



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 133 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, October 3, 2003

—
Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 3, 2003

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

•(1000)
[English]

ASSISTED HUMAN REPRODUCTION ACT

The House resumed from April 10 consideration of the motion that Bill C-13, an act respecting assisted human reproduction, be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate which has gone on for a very long time.

Given new found interest in the passage of this bill, I am sure that members would eagerly want to vote on it. Therefore, I move:

That the question be now put.

The Deputy Speaker: There will now be a period of questions or comments.

On a point of order, the hon. member for Calgary Southeast.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarification, you stated that we would be in a period of questions or comments. Is it debate for 10 minutes, and if so, for how long?

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair erred in suggesting or putting forward the possibility of questions or comments.

We will proceed to debate, with interventions of 10 minutes without questions or comments.

On a point of order, the hon. member for Mississauga South.

Mr. Paul Szabo: Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, the main motion before the House is passage at third reading and members are here to speak. If members rise to ask questions or to speak on the motion that the question be now put, does that take the place of their time or their opportunity to speak at third reading? Is this similar to the process that we go through when the government proposes closure and there is an isolated debate around that motion?

•(1005)

The Deputy Speaker: No, this is not an isolated debate. We will proceed with the debate on Bill C-13, with interventions being 10 minutes without questions or comments.

On a point of order, the hon. member for Mississauga South.

Mr. Paul Szabo: Mr. Speaker, the last time this bill was called was April 10. Prior to that we went through a period of report stage motions. There were many that were passed on voice votes during the debate at report stage, and several that were passed where a recorded division was requested.

I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to request a reprinting of Bill C-13 that was returned from committee because members are now being asked for the last time to speak on Bill C-13. It would be very useful for them to see exactly what bill they are debating and what the specific provisions are.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Mississauga South have the consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary Southeast.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am not pleased to speak under the current circumstances. The government House leader has effectively brought closure on this matter of great importance.

The field which we are addressing in the bill is a dynamic field of science where the facts are changing on a weekly, if not daily basis. It is rare that we can open a newspaper without seeing some startling new scientific success and discovery with respect to the potential of adult and non-embryonic stem cells.

The science in the field of non-embryonic stem cells is increasing almost exponentially. We are now in a world of potential in terms of the research and application of non-embryonic stem cells. I would suggest that this is dramatically different in concrete terms than it was when the bill was first tabled by the Minister of Health.

In that time, in the ensuing two years since the original tabling of the bill, we have yet to see a single concrete application or useful research discovery with respect to embryonic stem cells, which is explicitly authorized in the bill.

Government Orders

That is why this matter deserves further consideration, not to delay for the sake of delaying. I recognize fully that there are aspects of Bill C-13 which are not controversial and have broad consensual support across the political and partisan spectrum in the House. There is also consensual support across the research and ethical spectrum of opinion for provisions in the bill that seek to ban human cloning and with respect to maternal surrogacy.

However, I believe, and I have heard members of the Liberal caucus argue in the House and members of all parties suggest, that there would be overwhelming consensus to pass a bill swiftly which would incorporate the non-controversial elements such as the ban on cloning which do not raise ethical concerns.

Following the review of the draft legislation tabled by the previous health minister, that is precisely why the majority of members from all parties on the Standing Committee on Health recommended that the bill be split between those elements, including the ban on cloning, which carry broad consensual support, and those elements, particularly the authorization of embryonic stem cell research, which raise grave ethical and moral questions.

It is regrettable that the government ignored the advice of its own members on the Standing Committee on Health by refusing to split the bill between those aspects which were broadly supported and those aspects which remain highly controversial because of the ethical and moral concerns in respect of creating human life in order to destroy it, which is essentially what is contemplated in the process of embryonic stem cell research.

As I say, this is a dynamic field, which is precisely why we ought to listen to those voices. Many witnesses at the health committee called for a three year moratorium or a moratorium of some reasonable period on embryonic stem cell research to prohibit this troublesome procedure and to allow us to assess the development of science in this field. This is a procedure which involves the destruction and manipulation of a unique nascent human life and which therefore offends, I believe, the ethical and moral principles upon which liberal democracies such as Canada are founded without a consequent scientific or health benefit.

There has not been a single assertion of a demonstrated scientific empirical benefit from research on embryonic stem cells.

● (1010)

Why then would we authorize the manipulation and destruction of a nascent life even from the utilitarian perspective given that there is no utility in that material demonstrated by scientists to this point?

That is the fundamental question which we now face. That is why many members would like further consideration of the bill unless the government is prepared to listen to the health committee and split it.

Let me point out a peculiar and strange contradiction with respect to government policy in relation to this bill. The government claims that the language in the bill would ban all forms of human cloning, both therapeutic and reproductive, and I hope that is the case. Some testimony was presented in health committee which suggested that the definition found in the bill with respect to human cloning was not sufficiently broad and was too narrow to cover all forms of human cloning.

I am not a scientist so it is difficult for me to make that assessment. However, I am a politician and I hear the government stating on the one hand that it wishes to ban both therapeutic and reproductive cloning in the bill, but currently is taking a different position at the United Nations where it has supported the ratification of a draft treaty which would explicitly ban only reproductive cloning but not therapeutic cloning. That raises serious questions for me.

If the policy of the government, as reflected in Bill C-13, were to honestly and sincerely ban all forms of cloning as it claims, then why would that the same government, in New York today as reported in newspapers across the country, be advocating in favour of the legalization of reproductive non-therapeutic human cloning?

There is a dichotomy in the government's position with respect to this issue which raises reasonable doubt as to the intent of those who drafted the relevant sections of Bill C-13 to actually ban all forms of cloning, both therapeutic and reproductive. That is why the bill requires further and closer scrutiny.

Is it really the position of the government not to ban all forms of human cloning—an odious, nightmarish procedure, which gives man the power to play God and create the kind of nightmare society that writers like Aldous Huxley imagined and described—or is it the position of the government to recognize the miracle of human life and not try to replicate it ourselves?

If the latter is the case, then why is the government today taking the position at the United Nations that we should legalize internationally,—and not just in Canada—through the instrument of a UN treaty, the cloning of human beings for so-called therapeutic purposes, a procedure which is itself grossly offensive to any thinking person from a rational ethical perspective? Why is the government taking the position that unique individual human lives should be created to offer spare parts as science experiments and replicated, each possessing an unviolable dignity, to be used in the same fashion as used cars thrown out in a junk yard?

It is deeply offensive, however that is the position of the government as reported in today's *Ottawa Citizen* and Southam newspapers across the country.

I would ask all members to reflect seriously on exactly what Bill C-13 says. I would ask them not to take at face value the claims being offered by the health department which do not seem to be reflected by the government at the UN negotiations today in New York.

● (1015)

I would also encourage members to look very closely at the false, specious, unproven assertion that there is some putative health benefit from research on human embryos which requires their production and then destruction.

Government Orders

Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I certainly also want to join in on the debate on Bill C-13 at third reading, even though basically there is now a move to invoke closure on the bill.

I think we have to take some time because the bill actually does represent life itself, and the information on this technology is certainly evolving. As time goes on, there is more and more in the technology coming forward that causes us to stop and to be concerned. The intent of the bill two years ago was certainly not the technology that is available today to support it.

I think the legislation could be passed very quickly if the bill were split and the controversial items in it taken out; they are very few and I do not understand the minister's reluctance to do this.

It bothers me that a committee of the House of Commons would make recommendations that would be completely ignored by the minister.

As we looked at changing the structure of the House of Commons, something in which I have been involved in the last few years, I was looking forward to the fact that committees would actually have some relevance, that they would not be partisan and that they would not be just carrying out the wishes of the government. I thought that committees would actually follow the recommendations that come from all parties during the debate and upon listening to the various witnesses who came forward.

In looking at this particular legislation, I notice that pretty nearly all the recommendations of the committee have been ignored, not necessarily on the things we all agree with, but on the things we disagree with.

The committee conducted very extensive hearings on the draft bill. It presented 34 recommendations, some of which the member for Mississauga South recommended and brought forward and which I seconded. I thought the recommendations had some basis for and merited discussion. I am sorry to see that the minister chose not to appear before the committee or not to listen to the committee. The minister chose instead to blindly go forward without any basis in fact on the actual bill itself.

As the committee went through clause by clause at report stage, the minister basically proposed three motions that reversed all three of the committee recommendations. I think that maybe the committees of the House of Commons in the next Parliament should be re-examined, reformed and looked at in the light of their relevance. Because if the government is just going to blindly pass legislation without input from the committees, if it is not going to refer the bills to committees and then take the recommendations of expert witnesses, I find I am in a quandary about how I can support such legislation going ahead.

Mr. Speaker, you will know that it was a legislative committee which did some of the work on the anti-terrorist legislation. Many of the recommendations came forward from witnesses, some of which were questionable witnesses, the ethics counsellor and some others, but the fact is that those recommendations were taken into consideration. Changes were then made to some of the 22 pieces of legislation before that committee.

We now have a bill with 28 areas in which regulations have to be developed, and the bill itself is flawed in many instances, to say the least.

I find that this is a bill dealing entirely with what I would consider the life of a baby. Even the Minister of Health, in recommendations on when life begins, has now come out with labelling on cigarette packages which states, "Smoking during pregnancy can harm the life of a baby". That does not say a fetus. That does not say something which does not exist. It says a baby. So on one side of its recommendations the department admits that life begins at conception, and on the other side it is saying it does not.

● (1020)

I find a contradiction here. I am at odds with the minister on this, because as a pro-lifer, which puts me in the "God squad" as I am told, whatever that means, it means to me that I stand up for what I believe. I do not intend to change my mind. I do not have any science to indicate that I should change my mind. Nothing has been brought forward to indicate that I am wrong, in my mind of course, as in some people's minds I am dead wrong on almost everything. That is what happens when one is in an adversarial situation with the Government of Canada and representing a large rural riding.

On Bill C-13 and the actual closure legislation that has been brought forth, it allows us an hour to debate a bill that should be debated at far greater length. Speakers should have been allowed to come forward, as the member for Mississauga South has indicated, like many groups appearing before the committee that have not been heard in Parliament and have not had their views brought forward.

Members of Parliament are uninformed about the bill. They have made up their minds based on what the minister has told them to say. I find that reprehensible in regard to the way I operate. I believe we should look at every bill, examine bills as members of Parliament, listen to all the evidence or at least have the courtesy to read the evidence, come to our own conclusions and then be judged based on our conscience as to how we in fact vote on a bill.

I was not prepared to speak on the bill this morning. I felt that it would follow its normal course. It would have a lot of debate on both sides, there would be input at third reading and I would be able to represent the views of my riding, which are, by the way, mixed. I think the views are mixed because the evidence brought forward is not evidence that in fact has reached a conclusion and it is not a basis for fact.

The difference between a disease and a syndrome is an inconclusive body of evidence. I believe that what we are dealing with here is indeed an inconclusive body of evidence. Technology changes almost hourly as laboratories do more work on reproductive technology and as people delve into the problems that come with this type of legislation, in which, as I said earlier, we deal with life itself.

Government Orders

We are facing a moral dilemma as to how we should deal with reproductive technologies, particularly the related research that goes with it. I believe there are medical doctors on all sides of this legislation that would allow for a difference of opinion and allow more technology to be considered. Also, not splitting the bill and not listening to the committee troubles me. I think that committees should have more input and more relevance and should be able to function separately from the House, bring back their reports and have those reports considered.

I am disappointed that the minister has chosen, first, not to appear before the committee, which I think is a travesty of justice. I think all ministers owe it to committees to appear, to put their voices forward and to explain to the committees why in fact they support a piece of legislation or why in fact they brought it forward. That bothers me.

I will conclude by saying that there are certain parts of the bill I support wholeheartedly, but there are areas that need further study and need to be looked at in their entirety, and the technology that is coming forward needs to be studied.

Therefore, I want to express my disappointment that this process has in fact been instituted by the minister.

• (1025)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-13 is very important. As we know, it concerns assisted human reproduction. I can understand that there are divergent opinions on this matter. I know that some members of the House oppose this project for religious or other personal reasons. I do not share their views. However, we must divide the issue and see the positive and the scientific side of assisted reproduction. As I was saying, it is not simply a religious question or a question of conscience; one very important aspect is that, with assisted reproduction, we can help families or people who truly need help.

I will give the House a little scenario. For some years now, a cluster of technological developments have made the headlines. From Dolly the sheep to the debate about cloning human embryos for therapeutic purposes, the exciting buzz of biotechnology is taking us down previously unexplored paths. The fact that today we have some ability to deconstruct matter and, to some extent, reconstruct a living being, means that we are confronted with new problems, whose extent we still do not comprehend. These new possibilities require increased vigilance and solid ethical examination, in order to ensure that we do not overstep certain boundaries. In order to do this, a new legal language, new concepts and a new political approach are required.

Over the years, many parliamentarians, including a number from the Bloc Québécois, have exposed the legal vacuum surrounding assisted reproduction. Again and again, we have revived the debate by calling on citizens and experts to express themselves and by demanding that the federal government impose socially acceptable limits as soon as possible. Still, we must admit that it is difficult to strike a balance between a solid ethical position that respects human dignity and the need to meet therapeutic needs.

We must decide overall how we view life and what kind of technological progress we want. Society has to make some choices,

and it is high time for this debate to move into the public arena, so that everyone can have their say. Recently tabled legislation on assisted human reproduction by the federal government is a good first step in stimulating this discussion and, at the same time, relaunching a social debate temporarily shelved.

I want to review the highlights of this legislation. On May 9, the Minister of Health introduced this highly anticipated legislation on assisted human reproduction. It seeks to protect the health and safety of individuals using assisted reproductive technologies to start a family, to prohibit unacceptable activities, such as human cloning, and to regulate assisted reproductive technologies and related research. The assisted human reproduction agency of Canada, which will be created under this legislation, will issue licences for research, monitor such activities and oversee the application of the legislation on assisted reproduction.

Safety must, to some extent, be ensured. In order to ensure the health and safety of those who turn to assisted reproduction, this bill stipulates that individuals thinking of donating an ovum or an embryo for assisted human reproduction or research purposes must give their informed consent in writing before any procedure. Children born through the use of reproductive material will have access to medical information on donors, but will not necessarily have access to their identity, donors being free to decide whether or not to divulge their identity.

The legislation would also prohibit unacceptable activities, such as the creation of human clones for any reason whatsoever, i.e. for purposes of reproduction or for therapeutic purposes. The legislation would also prohibit creating an in vitro embryo for purposes other than creating a human being or improving assisted reproduction procedures, creating chimeras or hybrids for reproductive purposes, providing financial inducements to a woman to become a surrogate mother, and buying or selling human embryos or providing property or services in exchange.

• (1030)

I would like to present an overview of the pros and cons as set out in the various arguments we have heard throughout the discussions on human cloning. The arguments of those in favour of stem cell research fall into four main categories: historical, medical, humanitarian and legal-political.

Let us begin with the historical arguments. In the 1970s, there was vocal opposition to DNA research. After the establishment of government guidelines, however, not only was there good monitoring of research, but research also led to the development of human insulin for diabetics.

As for the medical arguments, many are of the opinion that embryonic stem cell research has a huge potential for curative medicine.

Government Orders

Humanitarian arguments are usually advanced by associations such as the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, based on their belief that such research is indispensable to improving the situation of those with the disease. Some experts point out that there are hundreds of frozen embryos in fertility clinics throughout Canada that have become useless, whereas they could have been used to help find treatments for such diseases as cancer, diabetes and Parkinson's disease.

Now for the legal-political arguments. Certain women's groups and certain legal experts argue that, in our current legal framework, the Supreme Court has been obliged, since 1988, to recognize that not only is a fetus not a human being—which civil law also acknowledges—but that it cannot be considered viable before the 20th week of gestation. Thus, if a fetus is not a human being, then tissues from it are not tissues from a human being.

Now for the arguments against. Research on human embryonic stem cells is controversial, mainly because it involves destruction of the embryo used. According to the Catholic Church, the creation of embryos for research purposes and the use of embryonic stem cells are actions contrary to the will of God, for whom reproduction must always be a conjugal act. Since the embryo is a potential human being, according to the Church it must have a special moral status. Moreover, numerous associations have expressed the fear that cloning, initially justified as a means to a cure for certain very rare diseases, will eventually become widespread and lead to the production of designer babies.

I will give a background on where we stand. The Bloc Québécois has been studying this issue for several years; we have had major discussions and extensive debate to ensure that the bill would protect human beings, and that the use of embryos would stop short of human cloning. At the same time, certain jurisdictions must also be protected.

Now, for our party's position; we have been defending this issue and talking about it amongst ourselves for many years. We also realize that Bill C-13, if adopted, would interfere in Quebec's jurisdiction with respect to health. That is unacceptable to us.

My colleagues from Hochelaga—Maisonneuve and from Drummond have done extraordinary work in the Standing Committee on Health. They tried to move amendments to ensure that Quebec's jurisdictions would be left alone, but, to no avail, since they were all lost.

For us, this is not a religious question, but a question of jurisdiction and the administration of justice. We do not want this bill to change the rules for health in Quebec. Quebec manages its own affairs quite well and we want it to stay that way. We are against this bill.

•(1035)

[*English*]

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am like so many in the House on this legislation. There is so much of it that I do support and I want to see it go forward. However there are other aspects of it that about which I am genuinely uneasy.

Part of the problem with legislation like this is it does go to the health committee. As other speakers have noted, there has been quite a full debate in the health committee and many difficult issues have been raised, particularly in the context of embryonic cell research. The problem is however good the debate in committee, the debate does not get into this House.

Every one of us are charged with many other tasks as MPs and it is difficult for us to find the time to look up the *Hansards* of the deliberations that were carried on in committee on legislation like this, and well we should. Every one of us has a duty to be thoroughly informed on the issues that surround legislation, that is, historic legislation, legislation that heralds the dawn of a new age and that heralds the dawn of a new age that may have many dark aspects.

I find myself inclined toward finding a way in which to use stem cells, non-embryonic stem cells would be preferable. However I also feel that if it is a matter of saving lives, then embryonic stem cells, which would be destroyed anyway, ought to be used in research, always on the assumption that these embryonic stem cells would not be deliberately produced for research, because I would find that absolutely reprehensible.

There is no doubt that there are diseases out there on which the clock is ticking. Parkinson's, for example, is a disease that there is some suggestion could be addressed by stem cell research. If embryonic stem cell research speeds up a solution for Parkinson's, then I would be one who would want to see it happen because it is very close to me. Both in my family and in my community people are suffering from Parkinson's and one's heart goes to them. One wants to help. There are many other diseases to which hope is offered if there is success in stem cell research.

I would make the distinction only that I would support embryonic stem cell research only if there were a reasonable possibility, not probability, a reasonable possibility that embryonic stem cell research could shorten the time to bring cures to the people who are suffering.

Having said that, I take the point of earlier speakers that the bill could have been divided because there are other aspects of the bill, which are not contentious at this point in time at any rate, that we ought to address and address rapidly, and I point to the provisions with respect to cloning.

I can remember when I was in my teenage years being fascinated by the science fiction literature at the time. This would be the 1960s. There was a lot of science fiction literature at that time. The prospect of something like cloning the human being came up in fiction from time to time. I well remember the idea they put forward in fiction, that this would be a way to create people who would never die; that is, create perpetual life.

What they basically would do is take an individual and by cloning they could create indefinite copies of an individual. All they would have to do, in the science fiction of the day, is take that, reproduce its physical body, implant in it the same memories and functions, possibly by a sophisticated computer, and they would get replication of, and I hate to say this, some of my political opponents indefinitely.

Government Orders

•(1040)

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, and I am sorry to take a serious subject and divert for a moment, I look at my friends across the aisle and the prospect of them carrying on for a hundred years or so in their seats, always in opposition, is a prospect that is truly daunting. However I digress.

To be more serious, the reality is the prospect of everlasting life through human cloning is actually a possibility in the age in which we are now. We have already started the process in the cloning of animals and the possibility of cloning human beings and having the computer technology which could actually collect and recreate that human being intellectually, perhaps that technology is to come only in the next 20 or 30 years, is before us now. We have to act now and assert what we feel about mortality.

I do not want to get into religious arguments or religious debates here, but I would argue that there is good reason why men and women were created mortal. It is not something with which I would want to see interfered. This is the type of issue on which the House should express itself.

I would have been in favour of dividing the bill and dealing expeditiously with this type of aspect of the bill. I think a the majority of Canadians who may not be associated with any religion, Canadians who may be very agnostic, would all agree that the prospect of cloning human beings is a frightening prospect and it is something certainly that we should try to prevent for as long as possible.

However let me come back to the embryonic research. I think that is terribly important. I would have hoped that this House could have set aside the time to analyze it fully, to set maybe several days aside where we could have had that debate because it is so vital to clarify and to decide whether we are prepared to set aside all embryonic stem cell research for moral reasons, if you will, and moral reasons are fine. Many Canadians react that way for moral reasons and we have to respect that. However there is this other side of it. No matter how strong one's morals, if lives can be saved, then we need to have that debate and we have to find that balance.

This is what Parliament is all about always in this House is that we have to deal with difficult issues and strike balances. We have had anti-terrorism legislation here just recently which is anathema to the vision that Canadians have of themselves. Yet we were forced, because of the world situation, to bring in measures that were unthinkable 10 years ago or only three years ago. I think this House tried very hard to strike a balance, and as a matter of fact I think we did it better than any other nation, a balance between new security provisions and retaining as best we could the liberties and the privacies that we hold so dear.

The issue on embryonic stem cell research is exactly the same type of thing. The House has to make a decision and it is a very difficult decision. I would have liked to have had more time myself to read everything that was said before the health committee and then come to this House in a debate and hear other members who have done the same thing, not the members of the health committee, other members who have the concerns as were expressed by all members of the health committee and have a real debate here, then

come to a conclusion by a vote in this House on this specific question of embryonic stem cell research. Right now, quite frankly, I think I would vote in support of it. However maybe after the debate I would vote against it. I do not know but a lot more debate would have been appropriate.

•(1045)

Mr. Larry Spencer (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very controversial subject across our land. It is probably third only to the recent bills that we have seen go through this place, one on the question of marriage and the other being Bill C-250. There are hundreds of people who have written who are concerned about Bill C-13. They are concerned about the view that this Parliament would reflect on humanity itself, the value of life and the dignity of life if we embark upon some of the measures provided for in this legislation.

Someone has said that this is not an issue of religion or conscience. I would suggest it really is an issue of conscience whether one is religious or not. I was reminded of that remark recently in the United States when we heard of someone who was fined something like \$25,000 for destroying an eagle's egg. I am remembering the burrowing owls that we have in Canada and the endangered species legislation that we are looking at where people could be fined for even destroying the habitat or the nesting grounds of species in this country.

Would we punish them for destroying an egg of a bird or the burrow of an owl? Would we punish them for that and say it was sacrilegious to destroy them, or are we being religious for passing laws to protect endangered species? No one accuses us of being religious for doing that. Why would they want to accuse us of being overly religious for passing laws to protect the dignity and the safety of the human race?

Our party supports a number of aspects of the bill. We support the bans on reproductive and therapeutic cloning, the bans on animal and human hybrids, the bans on sex selection and the bans on buying and selling embryos. We recognize that these are the good aspects of the bill. As so often is the case, we get caught between a rock and a hard place when we deal with legislation. So often, there are parts of a bill that are good, as are these points that I have mentioned in this bill, and then there are parts that are weak or bad and cause us to have to violate our conscience to support that part of the legislation.

With regard to cloning, the Canadian Alliance opposes human cloning as we believe it is an affront to human dignity, individuality and rights. We have spoken often and for a long time against human cloning. We have been urging the federal government to take a stand and bring in legislation. It has been over 10 years since the report first came out that we should deal with these kinds of things. The Liberals have put it off and waited. It is my understanding that some companies in Canada announced recently that they were tired of waiting and that they were going to go ahead with some of this research. It is a shame that we have waited this long to deal with these kinds of issues.

Government Orders

The practices that are still allowed in this bill are not acceptable to some of us. The bill does say that the health and well-being of children born through assisted human reproduction must be given a priority. We believe in that and we believe in it very strongly. In fact, the health committee itself in its meetings came up with a ranking of the interests that should be made around this bill.

First of all, it said children born through assisted human reproduction should have priority in the decision making; second, adults participating in that procedure; and third, the researchers and physicians who conduct AHR research. They did not mention it, but I guess fourth would be the society in general that would benefit from anything that came out of this kind of research.

● (1050)

Even though children are mentioned as the ones who are to be considered first when we talk about these procedures, we have a way of saying something and then quickly forgetting what it really means. In the bill, children born through donor insemination or from donor eggs are not given the right to know the identity of their biological parents. How can we say that we are considering the needs of the children first when we refuse to even allow them to find out the identity of their biological parents?

In this day and age we know there are many cases where it is very valuable information medically to have a knowledge of who one's parents really are, where they came from, what were the diseases they had, what were their traits and characteristics. We do not allow for that in the bill.

The bill does not provide an acknowledgement of human dignity or respect for human life. The government makes some statements that are sort of related but it refuses to make a statement about the dignity or the sanctity of human life. The bill is intimately connected with the creation of human life, human life that will in its end be used strictly for research.

The minority report recommended that the final legislation would recognize the human embryo as human life and that the statutory declaration include the phrase "respect for human life". I heard already this morning in this debate that the human embryo is not human life. Is it life at all? I think it can be proven scientifically that it is life. The cells are already beginning divide. It is growing and only living things grow. Certainly we must know that it is human. It is not another kind of animal. It is not a plant. It is not a vegetable. It is in fact a human life.

The bill also allows for experiments using human embryos under four conditions. Only in vitro embryos left over can be used. Written permission must be given by the donor. It does not say donors, it just says donor. We believe that every human embryo by scientific evidence would have to have two donors and not just one. There should be the recognition of both donors in this case and that both donors should give permission and not just one. The bill also allows for research on human embryos if the use is necessary. Necessary is undefined. In vitro fertilization requires the creation of human embryos and the bill says it is only as many as are necessary, but when the end comes, when the implantation is made I think we will find that many embryos have been destroyed that were not necessary and unused only to speed up the process. We are in such a hurry to

see things happen. We cannot wait to see one or two eggs fertilized at a time so that a couple can bear children.

Sometimes we forget that Bill C-13 would allow the creation of embryos for reproductive research. Canadian law will now legitimize the view that human life can be created solely for the benefit of others and sacrificed in the name of research.

I come back to the fact that the human embryo is life. Whether it is a senior adult, a young adult, a child, a baby, a fetus or an embryo, I must conclude that it is human life.

I will close by quoting Suzanne Scorsone, a former member of the Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies, who said "The human embryo is a human individual with a complete personal genome, and should be a subject of research only for its own benefit". She also said that many people hold to the idea that to destroy the embryo or utilize it as industrial raw material is damaging and dehumanizing not only to that embryo but to all of human society.

I maintain that that is the right position.

● (1055)

Mr. Alan Tonks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to the bill. Initially when the bill was considered, the concern was raised with respect to the ethics of destroying human embryos to harvest stem cells for research. The issues have broadened somewhat from that initial concern and I would like to outline a few that members of the House have mentioned before but which I think are very important to put on the record again.

Despite the fact that Health Canada has already corrected one error in the definition of human clone, the bill still does not ban all known forms and techniques of human cloning. This is probably the essence of many of the ethical concerns that members from all sides of the House have talked about. There were numerous discussions at committee. Non-governmental organizations, advocacy groups and people from the scientific and health communities all expressed concern with respect to this shortcoming in the bill.

The bill permits the implanting of human reproductive material into non-human life forms. The biomedical definition of chimera involves the implantation of reproductive material from a human into an animal, or from an animal into a human. However, the definition in the bill only refers to the latter.

These are two fundamental aspects that I think members of the House are concerned about. On behalf of those on all sides, I want to put on the record that the bill is short with respect to those. Hopefully, it could be expanded upon at some future time.

S. O. 31

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

WORLD TEACHERS' DAY

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to teach is to open doors to a better world; in French, enseigner ouvre les portes vers un monde meilleur. This is the theme chosen for this year's World Teachers' Day on October 5.

Without teachers, education would not be what it is meant to be. Teachers transmit information, but teachers do so much more. Teachers inspire. Teachers guide students in developing values that are essential to peace, tolerance, respect and understanding. Teachers assist in developing essential life and social skills, trust, confidence, critical thinking and self-esteem. Teachers can be catalysts for creative, productive, successful lives.

Let us remember with thanks on October 5 and throughout the year the magnificent contribution of teachers everywhere. Let us celebrate together la Journée mondiale des enseignants, World Teachers' Day.

* * *

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government is bungling yet another registry. It seriously underestimated the task. Many landed immigrants are unaware of new requirements that they must have a permanent resident card to re-enter Canada after December 31.

Meanwhile, I have constituents who applied this spring and who have not yet received their card. I say good luck in applying now.

People are booking winter holidays with departure in December and return in January. Others will need to travel for family emergencies. They will not be eligible to return and many do not know it. They will have to find an embassy to obtain an entry visa, which could be a tall order.

Those who have applied cannot determine the status of their application. MPs' offices are in the same boat, as e-mails go unanswered and the telephone is essentially non-functional. This needs to be fixed today.

* * *

● (1100)

YOM KIPPUR

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Sunday around the world Jews will celebrate Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement. This day of contemplation and reflection is the most important day of the Jewish calendar.

Starting this Sunday night, until sundown on Monday night, Jews around the world will fast and reflect on this year's past actions and ask forgiveness for their failings.

Some also use this day to commemorate the devastating events of Kristallnacht, which occurred on the evening of November 9, 1938, the evening of Yom Kippur, when anti-Jewish riots swept through

Germany and Austria, destroying many Jewish businesses and synagogues.

On this day of prayer, on behalf of my colleagues in the House, I wish all Canadians of Jewish faith an easy fast and a meaningful Yom Kippur.

* * *

MARATHON VICTORY

Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured today to rise in tribute to a remarkable 93 year old marathon runner named Fauja Singh.

A retired farmer originally from the province of Punjab in India, he became the first person in the world in his age class to break the six hour barrier at the Scotiabank Toronto Waterfront Marathon on September 28. He had a time of five hours, forty minutes and four seconds.

When he was young, he ran cross-country in his native India. Then, at age 36, he retired from running. A lifetime later, with four children, thirteen grandchildren and five great-grandchildren, he returned to his first love: running marathons.

This man's latest achievement in Toronto stands as a source of inspiration for people across Canada and around the globe. I would therefore urge all my colleagues to join me in wishing him continued success.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was with pleasure that I participated yesterday in making an important announcement concerning my riding of Hull-Aylmer, in conjunction with the National Capital Commission.

The NCC concluded an agreement with Weston Inc. to acquire property on the north shore of the Ottawa River, which is currently home to Scott Paper operations. The NCC considers this site as a part of its long-term strategy for the core area of Canada's capital region. I have reason to believe that jobs will be preserved for at least 25 years and hope that Scott Paper will be able to relocate within the Outaouais region.

Our society is evolving and, over the next 25 years, the use of the riverfront where the Scott Paper plant is located will be changing. These industrial lands will be transformed to give all Canadians unique access to this site with its rich history and remarkable beauty.

Thank you to Weston Inc., to the NCC and its chairman, and to the Government of Canada.

[English]

ARTS AND CULTURE

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last month in Los Angeles, Charles Porlier of Pitt Meadows, British Columbia, in my riding, was presented with an Emmy award for outstanding makeup on the TNT made for television movie *Door to Door*.

Charles received a second Emmy nomination for his work in the Spielberg DreamWorks mini-series *Taken*, as well as two nominations for the Canadian Network of Makeup awards to be held in Toronto next month.

He earned his first Emmy in 1996 for the TNT production of *Kissinger and Nixon*. His box office credits include key makeup effects artist on *X-Men 2* and *The Santa Clause 2*.

With over 25 years of experience as a makeup artist, Charles is also head of makeup design at the Vancouver Film School. He said recently that the 1960s television series *Planet of the Apes* sparked his interest in pursuing makeup artistry.

On behalf of the citizens of Dewdney—Alouette and all members of the House, I would like to wish Charles Porlier good luck in Toronto next month and congratulate him on his outstanding achievement at the Emmys.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN WOMEN'S SOCCER TEAM

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, having played a lot of soccer in my youth, it was with great interest that I followed the amazing development of international women's soccer as well as its characteristic enthusiasm and fair play, which are truly an inspiration.

Last night, the Canadian women's soccer team won a historic victory against China. This is the first time our national team has made it to the semi-final of the World Cup.

●(1105)

[English]

It is truly an amazing feat for our young Canadian women to have reached a level of achievement so close to the summit of women's international soccer.

Canada will be playing Sweden in the semi-final on Sunday. I am sure all members of the House will join with me in wishing our Cinderella team Godspeed and the continuation of their inspiring international adventure. Go, Canada, go.

* * *

[Translation]

WAR ON DRUG TRAFFICKERS

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, five years ago, farm families were living daily with threats from cannabis growers who had taken over fields in the region. Along with other stakeholders, I decided to set up an Infocrime citizens

S. O. 31

committee in order to break the wall of silence that had grown up during this reign of terror.

Thanks to the determination of individuals like Raymonde Rivard, chair of the school board and co-chair of the Infocrime committee, Sylvain Michon, a farmer, and Claude Denis of the Sûreté du Québec, along with the municipalities and the media, such as *Le Courrier* in Saint-Hyacinthe and Boom FM, we are now seeing a definite improvement.

Unfortunately, the situation is not as good in all regions and that is why I have asked the Quebec minister of public safety to set up a commission of inquiry in order to get an overall picture of the situation and develop the tools we need to continue the fight.

I would like to point out, however, that the most powerful tool we have in standing up to organized crime is having citizens take responsibility for the future of their community. Do not give up the fight.

* * *

[English]

GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO

Mr. Carmen Provenzano (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been 67 years since a Liberal was elected to represent my riding of Sault Ste. Marie in the Ontario legislature. Yesterday history was made in Sault Ste. Marie when David Oraziotti, the Liberal candidate, won a decisive victory over his NDP rival.

I wish to offer my congratulations to David Oraziotti, the new MPP for Sault Ste. Marie, and Dalton McGuinty, our new premier, and to the Ontario Liberal Party for these landslide victories. The citizens of the Soo and across Ontario have chosen change. They have chosen a path to better health care and better education. In Sault Ste. Marie they have rejected the politics of negativism and fear.

I look forward with enthusiasm to working with David Oraziotti, Dalton McGuinty and our new Liberal government for the betterment of our province and particularly for the betterment of our fine community of Sault Ste. Marie.

* * *

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE BOARD

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today we review a blockbuster Liberal movie. The hero: Yves Berthiaume, veteran Crown prosecutor. He has RCMP evidence that an IRB judge has been taking bribes from organized crime. It turns out the IRB judge is a Liberal cabinet appointee with political ties to the Treasury Board minister.

Enter Mario Bilodeau from the Quebec justice department. He is also a former defence lawyer for organized crime figures. To everyone's shock, he commands our hero to reduce the charge against the IRB judge. Our prosecutor hero resigns, in outrage and disbelief.

The plot thickens. If the IRB judge pleads guilty to the lesser charge, some very interesting wiretap conversations will never come out in court.

S. O. 31

Who is the real villain in the movie? Who is behind this corrupt cover-up? Keep watching, folks. We are sure to see more episodes of scandal from these Liberals.

* * *

[*Translation*]

WORLD FORESTRY CONGRESS

Mr. Gilbert Barrette (Témiscamingue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Natural Resources Canada is proud to have been the lead federal department hosting the UN-FAO 12th World Forestry Congress last week in Quebec City.

The Congress is much more than a forum for Canada to demonstrate its leadership in sustainable forest management.

For some 4,000 delegates from all parts of the globe, who travelled to Quebec City for the Congress, it was an opportunity to form new partnerships, share information, and learn about the advances being made here and elsewhere in forest practices and research. Some dynamic highlights of Canada's progress were on display at the visually striking and interactive Canada Pavilion.

Canadians can be proud of our leadership in sustainable forest management which has been readily apparent to World Forestry Congress delegates. I encourage all Canadians to learn more about Canada's leadership in sustainable—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for South Shore.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I met with Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries Chris d'Entremont of Nova Scotia, along with Willy Versteeg of Barney Brook Farms in Milford Station and Brian Smith, executive director of agriculture for the Province of Nova Scotia. They wanted to talk about two issues.

The first issue obviously was the effects and after-effects of hurricane Juan and the amount of damage done to barns and silos, especially in the Musquodoboit Valley area. The other issue they wanted to talk about was more federal assistance for BSE. Neither one of those files has been handled very well by the government.

My colleague from Kings—Hants stood in the House yesterday asking for assistance on hurricane Juan. The government gave a namby-pamby answer and in fact did not really give him any answer at all.

The truth is simply this. For the last five disasters that have affected the province of Nova Scotia, dating back to 1999, not one of them has been paid for. Not one cent has been received from the federal government yet.

* * *

• (1110)

[*Translation*]

GREATER JOLIETTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 6, the greater Joliette chamber of commerce will host a

dinner to celebrate its 110th years of work to foster the region's economic, civil and social well-being and the development of its resources.

Since the beginning, the chamber of commerce has striven to study, lead and promote, protect and develop the area's economic interests.

In recognition of this commitment, past directors and residents interested in the area's social and economic progress will be invited to this celebration.

The dinner will be a time to remember the past and see archival photos. There will also be an address on the history and role of the chamber of commerce.

With over one hundred years of history behind it, the greater Joliette chamber of commerce can continue to be proud of its efforts to ensure the area reaches its full potential under extraordinary leadership. May the greater Joliette chamber of commerce enjoy another one hundred years as a lever for growth for the Lanaudière region. Happy 110th anniversary.

* * *

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the government are to be congratulated for their excellent legislation addressing some of the most urgent needs of Canada's veterans and their spouses. Extending health programs for veterans and extending compensation for former prisoners of war, among others, is positive and needed.

There is, however, one glaring inequity that must be addressed now.

Nancy Clark is the widow of a second world war veteran. Her good friend, Joyce McClelland, is the spouse of a second world war veteran. They both reside in their own homes. Should Mrs. McClelland's husband pass away, she is entitled to a lifetime benefit to help with grounds and housekeeping under the veterans independence program. Mrs. Clark and 23,000 other Canadian veterans' widows are no longer entitled to such benefits.

I urge the Minister of Veterans Affairs, the Prime Minister and the government to find the resources to correct this unfair and inequitable position. As difficult as this decision may have been from a budgetary perspective, let us now show what a big heart our government has. There are no second class veterans' widows in our society. We owe so much to so few.

*Oral Questions***VETERANS AFFAIRS**

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in May 2003 the Prime Minister and the Liberal government chose to exclude 23,000 war widows from the veterans independence program, which provided funds to help with things like snow shovelling. The cost to include them would be, at a maximum, \$5 million dollars a year, with this amount decreasing yearly as most of the widows are in their most vulnerable senior years.

The Liberal government is saying that these widows are not worth the money. The Liberal government is saying war widows are not a priority. The Liberal government lavished millions on non-repayable grants to Bombardier. The Liberal government blew millions on untendered contracts to Groupaction. The Liberal government approved a half million dollar tax write-off for George Radwanski. The Liberal government allowed millions in trust fund dollars to move tax free to the U.S.

It is time the Liberal government put its priorities in order. War widows are the real VIPs in this country, not Liberal hacks.

* * *

GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure and satisfaction that last night I called up my provincial counterpart in my riding, Liberal Ted McMeekin, and congratulated him on his handy victory over his provincial Tory opponent, who became twice a victim because the delicious irony of Mr. McMeekin's victory last night was that he overcame the same person I defeated 10 years ago.

I would like to add that this gives me the opportunity to congratulate all the provincial Liberals for a very fine campaign and to take note of the fact that one factor, among many other factors certainly, that led to the success of the Liberals in the riding was the terrible attack ads of the provincial Tories, which Canadians, the people of Ontario, rejected absolutely. I hope that is a lesson to all of us that this is not—

• (1115)

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

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it has now been over four months since the American border was closed to Canadian beef. Although boneless box beef has been allowed to cross the border for about a month, that only accounts for a very small percentage of traditional exports to the U.S.

One thing is certain. Until the border is fully reopened, Canadian cattle producers and their communities will continue to suffer economic hardship and loss.

Beef is a very big industry in the Peace River country and at this time of the year many people in my riding depend on selling their livestock for cash flow. A reopened border is vitally important to my constituents, as well as many other Canadians right across the country.

I urge the government to renew its efforts to make sure the border gets reopened fully, very soon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we asked the government about assistance for the victims of hurricane Juan. The defence minister had no answer.

We have heard the promises of assistance to people in B.C. after the fires, to the prairies after BSE. The government promises assistance but does not deliver.

When will the money begin to flow to those hurt by hurricane Juan?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the defence minister did have an answer. Perhaps the hon. member did not hear it. I said that having visited the region and spoken with the premier, we both agreed that the immediate priority was to get the power back and the roads passable. The money will be coming, I have said that several times. A hurricane is a natural disaster and the money will come.

The immediate priority is to get the roads back in order, to get the power back and our soldiers and sailors are helping to do that. That is the immediate priority.

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, empty promises do not repair boats, buy gear, rebuild homes or farms.

Here is a waiting list for full government assistance: Manitoba flood, eight years; Quebec ice storm, four years; and Saguenay flood, five years.

Can the residents of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island expect the same delays?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the Nova Scotia government has not yet applied. The government of Prince Edward Island has applied.

I have directed my officials to report back to me very quickly as to the feasibility of making advance payments to the provinces afflicted by the hurricane, as well as to British Columbia. I will hear soon from my officials as to the possibility of an advance payment because I am conscious of the priority and the need under these circumstances.

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister said that the area qualified for the disaster financial assistance program. Clear eligibility requirements have not been stated. People need to know if they are covered and to what extent.

What are the requirements and how many people will not qualify?

Oral Questions

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. I have already said that the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island are qualified. I have said that to the public. I have said that to the premiers. I have said that to members of the opposition who care to listen. They are qualified.

As I have just said, I have directed my officials to let me know very soon as to whether we will be able to make advance payments to these provinces. I understand very clearly the urgency of the situation.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government has known for years that the Iltis jeeps are long overdue for replacement. Yet it sends our troops into a war zone with these unprotected, antiquated vehicles.

We know there are patrols in the narrow rubble strewn streets of Kabul where it is necessary to take the risk of using the Iltis. The real question is this. Why were our soldiers sent out into the foothills, into self-described bad guy country, in unarmoured, rusted out dune buggies, rather than lightly armoured vehicles?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thought the respect for our fallen heroes would last a little longer than this.

That having been said, General Leslie has said on a number of occasions that it was an extremely big hole, an extremely large explosion and that irrespective of the vehicle, there would have been great trouble as a consequence.

It is also the fact that the commander on the ground takes the decision as to the appropriate vehicle or indeed whether the soldiers go on foot, and the commander—

• (1120)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting is the government should have given our troops and our commanders over there more lightly armoured vehicles so they did not have to use these damned jeeps.

The minister has said he receives daily briefings on the events in Afghanistan. Has the investigation into yesterday's tragic deaths of two of our soldiers yet revealed if the explosion was caused by a pressure activated mine or a remotely detonated bomb? Regardless of which it was, can he guarantee that our troops on the ground in Afghanistan have all the appropriate protection that they need?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have said many times that the government will spare neither money nor effort to ensure that the army has what the army deems necessary. The army and the deputy chief of the defence staff have informed me on several occasions that, yes indeed, they are well equipped.

The commander stated at the time that this was a relatively low risk area because the road had been cleared 24 hours earlier. Indeed,

vehicles had passed safely on this road two hours before the explosion. Therefore the fact is the commanders deemed this to be a relatively low risk area. Sadly and tragically, it turned out not to be the case.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN GRAND PRIX

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, *La Presse* reports that the Montreal Grand Prix is some \$5 to \$7 million US short of the \$30 million needed to survive.

Normand Legault, all those involved in Formula 1, RDS, and the Government of Quebec are all prepared to make a financial contribution to enable the race to go on without any tobacco sponsorship—everyone, that is, except the federal government.

Since the target figure is so close to being reached, and the private sector is prepared to foot most of the bill, will the federal government listen to us at last and invest the few million still needed to save the Montreal Grand Prix and the \$80 million annually in economic spinoffs that go with it?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): I should begin, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that the Canadian government made its position very clear concerning the Tobacco Act, and has reinforced its message that it was vital that the legislation apply here, and that it was a matter of public health.

That said, the matter of having a brand-free race has been the issue right from the start of the discussions. As we speak, we are well aware that Mr. Legault has held discussions with the Formula 1 people and Mr. Ecclestone about a funding structure. Let us allow them to finalize that structure, and then we will determine our position.

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, so much for any leadership from the Minister of Justice.

According to the *La Presse* article, the Minister of Justice has indicated to Bernie Ecclestone that the federal government has the money the Grand Prix needs to survive and to protect the \$80 million in spinoffs. Clearly, what is lacking on the other side of the floor is not money but political will.

While Normand Legault is busy consolidating the funding, why is the Minister of Justice, who has the money, still refusing to send a message to the private sector by committing the few million needed to save the Montreal Grand Prix?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, regardless of the \$80 million in economic spinoffs, the fundamental character of the event remains unchanged.

The Formula 1 Montreal Grand Prix is vital to Montreal, Quebec and the rest of Canada as well.

Oral Questions

That said, Mr. Legault is working at this time with the Formula 1 people, and in fact met with Mr. Ecclestone this very day. They are working on the financial arrangements. Having a brand-free race is one that has been suggested right from the start. We need to let them finish their work; then we will see what request they make to the Canadian government.

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on September 29, the Secretary of State responsible for Canada Economic Development said that there was no question at this time of the government investing in the Montreal Grand Prix unless the private sector did the same.

Given that the private sector is prepared to get on board, and solutions are coming from all sides, except from the federal government, can we at least get a commitment today that the government will do its part to make up for the shortfall?

• (1125)

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to repeat the latter part of my answer earlier, a few years ago, when we talked about changing the legislation, it was the people on this side of the House who managed to get the change. It was the people from our Liberal caucus who got the change. Why? Because we believe in the fundamental impact of the Canadian Grand Prix.

The first phase is over, in other words, the principle of the bill, or the application of the bill. Now we are discussing the possibility of having a race without trademarks. Let us look at the financing package, and then the Canadian government will reconsider its position.

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while Mr. Legault is in London to save the Montreal Grand Prix, why does the government not provide him with one more trump card in negotiating with the private sector by promising to do its part to save the Montreal Grand Prix?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are currently no players who have taken a firm position with respect to figures. We have basically heard from Mr. Ecclestone, who talked about millions of dollars. We also know that he may be able to invest some money in the Canadian Grand Prix.

Mr. Legault is currently in the process of meeting his counterparts. He has also spoken to Mr. Ecclestone. They are preparing a financing package. Before doing anything, we will have to see what Mr. Legault has to say after meeting with his counterparts, to see what the financing package would be and then determine what the Canadian government's position could be.

Our position seems entirely reasonable, and it has always been a position of leadership.

* * *

[English]

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of National Defence said that “now is not the time to be dealing with money”, in relation to disaster assistance for Nova Scotia.

Meanwhile, in Halifax, the member for LaSalle—Émard, the Prime Minister-in-waiting, said Ottawa must respond quickly with disaster funding.

With unpaid claims, outstanding for four previous disasters in Nova Scotia, dating back to hurricane Hortense in 1999, will the minister tell the House when exactly is a good time to be dealing with the money?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it sounds like the hon. member prepared his question in advance and did not take account of the answer I gave to the earlier question.

As I just said, I have asked my department to give me very quickly the answer concerning my question as to whether we can make advance payments to the provinces. I do understand the urgency of the situation and I would very much like to be in a position to make such advance payments.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, that is cold comfort for Nova Scotians and the Nova Scotia government that has been waiting since 1999 for the federal government to pay the unpaid bills.

There is a double standard at play. Internal government problems with HRDC or the privacy commissioner go unchecked, while the provinces which have suffered disasters are subjected to shamelessly lengthy audits.

Will the government commit to the immediate payment of the four outstanding claims from Nova Scotia and make an advance payment for this week's disaster, the fifth to hit the province in five years?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reason why I am moving in the direction of advance payments is that I understand that it takes some time to do the auditing.

We also have to wait for the province to develop its programs and then for the federal government to get involved. It is a bilateral affair involving provincial and federal initiatives. It does take time.

I want to speed up the process as a whole. But in the meantime, I am looking at making advance payments.

* * *

ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is funny that so many Liberals are up on their feet today congratulating Mr. McGuinty when it was Mr. Eves—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Maybe we could just rewind the clock and start over.

The hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, it was Mr. Eves who linked his agenda to that of the new Liberal leader, not once, but six times. Mr. McGuinty has promised to do in Ontario what the NDP tried to accomplish three days ago in this House, with respect to proportional representation.

Oral Questions

Now that Mr. McGuinty is the Premier of Ontario, has the Liberal government changed its mind about a referendum on proportional representation? Or does it think that Mr. McGuinty is wrong-headed on this issue?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to associate my words of congratulations to the new Premier of Ontario with those of the interim leader of the NDP. We are very pleased with Mr. McGuinty's victory. The Government of Canada will work very closely with him for the betterment of Ontarians.

As to his other request, we voted on it a couple of days back.

* * *

● (1130)

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the fact is the Liberals voted against what Mr. McGuinty is proposing to do in Ontario.

But I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food

He will know that the U.S. International Trade Commission came out with its decision today. Unfortunately, it seems that the harassment of Canadian farmers will continue. A good decision on durum but a bad decision on spring wheat.

What does the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food intend to do now to protect Canadian farmers from this continuing unjustified harassment of Canadian exports to the United States?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have said prior to this that we would take every step that we possibly could, including launching panels in both NAFTA and WTO if that is seen necessary.

We have very successfully demonstrated in the past that the Canadian Wheat Board works and acts within WTO compliance. We have proven that in the past and I am confident we can prove it in the future.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, highway tolls are rising, roads on the Prairies are falling apart, the link to the Vancouver airport is struggling to be financed, there is still a toll on the Trans-Canada Highway in Nova Scotia, and traffic in the City of Calgary has doubled in the past four years.

We have all kinds of transportation problems but they cannot be solved because of the \$4.7 billion that the government collects in gas taxes. It is only reinvesting 2.4% back into roads.

My question for the government is, with all the problems that we have in infrastructure and roads, do Canadian taxpayers not deserve a little bit better than 2.4% being put into roads?

Hon. David Collette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we would have thought that the hon. member would have acknowledged the nearly \$8 billion that the government has put into

infrastructure in the last 10 years. It is infrastructure that has been improved: it is roads, it is sewage capacity, and it is water systems.

It is everything that is of concern to Canadians. I hope that the hon. member will acknowledge what we have done and congratulate us for the investments we have made.

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge what the government calls infrastructure, which includes a canoe museum in the Prime Minister's riding. That is not exactly the infrastructure Canadians are looking for.

In 2002 B.C. motorists gave Ottawa \$1.1 billion in gas taxes. In return it gave British Columbia \$37 million. That is 3%.

Mayors Joe Trasolini, Ralph Drew, John Kingsbury and other mayors from across British Columbia need more money for the transportation infrastructure in Canada's fastest growing province. The former Liberal finance minister had 10 years, 9 budgets and a majority government to deliver. He failed.

Why does British Columbia have to constantly wait for the government to ante up and give our province the money it needs to grow for the future?

Hon. David Collette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from B.C. has forgotten the investments we have made on the Trans-Canada Highway in his province.

He has forgotten the investments we have made with the expansion of the cruise facilities and convention centre in Vancouver. He has forgotten about the commitment we have made to a rapid transit line to Vancouver airport. These are all infrastructure projects in his own province.

If he does not know what is going on in his own province, how can he come here and lecture the government?

* * *

[Translation]

FORMER PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General is categorical: George Radwanski's contract was negotiated and approved by the Privy Council Office. The position of head of the Privy Council is an honorary position. A handbook signed by the Prime Minister confirms that appointments are made by his office. And finally, Eddie Goldenberg said he never got involved.

If that is so, we would like to know who in the Prime Minister's Office negotiated the appointment and hiring conditions of George Radwanski.

Oral Questions

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, Mr. Radwanski's appointment was put to a vote in this House. Of course, the appointment was proposed by the government, as we know. This was done through an order in council. Then we had a debate followed by a vote in this House, both of which are duly recorded in the *House of Commons Debates*.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it would appear that neither the Treasury Board, nor the Privy Council, or the Prime Minister's Office or the Prime Minister's adviser, Eddie Goldenberg, authorized the extension of benefits granted to George Radwanski.

Are we to understand that the decision ultimately came from the Prime Minister himself?

• (1135)

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what extension the hon. member is referring to. If she is talking about the housing allowance, there is an optional housing allowance available to senior officials in the public service who are from out of town and who temporarily relocate to Ottawa. This is not the first time it was granted. Other officers of Parliament have enjoyed similar benefits in the past.

* * *

[English]

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, when the smell of fresh asphalt is in the air, it must be election time in Canada.

For 10 years the phantom Prime Minister imposed tax after tax on gasoline. Then he had the audacity to add GST on top of that. Of the \$5 billion he hoarded every year, less than 2.5% leaked into road construction between elections.

Is the present finance minister prepared to reverse this rip-off today, or is he just the new front man in these pre-election games?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Alliance is obsessed with Liberal leadership, and with good reason because we will be changing leaders, and we will go to victory in next year's election.

However, I want to talk about more current leadership and that is the leadership that Dalton McGuinty gave last night in ending eight years of darkness for the people of Ontario. That is what he should know about.

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that within the year Mr. McGuinty will have his own feuds with the finance minister over there too.

The Liberal concerns for infrastructure peak in the months preceding an election and then conveniently fade away. It proves the point made by H.L. Mencken, who the finance minister loves to quote, when he said, "and every election is sort of an advance auction sale of stolen goods". Nothing could be truer. Roads and bridges take years to build and need regular upkeep.

Why does the Liberal government always ignore these facts between elections?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, official opposition members want to give us lectures on infrastructure, and its members are clapping that. They are in no position to give any lectures on any subject. They cannot even get their amalgamation with the Tories straight. They cannot even get their own leadership straight.

As a member from Ontario I hope they get together and that Mike Harris becomes their leader so the people of Canada can do to Mike Harris what Dalton McGuinty did to Ernie Eves last night.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this week, the President of the Treasury Board demonstrated how badly she has been overtaken by events in the Radwanski affair. The same incompetence is evident when it comes to official languages.

In point of fact, how was the President of the Treasury Board able to ignore the alarming signs of non-respect for the Official Languages Act in the recent annual reports of the Department of National Defence?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely aware of the importance of official languages. As an anglophone Montrealer myself, I know the importance of speaking both languages and being able to teach in both languages, for instance at the l'Université du Québec à Montréal.

You can be absolutely assured that I am completely and formally committed to substantially improving the linguistic performance of members of the Canadian Forces.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will preface my question to the President of the Treasury Board with this quote, "National Defence, like the 182 other institutions subject to the Official Languages Act, must report to the Treasury Board Secretariat each year." I was not the one who wrote that; it was Diane Allard, Special Assistant to the President of the Treasury Board for official languages.

In the latest report, it is clear: at National Defence, they do not respect the law. How does the President of the Treasury Board intend to go about doing her job and enforcing the law? I address my question to her.

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have just said that I am extremely serious about the importance of official languages, particularly in my own department.

Specifically, I have made a commitment to do certain things, including incorporating language skills into performance evaluations for senior military staff, increasing the number of bilingual positions staffed with qualified incumbents by 15% over the next three years, and much more, but I am out of time.

Oral Questions

● (1140)

[English]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, veterans' widows and indeed the general public are aware that the government is now giving some consideration to making changes in the veterans independence program.

If these changes are made and if they are presented to Parliament, the government can rest assured that this House and the Canadian Alliance will give swift approval.

Can the acting Prime Minister advise the House when we can expect to be made aware of these changes that will treat all war widows equally?

Mr. Ivan Grose (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have said in this House before, we did what we could within our budget. This department stays within its budget.

Is the member opposite suggesting that possibly because we could not look after all the widows we should look after none?

If, as, and when this question comes before the House, we will address it at that time.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, a ray of hope has been given to these veterans' widows and the public in general through the media.

Can the government confirm today that the necessary changes are forthcoming in an expedient manner, allowing war widows to have their share of their deserving benefits prior to November 11 of this year?

Mr. Ivan Grose (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me assure the member opposite that it is a priority item with this department. It was a priority item. That is why we addressed it as well as we could. It will continue to be a priority item with this department.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

I have heard that Mexico has reopened its border to Canadian beef products.

Will the minister bring us up to date on this? When will shipments start and are there similar opportunities in other countries?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Peterborough for his involvement and engagement on this and other issues for his agriculture constituency.

Yes, we are very pleased that the country of Mexico has opened its borders to boneless beef. This will now allow certificates to be granted and shipments started to Mexico. It is our second largest trading country. That will add to what we have already shipped to the United States, this month's certificates, 35 million pounds. We are

looking forward in the near future to making similar announcements for countries such as the Philippines, Russia and others.

* * *

[Translation]

PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current review, all the members agree that developing countries must have access to cheaper versions of patented drugs to fight AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. However, standard procedures must be followed, with indepth consideration of this proposal by the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology.

Given the Minister of Industry's history with generic drug companies, what type of legislative agenda will he propose to the House? Will he use this opportunity to help his friends at generic drug companies or will he implement real measures to help the poor and the sick?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is well aware that the parliamentary leaders of each party in the House discussed this issue a few days ago. They indicated their general support for such measures, subject of course to the text of the bill he will introduce, in an attempt to assist developing countries, while fully respecting the positions of all the stakeholders.

* * *

MUSÉE LAURIER

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question has to do with a matter of great concern to me. In a letter to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Canadian Heritage, among others, the Director of the Musée Laurier in Victoriaville, in my riding, stressed that although Sir Wilfrid Laurier's personal residence has been recognized as a national historic site, it does not receive federal funding, which causes many people to question its importance.

On the eve of the museum's 75th anniversary, can the minister ensure that, finally and officially, the museum's request for approval under Parks Canada's national historic sites of Canada cost-sharing program will be granted and that it will get the necessary funds?

Ms. Carole-Marie Allard (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the interest of the hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska in honouring the memory of the great Sir Wilfrid Laurier is praiseworthy. Let him rest assured that the Department of Canadian Heritage has already invested over \$16,000 since 1996 in this historic site. We are certainly very open to the possibility of celebrating its 75th anniversary, and await the Musée Laurier's proposals.

* * *

[English]

INTEREST RATES

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the acting Prime Minister.

As he knows, the prime interest rate now is at 4.5%. Yet the interest rates on most credit cards in the country are over 18%, in other words, about four times the prime rate.

What I want to know from the acting Prime Minister is what will the government do to bring down the exceptionally high rates on credit cards and help people who are locked into them?

• (1145)

Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has done quite a good job in educating Canadians about the fact that there are over 500 products in the credit card business which means that the best way to protect the consumer is to create a competitive environment. That competitive environment exists here in Canada.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Petro-Canada has announced that it will be shutting down the refinery in Oakville by 2004, importing 45,000 barrels of oil per day from Europe and elsewhere to supply its gas stations in Ontario, possibly via Canada Steamship Lines. Let us hope it does not dump it into the ocean again.

The reason for the shutdown is the government's decision to promote cleaner gas use in Canada by January 2005. The company has decided it will not invest in clean technology.

The government remains a 20% investor in Petro-Canada. How does the government expect other Canadian companies to follow new environmental guidelines and keep investment, jobs and maintain secure energy supplies with this example? What is the minister responsible for crown corporations doing about this?

Mr. Alan Tonks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the thrust of the question really is aimed at understanding better the government's rational plan with respect to climate change and the restructuring of our economy in a sustainable way.

As the member will know, in the last budget we spent \$1.7 billion on new technology, \$2 billion was announced in the last budget, \$1 billion investing through initiatives that are looking at alternative fuels. All of this is to take our dependence off those resources that are not renewable. In fact, I am sure that is a step in the direction the member would—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last week the government incredibly tried to retroactively cut the danger pay of our armed forces personnel who are working hard in the war against terrorism in the Middle East. This week the government announced that it is going to increase the rents on their private married quarters up to \$100 a home, which completely neutralizes the 2.5% pay increase they received. This is absolutely disgraceful.

Oral Questions

Will the Minister of National Defence do the right thing and stop this shameful money grab against our armed forces and freeze the rents on their private married quarters?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the interest of stopping misinformation with regard to the preamble, there was absolutely never any clawback. Let us get that point straight first.

Second, on the members question, the Canadian Forces, my department and myself are devoted to the provision of affordable housing to all members of the Canadian Forces. At the same time it is government policy that we not subsidize those who occupy government owned houses. The Canadian Forces have 70% of their people in privately owned houses and 30% in government owned houses. It would be inappropriate that one group be subsidized at the expense—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister needs to come to my riding in Esquimalt and see the substandard housing that my military families are living in. It is absolutely disgraceful.

It is completely unfair for the government to give our armed forces personnel money with one hand and then yank it back with the other.

I ask once again. Will the minister do the right thing and stop the shameful increases in the rents on the private married quarters and freeze those rents today?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have visited the hon. member's riding many times.

I would repeat that quality of life initiatives are a top priority for the government. Indeed I would give my predecessor credit. He always made quality of life for members of the Canadian Forces his top priority. He achieved many successes in terms of salaries, resource centres, health expenditures and many other initiatives.

In terms of this rent issue, as I said before, it is an equity issue. The government certainly limits the annual increase that is permissible and also limits the percentage of any individual's income that is devoted to housing.

* * *

[Translation]

CINAR

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the week, the question to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons was clear: did the Minister of Justice receive a report from the RCMP with respect to the CINAR case?

Instead of answering our question, the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons tried to cloud the issue by saying that he would not comment on whether or not there had been RCMP investigations. We know that CINAR was investigated. That was not the question and the government House leader knew it.

Oral Questions

We want to know whether the RCMP submitted its report or not. Can the Minister of Justice enlighten us?

• (1150)

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I answered the question yesterday. I thought it was a thorough answer. A question was asked in the House. Someone wanted to know whether there was a report. I said that I would inquire. Later, upon rereading the question, I noticed that it implied that it was about a police report. Of course, we do not comment on whether or not there is a police report, let alone on its content and even less so on who submitted it to whom.

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question was for the Minister of Justice. Why is he so afraid to confirm the existence of a report? What is the government trying to hide? The question is simple: did the Minister of Justice receive a report from the RCMP concerning CINAR and does he intend to follow up on its recommendations? It is simple; he should be a man about it.

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier in my first answer, we do not comment on whether or not there is an RCMP report, let alone on its content or to whom it was submitted. We did not comment on a such a case in response to a first question, nor will we comment in response to a supplementary question.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government has failed to answer my questions regarding BSE so I will try a question from Beth, a constituent of mine. Beth writes "My family operates a cattle hauling business that has been at standstill since BSE hit. Twelve families depend on this business. We have no cash coming in. The aid program that is being offered has not filtered down. What about the spinoff businesses that are collapsing as a result of this? We need help".

My question on behalf of Beth is, who in the government is prepared to step forward and help businesses like Beth's? Who will do that?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the way to recover for the beef industry is to get beef moving and then Beth and her employees will have an opportunity to truck cattle again.

As I have said, we have the American border open partially. We have the Mexican border open now and a majority of the product that we have sent to Mexico, to our second largest customer, will now be eligible, can I say, to go there.

We are moving very well as far as opening the border to the United States for live cattle under 30 months of age. We anticipate that in the not too distant future that is the way Beth and everyone in the beef industry will start to recover even more so from the situation that we are all in.

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that border is only open a crack and the minister knows it.

Beth is 68 years old and she is watching a lifetime of hard work, sweat and tears slip away. She went on to say that she has been in contact with the government and she was told there were other things more important on its agenda. BSE was third on the list behind SARS and the definition of marriage. It is unbelievable.

Her question is straightforward. How can the most devastating issue facing our industry be third on the list of the government's priorities?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. member could give me a copy of the letter from whoever responded on behalf of the government.

We have a number of issues and that party over there wants us to address all of them. The reaction of the government within 30 days of announcing we had BSE was to come forward with \$260 million, followed up with \$36 million more. Two weeks ago I announced \$600 million in transition funds. We signed implementation agreements. There is over \$500 million in business risk management for Canadian farmers.

We have made that money flow. We have shown we are there to support.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Carmen Provenzano (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that skills development and learning are crucial to an individual's success and to Canada's labour market and economy as a whole.

The government has made skills and learning a priority and Canada's labour market performance shows the positive results of this approach.

However, aboriginal people, especially in remote and northern regions, do not have the same opportunities for skills development or employment as other Canadians.

Will the Minister of Human Resources Development tell the House what the government is doing to help aboriginal Canadians develop the skills they need for the workforce and to participate in economic opportunities?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, indeed in Canada today we have a concerning paradox. On the one hand we anticipate a shortage of up to a million skilled workers by the year 2010. On the other hand we know that many aboriginal workers are not fully integrated into the labour force.

The gap here is skills. That is why today I am pleased to announce the aboriginal employment and skills partnership, an \$85 million program that will assist aboriginal people in gaining the skills that they need to participate in the economic development and activities in communities in and around where they live.

We hope through partnership to build 7,000 jobs for aboriginal people so that they can make a vital contribution to the Canadian economy.

* * *

• (1155)

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last week Canada's top cop, Toronto police chief Julian Fantino admitted to an international conference on child exploitation that he was "embarrassed and ashamed by the performance of our criminal justice system that in essence has put the rights of pedophiles ahead of the rights of children". He went on to say "Canada lacks both the vision, determination and the moral courage to address this issue", words I have heard from many parts of this country.

When will the government obliterate conditional sentences and house arrest for these horrific crimes against children?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Do you want to dance?

The Deputy Speaker: I no longer referee so please make it easier for the Speaker. The hon. Solicitor General.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in fact the reason the Minister of Justice and I were both trying to get up to answer this question was that we just had a federal-provincial-territorial ministers meeting in which we did announce the centre established by the RCMP for child protection services. That comes from the coordinating committee that we announced last January or February between the OPP and the RCMP.

We are moving forward on the issue of child pornography and we are continuing to take on that challenge.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Tweedledum or Tweedledee, it does not matter. I am looking for an answer to the question.

I will now ask the Solicitor General. He is now reconsidering changing the sex offender registry to include convicted pedophiles and that is a good improvement. Does the Solicitor General agree with me that child pornography is a vile crime and should be stamped out altogether? If he does not agree, why not?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Of course, Mr. Speaker, I agree with him on that point. Of course I do. That is why we have been moving ahead as we are.

The member should be congratulating us for some of the success coming from the federal-provincial-territorial meeting. We are moving ahead on child pornography. We are gaining greater consensus for our national sex offender registry. We are taking on the challenges that are before the country in terms of making our streets safer.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

STEEL IMPORTS

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have learned that several ships with approximately 80,000 tonnes of reinforcing steel on board are about to set sail, if they have not already, from Turkey to Quebec and eastern Canada. An August 2002 decision by the Canadian International Trade Tribunal on a safeguard inquiry into the importation of certain steel goods into Canada recommended that the federal government impose a surtax on reinforcing bars.

Since this decision excludes the United States, does the Minister of Finance intend to act on it in order to prevent steel dumping on Quebec and Canadian markets?

[English]

Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is seized with this issue. The government is very much aware of the problems of the international steel market caused by overcapacity and cheap imports. The overcapacity is a global problem that we are attacking on several fronts, particularly in the context of discussions and negotiations with the OECD.

* * *

[Translation]

GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT

Mr. Marcel Gagnon (Champlain, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while the federal government is squandering public funds in the boondoggle at Human Resources Development Canada, the sponsorship scandal and the Radwanski affair, seniors have to tighten their belts while waiting for the money they are owed under the Guaranteed Income Supplement Program.

Is it not time for the Minister of Human Resources Development to recognize that her department has been negligent and to give seniors the money they are owed, with full retroactivity?

• (1200)

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, the government is anxious to ensure that seniors have access to the programs that we have in place to support them. That includes the guaranteed income supplement.

The hon. member will know we have increased our connections, our contacts with Canadian seniors so they are aware of this program. We have made the applications much easier because indeed, we want those citizens to have access to these important supporting programs.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC): Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I introduced Bill C-241, a whistleblower's bill, in this House which would go a long way in reducing or eliminating wrongdoing in government by protecting whistleblowers.

Business of the House

Why is the minister so reluctant to embrace that legislation or at least at the minimum, introduce government legislation which would do the same thing; protect whistleblowers and end the type of corruption that we have seen in this government?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not only do we have a policy but we received the first annual report of the Public Service Integrity Officer. Dr. Keyserlingk has recommended a legislative framework for his actions. At the same time he said that he needed some further analysis to suggest any model to the Canadian government.

We have a working group, led by Professor Kernaghan, that will report to me in 2004, and I took the commitment to submit those recommendations directly to parliamentarians so they can have a say in it.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the good news is the International Trade Commission has ruled unanimously today that U.S. tariffs on Canadian durum are illegal. The bad news is the ITC split two to two on wheat tariffs so the United States will doubtless continue its ongoing harassment against wheat farmers as political considerations trump common sense.

Does the government intend to launch an appeal on the 14% tariffs that harasses our wheat farmers and will it help by picking up some of the legal tab which is now running in excess of \$10 million?

Mr. Murray Calder (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, Canada's wheat exports to the United States are not subsidized. We are carefully reviewing the U.S. decision and then we will examine our WTO and NAFTA options under the context of deciding the most effective steps to take.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General has now twice used the phrase "every rule in the book was broken" in her reports about the financial mismanagement of this government. It appeared in the report on the Quebec advertising scandal and just this week appeared in her report on the expenses of the former privacy commissioner.

My question is for one of the prime ministers over there. Given the stinging indictment of the Auditor General, why is this behaviour allowed to continue?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General was very clear this week. She said not to generalize problems found in the Office of the Privacy Commissioner to the whole public service. This is not me who is saying that. The Auditor General is saying it.

This is exactly what the member is doing. This is not a general problem across the public service. For the Officer of the Privacy Commissioner, we have said that we will implement all the recommendations of the Auditor General.

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Deputy Speaker: Today we are honoured to have with us a group of distinguished Canadian craft artists: the winner and two of the finalists for the 2003 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: Walter Ostrom, ceramic artist, from Indian Harbour, Nova Scotia, winner of the 2003 Saidye Bronfman Award; and the finalists Michael Hosaluk, wood turner, from Saskatoon and Gordon Peteran, furniture designer and artist, from Toronto.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

BILL C-41

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been negotiations and an agreement reached among House leaders yesterday and earlier this morning about the following motion. If you were to seek it, I believe you would find consent for its adoption. The motion is with regard to Bill C-41, the technical corrections bill. I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice, all questions necessary to dispose of amendments at the report stage, concurrence at report stage and third reading and passage of Bill C-41, the technical corrections bill, be now deemed to have been put and carried.

● (1205)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill deemed reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed)

* * *

WAYS AND MEANS

NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 83(1) I wish to table a notice of a ways and means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act. I am also tabling legislative proposals and explanatory notes on the same subject. I ask that an order of the day be designated to debate the motion.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FINANCE

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Finance concerning Bill C-48, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (natural resources).

The committee has considered Bill C-48 and has agreed to report it (without amendment).

[English]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage seeking authorization to continue its deliberations for the statutory review of the Copyright Act beyond October 3, 2003, as determined by the act, and to present its final report no later than September 30, 2004.

[Translation]

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

[English]

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move that the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, presented on Friday, June 13, 2003, be concurred in.

I understand that I have 20 minutes with a 10 minute question and comment period. I would like to advise the Chair that I will be splitting my time with the member for Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot.

The fourth report of the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates was presented and tabled in the House on June 13, 2003. I would remind all hon. members that this report is the one page report in which the committee reported that it had lost confidence in the Privacy Commissioner.

I would like to read relevant extracts from the report, which states:

Officials of the offices of both the Privacy Commissioner and the Information Commissioner, having acknowledged that they were testifying under oath and had a duty to speak the truth, have given the Committee information during a series of in camera hearings that has compelled Members to conclude, unanimously, that the Privacy Commissioner has deliberately misled the Committee on several recent occasions.

The report continues:

Committee Members believe the Commissioner has misled the Committee with respect to: (a) the circumstances under which the Office provided a copy of a letter from which one of the original paragraphs had been deleted; (b) a set of expense reports whose incompleteness was not acknowledged in the cover letter; (c) travel expense forms on which there had been an attempt to conceal, by the application of white-out material, certain information; and (d) the reasons for his failure to appear in person at a hearing on the Commission's main estimates. When these concerns were brought to the attention of the Commissioner or Office officials, some additional documents were provided but the Commissioner has continued to mislead the

Committee with respect to these matters in subsequent letters and testimony before the Committee.

The report concludes:

Absolute honesty, in reporting to Parliament and its committees, is a central requirement for all officers of Parliament. Unconditional confidence in that honesty, on the part of parliamentarians, is essential if Parliament is to support its officers in their important duties.

Having deliberated upon the findings set out above, Members of the Committee are in unanimous agreement that they have lost confidence in the Commissioner. We are no longer able to believe that information provided by the Privacy Commissioner about his activities can be assumed to be accurate and complete.

Furthermore, evidence provided to the Committee raises concerns about financial practices in the Office of the Privacy Commissioner, and the Committee has requested by letter that the Auditor General conduct a comprehensive audit of financial practices at the Commission.

First of all, I would like to acknowledge the significant contribution of the member for Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot. I want his constituents to know that he is an excellent member of Parliament who has earned a lot of respect in this place for the work he did to assist the committee to identify in the first instance some of the threads of evidence that led to this report. He is singularly responsible, and his constituents should know that he has been of enormous assistance to Parliament in addressing this most serious matter.

The Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates is a new committee. We have a number of responsibilities. One of them was to review Bill C-25, a very important bill on the renewal of the public service.

The committee reviewed this very extensive, comprehensive bill, Bill C-25, which came forward after two years of consultation in the preparation of the bill on behalf of the President of the Treasury Board and her department, on behalf of the Public Service Commission, and on behalf of all the representative groups. In the committee's review of the bill, one aspect of that bill and the discussion was the aspect of whistle-blowers. Whistle-blowing is a label given to a person who brings out information when they believe or allege that there is some wrongdoing, which may in fact come back on them in a punitive way, whether it be fear of reprisals, et cetera.

● (1210)

This is a very serious question and I want to assure the House that the President of the Treasury Board, in consultation with the committee and the other stakeholders in this matter, all of us, are working very diligently. In fact, the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates now has struck a subcommittee to examine this more carefully to determine what steps might be appropriate to ensure over the long term that our very honourable and capable public service will have the protections it needs, not unreasonable protections but general protections, so that there are no frivolous allegations, but so that should there come to our attention even the slightest allegation of an impropriety or a violation of the Financial Administration Act or other aspects, they will have a venue to be able to bring that to the attention of those who are in a position to properly investigate and to address it as appropriate.

Routine Proceedings

This was the environment in which our committee was first engaged: this aspect of the need for whistle-blower protection. As a consequence, the rest of our responsibilities involved the review of the estimates of a number of departments to look into the financial activities.

The member for Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot has been a champion for transparency and accountability, for access to information provisions, for protection of privacy, for the protection of the privileges of Parliament, but not unduly, and has championed that if we set standards, we should set standards by our own performance. He is working very diligently to show that parliamentarians are on side. It is extremely important and it is because of his contribution.

I will not be going into the details of how this has all unfolded, but in my brief time I did want to make the point very simply. I want Canadians to know this. Notwithstanding that a particular office, the Office of the Privacy Commissioner, with approximately 100 employees, of which it has been identified that there are some people who have committed acts in violation of policies, procedures and maybe even criminal law, I want Canadians to know that this should not be taken as a broad brush indictment of the employees of the privacy commission, of the access to information commissioner's office, or of any other public service group or department.

Our work addressed solely the matters that came to our attention with regard to the Office of the Privacy Commissioner. We did not conclude or have any evidence or any indication that the problems we identified in this one office were endemic outside that office. I want to assure Canadians that our public servants continue to be held in high esteem by parliamentarians for their work and the support they give to the processes of making good laws, of making sure that there is compliance with all the rules, the policies and procedures, and the laws of Canada. We had that evidence and the committee is very supportive of our very capable public service.

There is one key area I wanted to mention but that I do not have time to go into, so let me try to wrap up. We will, over the coming weeks and months, be addressing some of the points that came out, not only from the committee's fifth report wherein the details of what we found are laid out and available on the parliamentary website, but also from the Auditor General's report on the Office of the Privacy Commissioner. There will be subsequent investigations ongoing, some even referred to the RCMP and to the tax authorities.

This will be with us for some time, but I want everyone to know that from what I can see in this place, parliamentarians are 100% in agreement, not only that each and every one of these matters has to be addressed and disposed of in the specific cases, but that we are committed as a Parliament to ensure that the tools and the changes are made to ensure that this never ever happens again.

• (1215)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I listened to what the member was saying. He was using phrases like "this should never happen again". I do not know whether he observed when I asked a question earlier today. The President of the Treasury Board responded to my question by saying that we ought to heed the Auditor General's report and not paint with the same brush all the civil servants. I am inclined to believe that, yet these things

seem to be dealt with only when they come to public light. So it does raise the question: How often is this occurring, notwithstanding that we do not want to paint all of the civil servants with the same brush? I too want to believe they are honest and forthright.

We now have this report. The member is suggesting that we should concur in the report, but I would like to know what steps the government is taking that are tangible and explicit and which will give a message to all civil servants that we expect that they are honest, but in the event they are not, this is not to be tolerated.

Has that message been sent out? What is the Liberal government doing to actually hit this thing at the beginning and prevent these problems?

Mr. Paul Szabo: Madam Speaker, I do not disagree with the member's statements, but I believe that Parliament must be very careful about how it attributes the root of the problem to the government or to the Public Service Commission or to the minister or whatever.

I commend to the member's attention for his reading the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, which is on the process of reviewing the estimates. That is the process under which this matter came to light. I would remind the member that throughout this place historically, 80% of standing committees have not reviewed the estimates. They have not done the work and we must share part of that blame. It is not the government; it is parliamentarians.

The member will know of an important op-ed piece that was written by Robert Marleau, former clerk of the House and now interim privacy commissioner. He suggested that Parliament was ignoring 50% of its responsibilities, that is, a proper and thorough review of the estimates. I agree with the member, but we cannot throw the mud away until we get our own act cleaned up. We are also culpable in this matter.

I know that all hon. members will want to read the sixth report of the standing committee because we will be encouraging all committees to adopt a process which will allow us to effectively discharge that 50% of our responsibilities that heretofore has been ignored.

• (1220)

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the member for Mississauga South could describe how the committee, in its investigations after the initial problem surfaced with respect to Mr. Radwanski's expense accounts, operated in a non-partisan way to reach the conclusions in the report he has just tabled.

Mr. Paul Szabo: Madam Speaker, because much of the information we received was in fact from whistle-blowers, from employees who had first-hand, direct knowledge, it came to our attention and we were able to discern that the best thing to do to get them to put that information on the record was to go in camera and under oath so that people could be open and would not be subject to any reprisals for their open statements.

Routine Proceedings

This matter, I am sure, will be discussed by others, but in the end result, we worked on a non-partisan basis and had a unanimous report of all parties represented on the committee, which is all five of our parties, that the process we used was appropriate and the conclusion we reached was the correct conclusion.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's interest and expertise in this important question.

Given the enormity of the government, with \$160 billion, \$120 billion of which is operating expenses, with some 28 major departments, some 400,000 employees, and countless agencies, boards, and commissions, how does he think we ought to, as a parliamentary body, choose which ones to focus on? Obviously there is some degree of waste in all of them and there may be some abuse in many that we do not know about. How do we choose and prioritize them?

Mr. Paul Szabo: Madam Speaker, I would recommend the sixth report of the standing committee to the member. It describes the process.

The Auditor General does not do a 100% audit every year, and we do not have to either. It is an established process of sampling, risk analysis, and consulting with existing documentation rather than reinventing the wheel each and every time. But we must start somewhere.

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak to the government operations committee report on the George Radwanski affair.

The member for Mississauga South was, I think, far too kind with respect to my role in the affair. However, it is certainly true that it was a question that I posed at the government operations committee that led to the disclosures and the whole salacious scandal, shall we say, of a servant of this House, an officer of Parliament, engaging in overspending, improper spending, and treating his staff and department in almost an abusive and brutal manner.

What ultimately came out was a story that has been in all the newspapers of a person who had very little regard for the expectation of integrity that he should have had, very little regard for the people he managed or very little regard indeed for the office that he held. And it has been quite a story, certainly.

Despite the fact that it has made headlines and it has been so salacious, it is, in fact, an exceptional circumstance. It does not speak to the entire civil service.

I would like to address part of my remarks to the concern expressed by the member for Elk Island. People must keep in sight the fact that the reason the Office of the Privacy Commissioner developed the problems it did was because it is not under the Access to Information Act.

The original question that started all of this was a question to the Privacy Commissioner about why he thought that his office should not be under the Access to Information Act. It is legislation that applies to most government departments and permits access to routine financial documents and operational documents by the media, other members of Parliament and the general public.

Mr. Radwanski replied in the negative. He said he did not want to be under the Access to Information Act even though other officers of Parliament said that they were willing to be under the Access to Information Act.

The fact that there was no routine disclosure and the fact that a department like the Office of the Privacy Commissioner would not come under routine external audit enabled Mr. Radwanski to engage in practices that would normally never have come to light.

Indeed, the fact that his documents were requested by the committee, which had the power to summon the documents, is the only reason any of this came to light in the first place. The documents were sent to the committee, and I was the one who requested his expense accounts and other details of his operations. When I looked at them for the first time, and when other members of the committee looked at them for the first time, none of us could see anything wrong with them. In fact, when I looked at them, I thought the hospitality expenses were rather high, but I did not see that as a very important issue.

However, because they were tabled before the committee, people in the Privacy Commissioner's office saw those documents and realized that they had been altered, that they were incomplete, that there had been sections whited out, and that in one document a whole paragraph had disappeared.

Now I submit to the House that no ordinary audit would have caught that alteration of documents. Had the Auditor General gone in on a regular external audit and looked at Mr. Radwanski's expense sheets or looked at the letter he sent to the justice department that later was discovered to have been altered, she would not have noticed it.

And this is the power of the Access to Information Act. When routine documents are available, they are not only available to the media, they are not only available to the public, they are also available to other staff in a department of government.

• (1225)

When documents are altered or changed and they can be called up on the Internet, then there is an opportunity for people who know that they are false to raise the alarm. That is precisely what happened in this case.

When the documents were tabled before the committee, there were people who called me, the chairman of the committee and others to point out the missing information.

That set in motion the investigation that my hon. colleague from Mississauga South and other members of the government operations committee conducted so thoroughly and effectively. It has now led to the resignation of the Privacy Commissioner and an ongoing investigation of where the failures occurred that enabled this person to abuse his public office.

I would insist and I would repeat that the primary problem, no matter what other problems existed, was the fact that the Office of the Privacy Commissioner was not under the Access to Information Act.

Routine Proceedings

Returning to the question of the member for Elk Island of how extensive the problem is that we discovered with Mr. Radwanski, I would suggest that it probably does not exist where government agencies and departments fall under the Access to Information Act.

There are many departments that are under the Access to Information Act. Unfortunately there are a number of small tribunals, small agencies and organizations of perhaps 50 or 100 employees that are not under the Access to Information Act, are not subject to internal audit, and are not required to publish annual audited statements.

They are out there and one of the things that has been disclosed by the Radwanski affair is the fact that there is this major gap in our coverage and our oversights of agencies that spend taxpayers' dollars.

Two things should flow, I hope, from the work of the government operations committee on the Privacy Commissioner's file.

First, we need to reform or adjust the Access to Information Act so that every agency of government that spends taxpayers' dollars comes under the Access to Information Act so that everyone can see how that money is spent. Second, we need to compile a list of those agencies that are not under the Access to Information Act and set up a regime where they are regularly audited. I do not see why any agency in government should not be subject to a proper audit. Those are two major lessons we can take from our experience with the Privacy Commissioner.

This whole exercise with respect to discovering the problems in the Privacy Commissioner's office and investigating them is a wonderful example of what members of Parliament can do together. It was not the government that discovered this problem and it was not just the Liberals. The fact that such a thorough job was done to expose the problems that existed with the Privacy Commissioner is a reflection on standing committees, in this case the government operations committee, realizing their power.

I have been in the House for 10 years and 10 years is a long time. But I can remember when I first came in 1993 and, generally speaking, standing committees did very little. Basically, because they were dominated by government members who always wanted to do what their leadership wanted them to do, it was very difficult to see standing committees show any independence or show any real initiative to get to the bottom of things, to look at government spending, and to look at the issues that they were really charged by Canadians to look at.

There has almost been a revolution. The government operations committee did a wonderful job on the estimates as well as on the Radwanski file. The Standing Committee on Public Accounts has done excellent work in looking at expense accounts and at the problems of the sponsorship files where public agencies appear to have misused public funds.

● (1230)

Other committees have shown similar initiatives but these two, in particular, I commend. I think what we are looking at is a new era of Parliament. Once backbench MPs discover the real power there will be no looking back. There will only be looking forward.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by my colleague across the way. I listened intently with great interest to the premise that I think he asserted very strongly, as did his colleague, the member who made the motion and whose motion we are now debating.

That is the premise that there ought to be accountability at all levels of government and I think I am right in saying that no taxpayers' money should be spent for them by the government without full exposure, transparency and disclosure. Everything should be available.

I would like to ask the member, how does he feel when we get information in a public document outlining how public money was spent and there is a whole bunch of information obliterated with whiteout? I, too, have experienced that when I have tried to find out some information. I got blank pages with a code that said "private", therefore I could not see it.

How can private stuff get into public expenditures? That is one of the issues of course in this particular case and I would like the member to respond as to whether that is a general premise that he is making, that it should be full and total transparency and disclosure?

● (1235)

Mr. John Bryden: Madam Speaker, obviously we cannot have absolute transparency because there are certain things that governments must keep confidential in order to be able to operate. Of course, personal information must be kept confidential, as well.

This is why, when the member summons documents under the Access to Information Act, and that is indeed what he is referring to, there are sections that are blanked out.

However, where he is very right is that both the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act must be reformed. They must be updated because there are sections of the acts that enable bureaucrats to take things out of documents that should remain there.

Unfortunately, the Access to Information Act is now 21 years old. It has never been reformed. There have been various tries at it. I am one of those who will be introducing a private member's bill to upgrade the Access to Information Act so that there is better access, for instance, to cabinet documents and background papers. Every document that is 30 years old should be accessible. The Access to Information Act must be reformed to bring the Privacy Commissioner and the Access to Information Commissioner under the act.

These are all very positive things that need to be done and I would hope that the member, and his entire side in fact, will support me when I table a private member's bill in the House next week that does this for the Access to Information Act. It would reform the Access to Information Act in these many ways and enable better transparency and accountability, and would bring in all those agencies that right now are outside the act. It would bring them under the act so that we could see what is going on because that is our job as MPs from both sides of the House.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am not being flattering to the member. The previous speaker has taught all parliamentarians quite a bit about how to be an effective member of Parliament.

He did say one thing in his speech that I think members would like to hear a little more about. He said that he did not think that departments that were currently under the Access to Information Act purview would likely have the kind of problems that were identified under the Office of the Privacy Commissioner.

At the same time the member has for some time been advocating some significant changes to the Access to Information Act in order to make it even more effective and transparent. It would be appropriate to have further commentary on the key elements of some further reform to the Access to Information Act that would help us with this matter.

Mr. John Bryden: Madam Speaker, I have already mentioned that there are many ways to reform the act and that we should bring those agencies that are spending public money under the act.

Our experience with the Privacy Commissioner's office, a small department that was without scrutiny, signals that there may be an even more vast problem out in the not-for-profit sector, the charities and non-profit organizations, that have no legislated scrutiny or transparency whatsoever.

This is a \$100 billion industry that could have problems similar to those disclosed in the Privacy Commissioner's office. Indeed, anecdotally one hears stories that this type of thing does occur.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I actually wish I did not have to get up to speak on this issue.

There is a statement made occasionally that "real men don't eat quiche". Then there is another one that says "real men don't cry". I have to admit that when I first saw this unfolding in the government operations committee, of which I am a part, I actually had a tear come to my eye. I was really distressed that an officer of Parliament would have so little regard for truth and honesty in what he did. I was really very concerned.

I should interrupt myself to inform you, Madam Speaker, that I will be sharing my time with the member for Lethbridge.

I would like to say a little in support of the motion. The hon. member who has made the motion is also a member of the committee. I would like to commend him for bringing this forward.

As the House knows, very often these reports are made to Parliament and they basically go on a shelf somewhere or a filing system and as the saying goes "they gather dust". However this is one report from the government operations and estimates committee that I believe should be concurred in. I would like to urge all members to support this motion to concur in this report.

I would like to take the few minutes that I have to highlight the main reasons for encouraging support of the motion.

This is a report which was done very quickly at the end of June, just as Parliament was winding down prior to the summer when we were informed. To a degree it was almost a stroke of luck, as the hon. member opposite has indicated, that we found out about the total

mismanagement, misuse and abuse of taxpayer money in the Office of the Privacy Commissioner.

To a degree some members may believe the report is now redundant because of actions that have taken place. However I think it is still very important that we concur in it to send a very strong message to all civil servants and indeed to all people who in any way receive public funds that, in my basic premise, are to be used in public trust.

We have heard of trust accounts. We have heard of people who are executors of estates. My young son has just been admitted to the bar and is now a lawyer. Among other things he administers trust funds on behalf of his clients. Whether a lawyer or anyone else is administering a trust fund on behalf of children or whatever, we expect that there be absolutely no absconding of those funds for personal use by that person.

That is my premise as a member of Parliament. Whenever I spend money on behalf of the taxpayer, I must remember that I am doing that as a trust. I do not know whether the adjective is appropriate here but I would almost say it is a sacred trust because it gets right at the basic elements of trustworthiness in government by the people who elect us. If we lose that trust, our whole democracy is at risk. That is why it is so very important that we do this.

One of the phrases in the report which we are debating today and whether we should concur with it is we received information from officials who testified before the committee and who had a duty to speak the truth. However as a result of this, we were informed of a situation which led very clearly to the fact that the commissioner himself was misusing funds.

● (1240)

It is important for us to remember that it is a two-way street here. The Parliament and parliamentary committee have to depend on witnesses and testimony that is given to us in committee. It must be truthful. Otherwise it is not useful. On the other hand, on the part of officers of Parliament, deputy ministers and others, if they want to continue enjoying the support and respect of Parliament, then they must ensure that they maintain this relationship of trust. That trust was specifically breached and in a very dramatic way in the Office of the Privacy Commissioner.

This report says that we, as a committee, have lost confidence in the commissioner. This was a unanimous report.

If I may just add a little sidebar here, it was so delightful to finally have a committee working together in unison and in unity, putting aside partisan differences. The last thing that any of us wanted to do was to make political points on this issue. This was a matter of serving the Canadian people, and I want to commend the members from all parties that were represented on that committee because we did set those considerations aside.

Routine Proceedings

I do not like the phrase “making cheap political points” because politics, being a politician, a member of Parliament, should be a position of high esteem, trust and honour. We call ourselves honourable members here and politics is the work we do. It is not some sleazy operation. I resent it when people say that we make cheap political points. I do not think we should ever do that. We do the work in a political environment here but it is our work as parliamentarians to do this.

I would like to say that this committee worked in extraordinary harmony without political consideration. That comes forward in this report as well when it says that we were in unanimous agreement.

I also want to say that a very important element is the committee wishes to commend the public servants who came forward with information. Here again I was touched emotionally with the integrity of these people. It was so obvious when they were testifying before us. It was all done in camera, so I cannot divulge the details of it. However some individuals actually admitted very candidly to the committee that they felt that what they were doing put their jobs at risk. That should never be.

• (1245)

If we, as a Parliament, as a House of Commons, vote to concur in the motion to accept the report, I believe that will send a very strong message to all civil servants that we want to trust them. If they come forward to a parliamentary committee with truthful information, they will be commended and we will protect them from punishment. That is what this report says. It says directly that the committee is assuring these individuals that they will receive neither harassment, job action nor any other negative results due to the fact that they have come forward to committee and that they are immune from any negative consequences for having done that.

I would like to add a very hearty thanks to those people who worked in the Office of the Privacy Commissioner and who had the strength of steel to come forward and say what they were saying to us. That is in the report. Those are just a few remarks. I probably would not be permitted, but I could go on for a whole hour in putting forward all the reasons why we ought to support the motion, and I commend it to all members of Parliament.

• (1250)

Mr. John Bryden (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the member for Elk Island because he was able to put into context not only the non-partisan way the committee operated, but also the very human dilemmas that people found themselves in when he appeared before the committee. I am told by my colleagues that it was really an exercise in good judgment and compassion on the part of the members of the committee who had to hear witnesses who were speaking from the heart and out of a sense indeed of fear of reprisal.

However let me put one question to the member opposite. Surely we members of Parliament should always be prepared to walk the talk. By that I mean, we have gone through an experience of looking at the expense accounts and other matters pertaining to the privacy commissioner who is outside the Access to Information Act. In another forum under the public accounts committee, there were

problems with respect to exempt political staff not having to disclose their expense accounts, but that has been corrected.

Should not members of Parliament and Senators also come under the Access to Information Act, at least in the sense that we too should be expected and should be willing to disclose our routine spending?

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, that is a very curious question. I have been asked that by members of the press and I have been asked that same question by individuals out there since this has broken out. They have asked if I would disclose my expenses. There are two answers to that.

First, a report already publicizes the expenses of every member of Parliament. It is in the public domain. I believe the *Hill Times*, if I can do some free advertising for it, gives quite a bit of attention to that once a year when that report comes out and it indicates who are the highest spenders and who are the lowest.

We need to recognize the inherent difficulty with that because sometimes people just reading the numbers will fail to take into account the fact that some members live far away and have very large travel expenses compared to those who are closer.

For myself personally, I like that information to be made public because as far as I know, my travel expenses, even though I go back to my riding in Alberta almost every weekend, I take the care to book cheap flights and I think that I am the lowest spending member in the whole province. For me it would be good. Maybe some of the others would not like it, but that information is out there now.

Second, with respect to expenditures, we have details of our office expenditures which are not in the public domain and I would have no problem with that. I purchased a photocopier for my office some time ago. I have nothing to hide and would let people know that I bought it.

As far as my personal expenses are concerned, I do not use government credit cards or anything like that. I am not a minister. I have no government expenses. Those are on my personal card and I pay them out of my own money. If I were to attribute any of them to a government expense, the instant I do that as far as I am concerned, it ceases to be private information. I have moved it into the public domain myself by putting it onto the public expense card.

Therefore, yes, let it be disclosed. I would encourage that and would welcome it. I would vote in favour of it, and of course it must apply to all members equally.

Mr. John Bryden: Madam Speaker, just to correct a detail, the member for Elk Island is perfectly correct. The MP's expenses are routinely released but they are global expenses. The information the public gets of MP's expenses is nothing like the detail that was required of Mr. Radwanski or is required of a public servant or is required now of ministers and politically exempt staff.

Routine Proceedings

I would just repeat the question to the member. Would he be prepared to see greater detail? For instance, we are given a form which describes our travel movements and that kind of thing. Would he be prepared to see that level of disclosure, always understanding that the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act protect who we talk to? That is we have to have the same level of confidentiality I would suggest that any minister has. Would he be in favour of the same level of disclosure that public servants are required to have?

• (1255)

Mr. Ken Epp: Madam Speaker, my answer will be very quick. I would support total disclosure of anything that happens, with the proviso that the member mentioned.

Sometimes people want to talk to members of Parliament and they do not want the public to know that they are going to an MP with an issue. I am ready to protect their privacy.

As far as I am concerned, as a public official, pretty well everything that I do should be an open book.

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it is good to have the opportunity to address this issue. The issue certainly has the attention of hard-working Canadians whose tax dollars go into the public purse and who sometimes have grave concerns over what happens with those tax dollars once they are collected.

Most Canadians do not mind paying a reasonable amount of tax. It would be better if we did not have to pay any but most Canadians understand that to fund the things that are important to us, a certain amount of tax is necessary.

However, when taxpayers see any kind of abuse it makes them wonder why they get up every day, go to work and work hard trying to make ends meet to raise their families. When the money that they send off to Ottawa through the tax rolls ends up being squandered it raises some questions.

Certainly as public officials we should accept when we take on this role that what we do should come under scrutiny by the public. If we are being paid through our MOBs or whatever it is to carry on the function of our offices, those are taxpayers' dollars and they have a right to know where the money is going. Certainly we would not have a problem with that. It would give a lot of credibility to us as politicians if some of that was exposed.

If there is something that we are doing wrong we need to know about it. Certainly if we are doing something that is not in the rules so to speak, we need to know those rules. It is our duty to make sure that we understand them fully and if we do not that needs to be pointed out to us or we need to ask the question.

When we look at the Auditor General's report and analyze what happened in the Office of the Privacy Commissioner, there is an old saying that a fish starts to rot at the head. I believe in this instance that is exactly what happened. When there was not the leadership needed and the leadership shown in that department and proper instruction given to the people under the commissioner, things started to fall apart and they fell apart in a hurry.

It is important that a person who is put into a position of responsibility or leadership is capable of fulfilling those responsi-

bilities and is truly a leader that will lead in the right way. I suppose many times what separates some people from that role is the fact that they cannot do that.

In this instance a little bit of power went to the person's head and he abused his responsibilities and his power.

I want to get into some of the specifics of what happened. Under the main points, the Auditor General found:

The former Privacy Commissioner abdicated his responsibilities as a deputy head to ensure the proper administration of the Office of the Privacy Commissioner.

I am sure that somewhere it was explained what the duties and responsibilities were. The Auditor General found that those were not being fulfilled. The Auditor General also found:

An environment of fear and arbitrariness in the Office of the Privacy Commissioner that led to a major breakdown of controls over financial management, human resources management, contracting, and travel and hospitality. The effect of this breakdown was a climate that allowed the abuse of the public treasury for the benefit of the former Commissioner and a few senior executives.

These are very serious accusations. It is very unfortunate. It goes back to the fact that if the person in the lead ignores the rules and starts to do things that are less than above board, it starts to filter down. People who answer to that person soon become influenced by that, even under fear of reprisal.

One of the things that was mentioned was that significant financial and human costs were incurred as a result of a poisoned work environment. It is the human cost, the intangible cost of people who lived in fear of their jobs, people who were doing things that they knew were wrong, but knew that if they came forward there would be reprisals.

Thank goodness for the committee that was able to get to the bottom of this and bring it to light, and for the Auditor General for taking it on as a project.

When the Auditor General got into some of the specifics she found that the former commissioner repeatedly abused his discretion and that he often failed to exercise sound and reasonable judgment.

• (1300)

There is a table in the Auditor General's report that indicates some of the travel that took place. Between May 2001 and September 2002 the commissioner and the senior director general went to London three times. They went to London in March, June and September. There was a total of six days without international business, so there were six down days while they were there. Expenses for those days without government business were \$3,500, \$6,000, and \$1,200. This just went on and on.

It seems to me that after the first time it happened, somebody that was paying attention to the bills or the reimbursement forms that were coming through should have picked up on that and come forward. When we hear of the fear that was held over that entire department, over the staff, then we understand why possibly some of these things were left unexposed.

Routine Proceedings

One of the biggest ones is a trip to Wellington, New Zealand in March 2002. The total days on the trip were 13: four days of travel, three days with international business, and four days without international business. The total expenses were \$30,000, but the expenses for the days when there was no government business going on were \$6,000. I can understand expenses for four days when one is staying in a hotel and having meals but that amount to me seems quite high. Six thousand dollars for four days, or \$1,500 a day, is pretty high living by most people's standards. It sends the wrong message to the taxpayers in this country who are trying to make ends meet and they see this kind of abuse happening.

The Auditor General will go in and check on departments. That fact alone helps to keep people doing the things they should be doing and not doing the things they should not be doing, knowing that there is somebody watching. We should not really have to have that. A lot of times the Auditor General just makes recommendations on process and procedure to departments. If they are acted upon, then the incidents that we have seen in this department would be kept to a minimum. What we are all trying to do is to eliminate them at best but certainly to minimize them at least.

As we went through this process, and I know over the last couple of months this has been a pretty hot topic for Canadians, we sometimes wondered why, when issues like this happen, there does not seem to be the attraction or the outrage by Canadians that there should be. However, in this instance some of the things that happened really hit home. People are talking about them. People are phoning our offices. People are saying that it is just typical. I do not believe it is typical. I believe there are cases and certainly we need to expose them, but we should not be all tarred with that same brush.

One of the main points by the Auditor General states:

In our view, these conditions have seriously impaired the ability of the Office of the Privacy Commissioner to function. A great deal of rebuilding is needed to restore its management capabilities. The present situation is cause for concern, given that parliamentarians provided the Office of the Privacy Commissioner with powers in an area of critical importance—assisting Parliament in protecting and preserving the privacy rights of Canadians.

All Canadians have a right to worry about these types of things. They have a right to their own lives. They have a right to a certain amount of privacy. Then they find out that the person who is in charge of protecting those rights has done some of the things that we are discussing here. It is not acceptable. We need to do what is necessary to make sure it does not happen.

The recommendations in the committee report and the recommendations in the Auditor General's report need to be acted upon to restore the faith of the average Canadian taxpayers that their money is being put to good use.

* * *

• (1305)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, discussions have taken place between all parties, as well as the member for Windsor West, concerning the taking of the division on Motion No. 399 scheduled at the conclusion of private members' business later this day, and I believe that you will find consent for the following:

That at the conclusion of today's debate on M-399, all questions necessary to dispose of the motion be deemed put, a recorded division deemed requested and deferred to Tuesday, October 7, 2003 at the end of government orders.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's contribution to what I think is an extremely important debate because the Radwanski affair really is troubling. I suspect that whenever Canadians hear the name Radwanski, they will have some memories of the Auditor General describing it as a reign of fear and terror. One can imagine what people were going through for an extended period of time in what the Auditor General described as a poisoned environment. How could they do their jobs?

Even more important, how is it that it took so long for it to come out, for it to be sensed by someone who was on the periphery at least? How is it that it took so long for someone to speak up? Quite frankly, it was not that someone just decided to speak up on his or her own volition. It was prompted by someone who saw a document being altered, heard a representation of how this happened and it turned out the representation that it was a complete, original document was not true and the person said it was not true because that person had witnessed it.

This is a sad story too. It is a very sad story because of the impact it has had on the people who worked within the Office of the Privacy Commissioner. It went so far that the people who did not play ball in this reign of fear and terror were prohibited from going to the floor on which Mr. Radwanski's office was located. It went from, "You are banished from this floor if you don't play ball", right down to having a meeting and being threatened. He has been quoted as saying, "If I find the rat who is making the leaks, that person's career as a public servant is over". Can anyone imagine that environment?

The member has raised some interesting and sorry aspects. It is important for us to learn lessons and that is why we have struck a subcommittee in government operations to deal with this, not only to report on the loose ends of the Radwanski affair but also to report to Parliament on the lessons learned. Since we are going to be doing this report, I would be interested if the member has some thoughts on the lessons that we have learned as parliamentarians or that we should pass on to the public service so that indeed situations like this are detected at the earliest possible moment or in fact do not happen at all.

Mr. Rick Casson: Madam Speaker, as I indicated in my remarks, the ultimate goal of any of this is to eliminate in its entirety any actions such as those we are discussing. However, being realistic, we must realize that we are going to move a long way to diminishing them.

If this was an isolated case, and I think in many instances some of the things that have happened are pretty unique to that office, but we have seen other aspects in government operations where that is the type of attitude, that the public purse is somehow disconnected from the people who send in those tax dollars. That is something we should never forget.

My lessons came from the municipal level of government. Everything that we did, whether it was a change in the water rate or garbage pickup or whatever, we knew all the people we were affecting. We knew the people who were on fixed incomes who did not have that extra \$5 a month. We knew the people who would not be able to do some of the other things that they enjoyed in life because they would have to put more money toward utilities and taxes.

When we went through the process at that level, it was minute. We were not talking about billions of dollars that were farmed out over many departments. We were talking about dollars and cents and what it meant to each and every taxpayer. That laid the ground for having a respect for tax dollars.

Hopefully we can all stand the scrutiny of a full-blown exposure of what we spend. Why should a member of Parliament have any aspect of his operation that the public cannot scrutinize? I understand some of the privacy concerns as far as the people we deal with and that is separate. That is dealing with the problems we face every day for our constituents on a one to one basis, but if it has to do with spending taxpayers' dollars, then certainly we should have to stand and answer those questions when they are posed.

Hopefully over a period of time these issues will be resolved to the satisfaction of Canadian taxpayers.

• (1310)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to this motion, brought forward by the member for Mississauga South, for concurrence in the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates.

I am pleased because it is a unanimous report. The input of my colleague from the Bloc Québécois, the member for Châteauguay, is very significant and I am proud to support this motion today. I am proud but I am also very concerned about statements made by Liberal members. Even the member for Mississauga South just asked Alliance members for solutions to these problems.

The government and its members have questions and they are asking the opposition for solutions to their problems. So I will try to help them find ways to solve these problems. I will not do it in a partisan way, by simply by quoting from the committee report and from statements made by the Auditor General and by experts, that is political observers who followed the infamous Radwanski saga. They also proposed solutions and tried to enlighten members from all parties. I hope that Liberal members will understand the message that I will be conveying today.

First, the unanimous report is simple. After hearing representatives from the Office of the Privacy Commissioner and a

Routine Proceedings

representative from the Office of the Information Commissioner, the committee drew four main conclusions.

The first addresses the circumstances surrounding the commissioner's providing a copy of a letter from which one of the original paragraphs had been deleted. The committee had requested certain documents from him, and we noticed that parts of original documents had been deleted.

The second relates to a set of expense reports whose incompleteness was not acknowledged in the covering letter. That is, reports were incomplete.

Third, there were travel expense forms on which there had been an attempt to conceal certain information, by the application of white-out material. That is, correcting fluid had been used in an attempt to alter the contents. Not very clever, but very noticeable. The committee members noticed it.

Fourth, the reasons for his failure to appear in person at a hearing on the commission's main estimates. When these concerns were brought to the attention of the Commissioner or his officials, some additional documents were provided but the Commissioner continued to mislead the committee with respect to these matters in subsequent letters and evidence given before the Committee.

Obviously, then, the committee could not do otherwise than to blame the Commissioner, since he was being asked questions. At the same time, the Auditor General was doing her job. Since one of the government institutions was being investigated, she, as any good Auditor General would, decided—since there was fuel for scandal here—to produce an in-depth report on the work of the Privacy Commissioner.

I will refer to some of Auditor General Fraser's observations:

Some employees cashed out vacation leave that they had, in fact, taken but not reported.

The RCMP is therefore looking into this, at her request.

Financial statements were falsified in order to disguise the fact that expenditures exceeded the amount approved by Parliament.

That is a pretty harsh statement.

Late in the fall of 2002, the Secretariat was advised that the OPC would likely exceed its approved funding levels. The Secretariat did provide it with \$73,000 from the Vote 5 operating reserve for additional personnel costs.

So the Secretariat is the one she faults.

The appointment of the personnel manager in April 2002 was approved by the Public Service Commission even though the candidate did not meet the security criteria.

There were also patronage appointments. The girlfriend of Mr. Radwanski's son was hired to a position in the legal department that was created especially for her.

In May 2002, Mr. Radwanski received \$15,000 without justification.

The Public Service Commission was aware of the violations of the staffing procedure since the human resources director of the office of the commissioner had warned the Public Service Commission during the summer of 2001.

Routine Proceedings

The public servants who were questioned talked about a “reign of terror” under Mr. Radwanski and some of his managers. They described instances where employees have been intimidated and humiliated.

● (1315)

What is even worse is that the Auditor General has said that both the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Public Service Commission were aware that there were internal management problems at the Office of the Privacy Commissioner but did nothing. This is serious indeed.

It gets even more serious when Liberal members have to turn to the opposition for ways to solve the problems.

At the Treasury Board Secretariat, there is a minister responsible for the Treasury Board, which means that she was aware of what was going on. The Auditor General had told her.

I will try to explain the government's response. We have no problem explaining what is going on in the public service. We will gladly do so. In fact, let me quote what political columnist Michel Vastel wrote in *Le Droit* yesterday:

The Auditor General's comments, damning for George Radwanski, were carefully weighed so as to not smear the whole public service. But why does Sheila Fraser not go see, in the offices of ministers and deputy ministers for instance, if she could find more artificially inflated positions, patronage hiring, unjustified performance bonuses, excessive time off, falsified financial statements, high travel and entertainment expenses?

Michel Vastel is a very prominent columnist who has been following politics on the federal scene and is keeping abreast of what goes on here on the hill. He wrote further:

But like the icing on the cake, these are the more recent of an incredibly long series of excesses: the billion dollar boondoggle at HRDC, triple billing for reports under the sponsorship program, the untendered contracts awarded by Public Works, the grants and loans to friends of the Prime Minister.

Of course, this is on top of what I mentioned earlier. I will add a few figures out of his article.

Data concerning infrastructure work underway in Ottawa illustrate the current climate in the federal government. The Department of Public Works has started projects totalling \$1.3 billion in the National Capital Region alone, while all projects for the rest of Canada represent a mere \$310 million.

And by National Capital Region we must understand the Ontario side: new buildings at \$150 million or \$200 million each, approximately \$500 million in renovations around Parliament Hill, plus \$300 million for museums of all sorts, and even \$60 million for a new radio and television broadcasting centre, CBC—Radio-Canada.

But \$57.4 million to renovate the garage of a federal building in Gatineau.

Out of the \$1.3 billion, only \$57.4 billion will be spent in Quebec, while the rest will go to the Ontario side of the National Capital Region.

And he continues:

Other expenses are more difficult to take into account. Shocked public servants have told me about new informatics systems intended for organizations with over 10,000 employees being ordered by agencies that employ only a few hundred. Flat-screen computers—the most expensive kind—high-definition television systems, and leather chairs are all being shipped into departments by the truckload.

And we are not even mentioning the contracts for all kinds of services, especially communications and public relations.

He finishes with this:

Too much money has finally corrupted all of Ottawa. We must have some lunches to celebrate—with lots of good wine.

That is from a political columnist who is not a member of the Bloc Québécois. He is quite critical of our party, in fact. Nonetheless, he is very much aware of what is happening on Parliament Hill.

And that is what staggers me, knowing that the federal Liberal members are asking us how this problem can be solved. It is as simple as cleaning the Augean stables. It will take a great tidal wave to clean out everything that has gone on here on this hill. This is just the result. There is no other way.

Obviously, when we listen to the government's answers, we ask questions. In closing, I will mention an article that appeared in this morning's *Journal de Montréal*. Under the title, “Radwanski affair: Prime Minister's Office in spotlight”, we read:

The Prime Minister's Office played a decisive role in granting generous privileges to George Radwanski, the *Journal de Montréal* has learned from reliable sources.

Those are not our words. The journalist learned from a reliable source that the Prime Minister's Office had played an important role. He continues:

The Auditor General estimates that this former adviser to the Prime Minister squandered more than \$500,000 in public money.

One person, all by himself, squandered over \$500,000 in public money.

● (1320)

The article continues:

All day, again yesterday, ministers in the Chrétien government passed the buck to avoid answering the question: who recommended that the former privacy commissioner receive additional allowances totalling \$85,000?

The reason is simple: the Prime Minister's Office is responsible. Several reliable sources within the government confirmed this.

The *Journal de Montréal* journalist says this, not the Bloc Québécois. We conducted our own investigations and we reached the same conclusions. The journalist did his job, he went to his sources and got confirmation that the Prime Minister's Office is the one responsible for appointing Mr. Radwanski and authorizing his spending.

There is more:

Others named the Prime Minister's chief of staff, Eddie Goldenberg. “At the time I was only the senior policy adviser”, Mr. Goldenberg told the newspaper. “I never was involved in the appointment process”.

We thought Mr. Goldenberg was responsible, and he himself says he was not.

Yesterday morning, the Office of the Auditor General of Canada, Sheila Fraser, stated that, “the contract was negotiated and approved by the Privy Council Office”.

But the President of the Queen's Privy Council, the hon. member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, refused to answer the newspaper's questions.

Ms. Fraser, the Auditor General, says that the Privy Council Office is responsible, and yet the person responsible for the Privy Council office does not want to respond.

His spokesman, André Lamarre, stated that, “the member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville is the honorary minister responsible for the Privy Council, but he plays no role and has no responsibility with regard to appointments”.

The Privy Council Office is responsible, but that individual plays no role.

Routine Proceedings

Appointments and related benefits are determined by the Prime Minister's Office, as the Prime Minister wrote in his guide on ethical conduct for ministers.

Obviously, everyone is saying that the Prime Minister's Office was responsible.

Last Wednesday, a PMO spokesman denied this.

The Auditor General tells us that the Privy Council Office is responsible; the head of the Privy Council Office, the hon. member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, says he is not responsible, but that the Prime Minister's Office is; the Prime Minister's Office says that it is not responsible.

Finally, we read:

In the House, the member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, who is responsible for the Privy Council, had also refused to rise to answer the Bloc Québécois' questions. And in the Prime Minister's absence, it was the government House leader who went up to bat.

The Leader of the Bloc Québécois said that:

No one in the government can deny that George Radwanski's working conditions had been negotiated in the Prime Minister's Office by Eddie Goldenberg.

The government House leader responded as follows:

Other officers of Parliament have received similar benefits.

When the Bloc Québécois told him that no one wanted to respond, the House leader replied by saying other officials have had similar benefits.

In order to wrap up the committee's work, the member for Mississauga South is proposing that we support the fourth report, but I hope he will support the recommendation that my Bloc Québécois colleague, the member for Châteauguay, submitted at committee. The newspaper has this to say:

The Bloc Québécois called for Mr. Goldenberg to appear before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. The request will be debated next week.

These are the journalist's words, and it is true. Our colleague submitted a request to have Eddie Goldenberg appear before the committee. I hope that all the Liberal members who sit on this committee will agree to this appearance.

Obviously, we do not necessarily have to be able to adopt a report today. But every day for almost two weeks now newspapers like the *Journal de Montréal* have been wondering who made the decision. I hope that the committee will tell us. As things now stand, it was neither the President of the Treasury Board, nor the minister responsible for the Privy Council, nor the Prime Minister.

The Liberals are going to end up making the public think that it was Mr. Radwanski himself who approved his own salary increases and that he controlled the budget. That is what will happen. That is what we are being told today. They are asking us for help in finding a solution. Earlier, the member for Mississauga South asked the Canadian Alliance to help them find a solution.

It is simple: the government is corrupt. That is the reality. Cleaning it up would be a very difficult task. Again, Mr. Vastel is absolutely right; it is a chronic problem from one department to the next. It is not just the Office of the Privacy Commissioner that needs to be cleaned up, but all the departments of this government.

● (1325)

Probably by focussing the spotlight on the Radwanski affair, we will manage to—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, but the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis wishes to rise on a point of order.

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I apologize for interrupting my colleague, which I regret having to do, but time is getting short.

This morning I tabled a report from the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, which calls for an extension of the Copyright Act review from its original expiry date of October 3, 2003 to September 30, 2004.

This could not be done sooner, because the committee had to be struck yesterday.

[*English*]

I presented that this morning to ask for the Copyright Act review to be extended to September 30, 2004, which is only a technical matter.

I move that the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel has three more minutes to complete his comments.

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, thank you for allowing me to conclude my remarks on government operations. Again, to make sure that the people of Quebec and Canada who are listening understand clearly, I will repeat what Michel Vastel wrote in *Le Droit* yesterday. He was commenting on the findings of the Auditor General.

The Auditor General's comments, damning for George Radwanski, were carefully weighed so as to not smear the whole public service. But why does Sheila Fraser not go see, in the offices of ministers and deputy ministers for instance, if she could find more artificially inflated positions, patronage hiring, unjustified performance bonuses, excessive time off, falsified financial statements, high travel and entertainment expenses?

I would not want this Radwanski affair to be considered unique. There is a need for a thorough clean-up of this public service, which is vastly overclassified according to prominent analysts and those who have been following federal politics for years. A permanent solution is required.

Private Members' Business

Again, I hope that the Liberal members on the standing committee looking into the Radwanski affair will accept the recommendation made by my colleague from the Bloc Québécois, the hon. member for Châteauguay, who is asking that Eddie Goldenberg be summoned to appear before the committee.

We really need to know who authorized the cost overruns and the unusually high travel expenses. Who made the decision? It would be important to know, if only to prevent this from ever happening again.

Of course, we must not stop there. It is especially important that the questions asked in the House by opposition members be answered. When we ask the government for an answer, it should avoid doing what it has been doing for the past two weeks: passing the buck. It is passing the buck. If it not the fault of the President of the Treasury Board. It is not the fault of the person in charge of the Queen's Privy Council, the hon. member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville—

•(1330)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): I am sorry to have to interrupt the member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel but, unfortunately, his time has expired.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

The House resumed from May 26 consideration of the motion.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it is Friday and I am a busy guy today. I seem to be getting up on a number of different motions.

Motion No. 399 brought forward before us by one of our colleagues from the NDP is a pretty good motion because it says we should take some measures that would prevent people from getting ill. It is very hard to argue against that. One would not normally say that we should vote against something that will prevent people from becoming ill.

I would like to read the motion in its entirety. It states:

That this House call upon the government to take the necessary measures, including the drafting of legislation, to prevent medical conditions and illnesses caused by exposure to identifiable environmental contaminants.

How could one ever vote against that? The government should take measures to prevent people from becoming ill.

I regret to inform the House that even though I have not heard all of the debate yet, I will probably be voting against this, not because I am opposed to avoiding illness but because I think this is a measure that is going nowhere. It would take an effort to produce legislation that I do not think would do anything unless it would be very intrusive.

What are we talking about here? First, we are talking about environmental contaminants. There are many things that contaminate

the environment. I remember that when I was growing up on the farm in Saskatchewan there were times when the wind blew from the barn to the house and we had a fair amount of environmental contamination. Not very long ago, and I do not know why, I think one of our little friends from the skunk family parked himself right next to our bedroom window at night. It got into a fight with somebody and it was not very pleasant at all. That was a contaminant.

In both those instances, I suppose one could say the offensive smell is biodegradable. For the most part, it has no long term health effects. It is just one of those things that happens in the cycle of life.

However, we have other things that are contaminants, for example, exhaust from vehicles. I used to ride my bicycle to work all the time. That was how I was able to maintain this fine physical condition I am in. I always enjoyed riding my bicycle, but part of the route from my house to the college where I taught involved climbing up a hill. Of course, the human motor when cycling up a hill tends to create the need for more oxygen, so the old guy was huffing and puffing going up the hill all the time.

I remember that right about that time they brought in catalytic converters. The exhaust from vehicles was always difficult. When one breathes really hard when one is exercising hard, as that was for me, one is really pumping in air through the lungs. When these vehicles right alongside the bike path also were going up the hill and spewing out their exhaust, it was very uncomfortable. But when they brought in the catalytic converters I actually could not breathe; it was interesting because the catalytic converters apparently were designed reduce pollution, yet my body's reaction to them was that the exhaust then was something that one should not breathe in at all.

•(1335)

I can think of other examples of environmental pollutants. To me, an interesting one is one my dad told me about. When he was a young kid, they used to mix formaldehyde into seed grain before they seeded. They of course were totally ignorant. My dad at that time was just a youngster. They would take off their shoes and socks, roll up their pant legs and get into the wagon, where they would put in the seed and pour a bunch of formaldehyde over it. The kids would trundle through it with their feet in order to mix it.

Formaldehyde is an environmental contaminant. These youngsters in my dad's family, my dad and his brothers, were exposed directly to huge quantities of it. I think the formaldehyde worked as a preservative because my father lived to be almost 91. At least it kept his feet in good shape for all of those years.

I could go on with different examples of environmental contaminants. This motion leaves the whole issue of environmental contaminants wide open. There is no definition here, which is one of the things that concerns me.

Private Members' Business

Right now, health and safety in regard to most pesticides is already covered under the Pest Control Products Act, which was passed by this Parliament. I am not at all sure why we would want to have another piece of legislation that would go beyond that. If so, I would like this motion to be more specific in terms of identifying exactly what it is that they want to identify now and control, and I presume it is control.

The other thing is that it is left so wide open. It states: "to prevent medical conditions and illnesses caused by exposure." How does the member propose to prevent illness caused by exposure to these contaminants? Would it be by preventing manufacturers from manufacturing it? Would it be by bringing in regulations with respect to how these contaminants are to be handled? Would it be, in the case of car exhaust, to plug all the exhaust pipes in all the vehicles so that we no longer have exhaust from vehicles? I think that is probably one of the greatest pollutants.

There are so many things in the bill that are so ill defined I really am reluctant to give carte blanche to the government to say, "Here, go and make some laws, prevent illness and prevent medical conditions that could be caused by exposure".

There is one thing that is clear, though, and that is the use of the word "contaminants". It is generally accepted that a contaminant is a negative thing, although again I can think of many instances where we have to use contaminants or totally change our lifestyles.

I think, for example, of the use of batteries. We all have electronic devices with small portable batteries in them, yet those batteries form a significant contaminant. What are we to do with those batteries? First, we definitely should take measures to dispose of them in a safe way, yet there are many people who just throw them into the garbage. I wish that were not so because it puts a lot of contaminants into our soil.

There should be measures taken. Is this the proper role of the federal government? Should the provincial governments be doing this? And is this what is envisioned by this bill? We are not really told, so it is really a difficult thing.

I definitely support good health, and one can tell by looking at me that I am a strong proponent of good health, and I have no problem at all with measures taken to preserve our health and avoid illness in our society, a laudable goal. I am afraid, however, that this motion just does not begin to cut it. It is very ill defined. It has no definitions in the terms and it seems to simply call on the government to do something, which I am not sure gives it even enough direction to know what it should do.

Therefore, I am in the difficult position of supporting in principle the concept the member is talking about, but because I cannot see how this is going to do the job my present thinking is that when the vote comes I will probably be voting against it. However, I will be very interested in hearing the rest of the debate and, as always, my mind is open.

● (1340)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Gagnon (Champlain, BQ): Madam Speaker, the debates that we are having this afternoon are most interesting. I am thinking of the one that just ended because my colleague from

Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel launched a discussion in which I would have liked to take part.

Today, we are also debating a motion dealing with environmental protection. It reads as follows:

That this House call upon the government to take the necessary measures, including the drafting of legislation—

I have some difficulty with that because too often people are under the impression that, if the job does not get done, it is because there is not enough legislation, when we spend our days here passing legislation. Unfortunately, too often our laws are not enforced.

I would say that if the federal government really wanted to protect the environment, we would not need more legislation. Simply enforcing the existing laws would go a long way in achieving results in that area.

I will give you an example. Since I have been elected to Parliament—and I was doing it even before that—I have been working, among other things, on a serious issue that is of great concern to me, namely the pollution caused by the federal government and the Canadian army.

I would like to come back to the problem in Lake Saint-Pierre. When I first raised this issue, I gave an interview to a radio station in Quebec City and the host of the show could hardly believe what I was saying, that the Canadian forces had fired 300,000 shells into Lake Saint-Pierre during the last 50 years. Imagine, 300,000 shells, including 10,000 to 12,000 which could still be live.

It is a serious pollution problem, so serious that it killed one man. In the early 1980s, a worker who had been dreaming about retiring for a long time had restored a sailboat, hoping to take his family around the world. One evening, before the launch of his boat, with the boat finally ready after many years of hard work, he decided to have a party to celebrate the beginning of his life as a retiree. His guests were dancing and singing around a bonfire when someone picked up what he thought was a piece of wood and threw it in the fire. It turned out to be a shell from Lake Saint-Pierre that had washed up onto the beach. It exploded and killed the man who was retiring and injured a few others.

These accidents were the result of pollution by the Canadian Forces. When I prepare my speeches on such subjects, I think that if the legislation were lacking in some respect, I would support the motion. However, I am convinced that the political will to protect our environment is all that is lacking. The problem is that nobody believes there is a problem. I refuse to believe that a few hundred million dollars could not have been taken from the defence budget to train people to clean up following firing exercises on a body of water as big as Lake Saint-Pierre, recognized by UNESCO. The shells still lie on the bottom of the lake and, after each spring thaw, they wash onto the beaches. One spring two years ago, a little girl was playing on the beach and came home with a shell that had washed up on shore after the thaw.

Private Members' Business

●(1345)

As a result, in the absence of legislation, when we ask the government to accept its responsibilities, this is our goal. However, if the federal government has the political will, it can protect the environment, according to its jurisdiction. I can give another example.

Back in the 1970s, there was the oil and gas crisis. Everyone panicked, certain that we would run out of oil and gas. Consequently, car manufacturers started to make cars that guzzled less gas. In the early 1980s, I remember seeing a Cadillac that consumed about six litres of gas per 100 kilometres.

The previous speaker talked about carbon monoxide pollution. Now that there is an abundant supply of oil and gas, people wonder how to protect the environment, and we allow cars that use up to 20 and 22 litres per 100 kilometres. I refuse to believe that protecting the environment is a priority. If it was, no car would consume that much gas.

What is needed is cars that are both comfortable and environmentally friendly. We know that carbon monoxide causes serious problems for many in cities like Montreal, including children.

I agree with my party on voting in favour of this motion, but only on condition that the federal government be asked to stay within its own jurisdiction. Let it do so. There is plenty for it to do there.

In connection with the state of public finances, for instance, which has already been addressed, when the opposition is told that this is the responsibility of the House, that comes pretty close to blaming the opposition for the mismanagement.

The government has plenty to keep it busy within its own jurisdiction, rather than stirring up trouble and interfering in provincial areas of jurisdiction. Where the municipalities, health services or education are concerned, we can see how the government is constantly trying to interfere in areas that belong to the provinces.

Since we are dealing with the environment, I would like to move an amendment, one I think people will agree with. We must vote in favour of this motion, provided the federal government stays within its own area of jurisdiction. But within that area, it must do its job properly. So let it clean up Lake Saint-Pierre. Let it see that ships, particularly Canada Steamship Lines ships, protect the banks of the St. Lawrence. That is a major problem in Quebec, excessive speed on the St. Lawrence which is destroying the banks.

The shipping company that belongs to the hon. member for LaSalle—Énard is probably one of the worst offenders. I live on the edge of the river and I know it is one of the worst offenders as far as not bothering about the river banks is concerned. It refuses to repair the damage it causes. We do not need any special jurisdictions in order to ensure we assume our responsibilities. This government is the one that needs to assume its environmental responsibilities.

I therefore move, pursuant to Standing Order 93:

That the motion be amended by adding after the words "necessary measures," the following: "within its sphere of competence,".

●(1350)

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is the hon. member for Windsor West in agreement with the amendment?

Mr. Brian Masse: Yes, Madam Speaker.

[Translation]

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my colleague from the Bloc Québécois for his amendment. We know the federal government has a tendency to poke its nose where it does not belong, especially when there are grey areas in so-called shared jurisdictions. This is an essential safeguard. It should be included in every text, or at least make them clearer. Perhaps it could act as some sort of extended warranty on the respect of jurisdictions.

My colleague from Fundy—Royal, who is the Progressive Conservative critic for the environment, supports the motion put forward by the hon. member for Windsor West and has spoken to it.

I would like to make a brief comment. I listened to the remarks of my colleague from the Canadian Alliance. He used the humour he has been known for in this place for a number of years to somewhat discredit the NDP motion, describing it as unclear. I think we may have lost track of the ground rules of the House. Some motions are wake-up calls for the government and this House; others inform the public of shortcomings in certain areas, such as the environment.

I hope that people will understand that it is necessary to have a sense of humour, particularly in politics. But in dealing with serious issues like the environment, I think that a sense of responsibility must come before a sense of humour.

That being said, this motion, even though it is broad, is necessary. Everyone in the country, including various groups and even the provinces, agrees that the federal government, within its jurisdiction—let us take that for granted—has not done much with regard to the environment. Several movements, including the Sierra Club and others, have condemned the government's inaction in that area. This is why the motion before us today is necessary to bring environmental issues to the forefront.

Of course, the government will talk about Kyoto. Between you and me, Kyoto may be the only meaningful measure that we have seen in ten years. On several occasions since 1997, that is since I have had the opportunity to sit in the House, environmental legislation died on the Order Paper. The government's record in that area is less than stellar.

Another important element is the legislation that can be put in place, while respecting existing jurisdictions.

Again, my colleague from the Bloc Québécois mentioned the issue of large utility vehicles. This is good for those people who use them for work, for those who have a business, for truckers. Certainly these vehicles use more fuel. But some kind of measures could be put in place for those who buy these big 8-cylinder vehicles, or even bigger, that use a lot of fuel.

Private Members' Business

If someone is driving a large vehicle that pollutes or consumes way more fuel than necessary for transportation, just to look good on the streets of Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto or Vancouver, perhaps it would be appropriate to look at some kind of taxation.

I know there will be a motion—and we will probably talk about this again next week—that gasoline taxes should be handed over to municipalities for their infrastructure programs. If we are prepared to turn over part of the excise tax for infrastructure, we might also be ready to establish a tax incentive or a tax penalty for large non-commercial consumers. It could be done.

The other aspect raised in this motion is the question of sustainable development. The committee must be satisfied that new measures can be implemented in favour of sustainable development. We start from the basic concept that it is better to prevent than to cure, informing people about the very risky situations they may be living in, in the future or right now.

The federal government must also solve its own problems. I know that it is necessary to invest billions of dollars in the environment, in the decontamination of federal lands, for one. The hon. member for Fundy—Royal has pointed out that a number of groups have claimed that \$2 billion must be spent at once to begin decontamination of federal sites, followed by a minimum of \$100 million more each year. We agree with them. We must get started.

• (1355)

There are numerous examples of places where we know there is a problem, where people are sick. Yet, nothing is being done about it. There are 1,200 to 1,600 contaminated federal sites. This is not talked about enough. People live around these sites without being truly informed. Of course we are talking about Val-Cartier, in Quebec. We are talking about other sites, in Nova Scotia or elsewhere in the country. More than 1,200 to 1,600 sites are listed, but the public does not know about them. If the list of these thousands of contaminated sites were published, people would panic.

That is one of the objectives of the motion put forward by the NDP member, namely to find a way to prepare solutions rather than react to situations and for the committees to have a role. This initiative is essential.

But when we talk about the environment, everyone is scared. Industrial zones, people wonder if the existing industry will be shut down. That is absolutely not the case. There is a way to apply very strict environmental rules and to involve the public.

I come from the Asbestos region. I was the mayor of the city of Asbestos for 11 years. Asbestos is known, of course, for producing asbestos. It is quite a challenge. I had two huge challenges during my lifetime, one as mayor of the city of Asbestos and the other as a Conservative member from Quebec. In both cases, I did quite well.

But in Asbestos, producing asbestos is a real problem since, as we all know, it has been banned everywhere around the world. But with the cooperation of the unions, education and awareness programs were carried out. There are various categories of asbestos. What is being produced in Canada, and especially in Quebec and my own region, is called chrysotile or white asbestos. It has saved many more lives than it has caused trouble.

In fact, with the assistance of the unions, the industrial process and working conditions have been improved. Nowadays, it is totally safe to operate the mine and to use the product.

More recently, the Magnola plant that produced magnesium from residues of white asbestos was closed. Unfortunately, because of a business decision, dumping by China and a 28% countervailing duty—two issues the federal government did not deal with—Noranda had to close the plant after operating it for 18 months and pouring \$1.5 billion in it. For six months, the people of Noranda asked to meet with the international trade minister. Their meeting was granted, but only after the closing of the plant had been announced.

I will give an example of what the effect of the motion can be. When Magnola set up operations, since potentially hazardous products were involved, the Government of Quebec, the municipalities, the general public and the workers joined together to say that there were hazards.

The motion does not mean that everything hazardous must be done away with. Unlike my colleague from the Canadian Alliance, we do not feel that skunks need to be got rid of because they disturb one night's sleep. The real environmental issue, however, needs to be addressed publicly and jointly. We have to talk about it.

When a problem is concealed, and then discovered, human health is not the only thing affected; it also impacts negatively on the public's perception of politicians.

We are, therefore, pleased to support this motion. I hope the public will understand the idea, the underlying philosophy, which is to ensure that this House and its committees address the environment, that we provide information about it and find solutions before things get worse, that is before people get seriously ill or die. The time has come for action, and I am pleased to support the motion of my colleague from Windsor West.

• (1400)

[English]

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Madam Speaker, I wish to congratulate both the Conservative member for Richmond—Arthabaska and the Bloc member for Champlain for their remarks on this motion that has been moved by my colleague from Windsor West.

The motion states:

That this House call upon the government to take the necessary measures, including the drafting of legislation, to prevent medical conditions and illnesses caused by exposure to identifiable environmental contaminants.

To place this in historical context, it was not until recently that western societies became aware of the great damage that industrialization had been causing to the environment during the last century. It was in the 1970s when we witnessed the emergence of a new concept called sustainable development. The protection of the environment and health quickly became a big concern in the developed world.

Private Members' Business

These concerns were translated into new policies and regulations in order to minimize the negative effects on health and ecosystems that arise from human activities. Progress has been made over the last 30-odd years, but there is still a long way to go.

As new environmental problems are identified and as the quality of the environment continues to decline, it is clear that the law, as it stands now, has many shortcomings. The introduction of new legal instruments to improve the current legislation, as well as better enforcement measures, are obviously overdue.

Exposure to environmental contaminants, and their adverse effects on air, water, soil and living organisms is an issue on which scientific research has concentrated significantly in recent years. Evidence suggests that exposure to a variety of environmental contaminants can alter the normal biological functions of the endocrine, reproductive and immune systems. Environmental contaminants are not only a source of air and water pollution, but also an important threat to our health and that of our children.

International institutions such as the World Health Organization understand that as well. In this way, they have contributed to the discussion with a number of analysis, statistics and reports calling for action and warning us about the risks assumed by those who are exposed to environmental contaminants.

Health care, at a minimum, is medical service offered by front line nurses, physicians and hospitals. But in this day and age, a good case can be made to broaden the concept of health care in Canada to include specific federally mandated legislation and regulations to include other so-called peripheral issues, such as environmental contaminants.

After years of offloading responsibility in the area of health care to the provinces, it is clear that the federal government has a responsibility in this area.

Although there is plenty of competition for the prize, environmental contaminants and their negative impact on human health is perhaps one of the bigger issues that the government appears to have swept beneath the carpet.

Three years ago the government and its provincial counterparts made a commitment to promote programs and policies "which extend beyond care and treatment and which make a critical contribution to the health and wellness of Canadians". As a part of that commitment, they identified many different determinants of health, including physical environment.

A recent estimate by the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research suggested that only one-quarter of the health of our population is attributable to the health care system, while fully three-quarters is dependent on factors such as the physical environment and socio-economic conditions.

A truly comprehensive approach, therefore, to health care in this country would focus on all the determinants of health, not just a quarter or a half of them.

This kind of approach, called a population health approach, would address the range of factors that determine health. It would devise strategies that affect and aid whole groups or populations of people and would involve not just the health care sector but organizations,

groups and individuals who work or are affected in health relevant fields, such as economics, education, the environment and employment strategies.

I ask my colleagues in the House to focus on the health relevant fields of the environment, and toxic and environmental contaminants.

In spite of years of research to identify what has been creating illness and death related to environmental pollution, little has been done in Canada to provide solutions or precautionary procedures for these issues.

We need to recognize the repercussions and negative impacts from exposure to environmental contaminants and be in a position to react accordingly.

A framework to address these problems needs to be there so that there is some triggering mechanisms within the legislation with which to respond when dealing with contaminants in the environment.

• (1405)

On that point of triggering, members will recall that the member for Elk Island said he was inclined to like this legislation but thought it already existed. He thought the motion to be therefore redundant.

Let me remind the member that last month on September 23, the parliamentary secretary, in a response to the question about the incinerator at Belledune, said that there was no trigger under section 46.

That was confirmed as well by the Minister of the Environment who had said six days earlier:

For the federal government to intervene under the environmental assessment legislation there has to be federal involvement, which is called a trigger, for the legislation to take effect.

So, this is not redundant legislation by any measure and I would urge the member for Elk Island to reconsider his position with regard to that.

Although current legislation does provide emergency mechanisms, they do not get triggered when it comes to environmental contaminants that damage human health. Scientific standards for demonstrating cause and effect for declaring a substance toxic in the sense of the law are high.

The use of potentially harmful substances and technology would be justified under the current legislation. The risk assessment process is limited. It cannot be interpreted as an absolute tool. Ecological and health effects are difficult to quantify. Risk assessment often takes into consideration narrow risks such as death, mostly caused by cancers.

Furthermore, the so-called acceptable level of risk is highly debatable, especially since most of the time people who must assume that risk are actually not aware of it, as the member for Richmond—Arthabaska so eloquently pointed out a few minutes ago.

In addition, the cumulative effects of all different chemicals are seldom evaluated, which means emissions could be damaging health even if each substance alone does not trespass the threshold of tolerance.

Important damage to health and the environment can be done before we achieve scientific certainty and thus take action.

Tobacco is an excellent example. Smoking was strongly suspected to cause lung cancer long before we were able to prove that conclusively. The number of diseases suspected to be linked to environmental pollution is increasing, as shown by multiple research studies that have been undertaken in recent years. These diseases are also the result of the interaction of other social and genetic factors, but the environmental links cannot be ignored.

The Sydney Tar Ponds, so eloquently discussed in the last Parliament by MPs like Michelle Dockrill and Peter Mancini, and the current problems that we have experienced in Windsor, as discussed by the members for Windsor West and Windsor—St. Clair, of high rates of mortality and diseases that are impacted locally have inspired this motion.

In both cases, the government failed to address the higher than normal death, cancer and birth defect rates that were found to be linked to environmental contaminants. Action was not taken quickly enough and it lacked transparency which undermined the confidence of Canadians in health officials as well as government institutions.

As I said before, the current framework does not trigger action and that is what this motion is all about today.

We know that environmental contaminants affecting one community do not result from only local emissions. Given that air pollution has no borders, it becomes an issue that requires international standards as well.

Transboundary air and water pollution are common and that is why federal participation is not only justified but absolutely necessary. Government participation and a strong commitment at all levels is required to ensure long term monitoring programs in the first place, investigation and control of sources of pollution in the second place, and finally, adequate funding to implement remedial action plans.

In conclusion, environmental degradation translates into high costs for cleanup and expensive remediation programs, and thus it cannot be ignored. Prevention measures and corrective procedures will make it helpful to reduce harmful substances.

My colleague's motion today asks for the ability to undertake specific action when a correlation between environmental contaminants and people's health is found. It is about investing in our health and that of our children. It is about admitting responsibilities and meeting government's liabilities. That is why I hope this motion will gain support from all members in the House.

• (1410)

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today and thank all parties, my colleagues from the New Democratic Party, the Bloc Quebecois and the Progressive Conservative Party who have spoken in favour of this motion. I want to touch on a couple of points that I think are important.

We are talking about is creating a process, or a trigger, for the general public and also the scientific community, the industrial community, that will lead to some results for people across this land.

Private Members' Business

We have a situation right now in Windsor and in Sydney, with its tar ponds. We have seen the pollution and the environment degraded to the point that it affects the health of people.

Last week Windsor received the distinguished achievement of having the most haze. Haze affects the air quality that people breathe and that affects them. It is not just an individual thing. It is a societal thing. It costs our province and our country billions of dollars in loss of wages, loss of health, and it shortens our lifespan.

We are asking for is a sense of responsibility. We are asking the federal government to take a leadership role in this by investigating and providing support. We ask that it consult with the community and bring awareness. Then the area would have the knowledge needed to participate in discussions of what to do next. That leadership is missing. The partners have to be brought to the table. Then we can bring the problems to the chamber so we can discuss possible solutions.

It is not about banning something outright. It is not about stopping something. It is about providing people with an educated ability to make decisions. We have to make decisions about the pollutants in the environment and the affect they have on people, the shortening of lifespan and disease. We have to discuss whether it is worth it to continue producing these or whether it is worth the wealth being accumulating. All we ask is that people have a chance to debate the issues.

There are plenty of things people can do. There is remedial action. Take a look at the Great Lakes. For decades we have looked at the neglect. We have continued not to invest in simple things that could improve our quality of life and could have an economic benefit.

At present, the city of Detroit is the largest polluter of the Detroit River. On the Canadian side of the river we have similar problems. We know there are problems with the reproductive systems of citizens in our community. We have high rates of children born without brains. We have high rates of lung cancer and respiratory diseases. We need the opportunity to get the resources to address these problems. This is what we are calling for here.

We are not talking about an outright banning of any particular perfume, chemical, object or product. We are asking for is public debate. We also want choice, so we can invest in solutions. The solutions can be achieved.

Another example is the Edison power plant which is across the river from Windsor. There is a pile of coal that simply sits at the plant and the wind blows that coal into the Detroit River. We then drink the water from the river after it is treated. There are simple solutions to stop that. We must discuss ways in which we can make change.

Private Members' Business

The motion does not come only from myself. The motion comes from a movement in Windsor to create a centre for environmental health. The centre would be a body that would work with everyone to raise the information and the knowledge, then it would come back to the community so we could discuss and decide what to do about the problem. If we do not have the mechanisms in place, we are subjected to continual health and environmental problems.

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development has identified that environmental contaminants costs billions of dollars across the globe. The OECD is looking at action plans to deal with this. It knows that we have to change our ways, not just for health reasons but for economic reasons.

In Ontario we lose billions of dollars of production because of smog. These things can change. We need to have the leadership.

● (1415)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Pursuant to order made earlier this day, all questions necessary to dispose of Motion No.399 are deemed put and a recorded division is deemed demanded and deferred until Tuesday, October 7, 2003, at the expiry of the time provided for government orders.

It being 2:18 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:18 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

HON. DON BOUDRIA

MR. LOYOLA HEARN

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay—Columbia	British Columbia	CA
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	Alberta	CA
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Allard, Carole-Marie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Laval East	Quebec	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	CA
Anderson, David	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CA
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Hon. Jean, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bagnell, Larry	Yukon	Yukon	Lib.
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	CA
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Rex	Gander—Grand Falls	Newfoundland and Labrador	PC
Barnes, Sue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Barrette, Gilbert	Témiscamingue	Quebec	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue	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

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

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	CA
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CA
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish— Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Macklin, Paul Harold, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Mahoney, Hon. Steve, Secretary of State (Selected Crown Corporations)	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour	Bramalea—Gore—Malton— Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	Quebec	BQ
Marcil, Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Quebec	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Manitoba	PC
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	CA
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Hon. Paul	LaSalle—Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	Ontario	NDP
Matthews, Bill	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	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	Waterloo—Wellington	Ontario	Lib.

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CA
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Quebec	Ind. BQ
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
VACANCY	Ottawa-Centre	Ontario	

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

MANITOBA (13)

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

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

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

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

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Lib.
QUEBEC (69)		
Allard, Carole-Marie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Barrette, Gilbert	Témiscamingue	Lib.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Lib. Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Portneuf	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Frulla, Liza	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	BQ
Gagnon, Sébastien	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	BQ
Gaudet, Roger	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Jobin, Christian	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Lancôt, 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, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Shefford	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Ind. BQ
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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CA
Skelton, Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	CA
Spencer, Larry	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	CA
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	CA
Yelich, Lynne	Blackstrap	CA
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Larry	Yukon	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of October 3, 2003 — 2nd Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:	Raymond Bonin	Vice-Chairs:	Anita Neville Maurice Vellacott	
Gérard Binet	John Duncan	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Gary Schellenberger	(16)
Serge Cardin	John Godfrey	Yvan Loubier	Benoît Serré	
David Chatters	Charles Hubbard	Pat Martin	Guy St-Julien	
Stan Dromisky				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson
Diane Ablonczy	Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton	Gilles-A. Perron
Rob Anders	Bev Desjarlais	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Norman Doyle	Dale Johnston	Scott Reid
Gérard Asselin	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	John Reynolds
André Bachand	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	Gerry Ritz
Claude Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Robert Lanctôt	Jean-Yves Roy
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Ghislain Fournier	James Lunney	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Monte Solberg
Stéphane Bergeron	Yvon Godin	Richard Marceau	Kevin Sorenson
Bernard Bigras	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Jim Gouk	Keith Martin	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Gurmant Grewal	Philip Mayfield	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Andy Burton	Art Hanger	Val Meredith	Myron Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Stephen Harper	Rob Merrifield	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Randy White
Joe Clark	John Herron	Lorne Nystrom	Ted White
Joe Comartin	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	John Williams
Paul Crête	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Lynne Yelich

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Paul Steckle

Vice-Chairs:
Gerry Ritz
Rose-Marie UrG rard Binet
Rick Borotsik
Rick Casson
Claude DuplainMark Eyking
Marcel Gagnon
Howard HilstromRick Laliberte
John Maloney
Larry McCormickLouis Plamondon
Dick Proctor
Bob Speller

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Andr  Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
St phane Bergeron
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
Paul Cr te
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina DesrochersNorman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald KeddyJason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Robert Lanct t
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Paul Harold Macklin
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
James RajotteScott Reid
John Reynolds
Jean-Yves Roy
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairs: Jim Abbott
John Harvard

Carole-Marie Allard	Liza Frulla	James Lunney	Alex Shepherd	(16)
Paul Bonwick	Christiane Gagnon	Dennis Mills	Caroline St-Hilaire	
Sarmite Bulte	Wendy Lill	Gary Schellenberger	Chuck Strahl	
R. John Efford				

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Libby Davies	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Norman Doyle	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	John Duncan	Jason Kenney	Benoît Sauvageau
Roy Bailey	Reed Elley	Robert Lanctôt	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Ken Epp	Yvan Loubier	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn	Monte Solberg
Stéphane Bergeron	Paul Forseth	Peter MacKay	Kevin Sorenson
Bernard Bigras	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Darrel Stinson
Diane Bourgeois	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Greg Thompson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Myron Thompson
Scott Brison	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Andy Burton	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Suzanne Tremblay
Chuck Cadman	Stephen Harper	Bob Mills	Maurice Vellacott
Serge Cardin	Richard Harris	James Moore	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Bill Casey	Loyola Hearn	Deepak Obhrai	Elsie Wayne
Rick Casson	John Herron	Brian Pallister	Randy White
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Charlie Penson	Ted White
Joe Clark	Jay Hill	David Price	John Williams
Joe Comartin	Howard Hilstrom	Dick Proctor	Lynne Yelich
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte	

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair:

Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs:
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Jerry PickardDiane Ablonczy
Sarkis Assadourian
John Bryden
Yvon CharbonneauRaymonde Folco
Art Hanger
Sophia LeungInky Mark
Pat Martin
Grant McNallyJohn O'Reilly
Massimo Pacetti
Yves Rocheleau

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Bill Blaikie
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Libby DaviesStockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale JohnstonJim Karygiannis
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Keith Martin
Brian Masse
Philip Mayfield
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Anita Neville
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
David Price
James Rajotte
Scott ReidJohn Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Joseph Volpe
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairs: Bob Mills
Paul Szabo

Mark Assad
Roy Bailey
Bernard Bigras
Joe Comartin

Sébastien Gagnon
John Herron
Joe Jordan

Rick Laliberte
Gary Lunn
Julian Reed

Andy Savoy
Hélène Scherrer
Alan Tonks

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Paul Crête
John Cummins
Stockwell Day

Bev Desjarlais
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston

Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Clifford Lincoln
Yvan Loubier
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
John Maloney
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
David Price
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FINANCE**Chair:**

Sue Barnes

Vice-Chairs:Nick Discepola
Monte SolbergScott Brison
Rick Casson
Roy Cullen
Albina GuarnieriRichard Harris
Rahim Jaffer
Sophia Leung
Maria MinnaShawn Murphy
Pierre Paquette
Pauline Picard
Gary PillitteriTony Valeri
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Bryon Wilfert

(18)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman DoyleJohn Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. PerronJoe Peschisolido
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Bob Wood
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Tom Wappel

Vice-Chairs: John Cummins
Bill Matthews

Andy Burton
Rodger Cuzner
R. John Efford
Reed Elley

Georges Farrah
Ghislain Fournier
Loyola Hearn

Dominic LeBlanc
Joe Peschisolido
Carmen Provenzano

Jean-Yves Roy
Peter Stoffer
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
G rard Asselin
Andr  Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitreuz
Scott Brison
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan

Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Marcel Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston

Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz

Svend Robinson
Yves Rocheleau
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:	Bernard Patry	Vice-Chairs:	Stockwell Day Diane Marleau	
Stéphane Bergeron	Irwin Cotler	André Harvey	Deepak Obhrai	(18)
Murray Calder	Art Eggleton	Francine Lalonde	Charlie Penson	
Aileen Carroll	Mark Eyking	Keith Martin	Karen Redman	
Bill Casey	John Harvard	Alexa McDonough		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stan Dromisky	Karen Kraft Sloan	Gerry Ritz
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Yvan Loubier	Svend Robinson
Rob Anders	Claude Duplain	Gary Lunn	Yves Rocheleau
David Anderson	Reed Elley	James Lunney	Benoît Sauvageau
Sarkis Assadourian	Ken Epp	Peter MacKay	Gary Schellenberger
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gurbax Malhi	Hélène Scherrer
Claude Bachand	Raymonde Folco	John Maloney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Inky Mark	Raymond Simard
Rex Barnes	Cheryl Gallant	Pat Martin	Carol Skelton
Sue Barnes	Peter Goldring	Brian Masse	Monte Solberg
Colleen Beaumier	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Kevin Sorenson
Eugène Bellemare	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Bob Speller
Leon Benoit	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Larry Spencer
Bernard Bigras	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Darrel Stinson
Bill Blaikie	Stephen Harper	Bob Mills	Chuck Strahl
Rick Borotsik	Richard Harris	James Moore	Greg Thompson
Garry Breitkreuz	Loyola Hearn	Shawn Murphy	Myron Thompson
Scott Brison	John Herron	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews
Andy Burton	Grant Hill	Pat O'Brien	Tony Valeri
Chuck Cadman	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Howard Hilstrom	Pierre Paquette	Joseph Volpe
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	Beth Phinney	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Rahim Jaffer	David Price	Randy White
Paul Crête	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte	Ted White
John Cummins	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid	John Williams
Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds	Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Stéphane Bergeron	Charlie Penson			(2)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Deepak Obhrai	Yves Rocheleau			(2)

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairs: Paul Forseth
Paul Szabo

Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
Joe Clark
Roy Cullen

Ken Epp
Raymonde Folco
Robert Lanctôt

Derek Lee
Pat Martin
Massimo Pacetti

Gilles-A. Perron
Judy Sgro
Tony Tirabassi

(16)

Associate Members

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

Brian Fitzpatrick
Liza Frulla
Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer

Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Brian Masse
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Dick Proctor

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WHISTLEBLOWING

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF THE OFFICE OF THE PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES PROCESS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE RENEWAL

Chair:**Vice-Chair:**

HEALTH

Chair:

Bonnie Brown

Vice-Chairs:Stan Dromisky
Réal MénardGilbert Barrette
Carolyn Bennett
Diane Bourgeois
Jeannot CastonguayBrenda Chamberlain
Hedy Fry
Grant HillBetty Hinton
Karen Kraft Sloan
Rob MerrifieldSvend Robinson
Hélène Scherrer
Greg Thompson

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Libby Davies
Stockwell DayBev Desjarlais
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Rahim JafferDale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
John Maloney
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Pauline PicardJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair: Judi Longfield

Vice-Chairs: Eugène Bellemare
Brian Pallister

Peter Adams	Peter Goldring	Ovid Jackson	Larry Spencer	(18)
Libby Davies	Jim Gouk	Gurbax Malhi	Diane St-Jacques	
Norman Doyle	Monique Guay	Larry McCormick	Suzanne Tremblay	
John Finlay	Tony Ianno	Raymond Simard		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Bev Desjarlais	Rahim Jaffer	Dick Proctor
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Karen Kraft Sloan	Gerry Ritz
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Robert Lanctôt	Jean-Yves Roy
Rex Barnes	Christiane Gagnon	Wendy Lill	Gary Schellenberger
Mauril Bélanger	Marcel Gagnon	Yvan Loubier	Werner Schmidt
Carolyn Bennett	Sébastien Gagnon	Gary Lunn	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	James Lunney	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Peter MacKay	Kevin Sorenson
Diane Bourgeois	John Godfrey	Inky Mark	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Yvon Godin	Keith Martin	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Pat Martin	Greg Thompson
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Myron Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	Stephen Harper	Réal Ménard	Alan Tonks
Rick Casson	Richard Harris	Val Meredith	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Loyola Hearn	Rob Merrifield	Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Joe Clark	John Herron	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Paul Crête	Grant Hill	James Moore	Randy White
John Cummins	Jay Hill	Anita Neville	Ted White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Howard Hilstrom	Deepak Obhrai	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton	Charlie Penson	Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:

Walt Lastewka

Vice-Chairs:Dan McTeague
James RajotteAndré Bachand
Larry Bagnell
Paul Crête
Brian FitzpatrickCheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Serge MarcilBrian Masse
Gilbert Normand
Andy SavoyBrent St. Denis
Paddy Torsney
Joseph Volpe

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Eugène Bellemare
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Gérard Binet
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell DayBev Desjarlais
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
John Maloney
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Joe McGuire
Grant McNally
Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Pierre PaquetteCharlie Penson
Dick Proctor
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Andy Scott	Vice-Chairs:	Chuck Cadman John McKay	
Garry Breitkreuz	Christian Jobin	John Maloney	Pat O'Brien	(18)
Sarmite Bulte	Robert Lanctôt	Richard Marceau	Kevin Sorenson	
Hedy Fry	Derek Lee	Inky Mark	Vic Toews	
Marlene Jennings	Paul Harold Macklin	Lorne Nystrom		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Bev Desjarlais	Gerald Keddy	Geoff Regan
Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Yvan Loubier	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Gary Lunn	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Ken Epp	James Lunney	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Peter MacKay	Gary Schellenberger
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	Keith Martin	Werner Schmidt
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Philip Mayfield	Carol Skelton
Bernard Bigras	Peter Goldring	Alexa McDonough	Monte Solberg
Bill Blaikie	Jim Gouk	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Gurmant Grewal	Réal Ménard	Darrel Stinson
Diane Bourgeois	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Greg Thompson
Andy Burton	Stephen Harper	Bob Mills	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	James Moore	Paddy Torsney
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	Lynn Myers	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Joe Clark	Grant Hill	Brian Pallister	Elsie Wayne
Joe Comartin	Jay Hill	Charlie Penson	Randy White
John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	David Pratt	Ted White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Betty Hinton	Dick Proctor	John Williams
Libby Davies	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston		

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOLICITATION LAWS

Chair:	Hedy Fry	Vice-Chairs:	Libby Davies Paddy Torsney	
Chuck Cadman	Richard Marceau	Inky Mark		(6)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

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

LIAISON**Chair:**

Peter Adams
 Reg Alcock
 Sue Barnes
 Mauril Bélanger
 Raymond Bonin

Bonnie Brown
 Charles Caccia
 Joe Comuzzi
 Joe Fontana
 Gurmant Grewal

Vice-Chair:

Walt Lastewka
 Clifford Lincoln
 Judi Longfield
 Bernard Patry
 David Pratt

Andy Scott
 Paul Steckle
 Tom Wappel
 John Williams

(19)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Eugène Bellemare
 Chuck Cadman
 John Cannis
 John Cummins
 Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
 Stockwell Day
 Nick Discepola
 Stan Dromisky

Paul Forseth
 Yvon Godin
 John Harvard
 Jay Hill
 Dale Johnston
 Diane Marleau
 Bill Matthews
 John McKay
 Dan McTeague

Réal Ménard
 Bob Mills
 James Moore
 Shawn Murphy
 Anita Neville
 Brian Pallister
 Carolyn Parrish
 Beth Phinney
 Jerry Pickard

David Price
 James Rajotte
 Gerry Ritz
 Monte Solberg
 Paul Szabo
 Yolande Thibeault
 Rose-Marie Ur
 Maurice Vellacott

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS**Chair:****Vice-Chair:****SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS****Chair:****Vice-Chair:**

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:

David Pratt

Vice-Chairs:Jay Hill
David PriceRob Anders
Claude Bachand
Robert Bertrand
Bill BlaikieCheryl Gallant
Ivan Grose
Dominic LeBlancJoe McGuire
Anita Neville
Lawrence O'BrienJanko Peric
Louis Plamondon
Elsie Wayne

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken EppBrian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
Wendy Lill
Yvan LoubierGary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
John Maloney
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Grant McNally
Dan McTeague
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
John O'Reilly
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Carmen Provenzano
James Rajotte
Scott ReidJohn Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Rose-Marie Ur
Maurice Vellacott
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Bob Wood
Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:**Vice-Chair:**

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:	Mauril Bélanger	Vice-Chairs:	Yvon Godin Yolande Thibeault	
Carole-Marie Allard Mark Assad Eugène Bellemare John Bryden	Jeannot Castonguay Christiane Gagnon John Herron	Rahim Jaffer Jason Kenney Dan McTeague	Scott Reid Benoît Sauvageau Raymond Simard	(16)

Associate Members

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

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Peter Adams	Vice-Chairs:	Dale Johnston Carolyn Parrish	
Marlene Catterall	Joe Jordan	Lynn Myers	Jacques Saada	(16)
Rodger Cuzner	Gerald Keddy	Geoff Regan	Benoît Sauvageau	
Yvon Godin	Judi Longfield	John Reynolds	Werner Schmidt	
Michel Guimond				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Gary Lunn	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Reed Elley	James Lunney	Gary Schellenberger
André Bachand	Ken Epp	Peter MacKay	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Inky Mark	Monte Solberg
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	Keith Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Stéphane Bergeron	Peter Goldring	Grant McNally	Caroline St-Hilaire
Bill Blaikie	Jim Gouk	Réal Ménard	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Gurmant Grewal	Val Meredith	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitkreuz	Deborah Grey	Rob Merrifield	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Stephen Harper	James Moore	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	Richard Harris	Lorne Nystrom	Paddy Torsney
Bill Casey	Loyola Hearn	Deepak Obhrai	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	John Herron	Brian Pallister	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Charlie Penson	Randy White
Joe Clark	Jay Hill	David Price	Ted White
John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	Dick Proctor	John Williams
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Betty Hinton	Marcel Proulx	Lynne Yelich
Libby Davies			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Carolyn Parrish	Vice-Chair:		
Yvon Godin	Lynn Myers	Benoît Sauvageau	Chuck Strahl	(7)
Gerald Keddy	David Price			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT

Chair:	Paddy Torsney	Vice-Chair:		
Yvon Godin	Gerald Keddy	Marcel Proulx	Scott Reid	(6)
Michel Guimond				

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

John Williams

Vice-Chairs:Shawn Murphy
Beth PhinneyColleen Beaumier
Odina Desrochers
John Finlay
Paul ForsethRoger Gaudet
Christian Jobin
Philip Mayfield
Val MeredithJoe Peschisolido
Jim Peterson
Judy SgroGreg Thompson
Tony Tirabassi
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(17)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell DayBev Desjarlais
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty HintonRahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Grant McNally
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
James RajotteScott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
Lynne Yelich

TRANSPORT

Chair: Joe Comuzzi

Vice-Chairs: John Cannis
James Moore

Larry Bagnell
Rex Barnes
Bev Desjarlais
Roger Gallaway

Jim Gouk
Ovid Jackson
Stan Keyes

Mario Laframboise
Robert Lanctôt
Pat O'Brien

Marcel Proulx
Yolande Thibeault
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Reg Alcock
Rob Anders
David Anderson
G rard Asselin
Andr  Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Bill Blaikie
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Paul Cr te
John Cummins
Stockwell Day

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Ghislain Fournier
Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Roger Gaudet
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Peter Goldring
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton

Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
John Maloney
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
R al M nard
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Dick Proctor
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Judy Sgro
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Guy St-Julien
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROCEDURES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chair: Yves Morin

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Michael J. Forrestall

Jean Lapointe
Vivienne Poy

Mauril Bélanger
Carolyn Bennett
Robert Bertrand
Marlene Catterall
Marcel Gagnon
Deborah Grey
Jim Karygiannis
Gerald Keddy

Wendy Lill
Jerry Pickard
Louis Plamondon
Jacques Saada
Carol Skelton
Guy St-Julien
Darrel Stinson
Andrew Telegdi

(21)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Libby Davies

Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom

Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chair: Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron
Mac Harb
James Kelleher

Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin

Rex Barnes
Paul Bonwick
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Liza Frulla
Gurmant Grewal
Michel Guimond
Derek Lee
Paul Harold Macklin

John Maloney
Pat Martin
John McKay
Lynn Myers
Caroline St-Hilaire
Maurice Vellacott
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(23)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan

Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston

Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
Hon. David Collenette	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. John Manley	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance
Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Health
Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Industry
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
Hon. Don Boudria	Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
Hon. Robert Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Denis Coderre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Robert Thibault	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
Hon. Susan Whelan	Minister for International Cooperation
Hon. Bill Graham	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Gerry Byrne	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. John McCallum	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Wayne Easter	Solicitor General of Canada
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
Hon. Paul DeVillers	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Gar Knutson	Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)
Hon. Denis Paradis	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)
Hon. Claude Drouin	Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Stephen Owen	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)
Hon. Jean Augustine	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
Hon. Steve Mahoney	Secretary of State (Selected Crown Corporations)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Rodger Cuzner	to the Prime Minister
Mr. Marcel Proulx	to the Minister of Transport
Mr. Alan Tonks	to the Minister of the Environment
Ms. Judy Sgro	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Ms. Carole-Marie Allard	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Bryon Wilfert	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of Industry
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Tony Tirabassi	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Paul Harold Macklin	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Ms. Diane St-Jacques	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Joe Peschisolido	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Murray Calder	to the Minister for International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Claude Duplain	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. Charles Hubbard	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Ms. Colleen Beaumier	to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Sarkis Assadourian	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Ivan Grose	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. André Harvey	to the Minister of International Cooperation
Mr. Dominic LeBlanc	to the Minister of National Defence

CONTENTS

Friday, October 3, 2003

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Assisted Human Reproduction Act	
Bill C-13. Third reading	8141
Mr. Boudria	8141
Motion	8141
Mr. Kenney	8141
Mr. O'Reilly	8143
Ms. Guay	8144
Mr. Bryden	8145
Mr. Spencer	8146
Mr. Tonks	8147

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

World Teachers' Day	
Mr. Adams	8148
Citizenship and Immigration	
Mr. Duncan	8148
Yom Kippur	
Ms. Carroll	8148
Marathon Victory	
Mr. Malhi	8148
National Capital Commission	
Mr. Proulx	8148
Arts and Culture	
Mr. McNally	8149
Canadian Women's Soccer Team	
Mr. Lincoln	8149
War on Drug Traffickers	
Mr. Loubier	8149
Government of Ontario	
Mr. Provenzano	8149
Immigration and Refugee Board	
Mrs. Ablonczy	8149
World Forestry Congress	
Mr. Barrette	8150
Government Assistance	
Mr. Keddy	8150
Greater Joliette Chamber of Commerce	
Mr. Paquette	8150
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Maloney	8150
Veterans Affairs	
Mrs. Desjarlais	8151
Government of Ontario	
Mr. Bryden	8151

Agriculture	
Mr. Penson	8151

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Government Assistance	
Mrs. Skelton	8151
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8151
Mrs. Skelton	8151
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8151
Mrs. Skelton	8151
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8152
National Defence	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	8152
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8152
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	8152
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8152
Canadian Grand Prix	
Ms. St-Hilaire	8152
Mr. Cauchon	8152
Ms. St-Hilaire	8152
Mr. Cauchon	8152
Ms. Guay	8153
Mr. Cauchon	8153
Ms. Guay	8153
Mr. Cauchon	8153
Government Assistance	
Mr. Brison	8153
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8153
Mr. Brison	8153
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8153
Electoral System	
Mr. Blaikie	8153
Mr. Boudria	8154
Agriculture	
Mr. Blaikie	8154
Mr. Vanclief	8154
Infrastructure	
Mr. Moore	8154
Mr. Collenette	8154
Mr. Moore	8154
Mr. Collenette	8154
Former Privacy Commissioner	
Ms. Girard-Bujold	8154
Mr. Boudria	8155
Ms. Girard-Bujold	8155
Mr. Boudria	8155
Infrastructure	
Mr. Ritz	8155
Mr. Collenette	8155
Mr. Ritz	8155

Mr. Collenette	8155	Guaranteed Income Supplement	
Official Languages		Mr. Gagnon (Champlain)	8159
Mr. Sauvageau	8155	Mrs. Stewart	8159
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8155	Public Service	
Mr. Sauvageau	8155	Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	8159
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8155	Ms. Robillard	8160
Veterans Affairs		Trade	
Mr. Bailey	8156	Mr. Proctor	8160
Mr. Grose	8156	Mr. Calder	8160
Mr. Bailey	8156	Public Service	
Mr. Grose	8156	Mr. Epp	8160
Agriculture		Ms. Robillard	8160
Mr. Adams	8156	Presence in Gallery	
Mr. Vanclief	8156	The Deputy Speaker	8160
Pharmaceutical Industry		Business of the House	
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	8156	Bill C-41	
Mr. Boudria	8156	Mr. Boudria	8160
Musée Laurier		Motion	8160
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	8156	(Motion agreed to, bill deemed reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed)	8160
Ms. Allard	8156	Ways and Means	
Interest Rates		Notice of motion	
Mr. Nystrom	8156	Mr. Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora)	8160
Mr. Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora)	8157		
The Environment			
Mr. Masse	8157		
Mr. Tonks	8157		
National Defence			
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	8157		
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8157		
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	8157		
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	8157		
CINAR			
Mr. Laframboise	8157		
Mr. Boudria	8158		
Mr. Laframboise	8158		
Mr. Boudria	8158		
Agriculture			
Mr. Casson	8158		
Mr. Vanclief	8158		
Mr. Casson	8158		
Mr. Vanclief	8158		
Aboriginal Affairs			
Mr. Provenzano	8158		
Mrs. Stewart	8158		
Child Pornography			
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	8159		
Mr. Cauchon	8159		
Mr. Easter	8159		
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	8159		
Mr. Easter	8159		
Steel Imports			
Mr. Bergeron	8159		
Mr. Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora)	8159		

		ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
		Committees of the House	
		Finance	
		Mrs. Barnes (London West)	8161
		Canadian Heritage	
		Mr. Lincoln	8161
		Government Operations and Estimates	
		Mr. Szabo	8161
		Motion for concurrence	8161
		Mr. Epp	8162
		Mr. Bryden	8162
		Mr. Kenney	8163
		Mr. Bryden	8163
		Mr. Epp	8164
		Mr. Szabo	8165
		Mr. Epp	8165
		Mr. Bryden	8166
		Mr. Casson	8167
		Business of the House	
		Mr. Szabo	8168
		Motion	8168
		(Motion agreed to)	8168
		Committees of the House	
		Government Operations and Estimates	
		Motion for concurrence	8168
		Mr. Szabo	8168
		Mr. Laframboise	8169
		Canadian Heritage	
		Mr. Lincoln	8171
		Motion for concurrence	8171

(Motion agreed to)	8171	Mr. Epp.....	8172
Government Operations and Estimates		Mr. Gagnon (Champlain)	8173
Motion for concurrence	8171	Motion.....	8174
Mr. Laframboise.....	8171	Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska).....	8174
		Mr. Proctor	8175
		Mr. Masse	8177
		Vote deemed demanded and deferred.....	8178
		APPENDIX	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS			
The Environment			
Motion.....	8172		

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Publishing and Depository Services

PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5

Internet: <http://publications.gc.ca>

1-800-635-7943 or Local 613-941-5995

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Les Éditions et Services de dépôt

TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Internet: <http://publications.gc.ca>

1-800-635-7943 ou appel local (613) 941-5995

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

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

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

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

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

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

Additional copies may be obtained from Publishing and Depository Services, PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5

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

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt, TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5**