



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 148 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, October 31, 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 31, 2003

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*English*]

### SPECIFIC CLAIMS RESOLUTION ACT

**Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development)** moved the second reading of, and concurrence in, amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-6, an act to establish the Canadian Centre for the Independent Resolution of First Nations Specific Claims to provide for the filing, negotiation and resolution of specific claims and to make related amendments to other acts.

**Mr. Charles Hubbard (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-6, the specific claims resolution act. It is one of the initiatives the government is bringing forward aimed at putting the tools of self-sufficiency into the hands of first nations enabling them to play a fuller part in the life of this country.

The specific claims resolution act proposed is a cornerstone of the government's overall strategy to have a new system to resolve specific claims that will be more efficient and effective than the process we now have.

As this proposed legislation made its way through the parliamentary process we heard from various first nations and first nations organizations express their concerns and perspectives. The Senate, in hearing these concerns, has put forward a number of important amendments to Bill C-6 that would directly address the concerns of first nations and render a better piece of legislation. This should give first nations the confidence to use the new claims resolution centre as outlined in the legislation.

It is comforting to see that the parliamentary process has worked and is responsive to the concerns of first nations and that better legislation is derived from the cooperative efforts of all stakeholders and parliamentarians in the House and Senate.

With respect to the proposal now before us, we have heard that the current specific claims process could be improved to make it more efficient and effective, and to avoid costly and slow litigation in the courts. Every dollar wasted in court is a dollar less for investment in economic development, governance, and real bread and butter issues facing aboriginal people.

With the current claims process, we are only able to settle a few claims each year. At this rate, we would have to leave it to our children to clear away the existing number of claims that are on inventory, and that inventory is growing each day.

The new centre that Bill C-6 would put in place under this proposal would be called the claims resolution centre. It would consist of a chief executive officer who would be responsible for the day to day administrative affairs, a commission to facilitate negotiations, and a tribunal with the authority to make binding decisions. This would greatly speed up the process in a much more cooperative atmosphere than in a courtroom. In an atmosphere of cooperation, I am sure the centre would play a very important role in helping us bring this new system forward.

It is important to be clear about what kind of claims the new centre would deal with. Its authority would cover a variety of claims that relate to Canada's management of first nations land and other assets. It would not deal with comprehensive land claims, which are based on the concept of continuing aboriginal rights and title, and which have not been dealt with by treaty or other legal means. There is a separate policy and negotiation process designed to find resolution to those types of claims.

To refresh our memories, this new legislation was arrived at through extensive input from first nations. That led to the recommendations from a joint task force concerning the need for an independent claims commission. The fact that we are here today looking at this legislation demonstrates that the work of the joint task force was for the most part successful.

The Senate committee heard from numerous witnesses concerning the bill. One of the concerns that was repeatedly put forward was the jurisdictional authority placed on the tribunal.

As originally proposed, the legislation set the jurisdictional limit on the tribunal at \$7 million on awards for claims resolved under the new system. Following extensive consultations and presentations before the Senate committee, an amendment was proposed, and is now before this House, to increase the tribunal authority to a maximum limit of \$10 million.

*Government Orders*

We are confident that this new ceiling is a realistic one and meets the needs of first nations. As we have heard, most of the claims currently before the Government of Canada would be dispensed with under this new increased amount. In fact, as of March 31, 2002, the average specific claim settlement was some \$5.6 million.

We have heard from those who say that there should be no ceiling at all. We wish there could be an unlimited budget. But again, in the interests of our country, our spending priorities and all, there must be a maximum amount set.

• (1010)

Another important element from first nations that we heard in the Senate hearings were concerns regarding the appointment process for the chief executive officer, the commissioners and adjudicators of the proposed new body. We listened to these concerns and have proposed an amendment that would give first nations a greater opportunity to make representations with respect to appointments and to be more actively involved in the review process. We also proposed to confirm post-employment conflict of interest rules.

Another important change that the Senate has recommended to the current proposal would deal with increased subpoena powers of the tribunal, thus giving greater credence to the independence and fairness of this quasi-judicial body.

Much work has been done in the drafting of this bill and it would appear that we are getting some improved legislation back from our Senate colleagues. As I said, this is very important because a key aspect of how it will work is a built-in regime of reporting requirements and mechanisms to allow us to fine-tune the practical applications of the new system. For that reason, I will sketch out a few of these important developments.

Accounts and financial transactions of the centre would be audited annually by the Auditor General. A report on the work of the centre, including the Auditor General's audit, would be submitted to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development after each fiscal year. This report would be tabled in the House of Commons and the Senate, and made available to first nations and public scrutiny.

Quarterly reports to the minister concerning compensation paid respecting resolved specific claims would be required under the act and a requirement for review of the entire process is built in and would take place between three and five years after the legislation came into effect.

A report on the review, to include any recommendations for changes to the legislation or functions, powers or duties of the chief executive officer, and the commissioners and adjudicators would also be submitted to Parliament.

These are extensive mechanisms that can help us make the new system work better. If not perfect, it certainly is a major step in the right direction. But until the system is running, we will not know what needs to be fixed.

It has been a long road to get here. The bill came before this House last year. It has gone to the Senate and is back now for its final approval. As a government, we pledged to have a system in place to resolve first nations claims in a way that would be accountable,

transparent and impartial. We want to have a system that would level the playing field for negotiation and would resolve claims more quickly and efficiently. This will allow aboriginal people to get on with their lives with enhanced opportunities for economic development in a climate of certainty.

With this act in place, we would finally be able to leave behind a process that has frustrated many first nations communities and other stakeholders. We will begin a new direction that will give first nations a more fair and efficient means to settle their long outstanding grievances and begin dealing with their affairs in a more prosperous way as full participants in this great nation of ours.

• (1015)

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak to Bill C-6, an act to establish the Canadian Centre for the Independent Resolution of First Nations Specific Claims to provide for the filing, negotiation and resolution of specific claims and to make related amendments to other acts.

This means that the bill before us today is designed to set up a permanent centre to evaluate specific claims brought against the federal government by first nations across our country. An Indian claims commission already exists, as most of us are aware, but it was put in place some 12 years ago, back in 1991, as a temporary measure, just like our taxation and many other things. It has lasted this long and now there is an attempt to put something together in a different fashion. This proposed centre for resolving first nations specific claims is supposed to replace that temporary commission of some 12 years ago.

For the most part, as my colleague across the way mentioned, specific claims deal with outstanding grievances that first nations have regarding Canada's fulfillment of its obligations under historic treaties or its administration of first nations lands or other assets under the Indian Act. That of course is in contrast to more comprehensive claims, substantial land claim treaties such as Nisga'a and Delgamuukw, which have been debated at length in the House over the last number of years. There is a difference with these claims in the fact that they are outstanding grievances in terms of their reserve lands not being handled by or being sold off by an Indian agent with funds being pocketed by that individual, or other things of that nature.

The House has already considered the bill, but now the Senate has sent it back to us and is reporting suggested amendments. The Senate examined Bill C-6 and found it to be unsatisfactory as it was written. Most of us on the aboriginal affairs committee had some sense that there were some major concerns around some things and probably some flaws in the bill. It comes as no surprise to those of us who served on that committee that the bill has come back from the Senate with some suggested amendments, but we do not think they go far enough.

*Government Orders*

In what was often a very passionate debate in the other place, both Liberal and Progressive Conservative senators condemned the legislation. They even tried to kill it with a hoist amendment. These senators observed all of the most serious flaws in the bill, which had already been noted by members within the committee, by myself and, in the House, by the Canadian Alliance before the bill went to the Senate.

As a result, after its scrutiny and examination, the Senate has proposed several amendments to try to improve the bill, as was mentioned by my colleague across the way. We think there is some partial merit to them. That would be faint praise, I suppose, in support of these amendments, because they go only a small way in an attempt to mitigate or improve the worst aspects of the bill. Unfortunately they do not go far enough, so we continue to oppose the bill itself.

In the Senate, a hoist amendment was introduced during third reading debate after the amendments had been tabled by the Senate's aboriginal peoples committee. We can see, then, from the public record that even with these amendments, this particular bill still generated strong opposition. In fact, the bill generated much more debate than the government expected, so the Liberals resorted to the use of a time allocation motion to terminate debate.

We have become quite familiar with that anti-democratic tool in this place. It has become a very popular weapon in the hands of governments and of this government in terms of using closure an unprecedented number of times, but for the record and for the viewing audience, it is rarely used in the other place. It is rather uncharacteristic to use closure in the Senate.

The disgust expressed against the government for stooping to such tactics in that place came not just from the opposition members in the Senate but also from Liberal senators. That is another experience that we in this House are unfamiliar with, as often protest or outrage is not expressed by members on the government side when closure is being used in the House of Commons.

My point in recounting some of these events that happened in the other place is to demonstrate that the Canadian Alliance is joined by many others of different political and cultural persuasions in our opposition to this government bill. That opposition to Bill C-6 is across party lines, across cultural lines and from aboriginals and non-aboriginals.

• (1020)

To show how obstinate the government is, it bulldozes forward with this agenda in the face of widespread, reasoned opposition. I believe it is another example of how the government has not been listening as it should. Maybe the majority it has in the House is far too large. Maybe there is too big a gap and it needs to have its feet held to the fire a little more.

In committee, we had some very reasonable amendments that were dismissed and summarily swept aside. That does not sit well with members of a committee who carefully thought through these things, had discussions and listened to the testimony and so on only to have it just simply batted aside as being of no account, with the bureaucrats and the department saying that they knew what was best

and they were just going to ram this thing through come hell or high water, that it did not matter what we on the committee said.

A government that gets to the point where it figures it has all the answers and is arrogant and unresponsive to the needs and circumstances of real people is a government that will not be bringing forward the kind of legislation we need. Its legislation will be badly flawed and marred. To say that it will be imperfect is an understatement.

As a result, a lot of the House's time is wasted on badly drafted legislation that does not suit the purposes, has a cosmetic and very superficial effect and is not for the good of the individuals directly affected by the bill.

Initially I was prepared to say I was pleased that some amendments have been made to the bill and that the minister has condescended to accept them, but I am not even sure that I am pleased with this situation. A couple of the amendments might have some consequential impact, one might say, on the specifics claims process. I will come to that in a moment.

We believe that others, like increasing the tribunal cap from \$7 million to \$10 million, are little more than tokenism in terms of the real substance of the issues involved in this particular bill. That increase from \$7 million to \$10 million came by way of the Senate report to the House, by the way.

It has been some time since this bill has been before us, seven months to be exact, so I want to remind the House of what Bill C-6 proposes to do in establishing a specific claims process. Then I want to go on to discuss some of those Senate amendments and how they relate to the concerns we and others in the committee process have raised about Bill C-6.

Bill C-6 would set up a claims resolution centre made up of a commission and a tribunal. A first nation could file a claim with the commission. If it were to meet the terms of an "admissible claim" for the purposes of the commission, the claim would then be submitted to the Minister of Indian Affairs for his consideration. The commission would then convene preparatory meetings to help the claimant present its case to the minister. Upon completion of this phase of the process, the commission must suspend proceedings until it receives a written response from the minister as to whether or not he will even consider to negotiate the claim.

One of the major flaws in this is the fact that the minister is not given a deadline of any kind with respect to making his decision. I think there might even be an admission from the government in its heart of hearts that this is a problem; in a quieter moment, off to the side, not in this more contentious atmosphere, this more partisan place, I think there might be an admission. It is a major problem. It is a recipe for stonewalling, for obfuscation and for never getting back. It is really very unfair.

In a court of law process or in any other kind of procedure across the country one would assume that at some point there must be deadlines. They might be protracted and extracted and long, but there must be some kind of deadlines. None of that is here for the minister and we think there is very major problem with that. It is not justice. It is not even the norm in respect to other contexts in our country.

*Government Orders*

If the minister were to decide not to negotiate the claim, the commission would sit down with both parties in an attempt to help them resolve the question of the validity of the claim, using alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. If that process did not work, then the claimant could request that the case be sent to the tribunal, but only if the amount of the claim did not exceed \$7 million, or \$10 million if the House accepts the Senate amendment to that effect.

If the tribunal were to decide that a claim was valid or, if at the earlier stage in the process the minister were to decide that he would negotiate the claim, the commission would then have to try to help those two parties arrive at an agreeable amount of compensation.

Again, if the compensation question could not be resolved by the commission, the claimant could then make an appeal for the tribunal to hear the case, but only if the compensation being demanded by the claimant—and this is the kicker—did not exceed, in the case of the Senate amendment, \$10 million. The tribunal then has the power to make a binding decision after it has heard the case. The government, however, can request a judicial review of the tribunal's decision.

● (1025)

The goal behind this bill, or at least what we are told is the goal behind this bill, is to expedite the process of resolving specific claims. Between 1970 and March of last year, Indian bands across the country had filed 1,146 claims. Only 232 had been settled. That backlog is terrible and it is only getting worse. It is not diminishing, with both the government and first nations, I would have to say, becoming increasingly frustrated with the current system.

Unfortunately, as I made mention of earlier, Bill C-6 is not the legislation that we need to solve the problem. In fact, the mechanisms proposed are likely to make matters worse. Liberal senators were very forthright, more forthright than government members in the House, when it came to acknowledging the imperfections in this particular bill, but those commissioned to push this bill forward essentially said that it is better to pass a bad law than no law at all.

I do not think I have ever known people as passionately committed to mediocrity as those in the current government, which says that it is better to get bad bills through than no bills at all. I do not buy that and I do not think a lot of the public does, because it then creates messes that have to be cleaned up thereafter.

Liberal Senator Anne Cools put it very well during debate in the Senate when she stated:

Honourable senators, I want you to know that we sit here again and again and feel compelled and driven by governments to pass bad bills or insufficient bills or inadequate bills.

I want to repeat that because I think it bears repeating. Senator Anne Cools, who is a Liberal senator, stated:

Honourable senators, I want you to know that we sit here again and again and feel compelled and driven by governments to pass bad bills or insufficient bills or inadequate bills.

Rarely if ever is it appropriate, in my view, to pass a bad bill rather than no bill at all. Even aboriginal people, those whom the government claims it is helping by implementing this legislation, are telling the government that it is better to fix this bill than to pass it in

its current form. That is the message the government has heard from the Assembly of First Nations as well as many individual bands. That is also the message the government heard from three of Canada's five aboriginal senators, all of whom are government members, as well as from Senator Gerry St. Germain, a Canadian Alliance senator who counts Métis as part of his ancestral heritage.

The Hon. Charlie Watt from Quebec, one of Canada's aboriginal senators, in reference to urging from the government to pass Bill C-6 as it began to turn up the heat and tighten the screws, stated this with regard to Senator Austin saying that action is needed now:

Maybe action is needed now, but is this the right instrument that we are providing to the aboriginal people? Will it advance the rights of the people? I don't think so

The Hon. Aurélien Gill, another aboriginal senator, made similar comments, stating that:

It became clear in committee that National Chief Phil Fontaine [the new head of the Assembly of First Nations] is urging the government not to pass this bill, but rather to discuss it further. Peter Hutchins, an expert, told us: "Wait, take your time; there are some major issues in this bill".

The fact that the Senate sent Bill C-6 back to the House with amendments is actually a good thing. It gives us one last chance, one might say, to fix it properly before the government passes this particular piece of legislation. The House can accept the Senate's amendments or reject them or amend them. The government is recommending that we just simply accept those recommendations and breeze on through, but my party and I do not believe that is the right solution. Rather, this House should amend those Senate amendments, strengthening them even further and adding to them before sending the bill to the other place and before sending the bill to the Governor General for royal assent.

Let us take a few minutes to look at some of the specific amendments proposed by the Senate. One of those amendments would raise the cap for cases that can be heard by the tribunal from \$7 million to \$10 million. This deals with clause 56 of the bill. This cap is the maximum award that the new claims centre is permitted to authorize for any single claim.

● (1030)

In light of the figures we are dealing with when it comes to specific claims, increasing the cap from \$7 million to \$10 million is ridiculous. It is almost not worth the effort. We proposed in committee a cap of some \$25 million.

If there is validity to the claim, and if they do not deal with some of the railway claims in B.C. and so on, then on average they are more than this. We think it is cosmetic, it is superficial, it is just on the surface and really not about the business of getting a better result for things here.

*Government Orders*

The Minister for Indian Affairs and Northern Development has claimed that the \$7 million cap has been set high enough to conclude most specific claims. At least that was the argument made at the earlier stage in committee when we had it before the House. Yet in a footnote to its legal analysis of Bill C-6, the Assembly of First Nations notes that AFN technicians have been informed by Miss Kathleen Lickers, commission counsel for the Indian Claims Commission, that of the 120 claims the ICC has dealt with, only three have been settled for less than \$7 million. The AFN analysis adds that in the past three years, from 2000 to 2003, 8 of the 14 claims paid out by the federal government were for amounts about \$7 million.

The Assembly of First Nations acknowledges:

It is true that in the earlier period from 1990-91 through 1999-2000, a majority of payouts actually were for less than \$7 million; but there is no reason to believe that this earlier record of relatively low settlements can be projected forward.

Some of these, as I said, reflected claims regarding railway land, and it was all small stuff. However, we could add up the numbers and say that we go through ICC a lot of claims, when in fact it is all small potatoes and there really is not a lot of stuff in dispute.

There is no reason to believe that this earlier record of relatively low settlements can be projected forward into the future. There was likely bias in the system for settling smaller claims, and without reports to an independent tribunal, first nations were in a very weak bargaining position.

Interest on the value of claims will also increase their value through time. If inflation is worked into it, then we have problems that are not taken into account by the cap, even in the amended cap that the Senate has suggested.

I have heard recommendations from first nations representatives calling, as a bare minimum, for an increase to the cap to anywhere from \$14 million to \$30 million, to enable the centre to hear the majority of current claims.

I introduced an amendment when this bill was being studied by the aboriginal affairs committee to increase the cap to \$25 million. I thought it was a reasonable one. After all, this is about getting it out of the very expensive, drawn out court system for the government. These people do not work for nothing and lawyers bill on a pretty good rate per hour. It is costing our taxpayers a considerable amount of money.

If we can get the right mechanism and the right kind of a claims centre together, such that there is a perception of independence, then we can save taxpayers a considerable amount of money. We will actually do service to the aboriginal peoples as well.

Some people might be concerned that making the cap higher is fiscally irresponsible because it will commit the government to greater fiscal obligations than would be the case with a lower cap, but really that is not the case. The government has dealt separately with the question of how much money is available annually. It is a different issue. It has already set an amount. It has already indicated what is available annually to distribute to the claimants who have won their cases.

As well, the claim centre does not increase the number of claims before the government. It simply provides an alternative process for

hearing them. Whether they were heard in the courts or resolved through this commission and tribunal, if the judges or adjudicators found in favour of a claimant, the government would be obligated to settle in either case.

Cases take longer and cost more when dragged through the courts, having the effect of delaying the time when a final decision is brought down and also postpones the date at which the government is required to pay out a claim for a decision made in favour of the claimant. Therefore, the imposition of a cap on the tribunal looks more like a strategic stalling tactic by the government rather than as an example of fiscal prudence, and I think members have commented on that.

● (1035)

I would think independent objective observers would say this is a recipe for disaster, a recipe for stalling by the government. The imposition of a cap complicates things and undermines the great thing we are trying to achieve by way of an expedited process.

The cap also looks like a stalling mechanism when examined from another perspective. The minister of Indian affairs has tried to play down the significance of the cap by noting that it only applies to the tribunal and not to the commission. In other words, it will only be applicable for screening out claims that cannot be resolved by the commission and therefore might be brought before the tribunal for a binding decision.

I thought I had unlimited time, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this matter.

**The Deputy Speaker:** As a matter of fact not that long ago, through the modernization committee, we made some rule changes that in fact allow during the first round of debate each member to have 20 minutes plus 10 minutes of questions or comments. I would simply remind the hon. member that he has approximately one minute remaining.

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott:** Mr. Speaker, are you sure that applies in respect to the first opposition speaker of the day?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member may remember that the former practice used to be that the first three members had 40 minutes, notwithstanding that the Prime Minister or the leader of the official opposition had unlimited time. The practice has been changed. Each member in the first round, including the government party and the four opposition parties, has 20 minutes plus 10 minutes of questions and comments. These are the new rules that have been put in place.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**Mr. Yvan Loubier:** Mr. Speaker, in today's Projected Order of Business I see that the mover of the motion has unlimited time for speaking—that is fine, since it is the parliamentary secretary—as does the first member replying immediately thereafter.

The first member replying is my colleague from the Alliance, and according to the Projected Order of Business, his time is unlimited.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Indeed, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot is absolutely right. I am wrong, and I apologize.

[English]

The hon. member is correct in his assumption because this is a motion and not the normal bill process. The hon. member for Saskatoon—Wanuskewin has unlimited time. I apologize to him and to the entire House for not having been correct in my first intervention.

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott:** Mr. Speaker, thank you for your admission and concession. I appreciate the rules of the House and your diligent application of them in fairness to all of us.

As I was saying, cases take longer when they are dragged through the courts to no end. They have the effect of delaying the time when a final decision is brought down, postponing the time at which the government is required to pay out the claim for decision made in favour of the claimant.

We believe this kind of strategic stalling by the government is not an example of fiscal prudence. I am a fiscal conservative and I think taxpayer dollars have to be watched carefully and closely. When we drag it out through the court system, which is the other route to go, it serves no one. In fact it is very negative in terms of getting disputes resolved in a very difficult area.

Surely, the minister understands that this cap gives government officials much greater leverage for claims than is to be expected in the ballpark of \$10 million. Let us use an illustration to make the point.

Take a situation in which the claimants believe their claim has a value of \$13 million. In this scenario the government refuses to accept the claim and negotiations collapse. The claimants therefore have to decide whether to lower their demand to only \$10 million in order to proceed to the tribunal or to insist on their demands for the full amount. In this case the claimants have to start from scratch all over again in the court system, drag it out to no end and add a great length of time. That is even if the band has the funds necessary to launch a court case.

This illustration demonstrates how the existence of a cap, and such a low cap at that, can greatly benefit the government victimizing the claimants all over again. In some of these cases it is quite heart-rending to read of how Indian agents took advantage of a first nation and pocketed the money themselves. There was great injustice. The first nations in an earlier time, in a different era, did not have the means to defend themselves and they were victimized. Now they are being victimized all over again.

Does the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development really believe that this kind of policy is helpful in building a culture

of trust and mutual respect between the Canadian government and first nations people?

There is another aspect to the cap, and I think it is a trap, that troubles me. It is not addressed by any Senate amendments, but it was discussed as an observation in its report to the House, and it was a topic of debate in the Senate.

The government could deal with the matter if it chose to do so by amending the Senate report that was delivered to us rather than simply accepting the Senate amendments as written. The troubling aspect of the cap revolves around the fact that Bill C-6 requires a claim to be heard twice by the commission and by the tribunal if the claim cannot be resolved through the commission.

It first has to go through a validity phase which is designed to determine the validity of the claim. After that claim is deemed valid, if the government decides to negotiate it or if the tribunal rules that the government must negotiate it, the claim then has to go through a similar process to determine compensation.

What is astonishing to me is that \$7 million, or if we take the Senate recommendation to amend it to \$10 million, that cap, whatever it is, applies to both stages. In other words, just to have the tribunal determine the validity of a claim prior to any consideration of the value of compensation that might be determined through compensation related negotiations, the claimant is then expected to waive the right to a payout higher than \$10 million.

There is absolutely no good reason why the potential value of a claim should have any bearing on the right of the tribunal to consider it for the purpose of determining its validity. That is another question. The validity and compensation amount are so interwoven, so inseparable that I think it does hurt the process.

Requiring a cap at the validity stage of the process greatly weakens the potential usefulness of the proposed claim centre. Since the bill clearly separates these two parts of the process, it should be relatively easy, we would think, to eliminate the cap requirement for the validity stage. Is it valid or is it not? Let us not get into the issue of the compensation at that point, but is it a valid claim?

● (1040)

In committee the Canadian Alliance introduced an amendment that would have done that but, unfortunately, there was no intelligent discussion of the amendment nor any give and take. There might have even been some adjustment on our part to hear some wisdom in respect to that, but it was just summarily swept aside.

In the Senate, the hon. Nick Sibbeston, an aboriginal senator who was supporting the bill, indicated that this matter was raised with the government by the Senate committee examining the bill. According to Senator Sibbeston, the response the committee received was to this effect. He said:

—the government sees the situation as putting a system in place. No one is perfectly sure how it all will work—

I admit that because that is the way it is with most bills. He goes on to state:

—and it wants to see how the system works before it makes more improvements.



*Government Orders*

The last part is the telling part. The government will use this as a guinea pig, a trial and error kind of system, not having any sense of the degree to which it will be effective and how it will work before it makes more improvements.

What kind of answer is that for the government to say that it is the government and therefore it will give it a shot. It will simply see what kind of mistakes there are, what kinds of messes are left and then it might take a look at it later. I do not know if this is too strong a word but I think it is a bit of arrogance when that attitude is taken and it oozes from the remarks in that statement.

What is wrong with the government in this respect? Has it lost its ability to think clearly and seriously consider reasoned amendments from others around the House? All wisdom does not reside in any one party. It does not reside on the government side or any party on this side. I would be the first to admit that but why does the government have to assume that it is all on its benches?

Has it lost any interest in developing effective, responsible, workable legislation? That is the role of members in this place. The role of the opposition is to constructively and positively go after these things and try to get a better piece of legislation and a better result.

If the government cannot defend an aspect of its legislation, but only say that it will try it out and see what kinds of messes and problems we have, what on earth is it doing here? If it does not have a reasonably good sense or projection that it will work, and that is the only response when questioned in respect to the perceived flaws in the bill, then what is going on in this place?

I want to read into the record the brief statement that the Senate made on this aspect of the bill because its observations following committee hearings are very instructive. It states:

The Committee frequently heard, both from First Nations and neutral observers, that the requirement for claimants to waive their rights to compensation above the specified cap (as set out in Section 32) in order to obtain a Tribunal ruling on the validity of their claim was the single most significant flaw with the Bill. The government expressed concern that removing this requirement would pose undue and unpredictable financial risk and might imbalance the overall operations of the Commission and Tribunal. Given the safeguards built into the legislation (Section 71), this seems to reflect an excessive concern with risk aversion.

That comes right out of the brief statement that the Senate made on this particular aspect of the bill. Those are not my words. Those are not the words of a possibly perceived partisan individual. Those words come from the Senate's report on this aspect of the bill. It says that it is the single most significant flaw in the bill. Those were not the words of the Assembly of First Nations, a member from the opposition side, some other native group nor somebody with a bigger axe to grind. The senators are telling the government that imposing the cap at both stages of the claims resolution process seems to reflect an excessive concern with risk aversion.

Let me continue from the Senate report. It states:

We are concerned that the financial cap on validity will create two categories of claims within the system and could create a significant impediment to the settlement of larger claims.

The committee then explains its views by saying that an incremental approach in this area may be better, which is why it recommends including it in the three to five year review of the bill rather than making it an amendment at this time.

● (1045)

I do not see any reason to wait to amend this section of the bill. If all kinds of groups saw it as the single most significant flaw in the bill, the Senate included, then if it remains in the legislation how will it encourage an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect surrounding the specific claims resolution process?

I want to stress that the first nations have indicated that without the potential for a tribunal to issue a binding decision on a claim, the government lacks the incentive to process the claim in an expeditious manner. We can see clearly their lack of confidence in this new system.

The claims centre proposed in Bill C-6 is seen as useless in terms of dealing with claims that are valued higher than the very minimal cap that is being proposed in the bill. If the cap is going to remain in the legislation it should be increased, as we suggested in committee, to at least \$25 million and should be removed altogether from the validity stage of the claims process. That is another issue: determining the validity, looking at the evidence, looking at the historical facts and so on to determine the validity of the claim itself.

The Senate also made a couple of amendments that would allow for some input from first nations in the appointment of the commissioners and the adjudicators for the centre, as well as for the agency's chair and for the vice-chair. This amendment affects clause 5, clause 20 and clause 41 of Bill C-6. Specifically, first nations would be able to "make representations in respect of appointments to the office or offices in question".

In other words, after the Minister of Indian Affairs has made his appointments, first nations representatives can provide input as to their thoughts about the people who have already been appointed. That is about as backward as it can get. It is a process that happens in our country maybe far too often when the PMO appoints individuals and then we have our chance to fire away, but what good does it do after the fact? We would like that in a whole range of things, in respect to judges and some of the other appointments where they are vetted through the appropriate standing committee, before not after.

What good does it do if the appointment is made and then after the fact we get to write letters and e-mails that go in the wrong files? We get to badger away and play it up in the media if they have an interest at that point because it is a done deal.

This is very disrespectful and not at all helpful when we just simply allow them after the fact. It is already a fait accompli and at that point then the first nations representatives can provide input as to their thoughts about the people who have already been appointed. What a useless, senseless thing to do in the bill. What good would it do when the person is appointed and already in place?

*S. O. 31*

This is certainly a far cry from what was proposed in the 1998 joint task force report produced by the government and first nations following several years of discussions. I want to spend some time later reading large sections of that report. The government spent three years negotiating with first nations, the back and forth, the give and take, around the table together. Some rapport, some mutualities and some respect I assume was built up over that time. They spent some three years coming up with a plan for dealing with specific claims.

The report from the joint First Nations-Canada task force on specific claims policy reform reiterated the longstanding recommendation for an independent claims centre, this being a fair bit of writing to which we can look at and refer to in respect to the independence of this bigger claim centre.

The primary mechanism by which it was going to be made independent was by a joint government first nations process for appointing the commissioners and adjudicators. That was in the report. Both parties were to arrive at a list of jointly approved candidates and the government would pick the commissioners and adjudicators from that list. It seems like a fair process. It seems like common sense.

• (1050)

The government, however, has completely abandoned that proposal. In Bill C-6 the government has the exclusive prerogative of appointing the officials and then reappointing them. Others in the peanut gallery can make comments and decry or deride these particular appointments but the government has the exclusive prerogative to increase or reduce the number of commissioners or adjudicators within, of course, the parameters provided by the bill. The Senate amendment does not change that process. Its amendment is nothing more than window dressing.

In response to demands for more first nations participation in the appointment process, government spokesmen object that there is no precedent for the government sharing the responsibility of making appointments, whether we are talking about judges or officials who serve on quasi-judicial tribunals or government boards. They say the government must preserve the final authority over such appointments, including to the specific claims agency.

While it might be true, whether we are talking about judges or other appointments, that there is no kind of precedent in our country, that is unfortunate. There is a precedent in other modern democracies around the world. Our neighbour to the south of us, just beyond the 49th parallel, has a very good process where there is that greater scrutiny, that greater look at individuals coming forth, because their background, their biases, their world view, their perceptions and so on are all pretty significant in terms of how they will handle that job and the degree of objectivity or lack thereof that might be the case. Just because we have never done it that way is not to say that might not be a considerable improvement. As we look at other places around the world where it is already in place, we think it actually allows the public to have a greater say and greater access to the process.

The government is confusing the issue with such an assertion that it has never done it that way before. I do not dispute the government's prerogative to have, and we will even concede, maybe

the final say in making appointments, but the proposal recommended in the joint task force report does not take away that prerogative from the government. I still do not understand why the government has refused to implement that very reasonable proposal in Bill C-6.

The joint task force proposal gives the government the final decision on appointments to the specific claims resolution centre but it also gives first nations direct participation in the appointment process. That is a far cry from the paternalistic tokenism reflected in the Senate amendment, not to mention the complete shutting out of aboriginal input that was established in the unamended bill.

When we read the Senate debates on Bill C-6 we will hear critics of Bill C-6 repeatedly raising the question of the independence of the specific claims resolution centre. Defenders of the bill repeatedly assert that the centre was as independent as one could make it in our political system, which is not saying a lot, and in respect of the fiduciary responsibilities the federal government has toward the first nations across the country.

Critics, however, remain unsatisfied with the government's assertions, warning that the centre could not and will not win the trust and the confidence of first nations people.

I do not dispute the point that making this centre independent, not to mention giving it the appearance of independence, is a challenge, admittedly so, but what is clear to me is that the government is not up to that challenge, not at all. It is not even coming close. It is not even attempting to give it the perception of any kind of independence here. The government is not up to the challenge, as would appear in the report from the Senate back to us and the intent of the government as it bulldozes ahead on this particular piece of legislation.

Proposals to help give the centre independence and the important appearance of independence are staring the government in the face from the pages of the joint task force report and the amendments proposed earlier by the Canadian Alliance, yet the government is completely ignoring them.

I will have to wrap it up as time runs out, but I assume that I begin to speak at the point where we resume with Bill C-6 in the future. I have much to say and I am just getting warmed up and getting into this crucial topic.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1055)

[*English*]

### CONFEDERATION CENTRE OF THE ARTS

**Mr. Shawn Murphy (Hillsborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Charlottetown Festival was awarded the prestigious title of Event of the Year by the Tourist Industry Association of Canada.

The Charlottetown Festival, sponsored by the Confederation Centre of the Arts, is a staple of Prince Edward Island's tourism industry. Each year it draws visitors from around the world who come to enjoy professional musical theatre and comedy, including the beloved and original production of *Anne of Green Gables*.

In addition to this award, earlier this year the Confederation Centre was designated a national historic site, was named top event in Canada by the American Bus Association and received the Premier's Award for Tourism.

The Confederation Centre was founded in 1964 as a memorial to the Fathers of Confederation. Covering an entire city block, the centre showcases the best in Canadian visual and performing arts.

I am sure all members will join me in congratulating David MacKenzie and all the staff of the Confederation Centre for these impressive accomplishments.

\* \* \*

• (1100)

#### APPRENTICESHIP COMPETITION

**Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, hats off to two Okanagan University College apprentices. Fourth year automotive service technician apprentice Sterling Logan and third year auto body collision repair apprentice Petr Ivandic, earned gold medals at the provincial competition and went on to receive silver medals at the national skills Canada competition held in Ontario earlier this year.

This is the eighth year in a row that an Okanagan University College trained apprentice has captured top spot in the automotive service technician competition at the provincial level. It is the fourth time in the last four years that a collision repair student has captured the gold medal. The automotive service technician competition was a two day, seven station test of knowledge, skills and aptitude.

Congratulations to Sterling and Petr on a job well done.

\* \* \*

#### CANADIAN FORCES

**Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Brampton Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Invisible Ribbon Campaign is a public grassroots demonstration of support for the families of military personnel.

This campaign helps reaffirm pride in the military and lets our men and women in uniform and those closest to them know that Canadians recognize and support their vital contribution to Canada.

The invisible ribbons also underscore that families of military members are as committed to the military way of life as are the personnel who wear the uniform. This is especially true today as we have almost 3,800 Canadian Forces members deployed around the world on peacekeeping missions.

I hope all members of the House and indeed all Canadians will join me in wearing an invisible ribbon to demonstrate that we very much appreciate military personnel and their families for a job well done.

*S. O. 31*

#### YOUTH AT RISK

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, according to Statistics Canada, youth recidivism, namely the extent to which offenders reoffend, is alarmingly high. Youth represented 60% of convicted offenders. The majority of recidivists had prior convictions in youth court. Sixteen is the most common age of first conviction. Nearly two-thirds of recidivists sentenced to custody have been incarcerated before.

These statistics show that we are not doing enough for youth at risk, not enough to prevent youth at risk from becoming young offenders and not enough to prevent offenders from reoffending.

This is a big social problem which requires attention. I urge the government to improve and strengthen existing programs aimed at youth and at reducing recidivism among young offenders.

\* \* \*

#### MARTHA CURGIN TEVLIN

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Fanshawe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this week the community of London, Ontario lost one of our outstanding citizens with the death of Martha Curgin Tevlin. I have known Martha for 40 years as a very friendly, generous and talented woman who served our community with great dedication and distinction.

A graduate of Catholic Central High School and the University of Western Ontario, Martha taught elementary school before moving to the non-profit sector in 1984.

Martha was the assistant executive director of the Canadian Diabetes Association, Ontario division. She later served as the director of volunteer services at Victoria Hospital before becoming the very successful executive director of the London Health Sciences Foundation which she helped establish. She also served with great enthusiasm as the chairperson of the London Public Library Board, as well as serving on several other boards and agencies.

On behalf of all Londoners, I offer our sincere sympathies to Martha's family. London is a better place for all of Martha's efforts. May she rest in peace.

\* \* \*

#### MARIJUANA

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, bad news about marijuana, violence and gang warfare is far too common. This week a gang-style double murder in Toronto was linked by police to the growing problem of marijuana and gang warfare in that city. This week a new poll shows that marijuana use is higher than tobacco use among teenagers.

The Liberal government discourages youth from using tobacco, but its proposed changes to marijuana legislation sends the opposite message. Canada's frontline police officers remain distressed over the Liberals' soft on pot, premature and seriously flawed Bill C-38.

*S. O. 31*

The Liberals must first set up a national drug strategy that works at the street level. They must establish a progressive schedule of penalties. Minimum sentences are required to reinforce the seriousness of the crime of marijuana grow operations. Drug driving laws and roadside assessment must also be in place. The police need legislation to enhance enforcement powers in situations where drug impairment is suspected.

It is not clear what constituency the Liberal government is trying to attract with this new approach to drug legislation, but it certainly is not the law-abiding citizens in my constituency—

\* \* \*

• (1105)

**ROYAL WINTER FAIR**

**Mr. Alan Tonks (York South—Weston, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is not often that someone can go to downtown Toronto and experience the inside story of agriculture in Canada, but once a year the country comes to the city.

On November 7 the Royal Winter Fair opens in Toronto. A Canadian tradition, the royal is the largest indoor agricultural, horticultural, canine and equestrian event in the world.

Fun for the whole family, the Royal Winter Fair has plenty of shopping, eating and learning opportunities. The royal is a wonderful experience and a chance to teach our kids that food does not just come from the grocery store. It is truly a show like no other, where the country shows the city a thing or two.

There is more information at [www.royalfair.org](http://www.royalfair.org). Everyone should get out and enjoy all that Canadian agriculture has to offer.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**MEMBER FOR LASALLE—ÉMARD**

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière—L'Érable, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today, hundreds of thousands of young people will go door to door asking for candy from behind their disguises.

Here in the House of Commons, many politicians wear a disguise all year round, but we always manage to recognize them because sooner or later, the truth comes to light.

In recent months, a supernatural phenomenon has been occurring regularly in Canada's Parliament. Is there an invisible man lurking about, or the same way there was a phantom of the opera, are we dealing with a phantom of Parliament?

The person behind this eerie dramatic political phenomenon is none other than the former finance minister, who remains invisible in the House of Commons and continuously haunts the current Prime Minister. The phantom of the opera sings, the phantom of Parliament speaks, but his message is inaudible and, when he sings, he sings off key.

Despite his many faces, Quebec will always see him as the person responsible for all the drastic cuts to EI, health and education.

Let us unmask the member for LaSalle—Émard, right now.

[English]

**JORDIN TOOTOO**

**Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House I would like to commend an outstanding young man who has been making some big news in the National Hockey League. I am talking about Jordin Tootoo, the first NHL player of Inuit descent.

Mr. Tootoo grew up in Rankin Inlet, Nunavut. He made his debut in the National Hockey League this past month on the Nashville Predators team.

Hockey fans across Canada and in Nashville are excited about Jordin Tootoo's style and ability. As a junior, he had a record setting season before entering professional hockey. His positive story means that regional and other barriers in our national game are falling. It proves that ability is what counts.

I am sure that all my colleagues in the House will join me in extending our congratulations and best wishes to Jordin Tootoo.

\* \* \*

**MEMBER FOR LASALLE—ÉMARD**

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, Halloween can be a scary time, especially for the new leader of the Liberal Party. We have discovered the top 10 things that keep the member for LaSalle—Émard awake at night.

Number 10, more spending announcements by the current Prime Minister.

Number 9, frankly, three more months of anything from the current Prime Minister.

Number 8, just exactly how will he manage a cabinet with 150 members in it?

Number 7, the thought that someone is actually out there keeping track of all of his promises.

Number 6, having to face the music in question period every single day.

Number 5, there is an Auditor General report out there, lurking in the shadows and ready to be tabled on the eve of the election.

Number 4, trying to keep a straight face while talking about democratic reform and the Liberal Party of Canada in the same sentence.

Number 3, the idea that someone will remember his original red book promises.

Number 2, what if there really was an ethics counsellor out there and he had real teeth?

The number 1 reason that the member for LaSalle—Émard cannot sleep this Halloween is that he has to face a united opposition in the next election in the form of the new Conservative Party of Canada.

### UNICEF

**Mr. Tony Tirabassi (Niagara Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to recognize the fundraising efforts of UNICEF volunteers and workers this Halloween.

The UNICEF on Halloween story began in 1950 when a small Sunday school class in the United States decided to collect coins on Halloween for children in need instead of asking for candy. They sent their cheques totalling \$17 to the United Nations Children's Fund. Since then, UNICEF has expanded and so has its fundraising efforts.

In Canada, Halloween represents one of the mainstays of UNICEF Canada's fundraising programs. Last year alone over \$3 million was collected by Canadian children for children in developing countries.

I would ask members to join me in congratulating UNICEF Canada for its outstanding efforts to help children in need on this special day. Happy Halloween.

\* \* \*

● (1110)

### MERVYN "BUTCH" BLAKE

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger (Perth—Middlesex, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Stratford Festival's most loved and longtime members, Mr. Mervyn "Butch" Blake, who passed away recently at the age of 95.

Mr. Blake joined the Stratford Festival in 1957 and remained with the company for 42 consecutive years, during which time he performed in every one of Shakespeare's plays. Butch Blake's talent and commitment to the theatre earned him the respect of his peers, the affection of audiences, and the recognition of his adopted country. He was awarded the Queen's Silver Jubilee Medal in 1978 and was invested as a member of the Order of Canada in 1995.

I know that the Stratford Festival is proud to have counted Butch Blake as a beloved member of its immensely talented family. I am equally proud to say that Mr. Blake lived for many years in my hometown of Sebringville, Ontario.

I am sure all members of the House will join me in expressing our condolences to Mr. Blake's family and the theatre community across Canada.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### RENÉ LÉVESQUE

**Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Quebecers are honouring the memory of an illustrious citizen who left us on November 1, 1987.

We will remember René Lévesque, the reporter, who saw the horrors of World War II first hand and was one of the first to witness the dreadful sights at the death camps. We will remember the simple and generous man, who tied his own destiny to that of his people.

A staunch defender of power to the people, he left as his legacy a number of progressive laws that are the envy of the world: the political party financing act, the revised elections act, the referendum act, and the access to public documents act are just some of them. A

*S. O. 31*

man who always knew how to listen, he was a source of inspiration to us all, and imbued us with an unshakeable confidence in ourselves.

A man of his century, René Lévesque humbly set himself the noble task of building the country of Quebec. That he was a born democrat goes without saying. His life, his commitment and his political action are eloquent testimonials to this. Je me souviens; I will remember him.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### WOMEN POLITICIANS

**Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, women have made substantial gains toward equality in many aspects of Canadian society. Even so, women's representation in political life remains unequal. As I am sure my colleagues from all sides of the House will attest, there remain barriers to women entering public life and also once elected. Why is this so and what can be done?

I am proud today to announce to the House that in celebration of Women's History Month, a colloquium on this very subject will be held today hosted by the Law Commission of Canada and the University of Ottawa. It will feature such distinguished participants as former parliamentarian Marion Dewar and activist Rosemary Speirs from Equal Voice. This discussion is just one more way to engage in a much needed dialogue on the possible changes that can make politics more inclusive and remove barriers for women.

I encourage all members of the House to work together in finding new ideas and solutions.

\* \* \*

### DWIGHT BISHOP

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to bring the attention of my colleagues in the House of Commons to the upcoming retirement of RCMP assistant commissioner Dwight Bishop.

Mr. Dwight Bishop has served with the RCMP since 1969, serving in the provinces of Manitoba, Ontario and Nova Scotia. He was a uniformed officer in commercial crime, illegal drugs, and customs and excise. He was the officer in charge in Cape Breton. He was a commanding officer of the RCMP in Nova Scotia. He was also the commander in charge of the Swissair disaster, as well as the commander in charge of the 9/11 aftermath.

The quality of this individual and how he treated his fellow officers was reflected in the fact that through 12 major labour disputes, he was able to coordinate each one to negotiated settlement.

On a personal note, this individual was born in Cambridge, Nova Scotia. He has served for 34 years and will be retiring in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. He is a wonderful gentleman and a proud servant to our country. We salute his efforts.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**INFLUENZA**

**Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House and all Canadians that October is National Flu Awareness Month.

Every winter, almost one-quarter of Canadians are infected with influenza. Thousands become seriously ill and thousands more die from flu-related complications.

Almost anyone who wants to improve his or her chances of having a flu-free winter can benefit from the annual flu shot. The flu shot cannot give a person the flu and side effects are minor.

Seniors, adults and children with chronic diseases, and their caregivers are most at risk. Without vaccination, they may face the possibility of serious or even fatal consequences should they get the flu. A yearly vaccination is the only preventive measure that has been proven to reduce the mortality rate from influenza.

I encourage all Canadians at risk to protect themselves and others. Flu shots are the best way to do so.

\* \* \*

• (1115)

[English]

**KAMLOOPS, THOMPSON AND HIGHLAND VALLEYS**

**Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to commend the many helping hands who have come to the aid of the people of Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys.

The North Thompson Relief Fund, headed by George Evans, has raised tremendous amounts of money to bring relief to the people in the valley as have the Red Cross, the Mennonite Disaster Service, and Habitat for Humanity. Last night, the coup de grâce, the All Party Party also raised money for the North Thompson relief and we will be making that presentation on behalf of every party in the House very soon.

On behalf of the people of Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, it is with great pride that I say thanks to one and all for being so generous of spirit.

---

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House unanimously accepted an all party report on VIP benefits. This report asks that benefits be extended to all qualifying war widows.

When will the government act on this recommendation?

**Mr. Ivan Grose (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as has been said before in the House and I pretty well have it memorized, the Department of

Veterans Affairs exhausted its budget enabling 10,000 additional widows to receive VIP treatment.

As reported in the press, the Prime Minister has said that he would take a look at this and see what he could do. I am sure that the Prime Minister, with the other important decisions that he has to make in the next while, will do so.

**Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the government has money for VIA Rail but nothing for our war widows. It took cabinet only 24 hours to buy two luxury executive jets, but it leaves our widows hanging.

How much longer will Canada's war widows have to wait?

**Mr. Ivan Grose (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as to the time interval, I cannot answer. It is under study at the moment. I am quite sure that a favourable answer will come somewhere down the pipe.

**Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, on November 11 we will pay honour to those who fought so hard for our country. Their widows deserve to be honoured as well.

Will the government commit to extending the VIP benefit by November 11, 2003?

**Mr. Ivan Grose (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I take a very important part in Remembrance Day ceremonies, I wish that I could make that kind of commitment.

I cannot make that commitment on behalf of the government. I am sure that a favourable decision will be made in the near future.

\* \* \*

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, PC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians and police agencies across the country are worried about the Liberal's marijuana legislation, Bill C-38.

The bill sends not only the wrong message but mixed messages to our youth about the use of drugs. Health Canada has already labelled marijuana as a dangerous substance. How can this help our youth?

My question is, how will decriminalization of marijuana prevent our youth from using pot?

**Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, clearly, there has been a message that has been sent to youth. It has been a very uncertain message because it has not been absolutely equal across this country.

We have found that in rural Canada there has been treatment that has been different from urban Canada.

*Oral Questions*

Bill C-38 attempts to bring forward a penalty that is appropriate for the crime and that will be enforced. I urge the support of Bill C-38.

• (1120)

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the RCMP and other federal agencies spend over a half a billion dollars every year trying to reduce the supply. Has Canada given up on drug control?

Just exactly what is the intent of Bill C-38? Is it to help criminal organizations increase their market share? We know that will happen. Is it to help the Prime Minister after he retires so that he can take up a bit?

Exactly who are we helping, the criminals or the recreational users, or both?

**Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is a very complex matter. The reality is that it has a very solid basis in harm to the individual.

Bill C-38 is intended to deal with that harm responsibly and respectfully, and to ensure that we do everything to diminish the use of marijuana.

For those that produce marijuana through grow ops, we are substantially increasing the penalties. We want to get tough on those who would harm our youth.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**QUEBEC**

**Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Quebec National Assembly unanimously reaffirmed that “the people of Québec form a nation”. Full stop. Not a nation dependent on the Canadian nation, as the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs would wish, but a Quebec nation, complete in every way.

Following the example of the National Assembly, is the federal government prepared to recognize, outright, that Quebec really does constitute a nation?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first, the question was on one single issue and did not, confusingly and dishonestly, mix up two issues. Second, the question came from someone whom we know to be a great Quebecker and a great Canadian, proud to be both, and in no way asking us to renounce either of our identities.

I have a clear question for the Bloc Québécois. In the very improbable event that they were to hold another referendum, they could add it to their agenda. They could ask Quebeckers the following referendum question, “Do you want to stop being Canadian?” They would get their answer, even in the riding of Trois-Rivières.

**Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it might be significant and interesting for the minister to remember that this is the oral question period and that he, as a minister, has a duty to answer questions.

**An hon. member:** He is the one who has to answer. If he would rather be in opposition, just let him say so.

**Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire:** The minister may suffer from double nationality but yesterday the National Assembly reaffirmed that Quebec forms a nation, without no need for further details.

The question I am asking him is clear; it is not multiple choice, and I am asking the minister to reply without evasion: does Quebec form a nation, yes or no?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member saying that to be Canadian is to be evasive?

**An hon. member:** You cannot answer the question?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** No, I am answering. Like all the Quebeckers on this side of the House, we are part of the nation of Quebec and the nation of Canada. What is most unfortunate is that the members of the Bloc Québécois are rejecting a part of their identity. They are rejecting something that life has given them and it is very sad for them. I hope that one day they will be reconciled with their Canadian identity, which is part of their identity as Quebeckers.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, true to form, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is trying to cloud the issue. However, I too asked a simple question.

Is the government prepared to recognize the Quebec nation, and I do mean Quebec nation, in the same terms as those unanimously reaffirmed by the Quebec National Assembly yesterday?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly, the hon. member is saying that being Canadian means clouding the issue. It is a serious thing to renounce one's identity. I want to ask him the following question. Why, in the 1980 and 1995 referendums, did they not ask Quebeckers, “Do you want to stop being Canadian?”

We are quite happy to be Quebeckers, to be part of the Quebec nation and the French-Canadian nation. We are quite happy to share a country with the Acadian nation and with all the first nations of Canada. We do not want there to be a barrier erected in this country between—

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

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I can guarantee the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs that the next question will be clear, “Do you want Quebec to become an independent country, yes or no?” And he will get his answer.

I am telling the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs this; back in the days of the Patriotes, he would have been considered a real “chouayen”. He knows what I mean by that. Now, today, we are asking the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to answer the question and it is his turn to answer, “Does Quebec unequivocally constitute and form a nation, yes or no?”

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to say two things. First, to the Quebec premier, the answer is yes; to the Bloc Québécois, the answer is no, because their idea of nation excludes a Canadian dimension.

Second, the hon. member has just made a confession. He has just confessed that the questions asked in 1980 and 1995 were not clear and that they were frauds. I challenge him to make his most recent question a part of the Bloc Québécois' platform.

\* \* \*

• (1125)

[English]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the Stryker is not a tank and, therefore, it cannot replace our main battle tank.

The notion that the Stryker can be airlifted overseas by our Hercules aircraft is likewise utter nonsense.

To add to this, an internal defence department memo now raises concerns about the Stryker's weapon system, armour and confined operating space.

Considering all the above, why is the defence minister now voluntarily reducing the future capability of the Canadian army?

**Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again, we are hearing nonsense from the opposition.

As I have said many times, this is the army's visionary plan for the future. It is the army plan. I liked it so much I made it happen five years earlier than it otherwise would, but it is the army plan.

I have spoken to Secretary Rumsfeld and General Hillier has spoken to his counterpart.

The United States is firmly committed to the Stryker. It is a state-of-the-art, extremely modern and transformational vehicle. We will be fully interoperable with the United States. We will get it fast.

As I have said before, this is fantastic news for the Canadian army. I know the opposition does not like good news.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, not all of our armoured personnel think that it is wise to get rid of the tank.

While the minister plows ahead with the Stryker, the Sea Kings sit grounded again. To add insult to injury, our Canadian forces had to endure the Prime Minister telling them that, since the President of the United States flew in one, they were good enough for our air crews. That is like saying a 1960 Volkswagen Beetle is the same as the one that sits on the lot today.

Why are older Challengers not good enough for this government, but 40 year old Sea Kings are? Could it be because of who flies in them?

**Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member says that not all armoured personnel want to get rid of the tank, I am sure he is correct.

When there are transformational changes, like getting rid of horses for tanks, certainly the horse people would have objected. However, I commend to them the head of the army, General Hillier, who has driven tanks or run tanks for 20 years. He has a picture of a tank in his office. He says that if he can go along with getting rid of tanks, everybody else can as well.

\* \* \*

**FINANCE**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Liberals have allowed the Sea Kings to become the tarmac kings, but my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Today the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives says that this year's surplus will be \$6.6 billion. Over the last four years, the CCPA's estimates have exactly mirrored the exact surpluses while the Liberals have been out \$36 billion. It is a good thing they are not forecasting the weather, we would not know what to wear.

Will the minister finally admit that he is in fact sitting on a surplus next year and has money to spend on things worthwhile?

**Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I looked at its forecasts. I hope they are right, but we do not rely on forecasts that we make up ourselves. We take 20 private sector forecasters, we take the average of their recommendations and we ask four private sector modelling firms to run those forecasts through their computers to come with the estimates, which I will present next Monday in the annual fiscal and economic update.

\* \* \*

**VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, given the obvious likelihood of a surplus and given all the talk around here about a democratic deficit, the fact of the matter is the House of Commons has spoken by unanimously adopting the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Defence and Veterans Affairs with respect to paying all war widows the VIP benefits. Therefore, it is not a question of what the Prime Minister can do, it is a question of the House of Commons having spoken.

Given this government's so-called commitment to democracy, will the Minister of Finance, because he can make this happen, get up and say that the government will honour the commitment to the widows and honour the will of this House?



*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Ivan Grose (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, speaking personally, which I am not supposed to do, I would like to honour that request. However, things do not operate that way around here. One has to get consensus. Sometimes one even has to get consensus from the members opposite. However, in this case the consensus will be reached and there will be an answer.

\* \* \*

●(1130)

**FINANCE**

**Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, federal health care funds in the provinces have dropped from 50% of the total cost to as little as 14% in some cases. Veteran's widows have been told only some of them will get pensions.

How can the Prime Minister brag about a balanced budget when it is balanced on the back of the sick and the elderly?

**Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, both on our website and in document form, the hon. member may want to look at this year's budget where we increased funding for health care over the next five years by \$35 billion. The single largest increase in spending this year is transfers to the elderly. He might want to rephrase his question.

\* \* \*

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, deeds, not words, is what we want.

The infrastructure in the country is literally falling apart. The government is higher on grass than it is on pavement. Downloading on the provinces and eventually the municipalities has led to an inability to maintain the system.

Instead of bragging about a balanced budget, when will the government deliver treats not tricks?

**Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, talking about infrastructure falling apart, look at the Progressive Conservative Party.

Let me tell the hon. member that in this province the credibility of that party, which left a province with a deficit in excess of \$5 billion, is totally shattered. It is almost as bad as the credibility of the leader of his federal rump.

Since 1993, we have been investing in infrastructure in the country year after year, including in the last federal budget with an investment in strategic and municipal infrastructure, an increased investment of \$3 billion.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION**

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, during the mini summit of the WTO in Montreal in July, the municipal authorities had to deploy a stronger security force than anticipated to ensure the safety of participants, at an additional cost of \$1.7 million, which the Solicitor General is now refusing to pay.

It may be useful to remind the Solicitor General that the mini summit in Montreal was held at the suggestion of the Minister for International Trade. Does he feel it is right for the federal government to invite itself to an event and then refuse to pay its bills?

**Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member opposite indicated, the Solicitor General is responsible for implementing the government's security policy, known as the federal government security policy framework.

I would point out, however, that the City of Montreal was informed well in advance of the WTO ministerial meeting that the criteria were not met. I would also like to mention that the meeting—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General refuses to pay the bill, claiming that the situation was not extraordinary.

Is the Solicitor General not using that as an excuse for not taking his responsibilities and, above all, not paying the \$1.5 million bill that goes with it?

*[English]*

**Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the federal government's security cost policy framework is clearly premised, as is known by the local law enforcement agencies and provincial and municipal governments, on the fact that local police services are responsible for ensuring public safety during major events in this jurisdiction.

As I already mentioned, the City of Montreal was informed well in advance of the holding of the meeting that the meeting did not meet the clearly defined criteria of this security cost policy framework.

\* \* \*

**MEMBER FOR LASALLE—ÉMARD**

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the ethics counsellor has fallen on so many swords lately that he is starting to look like a pincushion to that Liberal cabinet.

Yesterday he attempted to whitewash up to \$12 million in undeclared government contracts received by one of the Liberal leader's companies, Lansdowne, over the past decade. The new Liberal leader was regularly briefed about his assets, but he still signed four false asset declarations.

If he cannot be trusted to fill out a truthful asset declaration, how can he be trusted to be prime minister?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I recognize that for political reasons the member for Medicine Hat wants to continue to his smear campaign against the member for LaSalle—Émard, who for 10 years has complied entirely with the requirements of the ethics code. In fact, as member of Parliament before coming into cabinet, he complied with rules that did not even apply to him.

The ethics counsellor has cleared the former minister of any conflict on this issue, and I wonder why the hon. member is not prepared to admit that he was wrong.

• (1135)

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, when the finance minister was running for the Liberal leadership, he said a lot worse about the member for LaSalle—Émard. I have to remind him of that.

The truth is that the new Liberal leader wants us to believe that while he is not competent enough to fill out the form properly or cannot be trusted to fill out the form, he should still be the prime minister of Canada. There were no penalties for breaking the code of conduct for those who flew air Irving.

Will the Prime Minister continue to undermine the code by giving the new Liberal leader a pass or will he have to face some real penalties for signing a false declaration four separate times?

**Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the hon. member. It is nice that he paid attention to our leadership campaign, but what I was asking for was full disclosure of financial contributions, something that all candidates for the leadership of the Liberal party have now done and something that the leader of his party has never done.

I want to know what were the sources of the contributions that went to the leadership campaign of the Leader of the Opposition. It should be known now. It should be known before the party members at the other end are asked to vote on whether they want to be taken over by that crowd. They want to—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Rosemont—Petite-Patrie.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister wanted to leave a more positive legacy by ratifying the Kyoto protocol. However, at the implementation stage, his ministers are in the process of ruining everything.

How does the minister responsible for CIDA defend the fact that her department funds projects that do not meet the most basic environmental requirements, as is the case with the joint project of the World Bank and the Plantar company in Brazil?

**Mr. André Harvey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as usual, the Bloc Québécois is quick to exaggerate.

CIDA is viewed as one of the most credible international agencies in terms of funding management and international standards.

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, under the Kyoto protocol, development projects abroad can be used to accumulate greenhouse gas emission credits.

Will the Minister of the Environment explain why Canada is avoiding, at all cost, applying international environmental standards to these projects, when it knows full well that the European Union is making the inclusion of these rules a pivotal issue for the future of the protocol?

[*English*]

**Mr. Alan Tonks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member will be aware, as part of the Kyoto protocol, that the whole issue of carbon sinks is one that will figure very emphatically into our strategies to reduce greenhouse gases.

I would expect the member would also respect that where there are initiatives, through the world bank and through non-governmental organizations, that are aimed at that objective, we should be in support of them.

\* \* \*

**ETHICS**

**Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians have long accepted the fact that Bombardier is the favoured child of the Prime Minister and that special treatment is always a factor.

The Auditor General is looking into one of the latest questionable deals: the purchase of two Challenger jets for the Prime Minister. Now we learn that government officials rode on a subsidized Bombardier jet to its plant in St. Louis for this purchase.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister think this is acceptable?

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is obviously not appropriate for government employees to accept free flights from suppliers.

The officials took the most expeditious and reliable way to meet the commitments they had at a meeting. They in fact negotiated a price for the travel that was in the same range as normal commercial travel at economy rate, and they did so at a bargain rate for taxpayers.

**Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, some of the bureaucrats involved in the trip to St. Louis on a Bombardier plane knew that it was a conflict of interest. They realized that by using a supplier's plane, it compromised the impartiality that the civil service is required to maintain.

Employees of defence, public works and Transport Canada knew that using Bombardier's plane was unethical.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister admit that the unethical behaviour in cabinet makes it difficult to enforce Treasury Board guidelines in the bureaucracy?

• (1140)

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, not at all. The hon. member is quite mistaken in her facts. If she would check the record, she would find out that this trip to a meeting in fact occurred after the transaction, not before.

\* \* \*

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government recognizes that it is important to collaborate with provinces and territories to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Canada. We also understand that discussions are currently ongoing to sign bilateral agreements to achieve this goal.

Could the Minister of the Environment inform the House on the status of these discussions?

**Mr. Alan Tonks (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister made it very clear when \$1 billion in budget 2003 was allocated for our strategies to reduce greenhouse gases consistent with our Kyoto commitments.

These bilateral initiatives with the provinces as partners will be made operational through memorandums of understanding.

I am pleased to report to the House that the minister is in Iqaluit, Nunavut, signing a bilateral protocol with the territory, and this is the first of many to come.

\* \* \*

#### ELECTIONS CANADA

**Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC):** Mr. Speaker, in the government's haste to speed up the timing of the next election it has forgotten one important element: the appointment of returning officers in all parts of Canada. We have a vacancy of returning officers.

I do not think I have to point out to the Minister of Public Works how important that position is for the democratic process, not only for candidates but for political parties, for democracy.

When will those appointments be completed? Will it be during the time of the present Prime Minister on his watch or will we have to wait for a regime change to get those appointments in place?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is no delay in the appointment of returning officers. As of a little earlier this morning, over 280 returning officers have so far been appointed. The others are in the process. Verifications are being made with security checks and so on for the remaining appointments to get to the total of 308. There are no delays at all.

#### Oral Questions

#### FISHERIES AND OCEANS

**Mr. Rex Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls, PC):** Mr. Speaker, river guardians in Newfoundland and Labrador have had significant cuts in their hours of operation. It is expected that next year their hours will be further reduced by another 30% to 50%. Concerns are being raised that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is in the process of eliminating our river guardians entirely. Will the minister confirm today his department's position with respect to river guardians?

[Translation]

**Mr. Georges Farrah (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is completely normal for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to be in the process of re-evaluating all the duties of everyone who works in the department, in order to ensure, in any event, that money is being spent efficiently.

The process is currently under evaluation. No decision has been made. The minister will inform us of the decision once it is made.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### HEALTH

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we know now that trans fats are really bad for us and especially bad for our children, yet instead of banning trans fats as other countries have, the Liberal government says it is okay to put this poison in our foods as long as it is clearly labelled, and even then only three years from now, and even then, unbelievably, baby food is exempt.

Why will our health minister not stand up for our public health and take concrete steps now to eliminate this toxic garbage from our food? Why will she not simply ban trans fats now?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should actually do better research in terms of how the rest of the world is responding to the challenge of trans fat. In fact we know that trans fat is an ingredient in our food that the public needs to know about. They need to know how much trans fat they are consuming. They need to know the risks of trans fat. That is why we in fact are requiring mandatory nutritional labelling. When our labelling is in full force and effect, we will have the best science based nutritional labelling of any country in the world.

\* \* \*

• (1145)

#### HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest challenges people have in this country is that of caring for a child under palliative care. Earlier this year, the government had an initiative that palliative care leave for parents looking after children in that situation would start in January 2004, but with the new regime change happening we understand that this program may be under review and may be delayed.

*Oral Questions*

I would like assurances from the Minister of Human Resources. Will this program for parents looking after children under palliative care be started in January 2004?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, indeed I am very happy to tell the hon. member that this government is on track to introducing one of the world's first compassionate care programs on January 4, 2004.

We know how difficult workplace and family balance issues are, and we believe as a country that we have to help Canadians deal with the moral issue of going to work while at home they have a gravely ill child, parent or spouse. This is indeed a great and positive addition to Canada's unbelievably important social safety net.

\* \* \*

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, on October 23 this government transferred Darcy Bertrand, a triple murderer and known pedophile, to a minimum security facility that does not have a fence. In 2001, Darby Cairns, another murderer, walked away from this facility.

Surviving family members of those Darcy Bertrand killed live only 20 minutes away from this facility. On behalf of the family, will this government reconsider the choice of moving this triple murderer, who committed the crime only six years ago, into a minimum security facility and put him back behind a real, real jail cell?

**Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, obviously the Solicitor General cannot discuss the specifics of any offender's case, but I do wish to assure this House on behalf of the Solicitor General that the Correctional Service of Canada is managing this case in accordance with the law. Risk assessment processes were used to evaluate this offender and he is currently in a facility that meets his security and programming needs and those of the Canadian public.

**Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the family does not care about his security needs. I care about the security needs of my constituents and the family members who are left behind by this murderer. I do not care about this convicted murder. This guy, on Thanksgiving Day 1995, walked up to a church in Coquitlam with a knife and murdered his mother-in-law and father-in-law and then murdered his wife in front of their seven year old child. He was convicted of three murders.

He is supposed to have three life sentences. After six years, he has been transferred to a minimum security facility with no fence. To the family, how is that justice, and why will this government not reconsider putting this murderer behind a real jail cell with real bars? What is the problem with that?

**Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House that the Correctional Service of Canada takes its role, its duties and its responsibilities very seriously. The question of public security is a prime goal and mandate of that service. The Correctional Service of Canada also takes the concerns of victims

very seriously and will continue to keep the victims apprised of this offender's case to the extent that our Privacy Act permits.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Roger Gaudet (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the huge demonstration by beef producers at the National Assembly, the Quebec minister of agriculture made the following statement, "The new program, as set up by the federal government, is not what the Quebec industry hoped to see".

Can the minister confirm that the assistance program will be flexible enough to compensate all producers affected by the mad cow crisis?

[*English*]

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, any further programs that are developed in conjunction with the industry and with the provinces will treat dairy farmers and beef farmers in exactly the same way in all provinces in this country, as they should. I can tell the hon. member and both the dairy producers and the beef producers of the province of Quebec that they will be treated the same as those in other provinces.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roger Gaudet (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in September the Quebec assistance program left out the cull cow producers, and the federal government has not yet announced its assistance plan.

Will the minister acknowledge that financial distress is financial distress, regardless of the type of animal operation concerned, and announcement of a program that will compensate all producers affected by the crisis is urgently needed?

[*English*]

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not have to repeat. I gave the answer earlier and it is the identical answer here, because all producers, dairy or beef, in all provinces will be treated the same.

\* \* \*

● (1150)

**CHILD PORNOGRAPHY**

**Mr. Larry Spencer (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-20 fails to alleviate the burden on those who prosecute child pornographers for their perverted crimes against children. Investigators must itemize and document every pornographic image seized, often numbering in the tens of thousands, before being able to prosecute.

Will the justice minister amend the rules of disclosure so that police will not have to examine every single image before prosecuting?

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-20 is clearly meant to deal with the problem of dealing with child pornography within our society and clearly it does so. It has addressed the Sharpe case and has brought forward a defence that is clear and well defined. It was placed before the House yesterday, so hopefully in the final debate the member will bring forward any concerns he has as the bill goes forward.

**Mr. Larry Spencer (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, there are plenty of concerns. Bill C-20 fails to legislate stronger sentences for convicted child pornographers. Maximum sentences are rarely used. What is needed is mandatory prison sentencing. The justice minister fails to use even the most basic of deterrents for predatory pornographers. Child pornography is child abuse.

Will the minister act to protect children by committing to some level of mandatory prison sentencing for convicted child pornographers?

**Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, clearly everyone in the House is against child pornography. I do not think there is any question about that. We are all interested in doing the right thing to make sure that child pornography is minimized and hopefully eliminated, but the reality is that we have to use sentencing procedures that make sense and that work. The evidence before committee was that minimum sentencing simply does not work.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last March this House adopted a motion referring the subject matter of Bill C-202 to the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

Hon. members will recall that the purpose of the bill was to add a sixth principle to the Canada Health Act, namely the respect of linguistic duality. The report was to be produced by today.

Can the committee chair tell us what progress the committee has made on this?

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I have the honour to report that the committee did indeed address this matter last spring and finished its work this past week. With leave of the House, I will have the honour to table its report during routine proceedings.

I realize it is inappropriate to discuss its content in reply to a question in the House, but I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who came before the committee or sent in comments, the experts who shared their knowledge with us, our clerk, and most particularly our researcher. Naturally I also thank the committee members for their serious and constant hard work, which we hope will prove productive.

[*English*]

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, last week in opposing Bill C-338, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice said that the Liberal government will not take any action against street racing.

Numerous serious injuries and deaths have been caused by these irresponsible drivers. RCMP Constable Jimmy Ng was killed when his patrol car was T-boned by an alleged street racer. Why is the government refusing to make our streets safer for our citizens and the police who patrol them?

**Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is taking this matter seriously, as do we in the government. We look upon this as being a very important part of law enforcement, making sure that in fact those who would street race do find appropriate penalties for their crime. We examined it, and I mentioned in my speech that day that in fact it is very clear we already have the appropriate provisions in place within the Criminal Code. All we need to do now is make sure that they are properly exercised by the judges within our communities.

**Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the government has also failed to respond to demands to strengthen our impaired driving laws. The minister is well aware of the carnage and the misery caused by drunk drivers.

Last week, RCMP Commissioner Zaccardelli was injured in a crash involving a suspected drunk driver. An impaired driver has injured Canada's top cop. Again, what is it going to take for the government to get serious about protecting not only our citizens but our police?

**Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that we have taken active steps to deal with this matter in the Criminal Code. It is clear that we have gone through with chemical tests that are available and that in fact samples can be taken at the roadside, but there are many ways in which we can deal with those who would drive impaired. We think we have a very effective program that works. There will be exceptions, which is unfortunate, but we believe that we have in place something that is very meaningful and works well for the Canadian public.

\* \* \*

● (1155)

[*Translation*]

**HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have questioned the Minister of Transport and his parliamentary secretary, and both have confirmed to me that the government is prepared to pay 50% of the cost of building highway 175. The government's intentions with respect to cost overruns are not quite as clear.

*Oral Questions*

Again, as part of its commitment concerning highway 175, does the government also intend to pay 50% of cost overruns? And when will the agreement be signed?

**Mr. Marcel Proulx (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I explained this to the hon. member yesterday, and I will take the opportunity again today to congratulate my hon. colleague from Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, who has done such a fine job on this issue.

**Ms. Girard-Bujold:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** If the hon. member bears with me and listens to the answer, perhaps she will not have to ask the question again.

The agreement was signed over the summer by the Prime Minister and the Premier of Quebec at the time. The agreement states that the costs will be shared 50-50 by the federal and provincial governments. I remind hon. members that the costs are estimated at \$525 million—

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**EQUALIZATION PAYMENTS**

**Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, this week we learned that another funding crisis has hit the health care system in Nova Scotia. The largest health district, the Capital District Health Authority, has been forced to cancel overtime for nurses in order to save money, yet despite the difficulties the province is having in providing acceptable levels of health care, the Liberal government is threatening to claw back over \$80 million in equalization payments.

Will the Minister of Finance guarantee that Nova Scotia will not be forced to cough up these funds instead of paying for vital services like health, education and disaster relief?

**Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, we are working on the renewal of equalization at the present time. It would be helpful if opposition parties would facilitate the passage of a bill which will ensure that equalization payments can be made through next April. I do expect that we will have renewal in place before then, but this is an insurance policy. Secondly, I would remind the hon. member of the \$35 billion that was added to the CHST specifically for health care as a result of the health accord of 2003.

\* \* \*

**TRADE**

**Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, Canada is losing its ability to compete in Asia. The Asia Pacific Foundation in its latest report reveals that our share of the top Asian markets has plummeted by nearly one-third since 1996 and by 13% in the last year alone.

We need to diversify our trade, but the Liberals simply lack the long term vision needed to revitalize our trading relationship in Asia. When will the government abandon its inconsistent, haphazard policies and open Asian markets to Canadian companies?

**Hon. David Kilgour (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, the only region of the world

where our trade is up is southeast Asia. Therefore we are doing better in southeast Asia.

His point about our market share being down in most Asian markets, unfortunately, is true and all of us in the House and in our country have to do more trading with Asia generally.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**HARASSMENT**

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, according to the International Labour Office, Canada has the fifth highest incidence of workplace harassment in the world. Moreover, many psychological harassment cases are being reported within the public service itself.

Can the government tell us what steps it intends to take to help victims of psychological harassment in the federal public service?

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have a policy to prevent harassment in the public service of Canada. This policy has been reviewed with our union partners. I must say that, in terms of enforcing this policy in the federal public service, there are some difficulties at the moment. We are discovering that there are still cases of harassment.

We are currently holding workshops to build awareness throughout the public service, in conjunction with the unions, in order to ensure that harassment becomes a thing of the past in Canada's public service.

\* \* \*

● (1200)

[*English*]

**ETHICS**

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, ministers sign the cheques and drive the legislative agenda. They are the ones the lobbyists go after.

The much touted new ethics package of the Prime Minister will not change the way the ethics commissioner deals with ministers who accept freebies. The commissioner will still give confidential advice to the Prime Minister and to the ministers, just as he does now.

Why did the government set lower standards for ministers than for ordinary MPs?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely inaccurate and the hon. member should know it.

He knows that the framework legislation that we put forward, Bill C-34, has two components in it, one for ministers, and that the ministers, in any case, are also subject to the code, generally, as it applies to members of Parliament. In fact, there are supplementary requirements for ministers, not less requirements.

## PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**The Deputy Speaker:** I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the hon. Sergio Bitar, Minister of Education of Chile.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

### OFFICE OF THE PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the interim Privacy Commissioner, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Report to Parliament on Actions Arising from the Auditor General's Report on the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada.

\* \* \*

[English]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

Pursuant to reference order made by the House of Commons on March 20, 2003, your committee has considered Bill C-202 and agreed, on Wednesday, October 29, 2003, to report its observations and recommendations to the House.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

This is a very important report for official language minority communities. The committee makes fourteen recommendations to improve access to health care for these communities.

For several years, we have found that, all too often, these communities lacked access to health care in the official language of their choice. Our recommendations seek to provide them with permanent and improved access to health care so that they too can benefit from the Canada health system, which is one of the best in the world. We realized that these communities have not always had such access. It is extremely important, if not essential, that the government provide a positive response to these recommendations.

## Routine Proceedings

[English]

### PETITIONS

#### BEEF INDUSTRY

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, PC):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour today to present three petitions on behalf of the good people of Dauphin—Swan River.

The first petition calls upon Parliament to take immediate action to develop internationally recognized protocols designed to restore confidence in Canadian beef products and to open international beef markets to Canadian producers.

• (1205)

#### FREEDOM OF RELIGION

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, PC):** Madam Speaker, the second petition calls upon Parliament to protect the rights of Canadians to be free to share their religious beliefs without fear of persecution.

#### CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, PC):** Madam Speaker, the last petition calls upon Parliament to protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activity involving children are outlawed.

#### MARRIAGE

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Fanshawe, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am in receipt of some 25,000 signatures on a petition from Canadians across London and southwestern Ontario and I am pleased to table today 2,000 of those signatures that have been properly vetted.

These Canadians are calling upon the Government of Canada to reaffirm the definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others. They remind the Parliament of Canada that it is on record on this several times, including in legislation.

I am very pleased to join with these Canadians in calling upon the government to reaffirm the traditional definition of marriage.

**Mr. Rex Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls, PC):** Madam Speaker, I wish to present a petition to recognize the institution of marriage as being a lifelong union of one man and woman to the exclusion of all others.

Only a couple of the petitions here today fulfill the requirement but I have many others. I have close to 7,000 others in my office that will be sent to the minister. I submit these today for the record.

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have several petitions to present from people in my riding and elsewhere calling upon Parliament to use all possible legislative and administrative measures, including invoking section 33 of the charter, if necessary, to preserve and protect the current definition of marriage.

*Government Orders***QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, Question No. 254 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 254—**Mr. Loyola Hearn:**

With respect to the Employment Insurance Program (EI), will the Department of Human Resources Development consider: (a) moving forward on the long-promised review of the EI premium-setting mechanism; (b) bringing EI premiums into balance with EI costs; and (c) separating the EI fund from general revenues?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** a) Moving forward on the long promised review of the EI premium-setting mechanism

The review of the EI premium rate-setting mechanism is already underway. In the 2003 budget, the government launched a consultation process on a new permanent rate-setting regime for 2005 and beyond and outlined five principles upon which the consultations would be based.

—The Department of Finance and HRDC held a series of roundtable consultations with business and labour stakeholders, economists and technical experts and the EI Commissioners for Workers and Employers.

—All Canadians were also invited to provide submissions by mail or Internet to the Government of Canada before June 30, 2003.

The consultation phase of the rate-setting review is now complete. HRDC and the Department of Finance will produce a public document summarizing the views received during these consultations. Legislation will also be introduced in time to have a new rate-setting mechanism in place for 2005.

b) Bringing EI premiums into balance with EI costs

The 2004 premium rate has been set at \$1.98 of insurable earnings in budget 2003. According to the private sector economic forecasts used in the budget, this premium rate should bring premium revenues in line with program costs over 2004. The premium rate for 2005 and beyond will be set as part of the new rate-setting regime. While the outcome of this process is not known, it must be emphasized that balancing EI premiums with EI costs is one of the five principles on which the future process is to be based.

c) Separating the EI fund from general revenues

Since 1986, following the recommendation of the Auditor General of Canada, the employment insurance account has been fully integrated into the overall finances of the Government of Canada as the government controls the parameters of the EI program. Separating the EI fund from general revenues is one of the several proposals that Canadians made during the premium rate-setting consultations.

At this time, it would be premature to speculate on the outcome of any particular option raised during the consultation process before all options have been thoroughly assessed.

[English]

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

**FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS ACT**

The House resumed from October 30, consideration of the motion that Bill C-54, an act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act and the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Regulations, 1999, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this important issue, the federal equalization program.

With this bill, the government wants the current five year equalization plan, which is to expire on March 31, 2004, to be extended for a year at the most, but perhaps just a few months. This would give the provinces and the federal government time to agree on a new five year equalization plan.

I can understand that the government wants to gain some certainty with respect to the equalization payments for 2004, given the completely unpredictable political context, which has been sending this government in two directions ever since the member for LaSalle—Énard decided to pull the strings from behind the curtain, and the outgoing Prime Minister lost any credibility in terms of leading the government and effecting the necessary changes, very quickly, to the equalization plan for the next five years.

Before explaining what needs to be done for the next five years in the equalization program, and the major changes that need to be made—because for this program and this governmental approach, it would take major changes—allow me to explain, for the public's benefit, what equalization is.

It is very complex and involves formulas that contain more than 300 variables. There are 33 tax bases to be considered in each of the Canadian provinces and in Quebec. It is very complicated.

Nonetheless, the equalization principle is simple and has been enshrined in the Constitution. Very few government programs are to be found in the Constitution. Nonetheless, the Constitution Act, 1982, recognizes equalization.



*Government Orders*

Why? Because it is a principle whereby each province in Canada, from east to west, can provide services such as health and education that are of equal quality, but not similar; in other words, equal quality from one province to the next. This applies to health and education.

To accomplish this, they came up with this equalization payment program, which uses complicated calculations to determine the fiscal capacity of each province, that is its capacity to collect taxes of various types from its taxpayers. Based on this capacity to generate funds for the provincial coffers in order to fund services, certain provinces are evaluated as disadvantaged compared to others, as far as providing quality services is concerned. As a result, there is a risk that service quality will not be uniform from one province to another. Briefly put, the equalization payment program works in favour of those provinces that would otherwise be the most disadvantaged, in order to establish, if not equal service quality, at least similar standards.

Toward the end of my speech I will address the payments per province. Federal government payments to the provinces are made on a per capita basis.

In other words, entitlement to compensation or equalization payments is based on the province's population. As a result, when we look at the advantages one province can gain compared to another as far as equalization payments are concerned, the amount per person is what must be compared, and not the total amount.

I will get back to this point. I have heard reference all through the debate about the extraordinary benefits Quebec draws from the equalization system. You will be surprised because Quebec is, out of all the provinces that receives such payments, the one that gets the least per capita. Such is the spirit of the system.

Obviously, the size of our population gives us a higher payment, but what needs to be looked at is the compensation for fiscal shortfall per capita, not the overall amount.

•(1210)

This equalization program is reviewed every five years. The last renewal was in 1999. Shortly before 1999, the federal government and the provinces tried to come to an agreement on a new, less complex, more efficient and less unpredictable formula. They were unsuccessful at the time.

This means that in 1999, the equalization program we still operate under today and which will be in effect until March 31, 2004, was basically the same as it was in 1994. It is extremely difficult for one province after the other to come to an agreement with the federal government on new data and a new framework for equalization.

There are major flaws in the present system. These are the same flaws that existed ten years or so ago. Allow me to list them because that is what is on the table for the federal government and the provinces to discuss in preparing the fiscal equalization program for the next five years.

One of these flaws concerns the equalization standard. Briefly put, there is need in this program to establish a standard on the basis of which the federal government can provide assistance to a province under the equalization system. To do so, the capacity of each

province to collect taxes per capita in order to finance services has to be determined.

The fiscal capacity of the provinces is determined based on five provinces instead of all ten. These provinces are Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. An average capacity is calculated for each province. For those provinces that fall below the standard, equalization makes up the difference between their own fiscal capacity and the five province average.

Let me just give you one example. If the fiscal capacity per capita of Manitoba for 2001-02 was estimated at \$4,834, this meant that each person in Manitoba was expected to pay \$4,834 in taxes. But in the five standard provinces, the average fiscal capacity was \$5,900.

In 2001-02, the shortfall for a province like Manitoba was approximately \$1,000. This meant that Manitoba was not in a position to get the maximum tax contribution from its taxpayers to finance quality services comparable to those generally found in Canada. The fiscal capacity of each province is compared to the average for Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

The problem with using this benchmark that is calculated based on only five provinces is that the other five provinces and the territories are forgotten. Leaving out Alberta, for example, Canada's richest province, means that one ends up underestimating the standard, the average point at which intervention is required in some provinces to compensate for the incapacity to generate tax revenue, in order to provide comparable levels of public services.

If the standard were established on the basis of ten provinces, not five as is the case at present, we would be in a situation where the payments to reduce the gaps would be much higher. For example, if the average fiscal capacity of all ten provinces—that is, the capacity in each province to generate taxes, including income taxes, to finance their services—were considered, the average would have been \$6,237. Some provinces would have found themselves with a fiscal undercapacity, that is the potential to seek more taxes up to \$6,237. Interventions would fill in the per capita gap.

Let us take Quebec as an example. In 2000-01, it was calculated that each Quebecer could provide taxes and income taxes in the amount of \$5,180 per person.

•(1215)

If the standard for all provinces were \$6,237, we would have needed \$1,100 in equalization payments per resident. But taking the average of five provinces that I mentioned earlier, this comes out to around \$730 per capita.

*Government Orders*

This ten province standard is a much better reflection of reality than the five province standard. Each province should be included in the average and the amount needed should be calculated fairly. That would mean that the differences in wealth to finance reasonably comparable levels of public services between the provinces would be smaller than they are at present.

The five province average means that, despite the equalization payments received by Quebec—I was using it as an example, although I could have used other provinces, because many receive equalization—there is still a gap of 8% between the fiscal capacities of Ontario and Quebec, for example.

This means that the goal of reducing as far as possible, if not eliminating, differences in wealth and providing comparable levels of public services from province to province, is not achieved. Still, if we used the ten province average as the standard, we would have a gap much smaller than the 8% one we now see.

The second problem with the current equalization program—and we hope that, with regard to the new program, the federal government will be open to our comments—is that there is currently a ceiling on equalization payments. This ceiling was set arbitrarily, in 1999, at \$10 billion indexed to inflation. However, when equalization payments exceed this amount, the federal government asks the provinces to repay that amount.

The problem concerns the repayment. There is a ceiling, which limits how far the gap between the provinces can be closed, which is the purpose of equalization. Furthermore, when repayment is requested, the amount is based on the proportion of equalization payments the province received several months earlier.

I want to use Quebec as an example. I mentioned earlier that payments are calculated on a per capita basis, but since Quebec has the second largest population in Canada, it receives 62% of all equalization payments.

When cuts are made, they are not done based on the amount per capita in excess of the ceiling, they are based on the proportion of equalization payments Quebec has received, which is 62%.

Since 1982, the ceiling has been exceeded five times. This cost the provinces \$3 billion, although normally they should have received the full compensation amount.

The third problem is related to tax bases. To establish each province's capacity to impose taxes, a list of government sources of revenue is drawn up. This means municipal, provincial and any other government in the province.

However, the 33 sources of revenue are often poorly defined for each province. They are often approximate. An equalization payment is made one year, followed by numerous revisions that can be made within 30 months of the first equalization payment. As a result, there can be enormous variations.

The provinces are struggling to keep their heads above water because, often, they are asked to repay as much as \$600 million to \$800 million at one time, because their fiscal capacity was incorrectly estimated. Their fiscal capacity was underestimated. So they received a higher payment than they should have, and then the correction is made 30 months later. These corrections leave

enormous holes in the revenues of the governments of Quebec and the provinces.

This needs to be corrected. The 33 types of taxes that are used for establishing the fiscal capacity of each province have to be reviewed. There has to be an end to the use of guesstimates, or approximations, simply because no one can be bothered to get the real figures.

● (1220)

Take property taxes for example. In calculating the equalization payment for each province, instead of finding out the real property taxes paid by taxpayers, the figure used is the average income per capita for each province. However, everyone knows that there is often a huge gap between the average income per capita and the property value of the homes which generate property tax.

Everyone knows that homes in Toronto, Vancouver, or Montreal do not have the same value and do not generate the same property tax revenue for their market value or median value. That is why the property tax base is not used for each province; income is used instead.

I will give a simple example. Using the real property tax value for Quebec in 2000-01 would not have resulted in a 22% difference in what was assessed as the capacity to generate revenue from property tax compared to the standard in the five provinces. The difference would have been closer to 35%.

This means that Quebec's fiscal capacity was overestimated because income was used rather than the proper criterion: property value. Had property value been used instead, we would have received a higher amount per capita. As far as property taxes are concerned, they would have seen that there is a large gap between Quebec and the five province standard.

This is just one of the problems. There are 33 sources of taxation revenue included in the highly complex equalization formula, and the whole process needs to be reviewed. Proposals for this have been made by the Government of Quebec and the provinces of Canada. Their purpose is to simplify administration of this program, to make it more predictable, and also to make it clearer as far as the variables selected are concerned, namely the various kinds of tax revenues used in calculating entitlement to equalization payments.

This great variability can have a variety of effects, and I will give a few examples of these. We are told that the equalization payments fluctuate because a lot of revisions are carried out and the approximations of variables used are poorly defined. Let us look at just one example.

*Government Orders*

In 1997-98, equalization payments increased by 3.1%. One year later, in 1998-99, they increased by 27.3%. The following year, they decreased dramatically to 18.5% and, in 2000-01, rose again to nearly 30%. Such a program is unmanageable. The difference in wealth between the provinces cannot be this huge over a period of five years. That is impossible. It is due to the volatility of the data used.

As I said, this is reviewed every 30 months and, in each province, equalization estimates are reviewed eight times a year to update each source of tax revenue. It makes no sense to have a program like that. Besides, it is causing problems for the provinces.

We hope that, by March 31, 2004, we will have a new equalization program, these problems will have been resolved and the program scheduled to end at that time will not be extended for too long. In fact, I think I heard the parliamentary secretary mention something about retroactivity to March 31, 2004, if the new five year program were implemented a few months after that date.

• (1225)

[*English*]

**Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to Bill C-54, an act to amend the federal-provincial fiscal arrangements with regard to equalization payments.

From the debate in the House today, we all know that the equalization program is an essential component of fiscal arrangements in Canada and it needs to be strengthened to fulfill its constitutional mandate.

The growing fiscal imbalance between the federal government and the provinces and territories raises concerns over the adequacy of fiscal arrangements between the different levels of government.

The equalization program enables all regions to offer more comparable levels of public services and narrows the differences in tax burdens for Canadians across the country. It is certainly not simply the NDP that believes this. In fact, this is entrenched in the Constitution.

The importance of equalization has been acknowledged in subsection 36(2) of the Constitution Act, 1982. It stipulates:

Parliament and the government of Canada are committed to the principle of making equalization payments to ensure that provincial governments have sufficient revenues to provide reasonably comparable levels of public services at reasonably comparable levels of taxation.

This is a critical part of our Constitution. It is certainly a critical part that regions like the one I come from, Atlantic Canada, hold onto and believe in deeply.

In its current structure, the equalization program is becoming more inadequate in its ability to achieve these constitutional commitments. Since the beginning of the nineties, equalization entitlements have been declining as a proportion of GDP while fiscal disparities in Canada have not been significantly reduced.

I would like to focus on the concept of adequacy and equity in this program of equalization.

I had a chance to look at the Finance Canada website recently, under transfers to provinces. I worked with the figures that were posted, showing total major transfers by provinces for the years 2000-01 to 2003-04.

Numbers are not necessarily my forte, but I do have access to a Radio Shack calculator. After crunching a few numbers from the Finance Canada website, I found some pretty disturbing things.

The website starts off telling us that between 2000-01 and 2003-04, total major transfers from the federal government to the provinces, mainly equalization and CHST, increased from \$42.8 billion to \$49.2 billion. That is an increase of almost 15% in just three years. That sounds good. The trouble is that not every province managed to get a seat on the gravy train.

For New Brunswick, total major transfers over the three year period increased, not 15% but a mere 3.6%. For Prince Edward Island, the increase was only 1.6%.

However, even those two provinces were better off than Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia. Unlike P.E.I. and New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador have some revenue from offshore oil and gas. Instead of getting a minor increase in major transfers, they got a major decrease in major transfers. Nova Scotia's transfers dropped 1.3%. Newfoundland and Labrador's dropped more than 10 times that, at 14%.

For the Atlantic region, overall total major transfers from the federal government dropped by 3.3%, from 2001 to 2004, for a total decrease of \$200 million. For the country as a whole, total major transfers from the federal government to the provinces increased by 15%, or more than \$5 billion.

The Atlantic region is the poorest part of the country. It has the highest rates of unemployment, taxation, and post-secondary tuition, and the lowest per capita rate of expenditure on social programs. For this region, major federal transfers dropped by 3.3%, or about \$200 million. There is something wrong with this picture.

• (1230)

If the purpose of these federal transfer programs is to provide a level playing field for Canadians from coast to coast to coast, why are the poorest provinces being cut back before they get anywhere near that level playing field?

Under our Constitution, Canadians have the right to reasonably comparable levels of public services at reasonably comparable levels of taxation. It is time the government started taking the constitutional obligations seriously.

The NDP is calling on the government not only to forgive the census related costs it has calculated in the recent census measurements but to accept a great deal of the responsibility for those losses. We are asking the government to work with Nova Scotians to make the province again a place that will sustain families and their hope for a better life.

*Government Orders*

We found out recently, this week in fact, that another funding crisis is hitting Nova Scotia's health care system. It is in the form of the largest health care district, the capital district health authority, being forced to cancel overtime for nurses.

Despite the difficulties our province is having in paying for our health care services, education services and what I have just been talking about, the Liberal government is threatening to claw back over \$80 million in equalization payments based on the recent census figures.

It took the federal government nearly seven years to realize that its failed economic development programs were forcing young Atlantic Canadians to leave. Its first response was not to determine what went wrong. Its first response was to demand money back. That is an astounding thing to me.

Changes in the employment insurance program meant fewer people could earn a living in Nova Scotia through seasonal employment. The federal government could have fixed that. Instead, it chose not to. A lot of people went down the road.

Cuts to funding for education and health care through the CHST have sent more people down the road. The incredible cost of post-secondary education in my part of the country has made it impossible for young people to carry those debts. Again, we have seen a decrease in our population due to the government's punitive economic measures. We are now being asked to pay back money that in fact is not coming our way.

The offshore oil and gas industry was supposed to be a saviour for Atlantic Canadians, a cash cow like the one Albertans have enjoyed for many years. However, the promise of increased revenue from our offshore has not come true and there are no signs that it will ever be a viable industry that will provide a great deal of revenue for our province.

The Nova Scotia offshore accord, signed by the province and the federal government, was supposed to provide an equalization holiday for Nova Scotia once oil and gas started flowing.

Unfortunately, the accord was signed and came into effect before the member for LaSalle—Émard brought in his infamous 1995 budget which dropped the Canada assistance plan for the new Canada health and social transfer and put in a new set of rules for the provinces. In addition, the transition period for offshore revenues was only set for 10 years. It runs out this year. I know our colleagues from Newfoundland and Labrador also face difficulties with revenue earned from the offshore and its impact on equalization payments.

Although it is not actually a part of equalization, under the CHST brought in by the member for LaSalle—Émard, health care funding to provinces is inequitable. It is based only on population, not on need.

The provinces with the lowest overall levels of health get the same level of money for health care per person as provinces with much healthier populations. For the Atlantic provinces, it is a double edged sword. Failed economic policies mean younger, healthier people are leaving our region, as I already mentioned. The result is an aging population in poor health which means we have higher health care costs per person.

●(1235)

Everyone in the House should be aware that a low socio-economic standing poorly affects health outcomes. Poorer provinces automatically have higher health care needs to offset that. The current Canada health and social transfer does not reflect that reality and the new separate transfer for health is based on previous spending. Again, it is not on need.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that we need to review how equalization payments are calculated so that they can truly be a tool for poorer provinces to provide a comparable level of care to that of our wealthier neighbours. We should not wait for another year and force provinces to scramble around to meet their budget priorities with such a flawed agreement.

We need an equalization program that treats provinces equally, that treats all citizens across this country equally, and that does not punish a province for the results of the federal programs that have been very hard on many of our provinces.

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Dartmouth for a very instructive and informative speech. I learned a great deal about some of the issues facing some of the provinces, especially in the Atlantic region.

A lot of us in the west would be interested to know that what we expected to be a brand new era for these two provinces with the harvesting of offshore oil and gas has failed to yield results. It has not brought the anticipated relief. Listening to the hon. member, I can certainly empathize with this situation.

I note from her speech that the budget promised \$10.3 billion in equalization to the provinces last year. According to the fiscal reference tables from finance they did in fact receive \$10.3 billion but during the same period of time, the government also clawed back \$2.3 billion.

I understand the hon. member's point. Nova Scotia, due to the census and the double whammy of losing population due to lack of opportunity, is being doubly disadvantaged by having its equalization payments cut on a per capita basis given the population it has lost.

The member is a representative from Atlantic Canada. Rather than managing poverty, which is essentially what the government has been doing with regions of Atlantic Canada, would it not be logical to simply allow Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia to keep all the revenue from oil and gas for a fixed period of 20 years until we actually equalize those provinces and the opportunities available to those provinces? Then perhaps we could look at negotiating the type of clawback that exists today. Would that not be a logical step in terms of a permanent solution to the disadvantages that unfortunately exist in some of those regions?

*Government Orders*

• (1240)

**Ms. Wendy Lill:** Madam Speaker, I wish members on the other side of the House and the government could actually see the wisdom of that kind of measure.

The Nova Scotia government, the NDP members of Parliament and members from the other side of the House from Nova Scotia have made that point. We need to have some kind of fair accounting and a method by which we can keep some of the wealth that is now being generated.

The size of this potential clawback that is going to be visited upon the Atlantic region, because of the re-figuring of the census, could be as high as \$500 million. That is a figure that Bernard Lord, the Premier of New Brunswick, has mentioned. It is an astounding figure. Half a billion dollars would keep a lot of schools and hospitals going across Atlantic Canada. In fact, it amounts to over 70% of the spending on public schools in Nova Scotia. It is almost equal to the budget of the capital district health authority, which I mentioned earlier.

We are talking about money that could absolutely cripple society and life as we know it in the place that we come from. This is at a time when we have already fallen way back in terms of our standard of living and the ability to keep our young people in the region with the hope of a good life in the future.

**Mr. Pat Martin:** Madam Speaker, along the same lines, I would like to ask the hon. member what her view is of the issue. Does it translate into pure politics? Does she think that the ruling Liberal government is wise to be going after the money now with an election looming six months from now?

I wonder what she thinks the reaction will be from ordinary citizens all over Atlantic Canada if the Liberal government follows through with these punitive measures of clawing back money that is already spent. It was not adequate to begin with but it was eagerly spent as soon as it was received. If the government actually followed through with the threats to claw this money back from these struggling regions, does she not think it would be political suicide for the federal government to do that? Would it not want to rethink that as a political strategy?

**Ms. Wendy Lill:** Madam Speaker, for one thing it would be quite in violation of the country's Constitution if the government clawed back moneys. It is absolutely required right in the Constitution to provide some level of reasonably comparable levels of public service at reasonably comparable levels of taxation.

I mentioned already that in our region, taxation and the costs of health care and post-secondary education are higher than anywhere else in the country. At a time when these are the realities for people living in the east, it would be unfathomable that the federal government which is sitting on this enormous surplus at this point in time would think it would be any kind of fair treatment for a major part of the confederation.

• (1245)

**Mr. Pat Martin:** Madam Speaker, as seatmates the member for Dartmouth and I have often had many conversations but it is rare that we get to have one on the record so it is my pleasure to continue this dialogue.

I wonder what the member's views are of dealing with surpluses, the last point she mentioned. A recent paper on fiscal imbalance from the finance department of September 2003 states that the federal government will not apply 100% of its future surpluses to debt reduction. I remember a time about two years ago when the Liberal government said it would be one-third, one-third, one-third, that any surplus would be divided equally in thirds. It would be one-third tax cuts, one-third debt reduction and one-third spending on programs.

What does the hon. member feel about this reversal? The current Minister of Finance is threatening to apply again, for the third year in a row, every penny of the surplus to debt reduction and not one cent to spending in regions such as her own.

**Ms. Wendy Lill:** Madam Speaker, it is clear that the whole issue around the use of the surplus is one that is very controversial. As far as I can see in the region that I come from, it is unfathomable that some of the surplus would not be spent on some of the very critical expenditures that need to happen.

We need our military equipment replaced. We need the Sea Kings replaced. That was needed 10 years ago and it is needed now.

Cape Bretoners who live on North America's largest toxic waste dump need that issue resolved. They need it cleaned up.

There are the widows of the veterans who are now being nickel and dimed by the government. Twenty-five thousand spouses of brave veterans of our country are being told sorry, too bad so sad, they are not eligible for the tiny pittance of money that would allow them to stay in their homes, help them shovel their snow and just look after themselves.

It is intolerable to think that the federal government would not use the surplus, which is based on the taxes of the country, for things that obviously would improve the quality of life of Canadians.

**Mr. Pat Martin:** Madam Speaker, I do not know where the bulk of the surplus came from but I do know where \$20.8 million came from. It came out of my riding in terms of EI money that used to be spent on income maintenance and benefits for people which under the new rules is not. That is \$20.8 million per year.

I wonder if the hon. member for Dartmouth can say how much the EI changes cost her riding per year that is adding to this enormous surplus.

**Ms. Wendy Lill:** Madam Speaker, \$30 million has come out of my community this year because of EI payments that have not gone to workers who have been laid off.

**Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to say a few words on this extremely important bill. This bill is of particular importance to my region of the country.

I listened attentively to what the member for Dartmouth said. She laid it out quite clearly as to how federal funding generally affects not only the country but specifically the Atlantic region. The points she raised when she referred to her home province of Nova Scotia, I could just switch the province to Newfoundland and they would also fit. I congratulate the member on how well she understands the financial situation in which the Atlantic provinces find themselves.

*Government Orders*

I want to say from the start that we support the legislation. That is not to say that we support the present equalization funding mechanisms because we certainly do not. We are supporting what the legislation does which is to extend the present agreements for a year so that presumably the new government will put in place a type of funding program for the provinces that will really be equal. Certainly, the equalization program that we have today is not equal in any respect and I will explain that as I go on.

The proposed legislation extends the present agreement for one year, I presume in the event that the government does not have its act together. We might ask why the government would not have its act together because it has known for some time that this agreement was going to run out. The answer is it has not been paying any attention to this agreement or any other agreement because it has been too caught up in playing its own games; one Prime Minister is trying to develop a legacy and the other prime minister is trying to make an impression.

What will be interesting when the incoming prime minister in comes is the effect it will have on the incomes of the people across the country. If he delivers on half of the promises, not on all of the promises, then we will not have to worry about surpluses any more because he will have overspent tremendously. People are looking at that very carefully.

The question raised at the end of the speech by the hon. member for Dartmouth concerned the overpayment to provinces and the negative effect it is having on the Atlantic provinces in particular, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, and P.E.I. perhaps in this case to a lesser extent. They have been told, "The census figures are out of whack. You owe us a lot of money and we want it". It is funny when the provinces come to Ottawa looking for money that they are owed or which they deserve, they do not get that same quick response that the federal government is expecting from them.

Perhaps the federal government should look more closely at the census generally. We are now seeing the manipulation of a process that has existed for a number of years, that is, the process of changing the electoral boundaries every 10 years. The change is based on a close accounting of the electors and the boundaries are adjusted to make sure that there is relative equality. We could argue equality here also because trying to represent 80,000 or 90,000 people in an urban riding compared to representing that same number in rural Canada is certainly two different kettles of fish entirely.

Because of the wishes of the incoming prime minister, there is a need to have an early election. He wants to get rid of those who surround the present Prime Minister and reward some of those who have patiently sat in the backbenches, all 150 of them who think they are going to be in cabinet, so that they will live happily ever after.

• (1250)

In order to do that he is faced with the conflict of having two groups around him. Because he does not want to bring a lot of the backbenchers up front and he certainly does not want to keep the frontbenchers around him, the easiest thing to do is to clean house. That is exactly what he intends to do.

There is a complication in that under the existing legislation he cannot call an election under the new boundaries until August 25, 2004. In order to have the best of both worlds, the incoming prime minister was instrumental in getting the government to bring forward legislation to move the implementation date up to April 1 so he could call an election any time after that date based on the new boundaries.

However because of the lesser amount of time that the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer has, despite what they say they cannot do justice to the census to determine the number of electors in certain areas by following such a circumvented process. Therefore we question the reliability of the figures upon which the government bases its payments or overpayments to provinces.

The member from Winnipeg asked whether the government, in light of an upcoming election, would put pressure on the provinces to pay back that money because it is not going to be a very popular political thing to do. There is another reason the government may not put pressure on the provinces to pay it back. There is an election coming, but when the government originally made that decision, it probably said, "It does not matter because the people are going to vote for us anyway as they have for the last 10 years". That is not necessarily true anymore.

There is a major political change taking place in this country. For the first time in many years, we are seeing a party that will be front and centre, that will be taking on the Liberals head to head in the next election. Unfortunately for my friend from Winnipeg, it is not the NDP, but as I have always said, I hope members of the NDP will still hold a small presence in the House because they do present that social conscience which a place like this needs. The new Conservative Party now gives Canadians an alternative and the Liberals will not be doing anything rash between now and election time. Hopefully that will be to the benefit of provinces such as my own.

On equalization, the word itself is certainly a misnomer. There is no way that equalization describes what is happening in relation to the payments that are distributed across the country. The cap, which the government has now agreed to relax for a while, prevented that equal flow of funds from the rich to the poor, sort of a Robin Hood scenario. The whole concept based around equalization is have provinces and have not provinces, but what is the definition of a have not province? Ordinarily one would think of these poor provinces that have no resources and consequently, out of the kindness of their hearts, those of us who have will help them.

History has shown that over the years provinces across the country, or even before provinces were established, regions across the country have helped one another during the bad times. When the west was having a lot of trouble, it was helped by the east. Now perhaps the east is being helped by the west. As oil and gas dry up in the west and it becomes much more lucratively developed in the east, then undoubtedly the reverse will be true again.

*Government Orders*

•(1255)

Newfoundland and Labrador is referred to as a have not province and yet we have major offshore oil developments. We have the best, the cleanest and the most prolific hydro developments anywhere in the country, and they compare with any in the world, although many are undeveloped. We have great mineral resources and new ones are always being discovered. We have a rich forest industry. We had and still do have to some degree a tremendous fishery. Unfortunately, because of the federal government's complete and utter mismanagement, we have seen the stocks diminish.

A recent assessment was done by some very knowledgeable people of some 1973 landings, which was before we let the foreigners take over the resources, before we let the seal herds grow to the point where they destroyed the fish and before we completely abandoned surveillance and protection of our resource. The value of the 1973 resource in today's dollars would have been \$3.38 billion on groundfish alone. One can just imagine what that could do to the economy of Newfoundland.

For the past couple of years the landed value of our total fishing resource has been roughly in the area of \$1 billion, mainly because of crab and shrimp, the shellfish, which 10 or 15 years ago was only a very small part of the revenues produced. Shellfish has now become the saviour of the fishery in our province and has become a lucrative resource for those who still participate in the industry.

However, with the amount of fish that we had in 1973, if we had been able to protect and preserve the resource, as we should have been able to do with any leadership at all from the federal government, instead of trading it off for other benefits, it would have amounted to \$3.38 billion. Newfoundland is not the only province that has been affected. Most of Atlantic Canada and a lot of Quebec also benefited from that resource. We have seen that resource disappear. As I said, it would have been \$3.38 billion alone in what was landed in 1973 if we had been able to maintain that level.

In relation to our hydro developments, because of poor dealings in the past, when we had a government, unfortunately, a Liberal government—maybe I should say, from my perspective, fortunately a Liberal government—we negotiated a deal with Quebec with no help from Canada and somebody on our side forgot to insert an escalator clause. Quebec has benefited greatly from the deal and our revenues each year are approximately \$10 million. From the sale or resale of that power I think the revenues for Quebec are somewhere in the area of \$1 billion at this stage. That is another resource that has completely disappeared.

We have had no assistance whatsoever in the development of lower Churchill. Newfoundland and Quebec have talked in the past and under the new progressive government in Newfoundland, with tremendous leadership and cabinet, which will be put in place this coming week, and tremendous individuals involved, we undoubtedly will see Newfoundland dealing with Quebec again, hopefully for the development of our power, but in a way where we all benefit, not just one party, from the agreement.

With our mineral developments, again without any federal assistance or federal input, we see the resources being developed

and brought out of the province to create jobs somewhere else. We are contributing to the national scene.

Some say Newfoundland is a have-not province and that it constantly takes from the centre. When we are providing Quebec with hydro and the spinoff from that is over \$1 billion, when we are providing Manitoba and Ontario with our minerals for processing, when we are providing everybody around the world with our fish, how can we be a have province?

People might say that it is our own fault, and a lot of it is. A lot of the decisions were made with the lack of input from provincial governments of the past. That day is over. The resource giveaway from Newfoundland and Labrador has ended. I would issue this challenge to the rest of the provinces. The resources within our provinces should be primarily developed for the good of our provinces.

•(1300)

In a federation we undoubtedly will share and help wherever we can but we must look after ourselves first. However coordination and leadership is supposed to come from Ottawa but we have not seen it. Is it any wonder that provinces are upset? Is it any wonder Quebec is upset by its treatment from Ottawa? Is it any wonder Newfoundland and Labrador is upset? Not at all.

We have not seen fairness. We have not seen solid, central control. What we have seen is a whittling away of our controls and a lack of input from the government in the areas where it should be helping. The government interferes in areas where it should not and does not help in areas where it should.

When we talk about equalization let us first look at what we are trying to do. The government says that the theory behind equalization is to ensure that everyone in the country is treated fairly. What a joke. If it wants to treat us fairly, then it should let us help ourselves. We do not need handouts. We do not want to take federal money and still hold on to our own. We have never asked for that.

As we develop our finite natural resources we want to be treated the same way as Alberta was treated in the beginning. We want to hold on to enough of our revenue to reinvest so we can become a have province. If we could hold on to a larger percentage of the revenues garnered from the development of our resources we could invest in our own province and it would not take too long to create the jobs that are necessary.

We need to get legislation through that does not put provinces in the position of having to give away their resources. We need the freedom to develop and the right to reinvest until we can become a contributing partner.

Newfoundland and Labrador has only 500,000 people. With our resources we should all be millionaires. Why are we a have not province? The answer is quite simple. It is like the old days of serfdom when the lords were sitting in Ottawa and the peons were scattered throughout the country taking only what the lord giveth forth. That is not the way a Confederation is supposed to work.

*Private Members' Business*

Maybe we should look at the word equalization again. Maybe we should look at the fact that all areas of the country are not equal.

We should listen to the member for Dartmouth who talked about health care funding. Some time ago the federal government funded 50% of health care costs. Today in some areas the funding is down to as little as 14% of the total cost. The burden has landed in the laps of the provinces.

• (1305)

The member talked about what was happening in Nova Scotia. The situation is even worse in Newfoundland because we are the only province that is losing a high percentage of its residents. Over the last 10 years around 50,000 people, or 10% of our population, have gone to British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and some have gone south of the border. What is left is an ageing population requiring, as the member said, more funding. Not only do we receive fewer dollars but we have greater needs. With the geography that we have, it is almost impossible to deliver that funding.

If we are going to look at the equalization situation and if we are asking for a year's extension to develop a proper program, then let us do it properly. Let us look at the entities across the country. Let us create a country where everybody is treated equally. Let us create a country where we help ourselves and the federal government lets us help ourselves by staying out of our hair.

• (1310)

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division is deferred until Monday, November 3, 2003, at the end of government business.

[*English*]

**Ms. Marlene Catterall:** Madam Speaker, I think you would find consent to further defer the vote until Tuesday at 3 p.m.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** Will we see the clock as being 1:30?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** The House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

### HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-260, an act to amend the Hazardous Products Act (fire-safe cigarettes), as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

**Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.)** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. John McKay** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to add a few words of wisdom to this bill.

There are a number of substances in our society which increase hazards significantly to people.

We know of the hazards of alcohol. The number of people who die or are killed in car accidents because of alcohol every year is astounding. As a matter of fact, it is probably a low estimate to say that 100 people a day die because of alcohol usage. If we had 100 people a day dying in an aircraft, we would soon ground the aircraft.

We have probably another 100 people a day who die from smoking, that is directly. They contract diseases that are related to smoking, such as heart and lung disease, and they die from it, again at the rate of about 100 per day.

Bill C-260 addresses yet another hazard that arises from the use of tobacco, and that is the fire hazard. It is a known fact that many house fires and other accidents in vehicles are caused by a smouldering cigarette.



*Private Members' Business*

Although I do not know the exact number, I have an estimate from several years ago. It indicates that about 100 deaths per year are the result of fires which are caused by careless smoking, as it is called. Careless smoking simply means people either go to sleep or they do not pay attention to where they have put their smouldering cigarette. The cigarette lights the chesterfield on fire. The chesterfield lights the house on fire, and lo and behold people are injured or killed.

Bill C-260, proposed by the member for Scarborough East, states that there should be standards on the flammability of cigarettes. If a cigarette is left unattended, instead of smouldering away, it goes out. In other words, a person has to keep sucking on the thing to keep the fire going. If a person fails to do that, then the fire goes out.

That is a very marginal step. It is an important issue. Surely this would result in fewer fires. I do not think it would eliminate them all, but it would reduce the number of fires from unattended cigarettes and thereby hopefully reduce property damage and reduce loss of life and injury to people.

The correct thing for members of the House to do would be to support the bill. I will be voting in favour of it, even though, as I say, it is a very timid step in reducing the damage done by this one harmful substance, which we use in great quantities in Canada.

It is also good to notice that a lot of people now are quitting smoking. I want to commend one of my constituency assistants, Jason, and he will be pleased to hear me say this, who has quit smoking. I say, "good on you, Jason. I hope you keep it up". He is much richer now that he does not have to spend that money.

Many people are quitting. As a federal government, instead of just reducing the fire hazard from cigarettes, it ought to do more and more to reduce the usage of cigarettes in total.

I would like to say that I am very pleased that in our present society it has now become politically unacceptable or politically incorrect to smoke in meetings. I am an older guy, and for many years I went through the early youth of my career before all the anti-smoking stuff was in vogue. For many years I shared an office with a smoker. I was in many meetings with smokers. I had a lot of headaches because of that. I was adversely affected by the smoke.

Now we have whole buildings that are smoke free. I really appreciate it, especially because there is some conjecture that my present lung ailment, from which I am suffering, could be a result of that second hand smoke which I was forced to inhale for all those years.

In conclusion, I recommend to all my colleagues in the House that the bill is worthy of support, and I certainly will be doing that.

• (1315)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ):** Madam Speaker, it is with great joy that I rise to speak today on Bill C-260 introduced by my Liberal colleague from Scarborough East.

I will be relatively brief this afternoon, because my Bloc colleague has, as you know, already expressed his views on this private members bill, which we support.

This bill to amend the Hazardous Products Act is on its third trip through the House. On October 8, 2003, the Standing Committee on Health reported on this bill, with proposed amendments.

The text amends the Hazardous Products Act by adding to the list of prohibited products cigarettes that do not meet the flammability standard to be set out in the regulations.

The purpose of this bill is to force the tobacco companies to manufacture fire-safe cigarettes. These cigarettes are subjected to flammability testing. If they fall onto a piece of furniture, they are less likely to start a fire.

Here are some important facts. First, according to Denis Choinière, director of the Tobacco Control Program run by Health Canada's Office of Prevention, Cessation and Education, approximately 3,000 fires are caused each year by cigarettes, resulting in 70 deaths and 300 injuries.

Furthermore, the State of New York recently adopted similar legislation, making it impossible to manufacture, sell or distribute cigarettes within its jurisdiction that do not meet not basic fire safety standards.

Furthermore, the tobacco companies have long known how to make fire-safe cigarettes, by using less porous paper and less dense tobacco.

Since then, only one brand of cigarettes out of 62 tested has passed. It was an American cigarette sold in Canada. Therefore, tobacco companies know how to meet the standard to reduce the potential fire hazard posed by cigarettes.

Once again, I want to reiterate our support for Bill C-260, since my colleague from the Bloc took part in this debate on November 25, 2002. He said:

Marketing fire-safe cigarettes, which could protect the lives of the citizens we represent, the people of Quebec, should have happened years ago. But once again, this bill has not been passed.

This bill should have received majority support, if not unanimous support, in the House of Commons long ago. Firefighters and non-governmental organizations agreed with my hon. colleague, a few months ago, as we can see from the speaking notes of Denis Choinière, the Director of the Office of Regulations and Compliance.

He said that, while firefighters and non-governmental organizations support the proposal, the main complaint is that the government did not act earlier.

I strongly believe that, among firefighters or NGOs, the vast majority want this kind of measure to be adopted by Parliament because it has already been agreed that the standard in question can be applied by companies and manufacturers.

So, in closing, to the extent that this standard can be applied, my hope is that this bill will receive the support of as many elected representatives in this House as possible. I therefore urge all members in this House to vote for Bill C-260.

*Private Members' Business*

● (1320)

[English]

**Mr. Shawn Murphy (Hillsborough, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am addressing the House today to reaffirm Health Canada's position concerning Bill C-260 as well as to provide the House with a status update concerning the development of regulations to mandate certain reduced ignition propensity cigarettes. I would also like to provide the House with a summary of the supporting activities presently being conducted by Health Canada.

First, I want to thank and congratulate the hon. member for Scarborough East for bringing this issue forward. He has certainly put a lot of time and energy into raising the whole issue of fires caused by unattended cigarettes. For this effort, we certainly thank him.

Let me begin by saying that one of Health Canada's mandates has always been to reduce health hazards where tobacco products are concerned. Over 14,000 fires were started by unattended cigarettes between 1995 and 1999. The death toll for these fires was over 350. Another 1,600 people were injured. These numbers account for the majority of deaths and injuries caused by household fires. The resulting damage to property is estimated at over \$200 million.

Some of the measures Health Canada has taken include a prevention by public education strategy. The department has also prompted the regulation of ignition sources, such as lighters and matches, and has restricted or banned flammable consumer products. These include materials used in mattresses, bedding and textiles. The department has also worked closely with the Canadian Council of Furniture Manufacturers to reduce flammability of upholstered furniture.

The final step is to mandate regulations that would force manufacturers to produce cigarettes that are less likely to cause fires. This kind of product is known as reduced ignition propensity cigarettes.

Over the course of the last year and further to recent consultations with other interested parties, Health Canada has made significant progress toward implementing ignition propensity regulations. It has found that there are some concerns which merit further attention. However, none of these are enough to preclude the development of regulations. It is expected that regulations will be proposed in the very near future.

The first formal step taken in the regulatory process was in December of last year. Health Canada released a public consultation paper seeking input on the issue of reduced fire risks from cigarettes. This document gave all interested parties an opportunity to express their concerns and also their priorities.

The feedback Health Canada received was mixed. Firefighters and non-governmental organizations were very supportive of the proposal. Although its main complaint was that government was initially too slow to take action, the comments the department received from the tobacco industry also indicated support for the proposals and the objectives.

However, the industry in this public consultation process raised concerns over issues ranging from methodology for testing to unsafe behavioural tendencies in which consumers might engage.

I would like to take a moment to address some of these concerns and offer some insight into the steps and activities that Health Canada has undertaken to address some of these issues.

The current test method has been put into question. After an extensive dialogue with experts, Health Canada maintains that the method being used by the American Society for the Testing of Materials is based on very sound scientific theory and is the best method for measuring the ignition propensity of cigarettes.

Also concerns over toxicity levels have been raised. Upon further investigation, Health Canada has concluded that the available eligible data indicates that there is no significant variation in the toxicity of reduced ignition propensity cigarettes. Due to the importance of this issue, Health Canada is considering mandatory toxicological testing throughout the implementation of the regulations to have access to sound data.

● (1325)

Some concern has also been expressed regarding consumer behaviour. The apprehension which was raised is that reduced ignition propensity cigarettes could mislead the consumer into believing that cigarettes no longer pose a fire hazard, leading, of course, to consumer carelessness. To date no scientific data has been provided to support this claim, and based on what I think of the assertion it would be highly unlikely that there would be any kind of empirical evidence to support this assertion.

Health Canada plans to deal with the issue by establishing fire safety and behavioural baselines. The references are twofold. The department is developing a questionnaire to measure the current behaviour of smokers and is also at the same time using data from the Ontario fire marshal's office to establish conclusive statistics regarding the nature of cigarette fires in Ontario. This will give Health Canada a basis of comparison once regulations have been implemented and will ultimately indicate possible behavioural changes in smokers.

Over the course of the last year, as has already been mentioned here this afternoon, ignition propensity testing has been performed on 62 brands of cigarettes sold in the Canadian marketplace. Only one brand has shown a significant reduction in ignition propensity.

A cost benefit assessment is also well underway. The department recently sent a questionnaire to affected stakeholders to ask for their input into cost assessment. This assessment is expected to be completed in about three or four weeks.

Let us now turn to Bill C-260. The intention of Bill C-260 is also to prevent the loss of life due to fires caused by smoking. The debate surrounding the bill has been a little enigmatic, in that we all agree something must be done, but the question we are faced with is how it should be done. That is the issue.

The position of Health Canada from the very beginning has been that the regulation of reduced ignition propensity cigarettes should fall under the Tobacco Act. There are many reasons for this line of thinking.

*Private Members' Business*

Among them is the fact that Health Canada has developed and implemented the federal tobacco control strategy. That would be the very best way to deal with this issue: to get people to substantially reduce smoking or to stop all together. This strategy allows Canadians to deal with tobacco-related issues by adopting a comprehensive, integrated and sustained approach. This way, the regulation of cigarettes falls under one single piece of legislation. There are several advantages to this.

Among these advantages is that of a comprehensive regulatory framework. In short, the legislative apparatus to achieve effective tobacco control strategies is, as everyone in the House is aware, already in place. This makes acting expediently considerably easier.

There is one final point I would like to make. The Hazardous Products Act sets out to deal with harmful products in two very specific ways: by regulating these products to make them safe or by simply banning them from the market all together.

One can begin to see the difficulty in incorporating cigarettes into this legislation. Regulating cigarettes to make them safe is neither feasible nor possible and makes very little common sense. Cigarettes by their very nature are a dangerous product, whether that danger is from inhaling the smoke they produce or from sustaining injuries in the fires they start. Altering them for ignition propensity is one thing. However, altering them to render the smoke safe is entirely another goal, a goal no one would know how to achieve. We may be setting a precedent that would allow other products that do not fit the model to be included in this act.

Likewise, at this point in time in the evolution of society, banning cigarettes would be difficult. It would be like banning paint additives or banning glue. Tobacco is an addictive substance. By banning it, we would be instantly turning 20% of our population into criminals.

• (1330)

Health Canada has demonstrated that the process to regulate ignition propensity is well underway and the mechanisms to achieve this are already in place. Cigarettes are a unique product with their own unique act. It is clear that cigarettes do not fit into the model that the Hazardous Products Act outlines. Health Canada will continue to work on measures dealing with ignition propensity that fall under the Tobacco Act.

On a global scale, Health Canada is a world leader in tobacco control. It has demonstrated this through its continued efforts and through a strong commitment to improve the well-being of Canadian citizens.

**Mr. Rex Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls, PC):** Madam Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to speak to Bill C-260, the private member's bill to amend the Hazardous Products Act. I thank the member for Scarborough East for bringing such an important matter before the House of Commons in the form of this bill.

Let me state at the outset that this bill deals with property damage caused by careless smoking, but most importantly, it deals with saving lives. In 1992, careless smoking in Canada accounted for 68 fatalities, 385 injuries, \$37 million in damages and 3,199 fires. On average Canadians consume approximately 56 billion cigarettes annually and the damage caused by them is substantial.

The solution to this may be found in what are known as flammability standards. When I read over this piece of legislation, the first thought that came to mind was that the bill is not trying to get Canadians to stop smoking, because smoking is an addiction that requires help. Rather, what this bill is saying and what it is trying to do is make it safer for people to smoke and safer for the people around them.

Essentially what this bill would do is compel the Minister of Health to report to Parliament and explain why the Hazardous Products Act should or should not be amended to include cigarettes under the category of flammability standards. Clearly this is an issue that affects all of us in the entire country, regardless of age or region. Further, members would no doubt agree that saving lives of smokers and non-smokers alike is of significant public interest to all of us here in the chamber.

One lit cigarette left unattended can have dire consequences and devastating impacts. Dangerous smoking may seem to be a non-issue; however, it is a very important one, which Canadians from coast to coast must be encouraged to take seriously. Over the years, cigarette fires have caused a large number of fatalities. The terrible tragedy is that most of these deaths could have been prevented if smokers had just taken a few simple precautions.

One thing that Canadians must be aware of is that it can happen to anyone, young or old, and at any time. If one is smoking late at night or after a drink, it is only natural that one's reactions tend to be slower. As such, this is a time when extra care must be taken while smoking.

A smouldering cigarette is the biggest cause of fatal fires, causing one-third of all deaths from fires in the home. These fires are more likely to start during the night. Some of the most common places for them to start are sofas, beds and carpets. A cigarette burns at up to 780 degrees centigrade, so I would remind all Canadians to ensure that when they put out their cigarettes they really are out.

There is good news in all of this, because cigarette-related fires can be prevented by taking a few simple precautions. Some of these include: avoid smoking in bed; avoid leaving lit cigarettes unattended; always use a proper ashtray and make sure it cannot be knocked over; take special care when one is tired or drinking; keep matches and lighters away from children; and fit and maintain a proper smoke alarm.

Although these personal safety precautions can be taken, more can and must be done. It is for this reason that I applaud my colleague for bringing forward this private member's bill. Cigarettes should be included in the Hazardous Products Act and flammability standards should be applied to them.

It is worth noting that currently in the United States the Massachusetts legislature has before it a unique opportunity to move Massachusetts out front in its efforts to save lives, lives lost to cigarettes.

*Private Members' Business*

Smoking materials are the leading cause of fatal fires in the United States. Recent statistics from the National Fire Protection Association show that there were 900 fire-related deaths, 2,500 injuries, and \$410 million in property damage caused by smoking materials in one year in the United States.

In Massachusetts in 1990, there were 178 deaths, 763 injuries related to burns and \$75 million in property damage caused by such fires. During the same period, these fires caused 677 firefighter injuries in Massachusetts.

• (1335)

The legislature has before it the Moakley bill, a state version of the federal legislation first introduced in Congress by Joe Moakley in 1979 which would require that all cigarettes sold in Massachusetts have strict fire safety standards. When left burning unattended they would extinguish themselves or burn at temperatures that would not ignite furniture or mattresses, thereby lessening the chance of fires.

This is a very good idea and a very worthwhile piece of legislation. Lessons can be learned from the Massachusetts approach. Also, New York State has recently passed a similar bill while unanimously stating that all cigarettes sold in the state had to meet flammability standards by July 2003.

It remains my solemn opinion that this is certainly the right thing to do.

We learn from statistics in Great Britain that smoking can be more dangerous than we think. Every three days someone dies because of a cigarette fire. The highest injury rate in smoking material fires is among young people between the ages of 25 to 34. Men are more likely to be killed or injured in cigarette fires. Six out of ten of those killed are men and over half of those injured are men. Six out of ten smokers say cigarettes are one of the top causes of house fires, but every year fewer people are taking steps to prevent these fires.

Only four out of ten smokers say they check their ashtrays before going to bed each night. Nearly half of all households have a smoker living in them. These households are nearly one and one-half times more likely to have a fire than non-smoking households.

Despite the dangers of falling asleep and setting bedding on fire, 70% of smokers confess to lighting up in bed. People 18 to 34 years old are even more likely to smoke in bed.

I think that my remarks today reflect the importance of implementing cigarette safety standards in Canada. The choices are simple: life or death.

We have a golden opportunity to support this private member's bill in the hope that the Minister of Health and the entire government will take notice of the widespread support for the bill and as a result will work hard toward implementing appropriate standards for cigarettes in the country.

• (1340)

**Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their generous support of the bill. They supported it through first reading and second reading, at the committee stage and were very helpful in getting it out of the committee unanimously. Their remarks today were quite generous and I appreciate each and every one of them.

I also want to thank the minister who has been very supportive in the process. I hope that at the end of the day between her and her department we will have leading edge regulations.

If I may make a comment, New York State is the only state in the United States that has ignition standards, and I am not even sure that they are proclaimed at this point. This would put Canada at the leading edge of fire safe cigarettes and setting standards for cigarettes.

We had quite a number of people who were very supportive of this. The Canada Safety Council immediately jumped on it and said it was an initiative that we should take. Physicians for a Smoke-Free Canada were also very supportive at the outset.

There are a great number of people to thank but I want to pay tribute to the Ragoonanans in Brampton who tragically lost two members of their family when their townhouse burned to the ground. That is what precipitated the bill in 1999. Believe it or not, it has been four years to get to this stage where the bill is at third reading in the House of Commons. Their lawyer, Doug Lennox, came to me and described the situation where he was trying to start a class action on so-called careless smoking.

Like a lot of other Canadians, I thought that careless smoking was just that, careless smoking. In fact there have been patented technologies available to cigarette companies for years that could have addressed the rash of fires.

Mr. Lennox described the situation and asked if there was anything that I could do. Frankly, my reaction was that I did not think there was anything that could be done, but upon subsequent research and discussions with the folks at the Library of Parliament and elsewhere, we felt that this was the way to go, compelling the minister to proclaim draft regulations under the Hazardous Products Act.

Whether the regulations are proclaimed under the Hazardous Products Act or are proclaimed under the Tobacco Act is no never mind. One way or another Canada will end up with leading edge regulations with respect to fire safe cigarettes. That is the goal of the bill.

I thank all of my colleagues for their support and ask that they continue to support it through a vote.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

*Private Members' Business*

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos):** It being 1:44 p.m., the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until Monday next, at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1:44 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	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 (Physical Activity and 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
Péric, 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
<b>ALBERTA (26)</b>		
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
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)</b>		
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 (14)

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
<b>NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)</b>		
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.
<b>NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)</b>		
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
<b>NOVA SCOTIA (11)</b>		
Brisson, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Cuzner, Rodger, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Lib.
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	West Nova	Lib.
<b>NUNAVUT (1)</b>		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Nunavut	Lib.
<b>ONTARIO (103)</b>		
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 (Physical Activity and 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.
Péric, 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	
<b>PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)</b>		
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.
<b>QUEBEC (75)</b>		
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	Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
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
<b>SASKATCHEWAN (14)</b>		
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
<b>YUKON (1)</b>		
Bagnell, Larry .....	Yukon .....	Lib.



## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of October 31, 2003 — 2nd Session, 37th Parliament)

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

<b>Chair:</b>	Raymond Bonin	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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 Breitzkreuz  
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 Members**Jim 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 Breitzkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Chuck Cadman  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
David Chatters  
Joe Clark  
Joe Comartin  
Stockwell Day  
Norman Doyle  
John Duncan

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

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

Svend Robinson  
Yves Rocheleau  
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

<b>Chair:</b>	Bernard Patry	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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

<b>Chair:</b>	Mark Eyking	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Stéphane Bergeron Raymond Simard	
Bill Blaikie	Bill Casey	Bob Speller	Tony Valeri	(9)
Murray Calder	Charlie Penson			

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>		<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Colleen Beaumier	Irwin Cotler	Gurbax Malhi	Beth Phinney	(8)
Bill Casey	Karen Kraft Sloan	Deepak Obhrai	Yves Rocheleau	



## GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

<b>Chair:</b>	Reg Alcock	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Paul Forseth Paul Szabo	
Carolyn Bennett	Ken Epp	Derek Lee	Gilles-A. Perron	(16)
Leon Benoit	Raymonde Folco	Pat Martin	Judy Sgro	
Joe Clark	Robert Lanctôt	Massimo Pacetti	Tony Tirabassi	
Roy Cullen				

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Reed Elley	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Liza Frulla	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Christiane Gagnon	Gary Lunn	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	James Lunney	Gary Schellenberger
Roy Bailey	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Peter MacKay	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Yvon Godin	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Monte Solberg
Garry Breitkreuz	Jim Gouk	Brian Masse	Kevin Sorenson
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Darrel Stinson
Chuck Cadman	Monique Guay	Réal Ménard	Chuck Strahl
Bill Casey	Art Hanger	Val Meredith	Greg Thompson
Rick Casson	Stephen Harper	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
David Chatters	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Vic Toews
Paul Crête	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Maurice Vellacott
John Cummins	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Elsie Wayne
Libby Davies	Grant Hill	Brian Pallister	Randy White
Stockwell Day	Jay Hill	Pierre Paquette	Ted White
Odina Desrochers	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Norman Doyle	Betty Hinton	Dick Proctor	Lynne Yelich
John Duncan	Rahim Jaffer		

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON WHISTLEBLOWING

<b>Chair:</b>		<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Carolyn Bennett	Raymonde Folco	Pat Martin	Judy Sgro	(8)
Ken Epp	Robert Lanctôt	Massimo Pacetti	Greg Thompson	

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF THE OFFICE OF THE PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

<b>Chair:</b>		<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Libby Davies	Gerald Keddy	Derek Lee	Judy Sgro	(8)
Paul Forseth	Robert Lanctôt	Massimo Pacetti	Paul Szabo	

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES PROCESS

<b>Chair:</b>	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>
---------------	--------------------

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

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

**Chair:**

**Vice-Chair:**

Eugène Bellemare	Norman Doyle	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Anita Neville	(9)
Carolyn Bennett	Reed Elley	Wendy Lill	Tony Tirabassi	
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral				

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

**Chair:**

John Godfrey

**Vice-Chair:**

Norman Doyle	Sébastien Gagnon	Wendy Lill	Larry Spencer	(9)
John Finlay	Ovid Jackson	Anita Neville	Alan Tonks	

## INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Chair:**

Walt Lastewka

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

(16)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Peter Adams  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Roy Bailey  
Rex Barnes  
Eugène Bellemare  
Leon Benoit  
Stéphane Bergeron  
Bernard Bigras  
Gérard Binet  
Rick Borotsik  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Andy Burton  
Chuck Cadman  
Serge Cardin  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
David Chatters  
Joe Clark  
John Cummins  
Stockwell DayBev Desjarlais  
Odina Desrochers  
Norman Doyle  
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

<b>Chair:</b>	Andy Scott	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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

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

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

<b>Chair:</b>	Derek Lee	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Marlene Jennings Kevin Sorenson	
Robert Lanctôt	John McKay	Lorne Nystrom	Geoff Regan	(11)
Peter MacKay	Lynn Myers	David Pratt	Vic Toews	

**LIAISON**

<b>Chair:</b>	Walt Lastewka	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Judi Longfield	
Peter Adams	Bonnie Brown	Gurmant Grewal	Andy Scott	(19)
Reg Alcock	Charles Caccia	Clifford Lincoln	Paul Steckle	
Sue Barnes	Joe Comuzzi	Bernard Patry	Tom Wappel	
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	David Pratt	John Williams	
Raymond Bonin				

**Associate Members**

Jim Abbott	Paul Forseth	Réal Ménard	David Price
Eugène Bellemare	Yvon Godin	Bob Mills	James Rajotte
Chuck Cadman	John Harvard	James Moore	Gerry Ritz
John Cannis	Jay Hill	Shawn Murphy	Monte Solberg
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Anita Neville	Paul Szabo
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Diane Marleau	Brian Pallister	Yolande Thibeault
Stockwell Day	Bill Matthews	Carolyn Parrish	Rose-Marie Ur
Nick Discepola	John McKay	Beth Phinney	Maurice Vellacott
Stan Dromisky	Dan McTeague	Jerry Pickard	

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS**

<b>Chair:</b>		<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Peter Adams	Gurmant Grewal	Judi Longfield	John Williams	(6)
Mauril Bélanger	Walt Lastewka			

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS**

<b>Chair:</b>	Walt Lastewka	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Judi Longfield	
Reg Alcock	Bonnie Brown	Andy Scott	John Williams	(9)
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Tom Wappel		

## NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Chair:**

David Pratt

**Vice-Chairs:**Jay Hill  
David Price

Rob Anders  
Claude Bachand  
Robert Bertrand  
Bill Blaikie

Cheryl Gallant  
Ivan Grose  
Dominic LeBlanc

Joe McGuire  
Anita Neville  
Lawrence O'Brien

Janko Péric  
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 Breitzkreuz  
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 Epp

Brian Fitzpatrick  
Paul Forseth  
Peter Goldring  
Jim Gouk  
Gurmant Grewal  
Deborah Grey  
Monique Guay  
Art Hanger  
Stephen Harper  
Richard Harris  
Loyola Hearn  
John Herron  
Grant Hill  
Howard Hilstrom  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Dale Johnston  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Francine Lalonde  
Wendy Lill  
Yvan Loubier

Gary 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 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  
Rose-Marie Ur  
Maurice Vellacott  
Randy White  
Ted White  
John Williams  
Bob Wood  
Lynne Yelich

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

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

**OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

<b>Chair:</b>	Mauril Bélanger	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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

<b>Chair:</b>	Peter Adams	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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

<b>Chair:</b>	Carolyn Parrish	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Yvon Godin	Lynn Myers	Benoît Sauvageau	Chuck Strahl	(7)
Gerald Keddy	David Price			

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Paddy Torsney	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
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 Members**Jim 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

<b>Chair:</b>	Joe Comuzzi	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	John Cannis James Moore	
Larry Bagnell	Jim Gouk	Mario Laframboise	Marcel Proulx	(16)
Rex Barnes	Ovid Jackson	Robert Lanctôt	Yolande Thibeault	
Bev Desjarlais	Stan Keyes	Pat O'Brien	Lynne Yelich	
Roger Gallaway				

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
Reg Alcock	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	Gary Schellenberger
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	Yvan Loubier	Werner Schmidt
G�rard Asselin	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	Judy Sgro
Andr� Bachand	Ghislain Fournier	James Lunney	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Christiane Gagnon	Peter MacKay	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	John Maloney	Kevin Sorenson
Bernard Bigras	Roger Gaudet	Inky Mark	Larry Spencer
Bill Blaikie	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Keith Martin	Guy St-Julien
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Peter Stoffer
Scott Brison	Deborah Grey	R�al M�nard	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Art Hanger	Val Meredith	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Stephen Harper	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	Deepak Obhrai	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	John Herron	Brian Pallister	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Grant Hill	Charlie Penson	Randy White
Paul Cr�te	Jay Hill	Dick Proctor	Ted White
John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	James Rajotte	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton		

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION

<b>Chair:</b>	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>
---------------	--------------------

## SPECIAL COMMITTEES

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS (BILL C-38)

<b>Chair:</b>	Paddy Torsney	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Carole-Marie Allard Randy White	
Gilbert Barrette	Hedy Fry	Richard Marceau	R�al M�nard	(13)
Mauril B�langer	Dominic LeBlanc	Inky Mark	Kevin Sorenson	
Libby Davies	Derek Lee			

## STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

**Joint Chairs:** Carolyn Bennett  
Yves Morin

**Joint Vice-Chair:** Deborah Grey

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc  
Michael J. Forrestall

Jean Lapointe  
Vivienne Poy

Mauril Bélanger  
Robert Bertrand  
Marlene Catterall  
Marcel Gagnon  
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 Breitzkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Andy Burton  
Chuck Cadman  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
David Chatters  
Joe Clark  
John Cummins  
Libby Davies

Stockwell Day  
Norman Doyle  
John Duncan  
Reed Elley  
Ken Epp  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Paul Forseth  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Jim Gouk  
Gurmant Grewal  
Art Hanger  
Stephen Harper  
Richard Harris  
Loyola Hearn  
John Herron  
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 Chairs:** Gurmant Grewal  
Céline Hervieux-Payette

**Joint Vice-Chair:** Derek Lee

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  
Michel Guimond  
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 Wasylcyia-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 (Physical Activity and 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 31, 2003

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Specific Claims Resolution Act

Mr. Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora) .....	9009
Bill C-6. Second reading and concurrence in Senate amendments .....	9009
Mr. Hubbard .....	9009
Mr. Vellacott .....	9010

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Confederation Centre of the Arts

Mr. Murphy .....	9016
------------------	------

### Apprenticeship Competition

Mr. Stinson .....	9017
-------------------	------

### Canadian Forces

Mr. Assadourian .....	9017
-----------------------	------

### Youth at Risk

Mr. Caccia .....	9017
------------------	------

### Martha Curgin Tevlin

Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe) .....	9017
-------------------------------------	------

### Marijuana

Mr. Vellacott .....	9017
---------------------	------

### Royal Winter Fair

Mr. Tonks .....	9018
-----------------	------

### Member for LaSalle—Émard

Mr. Desrochers .....	9018
----------------------	------

### Jordin Tootoo

Mrs. Jennings .....	9018
---------------------	------

### Member for LaSalle—Émard

Mr. Strahl .....	9018
------------------	------

### UNICEF

Mr. Tirabassi .....	9019
---------------------	------

### Mervyn “Butch” Blake

Mr. Schellenberger .....	9019
--------------------------	------

### René Lévesque

Ms. Guay .....	9019
----------------	------

### Women Politicians

Ms. Bennett .....	9019
-------------------	------

### Dwight Bishop

Mr. Stoffer .....	9019
-------------------	------

### Influenza

Mr. Castonguay .....	9020
----------------------	------

### Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys

Mrs. Hinton .....	9020
-------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Veterans Affairs

Mrs. Skelton .....	9020
Mr. Grose .....	9020
Mrs. Skelton .....	9020
Mr. Grose .....	9020
Mrs. Skelton .....	9020
Mr. Grose .....	9020

### Justice

Mr. Mark .....	9020
Mr. Macklin .....	9020
Mr. Mark .....	9021
Mr. Macklin .....	9021

### Quebec

Ms. St-Hilaire .....	9021
Mr. Dion .....	9021
Ms. St-Hilaire .....	9021
Mr. Dion .....	9021
Mr. Loubier .....	9021
Mr. Dion .....	9021
Mr. Loubier .....	9021
Mr. Dion .....	9022

### National Defence

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	9022
Mr. McCallum (Markham) .....	9022
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	9022
Mr. McCallum (Markham) .....	9022

### Finance

Mr. Blaikie .....	9022
Mr. Manley .....	9022

### Veterans Affairs

Mr. Blaikie .....	9022
Mr. Grose .....	9023

### Finance

Mr. Hearn .....	9023
Mr. Manley .....	9023

### Infrastructure

Mr. Hearn .....	9023
Mr. Manley .....	9023

### World Trade Organization

Mr. Bergeron .....	9023
Mrs. Jennings .....	9023
Mr. Bergeron .....	9023
Mrs. Jennings .....	9023

### Member for LaSalle—Émard

Mr. Solberg .....	9023
Mr. Manley .....	9024
Mr. Solberg .....	9024
Mr. Manley .....	9024

<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Bigras .....	9024
Mr. Harvey .....	9024
Mr. Bigras .....	9024
Mr. Tonks .....	9024
<b>Ethics</b>	
Ms. Meredith .....	9024
Mr. Goodale .....	9024
Ms. Meredith .....	9024
Mr. Goodale .....	9025
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mrs. Kraft Sloan .....	9025
Mr. Tonks .....	9025
<b>Elections Canada</b>	
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) .....	9025
Mr. Boudria .....	9025
<b>Fisheries and Oceans</b>	
Mr. Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls) .....	9025
Mr. Farrah .....	9025
<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	9025
Ms. McLellan .....	9025
<b>Human Resources Development</b>	
Mr. Stoffer .....	9025
Mrs. Stewart .....	9026
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Moore .....	9026
Mrs. Jennings .....	9026
Mr. Moore .....	9026
Mrs. Jennings .....	9026
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Gaudet .....	9026
Mr. Vanclief .....	9026
Mr. Gaudet .....	9026
Mr. Vanclief .....	9026
<b>Child Pornography</b>	
Mr. Spencer .....	9026
Mr. Macklin .....	9027
Mr. Spencer .....	9027
Mr. Macklin .....	9027
<b>Official Languages</b>	
Mr. Bertrand .....	9027
Mr. Bélanger .....	9027
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Cadman .....	9027
Mr. Macklin .....	9027
Mr. Cadman .....	9027
Mr. Macklin .....	9027
<b>Highway Infrastructure</b>	
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	9027
Mr. Proulx .....	9028
<b>Equalization Payments</b>	
Ms. Lill .....	9028

Mr. Manley .....	9028
<b>Trade</b>	
Mr. Grewal .....	9028
Mr. Kilgour .....	9028
<b>Harassment</b>	
Ms. Bourgeois .....	9028
Ms. Robillard .....	9028
<b>Ethics</b>	
Mr. Epp .....	9028
Mr. Boudria .....	9028
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Deputy Speaker .....	9029

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Office of the Privacy Commissioner</b>	
Ms. Robillard .....	9029
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Cuzner .....	9029
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Official Languages</b>	
Mr. Bélanger .....	9029
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Beef Industry</b>	
Mr. Mark .....	9029
<b>Freedom of Religion</b>	
Mr. Mark .....	9029
<b>Child Pornography</b>	
Mr. Mark .....	9029
<b>Marriage</b>	
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe) .....	9029
Mr. Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls) .....	9029
Ms. Catterall .....	9029
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Cuzner .....	9030

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act</b>	
Bill C-54, Second Reading .....	9030
Mr. Loubier .....	9030
Ms. Lill .....	9033
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	9034
Mr. Hearn .....	9035
Division on motion deferred .....	9038

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Hazardous Products Act</b>	
Bill C-260, Report stage .....	9038
Mr. McKay .....	9038
Motion for concurrence .....	9038
(Motion agreed to) .....	9038
Mr. McKay .....	9038
Third reading .....	9038
Mr. Epp .....	9038

Mr. Bigras .....	9039	(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed) ..	9043
Mr. Murphy .....	9040		
Mr. Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls) .....	9041		
Mr. McKay .....	9042		

**APPENDIX**

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Publishing and Depository Services

PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5

Internet: <http://publications.gc.ca>

1-800-635-7943 or Local 613-941-5995

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*

Les Éditions et Services de dépôt

TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Internet: <http://publications.gc.ca>

1-800-635-7943 ou appel local (613) 941-5995

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

**Additional copies may be obtained from Publishing and Depository Services, PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5**

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

**On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt, TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5**

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5**