommet des régions in Quebec City last November.

According to Jacques Talbot, the president of Val-d'Or's chamber of commerce, many other regions are already eyeing Project Frontenac with interest. He says that the fund will help new companies that require an investment of between \$500,000 and \$10 million to start up, businesses that are presently being neglected by Canadian financial institutions.

* * *

[English]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, critics say Canada does not have a plan to meet the Kyoto target. This is false. There is already an initial "Action Plan 2000 on Climate Change".

Implemented two years ago, the plan will help Canada meet one-third of the Kyoto target. In addition, after consultations with the provinces and territories, the government released this year a document proposing 4 options and 40 measures to reduce emissions for the remaining two-thirds of Canada's Kyoto target. Consequently, in a few weeks the government will be able to release an implementation plan for the public, the provinces and Parliament before a vote on ratification takes place.

We have a plan that will take us one-third of the way and the soon to be released plan for the balance, developed after widespread consultations. Critics should stop misleading the public and instead help the government achieve Canada's Kyoto commitment.

* * *

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Mr. Andy Burton (Skeena, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, on this the first day of Her Majesty the Queen's visit to Canada I am honoured to pay tribute to the following constituents of Skeena riding, nominated by their peers for exemplary community service and who have been selected to receive the Queen Elizabeth II Golden Jubilee commemorative medal.

They are: Dr. Lawrence M. Greene, Teresa Mackereth, Ben Matheson, Jonna Mattiesing, James Goodacre, Gordon William Sr., Eric Janze, Peggy Underhill, Brigitta van Heek, Doug Leach, Mary Anne Dilley, Yvonne Moen, Aileen Frank, Eric Ross, Miles Bode, Audrey Bode, Elizabeth Joan Wilson, Patricia Grue, Mary Kasum and Vera Kirkwood.

My sincere congratulations to them all.

* * *

JAMIE BELL

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I announce the passing of one of my constituents, Mr. Jamie Bell. To many of my constituents and to many in Toronto, Jamie was the public face of Swansea, one of the city's most historic and liveable neighbourhoods.

Jamie was a leader and an active participant in the High Park Citizens Advisory Committee, the March of Dimes, the Ontario Science Centre, the Mariposa Folk Festival and the Swansea Recreational Advisory Board. I especially remember his leadership and enthusiasm in building the playground in High Park with a number of volunteers.

As Jamie was the executive director of the Swansea Town Hall, I had to meet with him on many occasions. The breadth of his knowledge and interests constantly impressed me. He also had a personal style of raising issues in an inclusive manner that invited cooperation and agreement. The loss to our community is great, but I will always treasure the opportunity to have worked with someone like Jamie Bell.

* * *

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

WORLD TEACHERS' DAY

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on this, the eve of World Teachers' Day, allow me to pay tribute to those who are vested with a great responsibility in the future of our youth, who play a critical role in the betterment of our communities.

The theme chosen this year, "Teachers create dialogue everyday", shows how big a challenge teachers have to meet everyday not only

S. O. 31

in sharing knowledge, but also in instilling positive values that will prepare our youth to become the citizens of tomorrow.

Given the economic, social and cultural situation in the world today, teachers face a double challenge: that of being mindful of these upheavals and also being visionary in educating students.

I invite parents and students alike to thank our teachers for their commitment to education and for being a bridge to the future, day after day.

* * *

WORLD TEACHERS DAY

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we are celebrating World Teachers Day, the theme of which is "Teachers Create Dialogue Every Day".

Dialogue involves a number of values that are dear to our society: understanding, respect and solidarity, and tolerance.

In a world where interdependence is of such great importance, undeniably the role of dialogue is becoming more and more important.

The theme is well chosen, showing as it does the involvement of teachers in the social development of the children and others they teach. All of us can remember a teacher who had a particular impact on our life.

Teachers contribute to Canada's future by teaching tomorrow's adults. In recognition and gratitude for their devoted service to society, I would ask the House to join with me in wishing them an excellent day and a great school year.

* * *

[*English*]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, British Columbia's forest firms and workers are victims of the government's failure to negotiate a softwood lumber deal with the United States.

The Liberals had more than five years to secure free trade in softwood lumber with the Americans. They failed to do this work and now our softwood lumber industry and B.C.'s economy is suffering terribly. It has been months and the devastation has wreaked havoc on families and local communities. They need some transitional help to get through a restructuring of this industry.

It was unfair for the natural resources minister to create expectations last May that federal help was only weeks away. These relief measures are still on hold. There was nothing in the Speech from the Throne for the \$10 billion softwood lumber industry in crisis. Nothing. The Liberal government has bailed out its favourite industries in Ontario, Quebec and Atlantic Canada in the past and even the auto sector during periods of downtime.

S. O. 31

Canadians want the federal government to stop ignoring B.C. and give more attention to returning B.C. from its have not province status. This is urgent. There is a 15% unemployment rate that needs to go down now.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last June the Minister of Agriculture came to Larry and Debbie Hipple's farm in Beamsville, Ontario to announce the government's plan to further develop environmentally responsible farming practices and fuelling growth and profitability for the Canadian agriculture and agrifood sector.

I am pleased that the minister came to Niagara to announce a \$100 million program to facilitate implementation of environmental farm plans and a \$54.5 million strategy to give Canadian producers better access to minor use and reduced risk pesticides. These initiatives are important to my riding of Erie—Lincoln as a major supplier and producer of world class tender fruits and wines.

These measures will provide farmers with better tools and realize the environmental goals of the agricultural policy framework. By giving Canadian producers access to more environmentally sound technologies for pest control we are further positioning Canadian agriculture for profitability and prosperity. These measures will also go a long way towards addressing the expectations of consumers for environmentally responsible food production.

I wish to congratulate the minister and his department for helping Canadian farmers protect both our environment and our consumers.

* * *

RELIGIONS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, sweeping statements about any world religion, particularly negative statements, are never very helpful, but in the post-September 11 context they are downright unacceptable and dangerous. Reverend Gerry Falwell's description of the Prophet Mohammed as a "terrorist" is in this category of statements.

Reverend Falwell would do well to heed biblical teachings that warn against self-righteousness and look for ways in which the best of all the world's faith traditions can be brought together in common cause against violence and injustice. Ill-informed attacks on the founder of the religion of one-fifth of the world's population are hardly the mark of a peacemaker.

Neither the Prophet Mohammed nor Jesus Christ should be held responsible for all that is said or done in their names.

* * *

• (1110)

[Translation]

MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette, BQ): Mental Illness Awareness Week, October 6 through 12, is a national public awareness campaign launched by the Canadian Psychiatric Association. Its aim is to eliminate the stigma associated with mental illness.

This year, the purpose of the week is to encourage us to reach out to overcome the barriers that stop people from getting help for their mental health problems. We need to be watchful and reach out to a friend, relative or colleague in need.

Anyone in need of help for themselves or a friend or loved one should waste no time calling the closest community mental health centre or a help line.

It is a sad fact that mental illness is an important factor in the rate of suicide. If we feel that someone near to us is in need of help, we must remember that reaching out a helping hand can prevent suicide.

* * *

[English]

THE ROYAL VISIT

Mr. Tony Tirabassi (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the arrival to Canada of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh.

This special golden jubilee year has brought Canadians from coast to coast to coast together in celebration of our many achievements over the past 50 years in every field.

Her Majesty's very first step on Canadian soil for the 2002 royal visit will be historic as she is the first member of the royal family to visit Canada's newest territory of Nunavut.

Her Majesty's day starts with a unique welcome to Canada ceremony according to Inuit tradition and a tour of Iqaluit that includes a visit to the legislative assembly, a tour of the local high school where she will watch Inuit sports demonstrations and a tour of the Nunavut Arctic College Sculpture Garden, a truly memorable start to what will be an unforgettable visit.

* * *

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, a royal commission is currently holding public hearings in Newfoundland and Labrador on our status and our future prospects in Confederation.

Some 53 years after joining Canada we have one of the highest economic growth rates in the nation, yet we are still the poorest province with the highest unemployment rate.

One of the reasons for our lack of economic progress is the clawback provision in the current equalization formula. Fully 80% of all the revenues from the development of our natural resources is clawed back to Ottawa through reductions in our equalization payments.

Under such a formula it is impossible for a small province to make any economic headway, especially a small province in Atlantic Canada. We need a reduction in or the elimination of the equalization clawback if we are ever to claim our rightful place in Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

SENEGAL

Mr. Serge Marcil (Beauharnois—Salaberry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this summer there was a lot of talk about Africa at the G-8 meeting held in Kananaskis, and about the adoption of a recovery plan for Africa called the New Partnership for Africa's Development, or NPAD, initiated by our Prime Minister.

Since last week, the population of one of Africa's most active countries in the defence of the NPAD has been trying to cope with an incredible tragedy. Senegal is mourning the death of over 900 people who perished when *Le Joola* sank. This ship, which was sailing from the south of the country to the capital, sank last Thursday during a storm. Over 1,000 people were on board, including children who were coming home to begin the new school year, saleswomen who were travelling to Dakar to sell local products, and teachers who were going back to work.

These men and women were from a region already greatly affected by the rebellion that has been going on for a long time, and they relied on that ship to travel safely, because there are too many ambushes along highways by armed gangs who steal and kill shamelessly.

I just got back from a visit to this beautiful country, Senegal, and I wish to express my sincere condolences to all its people, particularly those living in the south of the country, following this terrible tragedy.

* * *

[English]

GUN REGISTRY

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the *Ottawa Citizen* called on the Liberal government to “end the gun registry, which has been reduced to mailing stick-on numbers to gun-owners”.

One of the main reasons the government used to justify the gun registry was to trace stolen firearms. Now the justice minister trusts criminals so completely that he thinks they will just leave his department's stickers on the firearms they steal.

In the throne speech, the Prime Minister said “We need regulation to achieve the public good”. What public good can come from issuing 4 million gun registration certificates with 3 million blanks and unknown entries, three-quarters of a million of them with no serial numbers?

Oral Questions

The registry has become the most expensive garbage collection system in the country. How big do the mistakes have to be before the government will admit its billion dollar blunder?

* * *

•(1115)

[Translation]

RENÉ COUSINEAU

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on September 10, the Gatineau community lost one of its sons, René Cousineau.

Mr. Cousineau was a notary by trade and he taught that discipline at the University of Ottawa. He was elected to Parliament in 1979 and re-elected in 1980. The Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau appointed him deputy government whip and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Small Businesses.

Mr. Cousineau was a dedicated person and he was always available to his fellow citizens. He was a member of the Knights of Columbus and of the Rotary Club in Gatineau.

I wish to reiterate my most sincere condolences to his wife Paulette, his daughters Danielle and Sylvie, and the members of the Cousineau family.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in response to the Solicitor General's contracts for friends scheme, the Prime Minister said that there was no problem.

There are problems. Everett Roche is a friend of the minister. He was the minister's two-time official agent. Public money was paid to the friend of the minister. The minister's office hired this friend and broke the rules in so doing.

Why did the Solicitor General award an untendered consulting deal to his friend?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday there were a number of inaccurate statements made by the opposition. This morning I have released a statement with the facts.

The contract was publicly posted on March 15, 2001, and signed on May 10, 2001. Companies had two weeks to appeal this contract. The contract was in accordance with all Treasury Board guidelines. The contract was given, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will be pleased to hear this, to a firm, not an individual. These are the facts.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that the contract was sole sourced and that there was no proper tendering process.

Oral Questions

The contract was given to a partnership. Everett Roche is the firm's principal consultant. He signed the contract. The correspondence was directed to Everett Roche. He obviously negotiated the contract. He directly benefited from it.

Is it really going to be the government's position that it is okay to funnel money through to friends if it is done through a firm?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the contract was for strategic advice to help me to do my job as Solicitor General and regional minister for Prince Edward Island. One can never get enough good advice.

That is why David Nicholson, a highly respected former federal public servant, who has contributed a lot to the federal system in the country, was the man who advised me on issues in the Solicitor General's office and on issues pertaining to Prince Edward Island.

If he examines the facts, Prince Edward Island and the federal government have received a lot of great advice.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, if this advice was so terrific and so memorable, one would think the minister would have been able to remember it yesterday.

We all remember the minister lobbying the RCMP for funding for his brother's college. I want to ask the minister something. Will the minister confirm that Everett Roche, his close friend who received this contract, was, 10 days later, appointed to the body charged with deciding the funding application for the Solicitor General's brother?

• (1120)

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a sad case in the House. They refer to a couple of institutions as my brother's.

Mr. Myron Thompson: You are a sad case.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Thank you very much. That is most inappropriate.

The fact of the matter is that what was required on this contract was a highly capable, former federal deputy minister to give me advice for the Solicitor General's office and for the province of Prince Edward Island. He certainly gave great advice which produced a lot of results, such as the national drug strategy, which is in the Speech from the Throne, and the Confederation Centre of the Arts in Charlottetown which received millions of dollars. With a man like this, it only helps Prince Edward Island and Canada.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General just said "with a man like this", yet he says that it is the firm they hired. This contract in question was sole sourced to the minister's official agent. Why?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they accessed the contract. They cannot read it. The fact of the matter is that the firm got the contract. It was not an individual. The individual who gave the advice was a very prominent former federal deputy minister who did a lot for this country and who ended up doing a lot for Prince Edward Island.

A minister needs lots of good advice and that is what I got. It was good for Prince Edward Island and it was good for Canada.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the contract awarded to Everett Roche's firm was sole sourced. According to Treasury Board guidelines, a department is allowed to sole source only if it meets one of the following criteria: first, the need is of a pressing emergency; second, the expenditure does not exceed \$25,000; third, the nature of the work would not be in the public interest to solicit other bids; or fourth, only one supplier can do the work.

Could the Solicitor General tell the House which criteria did he use, one, two, three or four, in justifying Roche's firm's—

The Speaker: The hon. Solicitor General.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member asked for yesterday was facts. What he is getting today is facts. The fact of the matter is I was able to hire one of the most capable advisers in this country to make sure that I, as the Solicitor General of Canada, had good advice and that we had a man that understood the needs of Prince Edward Island. Both of these requirements were this man's strengths and he certainly proved it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 2000, in an e-mail sent to the individual responsible for awarding contracts at Canadian Heritage, the director of the national sport policy task force wrote "The firm the secretary of state wants to hire is Everest".

Will the Minister of Public Works tell us whether, under the usual procedure for awarding contracts, a minister is allowed to impose his choices?

[*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, it is my information that the contract in question was in fact awarded by the Department of Public Works and Government Services on behalf of the Department of Canadian Heritage. I am advised that the choice of Groupe Everest was made by officials in my department on the basis of the agency's standing offer with the department. That standing offer was established by a competitive process.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, government contracts must be awarded without any political influence being brought to bear, and the minister knows it.

That being the case, how does the Minister of Public Works explain that there is an e-mail stating in black and white that the former Secretary of State for Amateur Sport wanted to hire Everest and that, as luck would have it, that is exactly what happened?

*Oral Questions**[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 have no personal knowledge of the e-mail. What I have done is to inquire of the officials of my department as to what transpired in this case. They indicate that there was a standing offer that was utilized and that standing offer was created in the first place by means of a competitive process.

• (1125)

[Translation]

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works assured us yesterday that he would make all the appropriate enquiries with respect to the contracts awarded to Everest following pressure brought to bear by the former Secretary of State for Amateur Sport.

My question today is a very simple one. Will the Minister of Public Works tell us whether, in March 2000, Everest appeared on the list of companies prequalified by Canadian Heritage for this kind of contract?

[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, the firm's name appeared certainly on the standing offer that was available to the government. I am making further inquiries about the details as to the departmental applicability of that, but indeed there was a standing offer and this particular firm was a part of it.

[Translation]

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Minister of Public Works is refusing to give a clear answer to my question.

Is this not because Canadian Heritage's list was bypassed and the Everest contract went through Public Works solely to comply with the wishes of the Secretary of State for Amateur Sport, a minister very familiar with how the system works and who did not hesitate to make use of it?

[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, if the question from the hon. member is whether there was a deliberate attempt made to circumvent the normal procedures, I can assure her, on the information that has been given to me by my officials, that is not the case.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General cannot seem to make up his mind whether they hired a firm or they hired a friend, but what seems sure is that Mr. Roche has a very firm friend in the form of the Solicitor General.

I am more concerned about people in Atlantic Canada and elsewhere who do not have access to the minister's largesse and who depend on unemployment insurance benefits for a portion of their income. It appears that there is a debate going on in cabinet about reducing employment insurance benefits in order to pay for some of the things that are in the throne speech.

I would like someone on the government side to get up in the House and assure us that this is not the case and guarantee the House today that there will be no changes in employment insurance benefits designed for that purpose.

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage the member opposite to reread the Speech from the Throne and to reread the government's skills and learning agenda. I would like to be very clear. We are not talking about cuts to EI benefits.

I will repeat: We are not talking about cuts to EI benefits. We are talking about ensuring the development and use of the skills and talents of all Canadians in an increasingly knowledge-based economy.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, next time I have an attack of insomnia I will reread the throne speech.

I did not get an assurance from the minister that there would be no changes in employment insurance benefits. She used the word cuts, that there will be no cuts, but we have seen other things that have amounted to cuts even though they have been described differently. We are reminded of the fact that the government fought its deficit on the backs of the unemployed. What is next?

I wonder if the minister could indicate what kinds of changes they have in mind. Let us have a little more detail. There is a lot to be worried about here.

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can talk about the compassionate family care leave initiative, for example, which would represent an enhancement, not a reduction, to current benefits provided through our programs. We have other programs as well. This is only one example. I would really suggest that he read the departmental papers, which would help in giving him an answer to his own question.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, as Solicitor General this minister's first priority should be to set a high ethical standard and first and foremost uphold the law. Instead, we see further evidence of a man fixated on funneling federal funds to family and friends.

The Solicitor General lobbied his own officials to help his brother's college. He saw to it that the P.E.I. Liberal president was going to be shovelled a sweetheart deal in his riding of Cardigan and now his own official agent is the beneficiary of the minister's Midas touch.

Oral Questions

Does the Solicitor General really believe that it is acceptable for him to reward family and friends and campaign workers with taxpayers' hard-earned money?

• (1130)

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government, I take great umbrage at the insinuations of the hon. member's question.

The Solicitor General has served this country with distinction in a number of posts. Yesterday he undertook to put the facts of this matter before the House. He issued a statement before question period which is a full statement. The matter will be looked into by the ethics counsellor. The hon. member has done what he said he would do.

I would ask the hon. member to get on to the important affairs of state and not just muddy the waters, as he loves to do.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, here comes the cavalry. I do not think we need to hear from the corruption approval officer who masks himself as the ethics counsellor.

Yesterday the Solicitor General did anything but give the House straight answers on this issue. He played dumb on whether he knew the details of this highly questionable contract. A sole source untendered contract for advice on criminal justice issues from an accountant is reason enough to ask questions, but when such a cozy Liberal connection exists, surely Canadians deserve answers.

I ask the minister again: Does he think anybody bought his answers yesterday that he knew nothing about these contracts? More important, does—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not only is the hon. member content to malign the Solicitor General but he is also maligning the ethics counsellor, someone who has served his country also with distinction and whose reputation is beyond repute. I would ask: Is the Conservative Party so bereft of ideas, is it so lacking of the issues facing this country that all it can do is stand here in question period and try to malign an honourable minister of the Crown?

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is going to be any doubt that the Solicitor General is going to be the new poster boy for EI reform. He is going to need it very shortly.

The former defence minister was forced to resign because he funneled taxpayers' money to his girlfriend. The Solicitor General is caught in that same ethical breach, so I am wondering how the ethics counsellor for these guys can find any difference.

The precedent is set. A friend is a friend. Taxpayers' money is taxpayers' money. How could he possibly find this issue any different?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the hon. Solicitor General has issued a statement that explains fully the context of the issue. The ethics counsellor is going to look into the issue. I would say that we should let that particular inquiry play out. Let us accept the explanations of

the hon. Solicitor General, which are made in good faith. There is no wrongdoing here. Everything has been done according to appropriate guidelines.

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I guess that is the big question: Have the guidelines been followed? We certainly see that they have not. None of the rules have been adhered to in this case and I am sure the Solicitor General is going to have some sleepless nights until the ethics counsellor waves his magic wand and makes it all go away.

Why is there a different ethical standard for friends of the Prime Minister? Why is the ethical bar lowered for someone like the Solicitor General as opposed to the Minister of National Defence when they breach the same code of conduct?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the ethical standards followed by ministers in this government are extremely high. We have not had a case where an accusation has been made and has been proven. There have been allegations made against ministers, unproven allegations.

I would hope that hon. members opposite would get down to asking questions about the real issues. Where are the questions about foreign policy? Where are the questions about national unity? Where are the questions on the throne speech? Where are the questions on the economy? The opposition is bereft of ideas and is showing it.

* * *

[Translation]

SECURITIES

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with the appointment of Harold MacKay yesterday, the federal government is stubbornly persisting in striking a Canadian Securities Commission, using as a pretext the latest financial scandals. Yet Quebec has already taken action by introducing a series of amendments to its legislation with investor protection as the first concern.

Can the Minister of Finance explain to us why he insists on wanting to intervene in an area that comes under Quebec jurisdiction, rather than acting within the government's own areas of jurisdiction and its own legislation, where there is plenty of room for improvement?

• (1135)

[English]

Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from the Speech from the Throne, which states:

Many investors and businesses have expressed concern that Canada's fragmented securities regulatory structure is inadequate and an obstacle to growth.

That is of course a concern to the government, which has to take on a leadership role, but let me be very frank: We will do this in concert with the provinces and all interested stakeholders.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois has already introduced a series of measures relating to corporate ethics aimed primarily at protecting small investors.

Oral Questions

Why does the government not come on side with our proposals instead of insisting at any price on once again invading Quebec's areas of jurisdiction and setting off another federal-provincial battle? [English]

Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will listen to all proposals. We are here to cooperate with all stakeholders, as I said earlier. Rest assured, though, that we have to build a very competitive economy, one that will bring capital flows to Canada. It is our responsibility to make sure that Canada continues to lead the G-7 as it will this year and next, and we will bring about the type of efficient regulatory system that speaks to that reality.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General would have us believe that there is a difference between rewarding a friend and rewarding a friend when he works for a firm.

But this is fact. The minister's friend negotiated the contract. The minister's friend signed the contract. All the paperwork from the minister's department is addressed to his friend. The minister's friend and his partners benefited financially from the minister's department. Every lead goes to the minister's friend.

Why can the minister and the government not see that there is a conflict of interest and this minister has to pay the price?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated this morning, the contract was awarded according to Treasury Board contracting rules, including its posting of advance contract award notice section of the public MERX government system. It was publicly posted on March 15, 2001. There were no appeals and the contract was signed on May 10, 2001, always according to Treasury Board guidelines.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister spent any time last night reading the Prime Minister's quotes when he had to do the dirty deed on the former minister of national defence. He said that the member from York Centre "...did not profit personally. But he helped a friend and under the guidelines, you cannot give preferential treatment to a friend or family".

Obviously preferential treatment has been given to a friend, a close campaign worker of the Solicitor General. He can say what he likes about no appeals to his contract, but it went to one firm. It went to his friend, and that friend has been helping that minister for a long time.

When will the minister do the right thing and—

The Speaker: The hon. Solicitor General.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this contract was for strategic advice. It was given—

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: You didn't even know what he did yesterday. Yesterday you had no idea.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Crowfoot was asking detailed questions yesterday about when the

contract was signed. I said I would get the details. I brought them back to the House. Today he shouts that I did not know.

The fact of the matter is I have detailed specifically what took place, and it was under Treasury Board guidelines, so I could have the advice of Mr. David Nicholson, one of the most capable advisers in the nation.

* * *

[Translation]

REGIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Neigette-et-la Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the regions are now faced with the disastrous consequences of the monopoly given to Air Canada by the government. The minister even went so far as to ask Air Canada to leave small communities, because it is more profitable for a small company to provide services with smaller aircraft.

Will the government act on the request made by the common front in eastern Quebec, which is asking Air Canada Jazz to defer its decision to stop its Mont-Joli-Quebec City-Mont-Joli flights?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is well aware that after the merging of Canadian Airlines and Air Canada, we set up a system, under Bill C-26, to protect services to small communities across the country, for a period of three years.

Air Canada now has the right to leave any city. In our opinion, if Air Canada stops serving a small community, it will be replaced by another carrier in that community.

We saw it happen in Newfoundland, for example, and in other communities across the country.

● (1140)

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Neigette-et-la Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the minister realize that by saying no to subsidies or regulations, he is encouraging Air Canada to abandon the regions, without helping small companies settle there and charge reasonable airfares?

[English]

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is certainly not the case. When Air Canada decided to leave a number of communities in Newfoundland, and it gave notice under the law passed by the House, Provincial Airlines and Air Labrador announced the next day that they would provide service to those communities and more frequent service.

Our experience has been, ever since deregulation came in a number of years ago, that when air carriers leave a particular community or a particular market others follow.

Oral Questions

We are concerned about some communities, in particular, Yarmouth, Nova Scotia and St. Leonard, New Brunswick, where it does not appear at the moment that other carriers will go in. However there are alternative airports with—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Southwest.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton Southwest, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Solicitor General barely knew his name, rank and serial number. Let us hope that he has been a little better briefed today.

The minister stated today that he has received all sorts of wonderful strategic advice. Could he explain precisely to the House and to Canadian taxpayers what sort of strategic advice, editorial services and communications strategies he and his department received for signing a political friend for a contract up to \$140,000?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague is well aware, and as I have mentioned a number of times in the House, this contract was for strategic advice for the Solicitor General's office and for Prince Edward Island. I was able to get the services of one of the most capable men in the country, Mr. David Nicholson.

For example, Mr. Nicholson serves on the Canadian Centre for Substance Abuse, if the hon. member is interested in listening. The fact of the matter is that he serves on this board and was able to supply a lot of advice to me, and we end up with a national drug strategy in the throne speech, a very important thing.

Mr. Nicholson also worked on the Confederation Centre of the Arts file and was able to access millions of dollars. That is what we call doing something for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton Southwest, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I sure hope after that answer the minister will certainly try to get our money back. The fact is that he did not name one piece of strategic advice that justified a contract of \$140,000.

He stated today over and over that he received strategic advice. Will the minister please tell the House and Canadian taxpayers what justified a \$140,000 contract to his friend?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how often I have to answer a question? The fact of the matter is that I told my hon. colleague. I told him that he gave great advice or gave me strategic advice. He gave me advice on the national drug strategy. He gave me advice on issues affecting Prince Edward Island.

In fact, Prince Edward Island and Canada area better places because Mr. David Nicholson was able to assist me.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food. To help farmers deal with various problems such as this summer's drought, the minister and Prime Minister announced \$600 million in federal transition assistance for this year alone.

The Canadian Federation of Agriculture points out that farmers stricken by drought would normally be taking their crops off at this time of year, so this is the time they need help. Could the minister tell the House how soon this money will be available to farmers?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I said all summer that the money would flow to the farmers' accounts in October and I am pleased to say today that the \$600 million in transition money that will flow to farmers this year started to flow into farmers' accounts today. It will be deposited directly into their accounts. They can trigger the money out of there, and I have instructed officials that, once a farmer requests the money out of his or her account, it be made available to the farmer within 30 days. The money started to flow today.

* * *

JUSTICE

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of the 63 missing women in the downtown east side, and 15 murder charges, raises deeply disturbing questions about the failure of our justice system. Systemic discrimination by police and federal laws that force these women into dangerous circumstances are key factors in their deaths, and for many more still at risk.

Will the minister responsible for the status of women demand that her government ensure that there is a public inquiry on policing investigations, and a review of federal laws to end this violence and exploitation?

• (1145)

Hon. Jean Augustine (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the concern expressed. I think all Canadians are horrified by the present situation before us. We sympathize with the families of those women and at the same time we are looking at the process that is occurring in British Columbia. The police and RCMP are involved in that activity.

We are concerned about violence against women and children. We addressed that in several ways. This is a very serious issue that we as Status of Women Canada are reflecting upon.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if the Solicitor General requires some strategic advice I will give it to him for free: resign now.

My question for the government is this. The British government has declared that all military personnel will receive the Queen's Jubilee Medal. In Canada an order in council said that only 8,000 members of our military would receive the medal.

If this is such a significant medal for contribution to our country, does the government not believe that all our military personnel deserve to wear this prestigious medal?

Oral Questions

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the aim of the jubilee medal is to honour people in Canada who have made a contribution to their communities. In fact, this program was modelled on previous medal programs, including the silver jubilee medal program in 1977 and the Canada 125 medal program in 1992. Exactly the same procedure was followed.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. He talked about strategic advice. Is there any hard copy evidence of any piece of strategic advice that the department received and will the minister table in the House every copy of every piece of strategic advice or other advice received from the firm associated with his official agent, the beneficiaries of this \$140,000 contract?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General issued a statement today and put all the facts before the House. He has answered a number of questions. I think we should allow those facts to speak for themselves.

I find it rather ironic that the right hon. member from Calgary talks about strategic advice. His whole career has been patterned on not following any strategic advice at any time.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, the House would welcome any evidence that any advice was received. The only way that can be provided would be for the Solicitor General to do the honest thing and to table this material in the House.

Let me ask a question of whoever is speaking for the minister responsible for ACOA.

Everett Roche is a member of the advisory board of the Atlantic Innovation Fund which awarded \$6.5 million to Holland College, whose president is the brother of the Solicitor General. Did the minister's official agent vote to give money to the minister's brother's college?

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Marcil (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one would swear that the leader of the fourth party in the House supports private colleges.

In case the hon. member does not know, Holland College is a public college under the responsibility of the Ministry of Education. We provide greater support to research and development in small universities and colleges located in the regions.

As far as we are concerned, the subsidy went to a public college for research and development purposes.

Would the opposition prefer that governments fund private colleges? And as regards the industry committee—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary—Nose Hill.

[English]

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Actually, Mr. Speaker, the money that the Solicitor General's friend voted on for his brother's college was to fund a course that had

been turned down by law enforcement officials as not necessary and not worth the cash.

The Solicitor General needs to get his story straight here for the House. First, he tells the House that this man, this friend of his, was providing advice regarding P.E.I. He said that this was good for P.E.I. and for Canada. However the contract stipulates that the man was supposed to give communication advice on matters of national security.

● (1150)

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my hon. colleague has referred to the man who has done the work and provided the strategic advice for me. In fact, Mr. David Nicholson is a renowned Canadian. He is a former deputy minister in the federal system. He won awards in the system for his efficiency. The fact of the matter is Prince Edward Island and Canada is a better place because Mr. David Nicholson was one of my advisers.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the House will note that the Solicitor General very carefully avoided clarifying particularly what advice he actually got as opposed to the advice that was contracted.

This is not a small matter. Here we have a man who is in charge of Canada's entire law enforcement infrastructure, responsible to preserve truth, justice and the rule of law in our country, weaseling around and not giving straight answers.

No matter how the minister tries to dress this up, is it not true that this was a plain, old, sweetheart contract?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have said many times this was the contract that was publicly posted. The fact of the matter is, what I needed was strategic advice from a man with the capabilities of Mr. David Nicholson. The fact is, I was able to do that with this contract, and Prince Edward Island is better off, Canada is better off and, for example, the national drug strategy is in the Speech from the Throne, and many other things.

* * *

[Translation]

STRIKEBREAKERS

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, in what has become known as his political legacy, the Prime Minister did not have a single thing to say about the weakness of the federal legislation which allows the use of scabs. He is thus sending a very clear message to the public: the Liberal government agrees with the use of scabs.

Why is the Prime Minister so dead set against civilized negotiations during labour disputes, and unwilling to include anti-scab provisions in the Canada Labour Code, which would finally enable Ottawa to catch up with the Government of Quebec in this regard.

Oral Questions

[English]

Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada Labour Code does not impose a general provision on the use of replacement workers during a legal work stoppage. The code inhibits the use of replacement workers where it is determined that such a use is designed to undermine the representational capacity of the union.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec has outlawed the use of scabs for 25 years now, and we do not want anything to do with them.

Quebec's legislation is producing very positive results. Why is the Prime Minister continuing to block the progressive measure I am proposing, preferring instead to encourage businesses to use scabs with complete impunity?

[English]

Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada Labour Code does not impose a general provision on the use of replacement workers during a legal work stoppage. However, if the trade union feels this is the case it can file a complaint with the Canada Industrial Relations Board for determination.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in 2001 municipalities on both sides of the National Capital Region amalgamated to form the two cities of Ottawa and Gatineau. Since that time the Liberal government has been relentless in its pursuit of official bilingualism on the Ontario side, but only on the Ontario side.

It has repeatedly demanded that Ottawa's bilingual status be entrenched in provincial law and transferred several million dollars to city hall for this purpose. Not one federal minister has uttered a single word in defence of the rights of the large English speaking minority in the City of Gatineau.

What is the reason for this double standard on minority language rights in the national capital area?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no double standard. The member represents, as I do, part of the National Capital Region. He knows, as I do, that the Prime Minister has been the strongest advocate of a bilingual Canada for a long time. He knows that as well as I know that.

I think the hon. member across would agree with me on that fundamental issue, as would probably none other of his colleagues by the way.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is quite right that I represent an Ottawa riding, however I was born in Gatineau.

The fact is the minority, of which I was once a member, is restricted in its rights by provincial law. Municipal services are restricted by provincial law. It is against the law in Quebec for the City of Gatineau to provide full services to its minority. This is not

true in Ontario, yet we have not heard a single word from a single minister on that side of the House defending the rights of that minority.

My question to the minister is: why are the rights of one minority in the national capital area not protected as well as the other?

● (1155)

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member across and I have another thing in common, we were born in the same city as well as agreeing on bilingualism.

However, that does not change the fact that our Prime Minister and our government are committed to bilingualism. We have repeated our rededication in the throne speech. Yesterday, the Official Languages Commissioner spoke of the progress made by the government in relation to our strategic program which will come shortly. Our commitment is there toward a bilingual and very strong Canada.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mrs. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Ajax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the recent Speech from the Throne reminds us that because of our collective efforts we have new opportunities, new possibilities and new choices for the Canada we want.

Could the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and the Status of Women tell the House what the Canadian government is doing to advance women's economic possibilities, choices and opportunities in the new economy?

Hon. Jean Augustine (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her question. I have just participated in the second ministers' conference on women in the APEC economies. The main theme was advancing women's economic interests and opportunities.

I am pleased that the Speech from the Throne reflected the fact that the government was committed to small and medium sized businesses. Those businesses had barriers, barriers that I hope we will pursue. There are benefits to women in exporting. We hope to remove some of the barriers in international trade and other avenues.

* * *

FOREST INDUSTRY

Mr. Richard Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government knows very well that the province of British Columbia is facing one of the greatest natural disasters in its history. The mountain pine beetle has infested over 60,000 square kilometres and at this point has caused over \$4 billion in lost timber. The government has ignored any and all of B.C.'s calls for help.

I ask the government, when will it come to the aid of the forest industry and the people in B.C. and help them with this fight against the mountain pine beetle? When will it do it?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Natural Resources who is unable to be here today I can verify that the minister has had discussions with the government of British Columbia.

We recognize the severity of this issue. We also recognize the responsibilities that may differ between the province and the federal government and we want to ensure that the jurisdictions of the responsibilities are followed.

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the spruce budworm is absolutely devastating Prince Albert National Park. The government to date has refused to do anything to deal with this problem despite the fact that BTK, an organic based chemical, is an effective and safe treatment.

Why has the government embarked on a massive expansion of national parks when it refuses to manage the existing parks?

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the member's direct question, we would like to advise him that the situation is presently being carefully monitored.

* * *

[Translation]

COPYRIGHT

Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière—L'Érable, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the report on copyright issues was recently released and committee consideration is expected to begin in a few weeks.

There are persistent rumours to the effect that this report will be considered by the standing committee on industry, rather than the heritage committee, which could not fail to send a very poor message for upcoming trade negotiations.

Will the Minister of Canadian Heritage assure us that the report on copyright will not be considered by any committee other than the heritage committee?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question.

The report has indeed been tabled in the House, but the government has not yet decided to which parliamentary committee it will be referred. I thank the member for his comments to the House in this regard.

* * *

• (1200)

[English]

GRAIN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport stated his intention to dispose of the federal hopper car fleet used for three decades that moved grains and oilseeds to port while keeping the costs to farmers down.

S. O. 57

The Farmer Rail Car Coalition is working to develop an efficient and affordable grain handling system and wants those 13,000 cars turned over to the coalition.

What assurance could we have from the minister that no decision would be made before a thorough review of the coalition's business plan and an opportunity for the coalition's executive to meet directly with the Minister of Transport?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have met with representatives of the coalition over the last year or so. I spoke with one of their key people this summer.

I can assure the hon. member that those cars will not be disposed of unless we have full consultation with all interested stakeholders, including the coalition of which he speaks.

* * *

DIAMOND INDUSTRY

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Under the Kimberley Process, Canadian diamonds must be certified before January 1, 2003, or they will not be allowed to be exported. This certification will involve six government departments and must be implemented by December 31, 2002.

Will the government be ready for implementation by December 31, 2002?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the hon. member that the government will be ready shortly to introduce the bill in the House of Commons.

I thank him for his interest and I hope all members of the House give that bill a quick passage in the House of Commons and later in the Senate so it can become law.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Today we are honoured to have with us a group of distinguished Canadian craft artists: the winner and finalists for the 2002 Saidye Bronfman Award for Excellence in the Fine Arts, which was presented last evening at the Canadian Museum of Civilization.

I would ask you to join me in saluting these distinguished artists: Kai Chan of Toronto, winner of the 2002 Saidye Bronfman Award, and the award finalists: Suzanne Edgerley of Val Morin, Gregg Payce of Calgary and Barbara Todd of Montreal.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND REINSTATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT BILLS

NOTICE OF CLOSURE MOTION

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that, with respect to the consideration of government orders, Government Business No. 2, at the next sitting I shall move, pursuant to Standing Order 57, that debate be not further adjourned.

*Points of Order***POINTS OF ORDER**

GOVERNMENT LEGISLATIVE AGENDA ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask for a ruling regarding the announcement of the entire legislative agenda by the government House leader outside the House at the National Press Club yesterday morning.

I raise this matter in the following context. The report of the modernization committee recommended on page 4:

First, it is important that more ministerial statements and announcements be made in the House of Commons. In particular, topical developments or foreseeable policy decisions, should be made first—or, at least, concurrently—in the chamber. Ministers, and their departments, need to be encouraged to make use of the forum provided by the House of Commons. Not only will this enhance the pre-eminence of Parliament, but it will also reiterate the legislative underpinning for governmental decisions.

This report was adopted by the House. One of its authors is the government House leader who signed off on the report and moved the motion to have it adopted.

My first question to the Chair is, would this not be considered a matter of misleading the House, to say in an official report and to Parliament that something will be done and then turn around and do something else?

I also want the House to consider this in the context of the leak of Bill C-15 and Bill C-36 in the previous session. When the context of the bill was leaked, the Speaker ruled the matter to be a prima facie question of privilege. Obviously leaking information about government legislation that is intended for the House is a serious matter. The Speaker ruled on this matter and said:

In preparing legislation, the government may wish to hold extensive consultations and such consultations may be held entirely at the government's discretion. However, with respect to material to be placed before Parliament, the House must take precedence.... To deny to members information concerning business that is about to come before the House, while at the same time providing such information to media that will likely be questioning members about that business, is a situation that the Chair cannot condone.

This is what the government House leader had to say during the debate on the question of privilege:

I cannot say much more other than to apologize on behalf of whoever is guilty of this. I use the word guilty because that is what comes to mind, given the respect that I have for this institution.

I will repeat that line, "given the respect that I have for this institution". He continued:

Anyone who breaches that respect is guilty of an offence in my book.

I believe the House leader for the Conservatives referred to this as privileged information. Actually it is more than that. It is secret, secret in the very sense of government secrecy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, if leaking information on one bill is an offence to the House, surely leaking the entire agenda to the press club is offensive to the House.

To give an idea of the impact that this had on me personally, I refer to yesterday's CBC Newsworld interview by Don Newman. He was interviewing all the House leaders and in his lead-in comments mentioned that he was going to talk to us about the legislative agenda and then mentioned that this agenda was announced at the press club yesterday morning.

I had no idea of the contents of that announcement. Don Newman knew more than I did and probably more than any other House leader on the panel, except maybe the government House leader. I did not expect to hunt down this information because such an announcement, at a minimum, should have been given to the House leaders at the House leaders' weekly meeting, or perhaps in the House during the Thursday question or by a statement by minister.

The government House leader put members, and particularly the House leaders, at a disadvantage and gave a huge advantage to the media.

How can this be defined as respect for this institution as the minister said in the House?

I also want to mention that the Minister of Canadian Heritage made a major announcement yesterday outside the House regarding parks. Also, today before question period our solicitor general made a statement to the media regarding questions put to him yesterday in the House. Therefore, they knew before we did.

Is it some sort of a government strategy to fan out all over the country and misrepresent the role of Parliament? The government's dismissive view of the House and its members is contemptuous.

• (1205)

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that somebody else wrote those remarks for the hon. member. I do not believe that they could possibly reflect anything she thinks. I would give her more credit than that.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Don Boudria: I know that the right hon. member over there is getting excited, but perhaps he could be patient and listen to this along with his House leader.

The legislative program in the broad sense was announced yesterday morning, after being in the throne speech as we all know, at the national newsmaker breakfast which has been held about four times a year for the last five years. That has been done all this time, the same organization, the same place. The National Press Club invites all of us to attend the event. It occurs all the time. One was held at Christmas.

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Hon. Don Boudria: The hon. member across the way is getting agitated again. I urge him not to suffer from too much premature excitement. I will get to those points.

That is in fact what was done yesterday. If it pleases the House what I did provide to the national press yesterday I would gladly table for the House to have a further look at in order to determine, as it no doubt will, that nothing in what I said was out of order or contrary to the rules, nor even to the respect of the House.

Points of Order

The hon. member across referred to the modernization report and used that as a basis for the allegation that she just made, which is wrong. It is unusual she did not say that at this time last week her own party was releasing what it called a second modernization report outside the House two days before we started to sit. That of course was circulated to the media in a press conference downstairs just before we started.

Therefore this effort on the part of the members across the way is not very serious. If it was a modernization report, it was not even provided to the House leaders of other parties as their contribution thereof.

I announced yesterday to the national media at the newsmaker breakfast that I would be willing to have another modernization effort in consultation with other House leaders. However I sure did not give the content of that to the media before the other House leaders. That would have been inappropriate.

I am glad the hon. member has raised it because it probably offended everyone else that she did that, as much as it offended me and gives me the opportunity to raise it now. I would not have used the time of the House to raise that but given that she has done so, I wish to inform the House of what in fact either her or some of her colleagues, or perhaps someone acting on their behalf has done.

In reference to the leaks of the past and my condemnation of leaks of contents of bills, I have done so and I will continue to do so. I believe, and I always have believed, that it is a very special privilege to be in this place. I have spent enough time out of every day of my life and have done so for long enough to know and to appreciate how special this place is.

In terms of bills that I will be introducing in this session, there likely will be one as illustrated in the throne speech, in regard to the issue of interest of parliamentarians, ministers and so on. Yes, I do intend to make a statement in the House upon introduction because I believe that is the place where it should be made and I will do that. We are not yet there though. We have not arrived at that stage, but that will be done.

In terms of the consultation with the House leaders of other parties, I met with them about four hours before the House started, and gave them the agenda of the House for the next several days. Also, as something I initiated after I became House leader in 1997, I actually provided a draft agenda of the House for as many as four weeks ahead to the opposition House leaders so that their critics could be prepared to give the appropriate speeches when those things were considered. That had never been done before.

●(1210)

There was a weekly business statement. That is the way it is done in the U.K. house and the way it had been done here from time immemorial. We have innovated. We have done these things out of respect and in consultation with everyone else and it has worked.

I thank even members across, but that is not the same as saying that I have breached the rules of the House nor the modernization report, nor that I have misled the House as has been alleged. I take umbrage to that.

On Monday the Governor General made a speech in the presence of all of us, or at least all of us had the opportunity to be there and listen to it, either directly or otherwise. A copy of the speech was deemed to have been read in the House by yourself, Mr. Speaker, and was printed in the record of the House. Everything I said yesterday was an elaboration of what Her Excellency said in her speech with a view to informing Canadians of what our role is and the agenda of Parliament.

Those are the facts. I would hope that the hon. member, wherever she gets her information, would verify it.

Finally, I am willing to table for the House the speech that I gave yesterday in both official languages.

An hon. member: Did you write it yourself?

Hon. Don Boudria: An hon. member is asking if I wrote it myself; a good part of it, yes.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I respect the hon. government House leader in that he takes umbrage at this, but we take a little umbrage at some of his comments as well and I want to correct the record.

Comparing the public release of this latest leak of government business to our publicly releasing our parliamentary and democratic reform package which we have entitled “Building Trust II” is a big stretch. That particular package of reforms was never designed for release in the House. It is a communication piece with Canadians. We are not government yet.

●(1215)

The Speaker: The Chair certainly has heard the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar and by the government House leader on the principal point of order which was raised concerning the government House leader's address to the National Press Club yesterday.

In the old days before I was elected to this position and was able to hold views on various matters, I used to go to the breakfasts at the National Press Club. I can tell all hon. members, they are very jolly affairs. It is a real opportunity to learn about either what has happened or what is about to happen because there seemed to be one at the end of the session and one at the beginning. They seemed to happen in the spring and the fall to the best of my recollection. When I was Deputy Speaker it was always useful to get information about what was going to happen and I sometimes went. Unfortunately that is not permitted any more.

However I will happily, in this circumstance, review the remarks that the government House leader has brought to the table which he made yesterday, in light of the comments made by the hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar. If I find that there has been some breach of the privileges of the House in something the hon. government House leader said, I will get back to the House.

Routine Proceedings

I must say that in my experience being there, unless something unusual happened yesterday morning, I had not detected breach of privileges of the House in any of the ones I had attended previously, but mind you, I do not think I would have come running back in those days either and said so. I will examine the matter and get back to the House if necessary. We will leave it at that.

of 250 hours a year, the eligibility of a \$1,000 tax reduction on their income tax.

Volunteers make this country what it is today and we, as the government and parliamentarians, need to recognize their effort. A lot of people suffer from burnout and from financial consequences.

The bill would allow a little bit of money to go back into their pockets to continue on the great work that they do for all communities throughout this entire country.

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

* * *

● (1220)

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill 208, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (herbal remedies).

He said: Mr. Speaker, a lot of Canadians are allergic to sulphate-based drugs, which is what approximately 80% of all pharmaceutical drugs are based on. If a licensed physician subscribes a herbal alternative to a patient then that patient should be able to claim that herbal alternative as a tax deduction on his or her medical expenses. That is basically the bill in a nutshell. This would aid and help a lot of people.

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

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill 209, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (expenses incurred by care-givers).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill would entitle, and God forbid that it happens to anyone in this country or in the House, but if an individual becomes disabled tomorrow and the individual has to renovate the interior of the home, such as the kitchen counter tops, the bathroom or widen the hallways, for whatever reasons, the expenses incurred by that individual should be tax deductible.

This would go a long way in aiding and assisting people to stay in their own homes. I think this would have wide approval from the House and people right across Canada.

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

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill 210, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (amateur sport fees).

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 109 I would like to present the government's response to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food report entitled "Registration of Pesticides and the Competitiveness of Canadian Farmers".

* * *

LOWER CHURCHILL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Natural Resources and pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) I am pleased to table, in both official languages, the 2001 annual report of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to five petitions.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the delegation of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association to the third part of the 2002 ordinary session of the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe, held in Strasbourg, France, from June 24 to 28, 2002.

* * *

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill 207, an act to amend the Income tax Act (volunteers).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the essence of what this private member's bill would do is it would allow anyone who volunteers for a registered organization, such as the Lions Clubs, the Kiwanis Club or any other organization, and who has volunteered for a minimum

He said: Mr. Speaker, a lot of families are struggling with not only high taxation but the ability to afford their children the opportunity to play in organized sports.

Organized sports fees are rising. What the bill would do is it would give people who pay to register their children or themselves in a registered amateur sport the ability to claim that as a tax deduction similar to that of a charitable donation. This would put more money back into the hands of families. It would create opportunities for young people throughout the country to actively participate in organized sports and, thus, would lead to a much better and vibrant country.

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

* * *

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill 211, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing this bill for the third time. What the bill would do is that any member of the House who has been voted in as a member from a recognized party, if they decide to cross the floor they should quit their seat, run in a byelection and let the people of their constituency vote for whether or not they should be under a new political banner. That would be democracy and that is the way the House should be run, because this is what Canadians want us to do.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

IRAQ

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from the citizens of the Peterborough area who are opposed to Canada supporting another attack by the United States on Iraq.

The petitioners suggest that such an attack would undoubtedly result in the death of thousands of innocent civilians, and that further bombing of Iraq would leave a legacy of hate, not only against the United States but against its allies. They reject violence in this case and support the lifting of sanctions.

They call upon Parliament to refuse to cooperate in any way in a war against Iraq and to use Canada's diplomatic efforts to convince the United States, Britain and the United Nations to choose the tools of diplomacy.

●(1225)

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present another petition from the citizens of Peterborough who support research into such diseases as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes, cancer, muscular dystrophy and spinal cord injury. They also support ethical stem cell research.

The petitioners point out that non-embryonic stem cells, which are also known as adult stem cells, have shown significant research

Routine Proceedings

progress without the immune rejection or ethical problems associated with embryonic stem cells.

They call upon Parliament to focus its legislative support on adult stem cell research.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a final petition from the citizens of Peterborough who draw the attention of the House to the fact that the creation and use of child pornography is condemned by a majority of Canadians, and that the courts have not applied the current child pornography law in a way which makes it clear that such exploitation of children will be met by swift punishment.

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

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the previous presenter actually went through the entire preamble of my presentation so I will just reiterate the key part.

The petitioners recognize that hundreds of thousands of Canadians are suffering from illnesses and diseases which can be possibly helped through stem cell research. They call on the government to back the research into adult stem cell research, which is actually superior to embryonic research. They urge that this be done because of the moral considerations as well as the fact that it is a proven opportunity for better solutions from the adult cells than from the embryonic ones.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present under Standing Order 36 a petition on behalf of the constituents of Erie—Lincoln.

The petition deals with the issue of child pornography. It acknowledges that the use of child pornography is condemned by the majority of Canadians. It also acknowledges that the courts have applied the child pornography law in a way which makes it clear that such exploitation of children will not always be met with swift punishment.

Therefore 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.

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from about 100 people in the St. John's area who make the point that the creation and use of child pornography is condemned by a clear majority of Canadians but that the courts have not applied the current child pornography law in a way which makes it clear that the exploitation of children will always be met with swift punishment.

Government Orders

Therefore the petitioners are calling 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.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Alan Tonks (York South—Weston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, similar to other petitioners, I have a petition to present on behalf of petitioners in York South—Weston with respect to embryonic stem cell research.

The petitioners are in favour of the research as it implicates on the diseases that have been mentioned, but they are concerned with respect to the ethical implications of embryonic stem cells being used for research, and support the government focusing its legislation on adult stem cells. I have affixed my name to this petition.

WOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions. The first petition is from the great people of Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore praying that the government will ban the use of compounds on pressure treated wood and other wood products.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from well over 100 people again in my riding who want Parliament and all government people to take all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I also rise to file a petition in the House today.

As have many of my colleagues on both sides of the House, I too have a petition signed by a number of residents in Parkdale—High Park asking Parliament to focus its legislative support on adult stem cell research in trying to find cures for the diseases that have been mentioned here today.

* * *

• (1230)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

AGRICULTURE

The Speaker: The Chair has notice of an application for an emergency debate from the right hon. member for Calgary Centre.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, the situation of Canadian farmers is critical. An August report of Statistics Canada stated:

The 2002 crop year will be remembered as one of the worst growing seasons for western Canada. Many producers believe that conditions were the driest ever experienced in the west.

The report shows that wheat production is expected to decline to the lowest level in 28 years.

This past summer the whole country saw nightly news stories about efforts to save cattle herds in areas of severe drought. Canadian farmers in central and eastern Canada responded with the hay west program and, belatedly, the federal government came on board to fund some rail cars for the donations of hay.

That was a minimal response. The federal government knew last spring that another drought was imminent and yet no planning was done to put in place a disaster relief fund to help those farmers.

The situation of Canadian farmers needs to be debated in the House as soon as possible. The throne speech made only the briefest mention of agriculture and nothing was said about the desperate situation of farmers suffering from drought. The program announced earlier in the year is simply not adequate.

We need a full discussion on ways to make government programs more responsive to the perils that face farming today. Agriculture is in a crisis which needs to be fully debated in an emergency debate in the House as soon as possible.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I thank the right hon. member for his contribution and suggestions. I must say that in my view I find the request does meet the terms of the standing order.

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 52(9), I will order the debate be held at the end of government orders on Monday, October 7.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND REINSTATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT BILLS

The House resumed consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am very pleased with the ruling that was handed down by the Chair today with respect to Motion No. 2 before the House, which came before us in an omnibus fashion and which the Speaker in his wisdom has now divided into its relevant parts.

Government Orders

Clearly what it stems from is the arrogant disregard that the government holds for Parliament itself. We know that the House was suspended for a number of weeks at a time when both an international situation and a domestic situation demanded the early recall of Parliament. Iraq, the crisis on our farms, which the Chair again has recognized, the collapse of grain supplies, the government's war on the provinces, all of these issues are more demanding and urgent than the way in which the government has treated them, and the consideration of Parliament is necessary.

Ironically, the government House leader is again using closure to get his way after presenting this motion to the House. How democratic. Having denied the representatives of the Canadian people the right to meet in Parliament as scheduled, the government now wants to strip the House of the right to consider the business under the normal parliamentary rules. What the government has done, essentially, the government House leader in particular, is that it wants to have all of the perceived benefits of prorogation to allow for the vacuous throne speech to occur, but none of the consequences, again typical of the government's arrogance and lack of accountability which have become so common. Very little has changed from the last session of Parliament.

Canadians are now looking at the spectacle of the great hunter from LaSalle—Émard, the former finance minister, travelling the country, distancing himself from his government's own performance and record. Over the summer this very same member went on this long journey of national discovery, listening to Canadians, hearing their concerns, walking among the people and having them line up to touch the hem of his garment, and there were even a few miracles performed along the way. One of those miracles was that the member for LaSalle—Émard discovered the deficit, the democratic deficit that somehow exists, and now he bills himself as the slayer of that deficit, financial and democratic, while we await the discovery of the ethical deficit plaguing his government.

On the quest of the new dragon, the democratic deficit, the trail took this huntsman to a meeting with the Assembly of First Nations where the dragon slayer told the first nations people of Canada that they needed to be consulted more on Bill C-61, that what they wanted was to have the bill not reinstated but reconsidered by Parliament. As a result of the government House leader's move, that is not in fact going to be the case. We believe that the House should be provided with an opportunity to revisit Bill C-61 and that the House should heed the words of the man who would be Prime Minister.

It was interesting to hear the Minister of Transport get so exercised when he felt that the integrity of the ethics counsellor might have been impugned by my reference to him being the corruption approval officer. This is the same ethics counsellor who we know lost signing privileges for inappropriate conduct prior to his appointment as the ethics counsellor.

Given what has taken place here today in the House, the Solicitor General's refusal again to come clean on some very important ethical matters, I now would look forward to those who feel similarly that the democratic deficit is not being conquered but widened as a result of the government. I believe the government needs sufficient time to consider its actions and to reconsider the approach that it has taken to this Parliament. I therefore move:

That this House do now adjourn.

• (1235)

Hon. Don Boudria: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the member could tell us if he needs time off to go and give one of his leadership speeches and that is why—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): That is not a point of order.

The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Call in the members.

• (1305)

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

(Division No. 2)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Benoit
Bigras	Blaikie
Brien	Burton
Clark	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	Desrochers
Doyle	Elley
Epp	Fitzpatrick
Forsyth	Gallant
Goldring	Gouk
Grey	Guay
Harper	Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hill (Macleod)
Hinton	Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)	Laframboise
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mayfield
Ménard	Meredith
Merrifield	Moore
Penson	Proctor
Rajotte	Reid (Lanark—Carleton)
Ritz	Skelton
Sorenson	Spencer
Stinson	Stoffer
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Tremblay— 46

NAYS

Members

Allard	Assad
Augustine	Bélanger
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Boudria

Government Orders

Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Carroll
Castonguay	Catterall
Easter	Eggleton
Farah	Folco
Godfrey	Goodale
Jennings	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Laliberte
Longfield	MacAulay
Macklin	Malhi
Maloney	Marcil
Matthews	McCallum
McLellan	Mitchell
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Reilly
Owen	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Pratt
Proulx	Redman
Robillard	Saada
Shepherd	St-Julien
Tirabassi	Tonks
Vancielief — 51	

PAIRED

Nil

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): I declare the motion lost.

• (1310)

Mr. Peter Stoffer: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is clear in this House that the rules state when a vote is taken all members of the House must be in their seats at that time. Even though we lost the vote on this one the precedent can be dangerously set, Madam Speaker, if you allow the member for Peterborough's vote to stand. He was not in his seat. He does not deserve the right to vote on this particular aspect.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): On a point of order, the hon. Minister of Industry.

Hon. David Collette: Minister of Transport, Madam Speaker. I mean, do I have hair, Madam Speaker? Am I running for the leadership?

• (1315)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Everybody is running for leader these days.

Hon. David Collette: Congratulations, Madam Speaker, I will see you on the court. I have noticed, contrary to the days of yore, that this particular rule is being applied somewhat laxly and therefore I thought that one could come into the seat as long as one's side was not starting to vote, but I have consulted with my colleague, the government House leader, who deems that my vote was inappropriate. I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. Peter Adams: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you are on the wrong track with the Minister of Transport. I do not know what the Standing Orders say about excuses, and it is not easy for me to explain with you in the chair where I was, but I was in a small room off the foyer and could not in fact get here in time. I withdraw my vote.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): We appreciate that the Minister of Transport in his honesty did say that he was not in his chair while voting. The rule does apply. Members have to be in their chairs when the vote is actually called, from the beginning. Accordingly, the vote is yeas 46, nays 51. I declare the motion defeated.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I have a real problem with this place today because of the fact that

Parliament has become so irrelevant when we look at the number of members present for the vote and the fact that the government is trying to jam through legislation and introduce bills that Canadians do not want. The government is making announcements outside the House. It never uses ministers' statements.

It is really very unfortunate that the House is behaving in this way. We need to make very sure that the House works on behalf of Canadians. We need to be here to debate the issues, to make thoughtful decisions and to vote the wishes of our constituents to make sure that Canadians have the best possible rules and laws. I really deplore the fact that Parliament has become so irrelevant that members here actually believe that we might as well just adjourn and go away. It is really sad that this has happened and the blame for that lies entirely on the side of the government. Two weeks into September, the Prime Minister said he did not think he wanted the inconvenience of Parliament, or else it had just become an annoyance to him, so it was postponed for two weeks.

There is a whole bunch of issues we should be dealing with. We think of the farm crisis. We think of the falling dollar. We think of the crisis with our families and children. We think of child pornography. Why can we not be seized with that matter and solve the problem?

Instead, the Prime Minister just said that the government would wait two weeks and come up with a throne speech. The throne speech of course was the most limp throne speech ever, just a regurgitation of a whole bunch of things which were either previously promised and not kept or which are just not high on the people's agenda.

It is very unfortunate that Parliament has degenerated to this level. I am very sorry that we cannot function as a real genuine board of directors for the company called Canada and do so in dignity, in great respect and with great honour. I will simply close my speech by saying that I deplore what this Liberal government is doing to the reputation of Parliament.

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I just want to say that much as I respect the member opposite for his kind contributions to this place, I think that when we constantly put it down and constantly deride this place for partisan reasons, and his speech was very partisan, we do a disservice not only to this place but to all Canadians and to this country.

In fact we on this side feel just as passionately about Parliament and the need to debate issues, and we do debate issues. I wish that the member opposite would find another way to score a political point.

• (1320)

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, I respect the hon. member opposite as well. I appreciate his expression of his respect for me. However the fact of the matter is that this place has become totally non-functional.

Government Orders

Whenever we want to address a problem and solve it, we are totally stymied, whether it is in committee or whether it is in the House. I know that it tends to feed the lowering of the respect for this place in the public. However if it is the truth, we need to correct it in this place and then ensure that the people of Canada know it has been corrected.

Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario), Lib.): Madam Speaker, in a similar vein, as with my colleague, I too respect the member. He spends a lot of time working very hard in the House and as a parliamentarian, and I respect that. However there is an inconsistency here.

He talked about a number of very important issues, and I share with him that they are important issues. However, if we go back and look at the transcript of question period today, we would see that the Alliance did not ask many questions on what he himself identifies as important issues. We have had a debate on the Speech from the Throne and there have been many opportunities to bring forward these issues.

As I said, I respect the member, but the inconsistency is this. I believe he just got up a couple of minutes ago to vote for adjournment rather than to have the House continue to debate the issues. Therefore, it is tough to say on the one hand that he wants Parliament to work and that he wants us to deal with those issues, then on the other hand, a few minutes ago, stand in his place and vote to stop this place from operating before the time it is due to adjourn. Could explain that inconsistency?

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, it is a very good question and I appreciate that. Why did I vote in favour of the adjournment of the House? Because of the fact that we somehow have to club the government on the head in order for it to understand what is going on.

Does the government and that member think that a minister of the Crown giving untendered, sole source contracts to his friends, his official agent, is irrelevant? Is he suggesting that we should go to the Canadian people and tell them that now has become the norm and that is what the government is defending. Is he saying that we should leave it, that it is fine and that we should go on and talk about other things? If that is what the government members are willing to defend, no wonder Canadians are not showing up at the polls to vote. No wonder people are losing faith in the Canadian government. It is time that we fix that.

I would love to be on that side of the House. I would love to be a minister. I am looking forward to the time when I can write a memorandum to every member in the department of which I am a minister and say that if there is any political interference with the process of procurement, they will not only be permitted to but will be obliged to make that public, to expose it and to stop it because it is totally wrong and it is shameful.

Yet the government says we should let it be and that we should talk about something else. Then it comes in and invokes closure as soon as the new parliamentary session begins.

I am afraid I cannot apologize. I do not think that us voting in favour of adjournment of the House on a Friday afternoon when it is irrelevant is much different from the Prime Minister saying, "Let's

shut down Parliament for two weeks while I continue my golf game".

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have listened to the member for Elk Island debate in the House many times. I think he is present for many of the debates and he takes an interest in all of the matters that are before the House.

I rarely agree with the member for Elk Island but in these circumstances today, he has made some very interesting observations. He has laid out very well that as an opposition member, whether it is himself or myself or other members of the opposition, we operate in this place with incredibly restrictive rules that are generally laid down by the government. We look for every opportunity to move and stretch those rules to bring some sort of balance into the House to ensure that the opposition is heard.

Therefore, I entirely agree with the comments the member has made and I am frankly very surprised that the government members would be so concerned about a member voting to adjourn and then voting another way. Surely they must have some political smarts about these things and understand what the role of an opposition is. We are doing our job.

In the business that is before the House today we will use every opportunity and every procedure that we can to ensure that there is a little balance that is brought to the debate in the House. That is a very fair point. I congratulate the member for Elk Island, which I have never done before and I do not think I will ever do again.

Would he care to illuminate on some of his concerns about the motion? I would be most interested to hear further what he has to say, which is a surprise to me because I have never been interested in what he has said before. I am suddenly extremely interested in what he has to say.

• (1325)

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, it is like salt and pepper. There were insults and compliments mixed tightly together. I regret that she has never been able to agree with me before but I suppose I will keep on talking and she will eventually come to her senses. There, I have had my shot in.

However, it is really important. I remember in the previous Parliament when we had that very long vote on the Nisga'a agreement. Some people thought that was acting foolishly. The House leader for the government is applauding this.

Why did we do that? This was an issue of such great importance to people in British Columbia and to people right across the country. We said to the government it could not just jam it through. What did it do? It invoked closure right off the bat.

An hon. member: Just like today.

Mr. Ken Epp: Just like today.

Government Orders

The government said that it would not discuss Nisga'a or debate it. It was going to jam it through. We said that it was so important that in one way or another we were going to spend a week on it. We asked the government to allow us to debate it according to the House rules, so we could express ourselves and so Canadians could express themselves. The government said no, that it would not do it. Then it turned around and said our using the week for voting was foolish. I contend that its use of forcing us to use that tactic instead of using it for debates in the House was where the foolishness was, and that is what we need to correct.

Mr. John Bryden: Madam Speaker, that is more like it. It is all about the opposition attacking the government. The reason for my original intervention was the member for Elk Island was attacking Parliament. I realize, when I hear the debate that has ensued, that he really meant to be attacking the government. We have to, as parliamentarians, protect this institution because we are extremely fortunate as Canadians to have a place where we can engage in this type of debate and rhetorical conflict.

If I may say so, what gave me great joy was not just that the opposition members were attacking the government but that they were attacking one another. That is Parliament at its superb best.

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, the member is absolutely correct. We are here to make Parliament work. That member should now take his own instruction and henceforth, instead of voting according to the command, vote according to the wishes of his constituents.

• (1330)

Mr. John O'Reilly (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I also want to compliment the member for Elk Island. I found him to be at first attacking the points that attack this institution. I do not mind if he attacks the government. It is his job.

This is not new. As the member for Elk Island knows, I do not use notes very often, but in 1999 the opposition agreed to a similar motion to proceed without debate to a vote at the start of the session. The House has been doing this on an informal basis for over 30 years and is quite prepared to continue with that. For some reason the opposition is now saying that it does not want to go along with that and that it will force the government to use closure.

This is maybe the second time since I have been in Parliament that closure has actually been used. There has been a number of instances of time allocation. Time allocation is brought in by the British House with every bill. We are more British than the British. We do not use time allocation all the time. However there are times when the opposition wants to oppose a bill strenuously for some reason or other and that is not a bad idea. It would then allow us to overcome that with the motion of time allocation.

The difference this time is closure. I was hoping that the government would never use closure. Quite frankly, it is against my nature to think that we would have to use closure.

However the identical procedure that we introduced for reinstatement of private members' bills the House agreed in the last Parliament to enshrine it in the Standing Orders. Yet the opposition has voted against allowing the private members' bills to be reinstated. I find that to be contrary to what I would think was fair.

When we look at the bills that we will reinstate, there are a number of them which have gone through various stages. Let us look at the species at risk act, for instance. It has been debated for 15 years probably, over and over again. Finally we get to a point where the species at risk act can be brought back in at final stage then sent back to the Senate, but the opposition is against that.

The opposition is opposing the Criminal Code, regarding cruelty to animals and so forth. We have the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, the Copyright Act, the Pest Control Products Act, the physical activity and sport act, which the member for Elk Island and I both need, the assisted human reproduction act, which we do not need, the specific claims act and the first nations governance act.

Miss Deborah Grey: Lord knows what we need.

Mr. John O'Reilly: Who knows? I know it is Friday. I can get away with a lot on Friday.

I will pass on the comments being made by my good friends on the other side because it may lead me into something that I would have to explain later.

When we reached prorogation in 1970, 1972, 1974 and 1986, the House adopted amendments to the Standing Orders to carry over legislation to the next session in 1977 and 1982. The House adopted reinstatement motions on division in 1991, 1996 and 1999. The 1996 motion included provision to reinstate private members' bills. I am concerned that private members' bills are being pushed off to the side when sometimes it is the only way private members on either side of the House can actually send a message to the government as to what concerns them and the people of their riding.

In 1997 a private member's bill was reinstated after dissolution. Standing Order 86.1 allows private members' bills to be reinstated. That order was adopted in 1999.

If we look at previous legislation in 1996 and 2000, Bill C-5 was introduced on February 2, 2001. At second reading, it had six hours of debate over five days then it was referred to the committee. Are we to bring that back and start all over again?

As much as I think closure should not be necessary, in this particular case I agree with it because I want these bills brought back.

• (1335)

I want all the work that has been done by committees, by members of the House, and the people that have come in as witnesses to be worthwhile. Are we to waste all their time and start all over again?

We have to consider that the environment committee held 42 meetings on Bill C-5, totalling over 90 hours. The committee heard from over 100 witnesses. Are we going to throw that out? Is that fair to over 100 witnesses? That is we are bringing it back.

Government Orders

Why would we spend 12 days of debate at report stage and third reading, and 50 hours of debate? Why would we throw that away as members of Parliament? What would be the advantage of taking all that valuable work done by members, committees, and all those witnesses brought in at great expense, and not bringing the bill back? Most of the witnesses were very sincere and wanted to have their evidence as part of the legislation that would be passed by the House.

The total time that was spent on Bill C-5 was 17 days of debate, 42 committee meetings, and 146 hours of debate in committee and the House. That amount of time cannot be thrown away.

I have great respect for the traditions of the House. I have worked as hard as anyone with my colleagues to improve the general pay scales, the insurance policies and all the things that affect members of Parliament. I have been fairly successful doing that and I feel good about it. I never made the headlines doing it which is even better. Every member of Parliament is benefiting from that hard work.

Members try to modernize Parliament and the way we act as members of Parliament. I accept that there are some things that I will never be able to change. I accept the fact that there are certain things that are out of my league or my prerogative. I recognize that. I have had a lot of help from opposition members. I have met with almost all opposition members one on one to ask them what improvements could be made to the House and the way we are treated as members of Parliament.

Most opposition members think the only way change can be made is if they become the government. That is never going to happen. We must deal with the people that are the government and try to make improvements. Forcing the government to introduce closure is not the way to go.

We should be meeting. Why has not one member of the opposition been brought forward as a committee member? There is no list from the opposition. It does not want the committees to meet. Why is that? Is there a reason why the opposition does not want committees to meet? I find this very difficult.

We are ready to begin. Our committee members are all in place. We would like to begin and then the opposition says no, it wants a secret ballot or something. How undemocratic that is for other members. The opposition wants to control the government, but it is not the government.

How do we best operate for the people of Canada? How do we give the people of Canada the best economy for their money? It is done by passing the legislation that the government was elected to pass.

I look at the traditions of the House and they should be followed. The traditions should be discussed and we should reaffirm our own personal respect for honoured traditions. Those traditions are shared by the government and the party with which I am a privileged member.

Respect for Parliament and its traditions has been demonstrated again and again over the last couple of years as the government has spearheaded a number of changes to the practices of the House in a

methodical and carefully thought out manner yet mindful of and respecting past parliamentary privileges and practices.

• (1340)

This being the case, it should come as no surprise that the provisions contained in the motion also reflect and respect the best practices, the past practices and the traditions of the House. To illustrate this, let us look at the motion and how it corresponds to our past practices.

Under the motion, any minister who introduces a bill during the first 30 sitting days of a new session of Parliament in exactly the same form as a bill in the previous session, and which has been at least referred to a committee, would be able to request that the new bill be reinstated at the stage to which it had progressed at the time of prorogation. Does that not make perfect sense?

Should the Speaker be satisfied that the bill is in fact the same as the previous one, he or she could then order it reinstated at that stage. As members will no doubt recognize, this indeed is in accordance with the past practice of the House. All we are doing is carrying on the tried and true traditions of the House as has been carried out since Confederation.

In October 1999, when the second session of the 36th Parliament began, the House adopted a similar motion as the one before us today. In March 1996, when the second session of the 35th Parliament began, the House also adopted a similar motion. Previous Parliaments have adopted similar motions including one that passed under a previous government in 1991. Members all know who that was.

A number of other precedents exist for this motion as well. For example, page 330 of Marleau and Montpetit cites a number of precedents for the reinstatement of bills following a prorogation. In 1970, 1972, 1974, and 1986 the House gave unanimous consent to motions to reinstate bills. In 1977 and 1982 the House adopted amendments to the Standing Orders to carry over legislation to the next session.

Such a long string of precedents testifies to the long-standing practice in the House of allowing the reinstatement of bills at the same stage as the motion proposes. The procedure contained in the motion is almost identical to the Standing Orders for private members' bills. It leads us to the conclusion to reinstate private members' bills at the same stage. It must also be reasonable to follow the same procedure in the case of government bills.

Members should take note that the UK Parliament, from which our own parliamentary traditions flow, is considering amending its rules to allow government bills to carry-over from one session to the next.

What we are suggesting in the motion is not some piece of wild-eyed radicalism. It does not represent a revolutionary break with the past. Rather it is very much within our own parliamentary tradition and that of the mother of parliaments in the UK.

Government Orders

The motion is not just a good idea because it is based upon precedents, rather it represents a proposal which is logical and can stand on its own merits. It is clear that many of the bills which would be reinstated following passage of the motion are worthy of our most serious attention and worthy of being passed into law.

The passage of bills takes time. As a parliamentarian, one of the things that probably bothers me the most is the amount of time it takes to pass something. I know we must give it a lot of consideration and that we have to work on it very hard, but the government presents many bills during a session of Parliament and not all of these are tabled early in the session. Bills take a long time, a lot of thought, a lot of consultation, and a lot of development. Some are tabled very late and leave us with a rush at the end. We should not allow bills to die because of the timing of when they are introduced. We should look at what makes sense as parliamentarians.

Closure is being brought in so that the motion can be dealt with, so that we can allow many important bills and committee work to continue at the same stage of consideration at prorogation.

I spoke earlier of the hours and hours that committees put in. We all sit on committees and we all spend a lot of valuable time. I do not want my time to be wasted. I have spent a lot of time on committees and I have listened to a lot of witnesses. I would like to carry on with any legislation that is before that committee at the stage it was at just before prorogation.

• (1345)

For this reason, and many more I will be supporting the motion and I will be supporting the closure motion. I feel that it is our parliamentary duty to not waste a lot of time and money, and to get on with the business of the House, not talking about adjournment but talking about the business that we must do here.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I need to respond to what this member said.

He said we ought not to ignore the work of committees. The House was in session and committees were struck. They were in place. There was as much need for this prorogation as there was for the election in the fall of 2000. It was redundant. Yet the government has called these things.

The member said he did a lot of work in committee and he did not want it to be lost. I recommend to him that if he does not want his work in committee to be lost, then he ought to listen to what the witnesses said. The committee heard witnesses who strongly urged amendments to Bill C-5, which we support and which ought to be done for the good of Canada. If he does not want to waste his time in committee, then let him listen to the witnesses, support the amendments that would correct and improve the bill, and then his time would not be wasted.

Instead, we hear the witnesses saying one thing and the government agenda coming in with something else. The government whips the vote in committee and forces everything through. It comes back to the House and we land up here in debate. We try to amend the legislation but those amendments are turned down. In the end we simply say that it is indeed a waste of time.

What we need to do in this particular place is to work hard in committees, we need to listen to the witnesses, and we need to ensure that our amendments reflect what the witnesses are telling us. The best example that I have is when I was on the finance committee. We had every witness, without exception, unanimously say that the security tax of \$24 per round trip would kill small airports and small air service providers. Every witness who came to the committee said that. Yet what did the government do? It did it anyway. That is what I call a waste of committee time.

Mr. John O'Reilly: Madam Speaker, I would hate to miss answering the member's question although it was framed more as a statement. The fact is the government introduced prorogation and in doing that asked to follow that with a throne speech which is normal.

The opposition members had indicated earlier that we had run out of ideas, I think is what they said, that we were not functioning, that we were just putting in time. That is what the opposition was saying. When we prorogue, what follows is a Speech from the Throne. It is a way to not dissolve Parliament. It is a method that allows things to continue and yet reintroduce the Speech from the Throne.

The Speech from the Throne is a blueprint. The blueprint is laid out in the throne speech and it is debated in the House. Then new legislation is introduced that flows from the blueprint in the throne speech. Ministers are obligated now to bring forward legislation that lays out a new plan if there is a certain redirection of the government.

That is not a bad thing. I think it is a good thing. It is a rejuvenation. However I do not feel that we can as a government allow all the work that was done previous to prorogation to be wasted. That is exactly what happens if the bills are not allowed to be reintroduced at the stage they were at. We do value the witnesses and our colleagues and the work they have put into the committees, the hearing of witnesses and the travelling that was involved. If the member does not believe in that, then I cannot help that but I do believe that it was valuable work and it should continue and the bills should be brought back at the stage they were at prior to prorogation.

That has been done over and over again. It is not new. It is not something that members should be unfamiliar with. They have already been through it, unless they were not here before the last election and previous to that when I would understand that, but the hon. member was here.

I think the member is drawing at straws. He would just try to attack the government, which is fine, but the institution that is here and the rules that we follow are there for a purpose. They are there to allow for the orderly procedure of this Parliament to proceed. The only way the opposition can change that is to elect enough members to become a majority. That is the tradition of the House since it was instituted. If the member has no hope of doing that, then I obviously understand his frustrations.

I have a great obligation as a member of the government to make sure that I hold the government's feet to the fire, that I work at trying to make sure that government introduces legislation. The member for Malpeque agrees with me. He also is a bit of a rebel in here sometimes. We will continue to do that as members of the government. We will try to work as hard as we can for the taxpayers of Canada and to make sure that the traditions of the House are followed.

•(1350)

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened to the member for Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, particularly with respect to committees. He talked about the laws being there for a purpose but having been around here for a few years now myself, would he not agree that we should and could be doing much better when it comes to committees?

I appreciate the point that he was making about the length of time it takes for a bill to get through, however, if the committees had more independence from the government, from the executive of cabinet, would it not be more beneficial for legislation and for the feeling that we are here for a purpose and with the ability to do something more than to be a talk shop or to have busy work going on in committees?

As a member of the agriculture committee, I have had a fairly good attendance record at committee meetings, and I appreciate that there are good witnesses that come before us on a fairly regular basis and we hear from them. I am sure other committees operate in the same fashion. The point is that we could be a lot more effective if those committees were given additional powers.

We talk about the democratic deficit. Surely that is an area that is in need of major change. I would like to get the member's comments on that.

Mr. John O'Reilly: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the member for Palliser but I differ with him. I think about the clerks of the committees, the table officers, the people who put together the witness lists, the people who do all the work in the background and who bring together witnesses who are relevant to the business at hand.

Some witnesses give extremely good evidence. We as parliamentarians have to sort out whether a witness is a lobbyist, whether a witness will benefit from giving evidence, or whether it is a company the witness works for or someone the witness is lobbying for. Our job is to make sure that witnesses have credible credentials and have all the necessary tools at their disposal to make their presentations and to be examined.

In my short stint as chair of the subcommittee on HIV-AIDS studying poverty and discrimination, we had expert witnesses from the health field, from caregivers, from families that have been affected and from individuals who have been affected. I felt that the evidence given at that committee was from the heart, and I believe the government acted on that evidence.

I am now a member of the defence committee but I do not believe, as parliamentary secretary, that I should be on that committee. I think parliamentary secretaries should be there to help steer through certain legislation, or to give expertise, or to work hand in hand with the minister who is trying to put legislation through, but I do not think they should be influencing what committee members know or do not know.

I do agree with my hon. colleague on some points. I think of the defence committee, which travelled across Canada and to other parts of the world when we were working on the quality of life report. That committee brought in 89 recommendations. The former minister of defence had the backbone to initiate that quality of life report and make it work. Some 39 or 40 changes I think were

Government Orders

relevant. The changes were brought in because the committee listened to the witnesses who had expertise, the people who were in the military. They gave us reasons to make those changes. The member for Lakeland came on that committee a bit later but he also agreed that the quality of life report—

•(1355)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Resuming debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to take part today in this debate on Government Motion No. 2. I must also express my opinion and indicate our intentions with regard to the motion brought forward by the Canadian Alliance member for Macleod. That motion would exclude from the process two bills, namely Bill C-15B on animal cruelty and Bill C-5 on species at risk.

First, I will talk about the purpose of Motion No. 2. For those who are listening to us, this motion is being brought forward so that bills that had been considered or adopted at various stages in the previous session may be deemed to have been considered or adopted at these same stages in this session. This means that we will resume consideration of bills at the stage where we left them, whether in committee or in the Senate, at the time of prorogation.

We have nothing against the process but I feel obliged to take part in the debate because I feel there is something rather paradoxical here. Taking just one example, the environment, for which I am my party's critic, there are three bills. There is the endangered species bill, the environmental assessment bill and, most particularly, the pesticides bill. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health is responsible for the latter, which did not get through all the stages of the legislative process. Now the government is announcing its intention to introduce another. Also, it intends to introduce, again, legislation relating to the Endangered Species Act. And it intends to introduce, again, a bill on environmental assessment.

The throne speech is somewhat of a paradox. Today they are telling us that they intend to reintroduce legislation that was introduced two years ago, or more recently than that.

So one may well wonder: why have a throne speech? Why such a hollow throne speech that does nothing but rehash old legislation? This Parliament is engaged in a pure waste of time.

I have just been listening to criticism from the other side of the floor, about some MPs wanting to waste money as well as members' time. Is it not making us waste time to announce legislative measures, bills and legislation already with the Senate? That too is a waste of time.

We agree in principle with having bills that have already been examined picked up where they left off, but with the exception of certain bills, such as Bill C-5 on endangered species, in connection with which the official opposition presented an amendment.

Government Orders

There are three reasons why we are opposed to this bill being reinstated at the stage it had reached. First of all, it is flagrant interference in areas that are under Quebec's jurisdiction. There is no greater interference as far as the environment is concerned than this bill, C-5. I would remind hon. members that Quebec had its own endangered species legislation as far back as 1992. This government came along with a bill indicating that it was creating new positions of authority over endangered species.

● (1400)

We were presented with this bill that they tried to ram through, a bill that shunted aside Quebec's legislation respecting endangered species, Quebec's legislation respecting the conservation of wildlife, and Quebec's fishing regulations, to introduce the federal legislation on species at risk and give it overriding powers.

I do not object to the species at risk bill. I think that we do need such legislation. Canada must have such legislation. In fact, this government should even be criticized for the amount of time it has taken to pass such legislation.

However, could this bill not have been limited to areas of federal jurisdiction, namely Crown lands and areas involving migratory birds? If that had been the case, we would have supported it. This bill interferes with and duplicates what is being done in Quebec. We are entitled to want to re-examine the situation and we will use every means available in the House to block this legislation, which would interfere in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

In the last ten years, since 1991, Quebec has developed expertise that is envied throughout Canada. Quebec was the first province to pass legislation on endangered species in Canada. And today, the federal government is introducing a comparable bill that might override Quebec legislation.

We are willing to re-examine this bill if need be to stall for time. We are prepared to improve Quebec's legislation, of course, but we will never accept a federal government that acts as a political watchdog, when Quebec has democratically expressed itself by passing an act respecting endangered species at the National Assembly. This legislation was supported by members opposite. I remind the House that the member for Lac-Saint-Louis, who is on the other side of the House today, had this legislation passed in Quebec in 1991. He was Quebec's minister of the environment at the time when it was passed.

Today the Liberal members from Quebec are prepared to have a federal statute that will override legislation they themselves supported. This is nonsense. If Quebecers and Canadians are to be able to trust the political system, politicians must be consistent. With respect to endangered species, this government, and in particular the members from Quebec, especially those who were members of the Bourassa government and who sponsored Quebec's endangered species legislation, have shown a flagrant lack of consistency.

There is a second reason why my colleagues and I will be supporting the Canadian Alliance amendment. Inevitably, both sides of the House will be engaging in an important debate on the endangered species legislation. I need hardly remind anyone that the Liberal caucus was divided on this issue, that they had more

discussions about the endangered species legislation than we had in this Parliament. Some Liberal members did not accept the legislative measures of this government and of the Minister of the Environment.

There were negotiations within the Liberal caucus. This is a good reason why the Liberal members should support the Canadian Alliance motion—precisely so that the issue can be re-examined. Bill C-5 is no more acceptable to members on this side of the House than it is to certain members of the Liberal caucus, who lobbied all the way up to the Prime Minister's Office to have the endangered species bill scrapped.

On the contrary, these Liberal members should make sure that we take another look at this legislation, so that their legitimate wishes can be included in the new endangered species legislation that we would have an opportunity to look at together. But instead, these members have refused. Suddenly, they are completely in favour of the fait accompli. They have a golden opportunity to re-examine this bill and to have their legitimate wishes heard in committee and in the House, but they are passing it up. They still have time to reflect on this issue. They have time, because we are at debate stage and there will be a vote next week on the Canadian Alliance motion. I would like them to listen to what I am saying.

● (1405)

They have a golden opportunity to ensure that what they asked for, and will not be in the bill, can finally be included in the act.

The third reason why I will support the Canadian Alliance motion is that, as everyone knows, the issue of compensation remains totally vague in the bill. We do not know where we are headed, what financial compensation will be given to farmers, what impact the clauses will have on compensation, because all this will be covered by the regulations, which have yet to see the light of day. The government did not follow up on the findings of the Pearce commission and now it wants to ram the bill on Canada's endangered species through Parliament. This makes no sense.

The fundamental and critical aspect debated by members in this House is the issue of compensation to landowners. We had major debates that ended with this side of the House not getting real answers, because the government could not provide answers. The clauses of Bill C-5 were just too vague.

Today, we have another opportunity, thanks to the Canadian Alliance motion, to get some clarification on the bill. Who knows? Perhaps public officials worked on this issue during the summer. Perhaps we can get some clarification on the clauses dealing with compensation, and perhaps this clarification could not only be provided in the regulations but also in the clauses of the bill. So, this is the positive aspect of the motion before us today.

Therefore, there are three reasons that lead me to support the Canadian Alliance motion. There is, inevitably, the fact that Bill C-5 is a complete intrusion in provincial jurisdictions. Also, following the debate that took place within the Liberal caucus, this is an opportunity provided by the Canadian Alliance to the Liberal Party of Canada to amend the endangered species legislation, something the caucus of that party wanted.

Government Orders

But now, that same caucus is refusing to have this debate again. This speaks volumes about the ability of the members of the Liberal caucus to represent those who voted for them. Why do we have to re-examine Bill C-5? It is because the issue of compensation is not clear. Perhaps we will finally get some answers to our questions.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague, the hon. member for Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, talk about Bill C-5, with respect to this motion before us and to the related amendment.

Throughout his comments, he referred to the part of Bill C-5, the bill on species at risk, dealing with compensation. I believe that it is important that he tell us more about it and elaborate on this topic.

I would like him to elaborate and explain what Bill C-5 involves when it comes to compensation to educate the members of this House, particularly the members opposite, to whom he referred in his speech. I think this is a good opportunity because he is very knowledgeable and we could learn more about the stakes involved in this issue.

Once again, could he repeat why he supports the proposal made by the Canadian Alliance that we are presently debating?

• (1410)

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Madam Speaker, my colleague raises an important point.

I am a member from Montreal, and I have not had repeated requests from my constituents about the impact that the Species at Risk bill could have in certain ridings on real estate. I am sure that the government members have gotten many calls on the financial impact that the Species at Risk Act could have, both from outfitters and from farmers.

Madam Speaker, like you, I represent a riding in Montreal; you likely have not received many calls about this either. However, the members opposite no doubt have. We have been told that citizens are prepared to protect the species found on their land, but this comes at a price. Quite often, farmers and landowners must bear a significant portion of the cost of implementing the Species at Risk Act. They believe, and I think that their request is legitimate, that there should be some type of financial compensation and they want this to be clarified in the Species at Risk Act. However, the government has refused to respond.

The matter was addressed, and government reports were produced. I am thinking of such documents as the Pearse report, which proposed a form of compensation that was fair for some but not in the least fair for others. As a protector of the taxpayers' financial interests, the government ought to have been made to reach a decision, but it has always refused to do so.

The Liberal members on the other side have been one of the major lobbies in this Parliament. They have put considerable pressure on the government, threatening even to bring it down if certain amendments presented by the Minister of the Environment himself were not passed by the House.

Today, the Alliance is proposing to reopen the debate, and some members have a unique opportunity to make their ideas known. I

seem to see some of them looking at me as if to say that I am right and that they refuse to support this process.

When it comes down to it, our fellow citizens, the property owners and the members of Parliament who represent the regions of Canada would very much like to see the Liberal members over there revisit this issue in order to give the government a chance. Who is to say that, over the summer, some public servants have not found a solution that is fair and balanced and what the public wants? Perhaps they have. The government would therefore have a golden opportunity to again introduce clarifications on compensation.

I believe this approach is democratic, legitimate and respectful of the wishes of our fellow citizens. The Liberals ought to commit to supporting and adopting this motion, which has really but the one objective, which is to ensure that we are, as elected representatives, attuned to the needs of our fellow citizens.

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Madam Speaker, first, I want to congratulate you on your appointment and I wish you an excellent session.

As regards Bill C-5, I was the Bloc Québécois critic on the environment for several years, and already back then the endangered species legislation was controversial. We could not support the bill, because we felt that it had not been drafted properly. There were huge complications regarding the implementation of the act. Already back then, we felt that, from a legal point of view, there would be constant disputes between Quebec, which has its own act to protect endangered species, and the federal government.

I remember that we asked that Quebec be allowed to opt out of this act, because it already had an act to protect its endangered species, but the federal government refused.

As we know, when bills are drafted, they are not always perfect. We currently have two bills that are very flawed—as was pointed out by the Canadian Alliance, and we agree with it on that—and this would give us an opportunity to re-examine them, to reorganize them and perhaps to even rewrite them.

Let us take a look at Bill C-15B dealing with animal protection. This bill was originally Bill C-15, but it had to be split in two, because it had become a catch-all bill that included all sorts of provisions, and it just did not work. So, the government split it in two. However, at the time, the government did not take into account the fact that the act might no longer work, like that. This is an opportunity for us to go back to the drawing board. These two bills are among the most complex ones currently before the House.

We have an opportunity to re-examine them and I would ask the hon. member to elaborate on Bill C-15.

• (1415)

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Madam Speaker, my colleague is giving me a fourth reason—I was listening to her comments and her speech—to review Bill C-15. Indeed, there is still the threat of legal action in response to Bill C-15.

Some believe that it is unconstitutional and that it violates provincial jurisdiction.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Government Orders

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Madam Speaker, from what I can hear from the member opposite—I do not know if starting the debate on Bill C-15 over again within the Liberal caucus is causing a reaction or not—it is an excellent idea. That is what this motion provides us with, an opportunity for the members opposite to have their say as we re-examine Bill C-15.

It must be acknowledged that the members opposite have not had much say in the last few years. However, with respect to Bill C-15, they did have something to say, and they put pressure on the Minister of the Environment. Eventually, they got fed up with taking calls in their offices, and realized that the bill went against what people wanted.

So this is an opportunity for these members to engage not only their caucus, but also the House of Commons in debate, so that the farmers and landowners, whom they are here to represent, can end up receiving fair and balanced financial compensation.

Today, Liberal members are really toeing the party line and refusing to enter into a debate on a matter that affects taxpayers. I listened to them during the debates on the Speech from the Throne. It sounded like they were reading from scripts handed out to them by the Privy Council, as though one by one they were simply repeating what certain people had recommended they say. We must be critical in this House. The Liberal members must be consistent with stands they have taken in the past and vote in favour of the Canadian Alliance amendment so that we can have a real debate, one which will meet the needs of Canadians.

[*English*]

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I too wish to congratulate you on your appointment. It is very nice to see you back in the Chair. I am pleased to participate in the debate today, which seems to have struck quite a chord among members from all sides of the House.

I have been listening to the debate and it struck me that some of the opposition members were challenging the government side as to why it was necessary to have the House prorogue. We were informed, from the government's position, that it wanted to come forward with a new throne speech, new ideas and a new direction. That is what it believes that it did in the throne speech.

However I guess it sort of begs the question: If that is the case, if one believes that, then if there is a significant new direction that has come forward why is it that all this business has to continue?

One would think that as a result of a new throne speech there would be an opportunity to look at some of the issues that had been before the House that the government is now trying to reinstate. It is pertinent and legitimate to debate where these pieces of legislation or other House business fall in light of the fact that the government chose to prorogue the House and chose to come back with a throne speech.

From the point of view of the NDP caucus we have significant concerns with some of the legislation that is now contained in one of these motions. One in particular that I could bring forward implies a new direction being put forward in the throne speech, however one would have to question why the legislation was coming forward,

why it was being continued and recycled? I am referring of course to the first nations governance legislation.

• (1420)

Our aboriginal affairs critic, who has worked closely with first nations organizations and who has done an enormous amount of consultation and received feedback from people, has heard repeatedly from every part of the country including first nations communities, that people are extremely concerned about what the long-term impact and consequences of this legislation would be.

When we look at the throne speech, we hear the Prime Minister say that he has a strong interest in the plight, and the social and economic conditions of aboriginal people in this country. In response, we would say that one really has to question why after 10 years of Liberal government we still face a political, social and economic environment, where aboriginal people are living in appalling conditions. Will the legislation that the government is now bringing forward again be the legislation that will address the pressing and desperate concerns that exist in those communities?

The first indication of that would be from the first nations communities themselves. When the legislation was first introduced before the end of the last session, they sent a strong message to government members, indeed to all of us, that the legislation was something that they did not see as moving these communities forward, as being inclusive, as being a way to address the fundamental concerns that exist.

I can say with certainty that we have serious considerations, and we are opposed to this legislation coming forward. We would wish that the government would withdraw it, particularly in light of its statements contained in the throne speech, where it has outlined a desire and an agenda that apparently addresses aboriginal issues.

I would like to spend a few minutes discussing another aspect of the motion that is before us today, something that I have been involved in. I believe there is an indication to move forward with an agenda and that is the reconstitution of the Special Committee on Non-Medical Use of Drugs.

The history of this committee is actually quite interesting. It was the idea of an opposition member from the Canadian Alliance, which was approved in the House. The former health minister agreed with the idea of setting up a special parliamentary committee that would look at the very urgent issue of the non-medical use of drugs.

As the member who represents Vancouver East, I want to say that we probably have the most serious crisis in the country on the issue of the non-medical use of drugs. People are literally dying on the street. From the very day that I got to the House I have been raising this issue and trying to draw attention to the fact that the leading cause of death in British Columbia for men and women between the ages of 30 and 44 is drug overdose. People find this hard to believe but it is factual. These deaths are not due to car accidents, heart attacks, strokes or some fatal illness, as horrible as those things are. These are preventable deaths that happen in the street because of the policies of our country around drug prohibition.

•(1425)

The special committee heard from witnesses right across the country and indeed even from as far away as Europe, Washington and New York because we also heard witnesses in those locations. The first thing I wanted to bring forward to the committee was that it is the prohibition policy that actually now creates the greatest harm. We drive people who are dealing with addiction issues and who, for whatever reason, are taking drugs that are illegal, into a criminalized lifestyle. I am not here to cast judgment one way or another but just to state that this reality exists. That can run the gamut from a fairly middle-class person who has resources and a good dealer, but for whom it is still an illegal thing to get a supply of maybe a few joints of marijuana for personal use, all the way to the other end of the spectrum in the downtown east side, which is an open drug scene of hundreds of people who are shooting up in doorways and back alleys in appalling conditions and sharing needles. The consequences of the prohibition and the criminalization have led to what has been described as a health emergency in Vancouver's downtown east side.

Today in question period I raised the issue, the tragedy, of the 63 women missing from the downtown east side. I have to say that these two issues are linked, because all those women were drug users. The issue is around addiction and criminalization and the fact that they had become so marginalized and were involved in the sex trade for survival. These women are out in the street in incredibly high risk circumstances, subject to violence, exploitation and, as we have seen, death.

I raise these issues because I think the Special Committee on the Non-medical Use of Drugs, which I hope will be reinstated with the same membership, would be a very good thing. It is something that I would certainly support and I know that our House leader and members of our caucus support it. This committee has done some very good work and we heard testimony right across the country. I would say, although we have not yet produced a report and I obviously am not going to speak about it, that if there was a common

Government Orders

thread that I heard while on this committee it was that people, no matter what their point of view, said that the present policies, the status quo, are not working, whether it is in our large urban centres of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver, or even in smaller rural communities where maybe there is not a pandemic of HIV and AIDS from injection drug use but other issues like the abuse of prescription drugs, which is something we heard very strongly when we visited Atlantic Canada.

So the work of this committee is very important and the members of the committee have begun to find a common understanding about what it is we are dealing with. I am very much looking forward, as the NDP representative on the committee, to continuing this work. As the motion before the House states, I believe the committee is to report on November 22. I know there is a lot of interest in the report because of course we have seen the Senate committee report that just came out, which I thought was a very courageous report. It actually comes forward and proposes ways in which we can take steps to legalize marijuana for personal use.

I think this has been an interesting debate. As I have said, the NDP has some serious reservations about some of the government business that would continue, but certainly in the case of the non-medical use of drugs committee I hope very much that the committee will continue its work and that we will produce a good report that all members of the House will look at seriously.

•(1430)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The hon. member will have 9 minutes and 38 seconds remaining when we return to this order at the next sitting of the House.

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

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

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. PIERRE BRIEN

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

HON. DON BOUDRIA

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (5)		
Barnes, Rex	Gander—Grand Falls	PC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Efford, R. John	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	PC
Matthews, Bill, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Burin—St. George's	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Cuzner, Rodger	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Lib.
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	West Nova	Lib.
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
ONTARIO (102)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Hon. Jean, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald, The Acting Speaker	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Lib.
QUEBEC (71)		
Allard, Carole-Marie	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	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.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Frulla, Liza	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de- Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	BQ
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Ind.
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	BQ
Marcil, Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Lib.
Martin, Hon. Paul	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister for International Trade	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Anderson, David	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CA
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CA
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Wascana	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Lib.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Ind.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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 October 4, 2002 — 2nd Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

FINANCE

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

HEALTH

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

LIAISON

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SUB-COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

Peter Adams
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitkreuz
Pierre Brien

Marlene Catterall
Wayne Easter
Yvon Godin
Michel Guimond

Dale Johnston
Joe Jordan
Carolyn Parrish
Geoff Regan

John Reynolds
John Richardson
Jacques Saada
Tony Tirabassi

(16)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMBATING CORRUPTION

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SPORT IN CANADA

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

STEERING COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

STEERING COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

STEERING OF THE SPORT IN CANADA

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SUB-COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

TRANSPORT

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chair:

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

(0)

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chair:

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panels of Chairman of Legislative Committees

The The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

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. Lawrence MacAulay	Solicitor General of Canada
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
Hon. Don Boudria	Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
Hon. Robert Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Denis Coderre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Robert Thibault	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
Hon. Bill Graham	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Susan Whelan	Minister for International Cooperation
Hon. Gerry Byrne	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. John McCallum	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
Hon. Paul DeVillers	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Gar Knutson	Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)
Hon. Denis Paradis	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)
Hon. Claude Drouin	Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Stephen Owen	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)
Hon. Jean Augustine	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Joe Jordan	to the Prime Minister
Mr. Steve Mahoney	to the Minister of Transport
Mr. André Harvey	to the Minister of Transport
Mrs. Karen Redman	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Paul Szabo	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Ms. Sarmite Bulte	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Bryon Wilfert	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Lynn Myers	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Alex Shepherd	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Paul Harold Macklin	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Ms. Raymonde Folco	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Bill Matthews	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Pat O'Brien	to the Minister for International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Larry McCormick	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Mr. Benoît Serré	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. John Finlay	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Ms. Sophia Leung	to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Mark Assad	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Carmen Provenzano	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Minister for International Cooperation
Mr. John O'Reilly	to the Minister of National Defence

CONTENTS

Friday, October 4, 2002

Points of Order

Government Business No. 2—Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	299
Mrs. Skelton	300
Mr. Strahl	300

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Committee Business and Reinstatement of Government Bills

Mr. Boudria	300
Motion No. 2A	300
Motion No. 2B	300
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	303
Amendment	305
Mr. Blaikie	305
Mr. Mayfield	305

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Citizenship

Mr. Easter	306
------------------	-----

Citizenship

Mr. Forseth	306
-------------------	-----

Fire Prevention Week

Mr. Malhi	306
-----------------	-----

Regional Development

Mr. St-Julien	306
---------------------	-----

Kyoto Protocol

Mr. Caccia	306
------------------	-----

Community Service

Mr. Burton	307
------------------	-----

Jamie Bell

Ms. Bulte	307
-----------------	-----

World Teachers' Day

Mr. Bigras	307
------------------	-----

World Teachers Day

Ms. Folco	307
-----------------	-----

Softwood Lumber

Mr. Mayfield	307
--------------------	-----

Agriculture

Mr. Maloney	308
-------------------	-----

Religions

Mr. Blaikie	308
-------------------	-----

Mental Illness Awareness Week

Mr. Ménard	308
------------------	-----

The Royal Visit

Mr. Tirabassi	308
---------------------	-----

Newfoundland and Labrador

Mr. Doyle	308
-----------------	-----

Senegal

Mr. Marcil	309
------------------	-----

Gun Registry

Mr. Breitreuz	309
---------------------	-----

René Cousineau

Mr. Assad	309
-----------------	-----

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Government Contracts

Mr. Harper	309
Mr. MacAulay	309
Mr. Harper	309
Mr. MacAulay	310
Mr. Harper	310
Mr. MacAulay	310
Mr. Sorenson	310
Mr. MacAulay	310
Mr. Sorenson	310
Mr. MacAulay	310
Mr. Brien	310
Mr. Goodale	310
Mr. Brien	310
Mr. Goodale	311
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	311
Mr. Goodale	311
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	311
Mr. Goodale	311

Employment Insurance

Mr. Blaikie	311
Ms. Folco	311
Mr. Blaikie	311
Ms. Folco	311

Government Contracts

Mr. MacKay	311
Mr. Collenette	312
Mr. MacKay	312
Mr. Collenette	312
Mr. Ritz	312
Mr. Collenette	312
Mr. Ritz	312
Mr. Collenette	312

Securities

Mr. Laframboise	312
Mr. Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora)	312
Mr. Laframboise	312
Mr. Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora)	313

Government Contracts

Mr. Strahl	313
------------------	-----

Mr. MacAulay	313	Grain Transportation	
Mr. Strahl	313	Mr. Proctor	317
Mr. MacAulay	313	Mr. Collenette	317
Regional Air Transportation		Diamond Industry	
Mrs. Tremblay	313	Mr. Keddy	317
Mr. Collenette	313	Mr. Boudria	317
Mrs. Tremblay	313	Presence in Gallery	
Mr. Collenette	313	The Speaker	317
Government Contracts		Committee Business and Reinstatement of Government Bills	
Mr. Rajotte	314	Notice of Closure Motion	
Mr. MacAulay	314	Mr. Boudria	317
Mr. Rajotte	314	Points of Order	
Mr. MacAulay	314	Government Legislative Agenda Announcement	
Agriculture		Mrs. Skelton	318
Mr. Adams	314	Mr. Boudria	318
Mr. Vanclief	314	Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	319
Justice			
Ms. Davies	314		
Ms. Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore)	314		
National Defence			
Mr. Stoffer	314		
Ms. Bulte	315		
Government Contracts			
Mr. Clark	315		
Mr. Collenette	315		
Mr. Clark	315		
Mr. Marcil	315		
Mrs. Ablonczy	315		
Mr. MacAulay	315		
Mrs. Ablonczy	315		
Mr. MacAulay	315		
Strikebreakers			
Ms. Guay	315		
Mr. Malhi	316		
Ms. Guay	316		
Mr. Malhi	316		
Bilingualism			
Mr. Reid	316		
Mr. Boudria	316		
Mr. Reid	316		
Mr. Boudria	316		
The Economy			
Mrs. Longfield	316		
Ms. Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore)	316		
Forest Industry			
Mr. Harris	316		
Mr. Vanclief	317		
National Parks			
Mr. Fitzpatrick	317		
Ms. Bulte	317		
Copyright			
Mr. Desrochers	317		
Mr. Boudria	317		

		ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
		Committees of the House	
		Agriculture and Agri-Food	
		Ms. McLellan	320
		Lower Churchill Development Corporation	
		Ms. Bulte	320
		Government Response to Petitions	
		Ms. Bulte	320
		Interparliamentary Delegations	
		Ms. Carroll	320
		Income Tax Act	
		Mr. Stoffer	320
		Bill 207. Introduction and first reading	320
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	320
		Income Tax Act	
		Mr. Stoffer	320
		Bill 208. Introduction and first reading	320
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	320
		Income Tax Act	
		Mr. Stoffer	320
		Bill 209. Introduction and first reading	320
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	320
		Income Tax Act	
		Mr. Stoffer	320
		Bill 210. Introduction and first reading	320
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	321
		Parliament of Canada Act	
		Mr. Stoffer	321
		Bill 211. Introduction and first reading	321
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	321

Petitions	
Iraq	
Mr. Adams	321
Stem Cell Research	
Mr. Adams	321
Child Pornography	
Mr. Adams	321
Stem Cell Research	
Mr. Gouk	321
Child Pornography	
Mr. Maloney	321
Mr. Doyle	321
Stem Cell Research	
Mr. Tonks	322
Wood Products	
Mr. Stoffer	322
Child Pornography	
Mr. Stoffer	322
Stem Cell Research	
Ms. Bulte	322
Questions on the Order Paper	
Ms. Bulte	322
Request for Emergency Debate	
Agriculture	
Mr. Clark	322

Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	322

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Committee Business and Reinstatement of Government Bills	
Motion	322
Mr. MacKay	322
Motion	323
Motion negatived	324
Mr. Epp	324
Mr. Bryden	324
Mr. Mitchell	325
Ms. Davies	325
Mr. O'Reilly	326
Mr. Epp	328
Mr. Proctor	329
Mr. Bigras	329
Mr. Brien	331
Ms. Guay	331
Ms. Davies	332

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :

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

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Communication Canada - Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9**