



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 137 • NUMBER 206 • 1st SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, June 14, 2002

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 14, 2002

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

●(1010)

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

CANADA PENSION PLAN ACT

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House of Commons immediately prior to consideration of Bill C-58 the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville rose in his place and suggested that in some form the Minister of Finance may have been in contempt of parliament over an issue. The issue did not involve contempt of parliament at all. There was a question, at least in my mind and perhaps in the minds of several members, whether it would have been in order for us to consider Bill C-58 at second reading.

I had some time to reflect upon this and obtain advice. With or without what was before us yesterday the second reading consideration of Bill C-58 would have been in order. In terms of proceeding beyond that it would at least have been questionable, particularly in view of the issues that were raised yesterday.

Section 115 of the Canada Pension Plan Act requires the Minister of Finance to ask the chief actuary to prepare a report “whenever any Bill is introduced”. That is the requirement. This has been done. Section 115 states that when the Minister of Finance receives the report, he must table it forthwith.

I can confirm that the Minister of Finance has not yet received this final report so therefore he has not breached any rule. He is not in a position to table it forthwith because he has not received it. Meanwhile, that does not stop us from proceeding with the legislation. The act has been complied with fully to the point possible, namely asking for the report. It will be further complied with as soon as the final report is received.

I should have checked this out before, but I could endeavour to determine whether these kinds of reports can be tabled even when the House is in recess. This is possible with a certain number of reports on the 15th of every month when the House is in recess. In any case if that is not one of those reports, perhaps we should pass a special order before rising for the summer to ensure that it can be tabled. If that is necessary I would endeavour to do that, further demonstrating the minister's intention to adhere to this rule.

There is nothing in the act nor elsewhere that prevents the House from proceeding with the bill. The hon. member for Lanark—Carleton and I would probably agree on that point because parliament should be able to consider legislation, particularly at second reading, almost at any time. The minister cannot fail to table a report because he has not received the report.

It is important to note that the act does not require the preparation of an actuarial report before the bill is introduced. There is no mention of that. Nor is there mention that it should be done before the bill is considered. That is not there either. I invite the Chair to take note of that as well.

I contend that the minister has complied with the act by requesting such a report and he will fully comply with the act by tabling the report when he receives it. As I indicated a while ago I will take even further measures should those be necessary if and when the House rises.

There is no substantive reason to claim that the law has not been complied with or that the minister is in contempt of parliament, which I do not think has ever been the case, at least not from my vantage point. No standing order of the House has been breached. Proceeding with the bill is not out of order; it is fully in order. I would hope that the House could now proceed with the legislation.

Mr. Richard Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. House leader is introducing in his remarks some interpretation of the act because there is no specific wording. The intent of the act is that before parliament proceeds with any piece of legislation—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Members have been drawing to the attention of the Chair the matter which is quite obvious to all of us. I regret to inform the hon. member that his attire does not conform with the appropriate attire for the member to be given the floor. I suppose with minor adjustments it will be all right. Styles are changing. I notice on CBC some people wear very thick tabs while some have no tabs and this might be a new trend.

Mr. Richard Harris: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are aware of the rules but also well aware that precedents have been set in this House by other members of other parties, including the member for Davenport.

An hon. member: No.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The matter has been rectified. The Chair fully recognizes the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

Government Orders

Mr. Richard Harris: Mr. Speaker, members of the House cannot possibly consider legislation that affects the CPP under section 115 without having a report from the chief actuary tabled. That is the reason this is put in the act.

The hon. government House leader is using some of his own interpretations noting that because it does not say in the act specifically that it has to be present, it does not have to be. The purpose of that section of the act is to ensure that all members of the House, both government and opposition members, have a basis report from the chief actuary as a resource to proceed on any legislation that may affect the Canada pension plan. That is the purpose of section 115.

He may be right that the finance minister may not be in contempt because he does not have the report, but that does not mean that this House under the act can proceed with this legislation without the opinion or the report from the chief actuary. A lot of the interpretation in the government House leader's argument may be his, and good for him. The fact of the matter is that section 115 was put in the act for a purpose so that all members would have a good resource base to work from, such as the opinion of the chief actuary.

●(1015)

CANADA PENSION PLAN ACT—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair is prepared to deal with this matter now. The Chair had been apprised of the matter when the question of privilege was raised yesterday by the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

He alleged that the Minister of Finance had failed to comply with the provisions of the Canada Pension Plan Act because he had not tabled a report of the chief actuary pursuant to subsection 115(2) of the act.

Since Bill C-58, an act to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board Act, was to have been called for second reading debate yesterday afternoon, the hon. Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons undertook to inquire into the situation and report back to the House. In the event he was not able to report back, the House proceeded with other business at that time yesterday.

Bill C-58 is scheduled for debate this morning. The Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons has now reported on the situation. The Chair is satisfied that no breach of the rules has occurred, and accordingly I am prepared to proceed with the business before the House.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Hon. Don Boudria (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-58, an act to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak at second reading of Bill C-58 which amends the Canada pension plan and the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board Act.

Through the bill the federal and provincial governments as joint stewards are completing the final stages of the 1997 reforms to the Canada pension plan.

Future generations of Canadians, including our children and grandchildren, would benefit from these measures which transfer all remaining CPP assets to an independent investment board, namely, the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board, CPPIB.

Endorsed by the federal and provincial financial ministers five years ago these reforms would help ensure that Canadians have a pension plan on which they can always depend.

The end result of moving to complete the market investment policy for the Canada pension plan would be increased performance, better diversification and enhanced risk management of the entire CPP portfolio.

To put Bill C-58 in context, it is necessary to take a moment and review the role and the responsibilities of the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board. However, it goes without saying that any discussion of the CPPIB must also include some remarks about the Canada pension plan itself. The background I am about to provide will be useful to hon. members in understanding why the amendments in the bill are needed.

I wish to begin my remarks with some general comments about Canada's retirement income system. As hon. members may know Canada's retirement income system is supported by three pillars—a blend of public and private pension provisions that are considered internationally as one of the most effective ways to provide for retirement income needs.

First, there is an old age security program which provides public pensions for seniors and ensures all Canadians a basic income in retirement.

Second, there is the Canada pension plan, a national contributory pension plan, which provides working Canadians and their families with income support at retirement and in the event of disability or death. It is central to today's debate.

Third, there are tax assisted fully funded employer sponsored pension plans, RRSPs and other private savings, the private component of the system.

Most Canadians take our retirement income system for granted, but that was not always the case. In Canada, in the early years, taking care of older citizens and those with disabilities was primarily the responsibility of individual families. The introduction of income tax in 1917 allowed the federal government to adopt national social programs, such as Canada's first old age pension in 1927, which included a means test. Unemployment insurance, family allowances and a universal old age security program were introduced after the second world war.

Government Orders

There was also a need for a public pension, one that could be carried from job to job and, indeed, from province to province. The answer was the Canada pension plan, a compulsory earnings based national plan set up jointly by the federal and provincial governments in 1966 to which all working Canadians contribute.

The CPP provides all wage earners with retirement income and financial assistance to their families in the event of death or disability. Quebec administers its own complementary plan, the Quebec pension plan, QPP. The Canada pension plan was designed to complement, not replace, personal savings and employment pension plans and for 30 years it worked well. By the 1990s, however, the sustainability of the plan had become a concern.

The Chief Actuary of Canada predicted that the assets of the Canada pension plan, the equivalent of two years of benefits, would be depleted by 2015 and contribution rates would have to be increased to more than 14% by 2030.

The federal and provincial governments subsequently released a document entitled "An Information Paper for Consultations on the Canada Pension Plan", which outlined the challenges facing the plan in the coming years.

• (1020)

They followed up in February 1996 with the announcement of public consultations on the Canada pension plan. Guided by panels of federal, provincial and territorial elected representatives, extensive consultations were held in every province and territory. In joint hearings from coast to coast, governments heard from actuaries, pension experts, social planning groups, chambers of commerce, seniors' groups, youth organizations and from many interested individual Canadians.

A common theme that emerged was that Canadians wanted governments to preserve the Canada pension plan by strengthening its financing, improving its investment practices and moderating the growth costs of benefits.

Following these consultations, the federal and provincial governments in 1997 adopted a balanced approach to CPP reform so that the plan could meet the demand in the coming years when the baby boomers would be retiring. These changes included: a rapid increase in CPP contribution rates and a building up of a larger asset pool while baby boomers are still in the workforce, investing this fund in the markets at arm's length from government for the best possible rates of return, and slowing the growth costs of benefits. Altogether, these measures ensured that a contribution rate of 9.9% could be sufficient to maintain sustainability of the plan indefinitely.

A key part of the 1997 CPP reforms was a new market investment policy for the CPP. The Canada Pension Plan Investment Board, an independent professional investment board, was set up in 1998 to implement this market investment policy. The mandate of the CPP investment board is to invest for CPP contributors and beneficiaries and to maximize investment returns without undue risk of loss.

Until 1999, when the CPPIB began operations, the CPP's investment policy was for funds not immediately required to pay benefits to be invested in provincial government bonds at the federal government's interest rate. This represented an undiversified portfolio of securities and an interest rate subsidy to the provinces.

Since then, under the new policy, CPP funds that are not needed to pay benefits and expenses are transferred to the CPPIB and are prudently invested in a diversified portfolio of market securities in the best interests of contributors and beneficiaries.

The CPP investment board operates under investment rules similar to those of other pension plans in Canada, which require the prudent management of pension plan assets in the interests of plan contributors and beneficiaries and, like other pension plans, is subject to the foreign property rule. This market investment policy is consistent with the investment policies of most other pension plans in Canada, including the Ontario teachers' pension plan, the Ontario municipal employees' retirement system, OMERS, and the Quebec Caisse de dépôt.

Because the CPPIB is responsible for billions of dollars of retirement funds belonging to Canadians, it is imperative that the board be fully accountable to them. These funds must be managed prudently to the highest professional standards and at arm's length from governments, with qualified managers making investment decisions.

The CPPIB act was designed to ensure full transparency and accountability. Let me explain. To begin, the CPP investment board is accountable to CPP plan members and federal and provincial governments. It keeps Canadians well informed of its policies, operations and investments by: making its financial results and investment policies public; releasing quarterly financial reports; publishing an annual report that is tabled in parliament; holding regular public meetings in each participating province to allow for public discussion and input; and maintaining a very informative website.

• (1025)

A robust process with strong checks and balances that is in place for identifying and appointing CPPIB directors also assures full accountability of the CPPIB. Great care was taken in structuring the CPPIB to ensure that the board of directors is independent and accountable to CPP contributors and beneficiaries. Directors are appointed by the federal government following consultation with the ministers of finance in the participating provinces. The Minister of Finance also consults with provincial ministers of finance and with the board of directors on the appointment of the chair.

Based on specific criteria, directors are chosen from a list of qualified candidates recommended by a joint federal-provincial nominating committee, which comprises one representative from each of the nine participating provinces. In addition, in making appointments to the board of directors, consideration is given to ensuring that a sufficient number of directors have proven financial ability or relevant work experience to enable the CPPIB to carry out its objectives. As a result, the board includes individuals with business, financial and investment expertise.

Government Orders

I am pleased to say that the independence and the quality of the CPPIB board of directors have received strong support from the public and pension management experts. Independence from governments in making investment decisions is critical to the CPPIB's success and public confidence in the CPP investment policy. This is of utmost importance, because the money the CPP investment board invests today will be needed by the CPP to help pay the pensions of working Canadians who will begin retiring 20 years from now.

This brings me to the measures in Bill C-58. Bill C-58 proposes to transfer all assets remaining with the federal government to the CPPIB over a three year period. This includes a cash reserve and a large portfolio of mostly provincial government bonds. In other words, these changes would mean that all CPP assets would be managed by one independent professional organization.

These asset transfers would represent the final steps of the path established by the federal and provincial governments in 1997 to invest CPP assets in the market by an independent professional investment board. Consolidating all assets in one organization would also put the CPP on the same authority and footing as other major public pension plans, thereby providing fund managers with the flexibility to determine the best asset mix and investment strategies to manage risks and optimize returns.

This may sound theoretical, but I want to take a moment to point out that the analysis undertaken by the Chief Actuary of Canada indicates that CPP assets fully invested in the market would be expected to earn a greater return and thereby grow more rapidly. The benefit, as estimated by the chief actuary, is very significant, in the order of an additional \$75 billion over 50 years. Obviously this welcome result would add considerably to the soundness of the Canada pension plan and enhance Canadians' confidence in the their public pension plan. In addition, transferring the bonds to the CPP investment board over three years would provide a smooth transition for capital markets, provincial borrowing programs and the CPPIB.

Last, all changes in the CPP and CPPIB regulations require the approval of the provinces. I am happy to report that all provincial and territorial governments unanimously support these changes and let me emphasize that it is unanimous. Also, before new legislation comes into force, the provinces need to formally approve the changes. As I have stated more than once during my remarks, the bill essentially would complete the process the federal and provincial governments began in 1997 of investing CPP assets in the market by an independent professional investment board.

• (1030)

Let me reiterate a few of the other points I made earlier. First, as I have just stated, according to studies, investing CPP assets in the market will produce a very large benefit in the order of \$75 billion over 50 years for the Canada pension plan. Second, as I also indicated, phasing in the transfer of the assets over a three year period will help to ensure that the transfer is absorbed smoothly by capital markets, the CPPIB and provincial borrowing programs. Third, placing all CPP assets under the management of the CPPIB will allow the board to develop a more coherent investment policy for all CPP assets to enhance rates of return and better manage risks on the total portfolio, thereby helping to ensure the sustainability of

the CPP. This puts the CPP on the same footing as other public pension plans.

As hon. members know, the CPPIB is responsible for establishing and fully disclosing its investment policies and for investing CPP assets while properly minimizing risk. With the transfer of the assets to the CPPIB, Canadians can feel secure that prudent, sound investment diversification as well as increased performance will result. I should mention, too, that the transfer of the CPP assets to the CPPIB will have no impact on the Quebec pension plan, which is administered separately from the CPP.

In closing, may I remind the House that during the 1997 public consultations on CPP reform, Canadians told their governments to fix the CPP and to fix it right. As I noted at the beginning of my remarks, Canadians also told their governments to preserve the CPP by strengthening its financing, improving its investment practices and moderating the growth costs of benefits. The provincial and federal governments have completed their work and have complied with all these requests.

The establishment of the Canada pension plan in 1966 was one of the most important public policy initiatives ever undertaken in the country. The CPP reflects a national benefit that retirement for working Canadians should not be a time of hardship. It also captures the Canadian value of shared responsibility among contributors and governments to provide reliable support to wage earning Canadians after they cease active work.

Ours is a government with a conscience. Together with the 1997 reforms, the measures in the bill ensure that the Canada pension plan will remain on sound financial footing for future generations, to which I am sure all members can relate. Through Bill C-58 the government is well on the way to fulfilling its goal of making the retirement income system secure for all Canadians. Most certainly, Canada's success as a nation must be the security of its seniors and the protection of those at risk.

I urge hon. members to support the passage of this legislation without delay.

• (1035)

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am rising today to respond to government Bill C-58, an act to amend the Canada pension plan and the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board Act.

The bill's function as stated by the government is to achieve the following four goals: first, it would permit the transfer of money from the Canada pension plan account to the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board; second, it would permit the transfer of assets held by the finance minister to the account for technical reasons; third, it would apply to the Canada pension plan fund the 30% foreign content limit that applies to registered retirement savings plans and employer and union sponsored pension plans in Canada; and fourth, it would deal with assorted housekeeping and technical amendments.

Government Orders

Those are the stated goals of the bill. It has other goals in mind as well, but before I speak to them I will turn to the remarks made by the hon. government House leader with regard to the government's compliance with its obligations under subsection 115(2) of the Canada pension plan. The Canada pension plan says a report of the chief actuary is required when the House is proceeding forward with a bill dealing with the act. Subsection 115(2) states:

—the Chief Actuary shall, whenever any Bill is introduced in or presented to the House of Commons to amend this Act in a manner that would in the opinion of the Chief Actuary materially affect any of the estimates contained in the most recent report under this section made by the Chief Actuary, prepare, using the same actuarial assumptions and basis as were used in that report, a report setting forth the extent to which such Bill would, if enacted by Parliament, materially affect any of the estimates contained in that report.

Moreover, the report must be laid before the House of Commons by the Minister of Finance forthwith. Subsection 115(8) states:

Forthwith on the completion of any report under this section, the Chief Actuary shall transmit the report to the Minister of Finance, who shall cause the report to be laid before the House of Commons forthwith on its receipt if Parliament is then sitting, or if Parliament is not then sitting, on any of the first five days next thereafter that Parliament is sitting, and if at the time any report under this section is received by the Minister of Finance Parliament is then dissolved, the Minister of Finance shall forthwith cause a copy of the report to be published in the *Canada Gazette*.

This answers the question the government House leader raised as to whether he could submit such a report or whether a report could be submitted while the House of Commons was not sitting. It could be and should be. It is difficult to have an intelligent debate in this place on the bill when we lack the requisite actuarial data from the Chief Actuary of Canada to determine what the likely effects of the legislation would be.

This is no small matter. We are talking about amounts in the tens of billions of dollars. The speaking notes given out by the government indicate that the proposed changes in the legislation would shift the earnings of the fund by \$75 billion. That is not pocket change.

This is the result of a material effect on the fund. For those of us trying to come to an intelligent understanding of the legislation, the question arises as to whether the extra \$75 billion would allow the 9.9% contribution rate to the fund to fall. This would have a substantial impact on employment prospects for Canadians. A reduction in a job killing payroll tax would be tremendously beneficial.

On the other hand, would it mean the CPP would be unsustainable without the projected \$75 billion infusion of cash? If that is the case, what we are really discussing is how to avoid a financial calamity which would deprive many Canadian seniors and all of us of our anticipated pension benefits under the Canada pension plan.

● (1040)

We are discussing the issue in parliament without knowing which of these two situations is the case because we do not have the report of the chief actuary. While the government may not be infringing the law or the rules of the House by bringing forth the bill without having produced a report from the chief actuary, the rules of good governance are very much infringed.

Quite frankly, the bill is before the House at this time for the same reason a flurry of other bills have been rushed forward in the last few

weeks. About three weeks ago one of the newspapers, the *Globe and Mail* or the *National Post*, published a warning that we could expect a large number of bills to be rushed forward in every department to give the impression the government had something on its agenda while it floundered around trapped by internal controversy over its leadership. Bill C-58 is one result of the government's effort to create an impression of energy and activity or sound and fury signifying nothing.

I am not saying the bill is not an appropriate matter to be considered by the House. It is absolutely necessary that the House consider the bill in a timely fashion when the appropriate work has been done by the authorities delegated to carry out these tasks under the Canada pension plan. I am referring to the chief actuary with whom I have worked in the past and whose office does excellent work when given the chance to so do. I am also referring to the Minister of Finance.

The appropriate course of action would have been for the government to bring forward the bill in the autumn after a report had been done by the chief actuary and tabled in the House. I gather that this will happen prior to committee stage. However second reading of the bill is not being conducted in as informed and intelligent a manner as it should be. We are all the losers for that.

Again, we are not talking about pocket change. We are talking about \$75 billion. We are talking about the retirement money that would keep millions of people across the country living at the standard they have been promised. We are talking about money that would be taken off people's paycheques whether they wanted it to be or not, money that could not therefore be put in their RRSPs or used in manners that could allow them to build for their pensions.

When dealing with these vast amounts of money we should proceed with caution and care. We should never put forward legislation for the purpose of making the government look like it has something on its agenda or is more prepared to deal with affairs of state than it is. We could such achieve propaganda goals through less costly means.

I do not know if the text of the bill is substandard. It may be very well drafted. The legislative drafters may have worked closely with the experts. I do not know. I do not have the report to compare the text of the bill and go through that kind of analysis.

However ill prepared the bill may or may not be, from what we have seen of it the bill's general theme is part of a pattern of pension legislation under the government and more particularly the former minister of finance who was responsible for drafting the bill and all the government's prior bills dealing with pension reform. It is a consistent pattern in which the government has said the purpose of pension funds and moneys set aside for pensions is not solely to achieve the best possible return on investment and therefore the best pension income for Canadian seniors and the best security for all Canadians who will one day become senior citizens. It is rather to achieve other political and social goals, some of which may be very worthwhile.

Government Orders

All this will have the consequence of diverting attention from the solitary goal of producing the best possible return on investment and therefore the best level of retirement income for Canadian seniors and the millions of people coming down the pike who will retire, become seniors and depend on the Canada pension plan and various other plans in our pension system.

● (1045)

I will go through a few examples to make the point. There were three key points in the process of redefining the goals of our pension system under the former minister of finance, the hon. member for LaSalle—Émard. First, in 1994-95, early in his tenure, the minister of finance floated a series of trial balloons. Canada faced a tremendous potential shortfall in its ability to raise revenues. We faced enormous deficits. The minister of finance tried to determine whether he could find ways of clawing back revenue from registered retirement pension plans to put it into the hands of the government so it could be changed from tax exempt or tax deferred money into money that was taxable. This would have had dire consequences for those who depend on registered retirement savings plans to take care of their retirement.

In one example, an article in the *Financial Post* on December 31, 1994 suggested the government might try to place a capital tax on firms through which RRSP investments are made. RRSPs must be invested through a bank, trust company or some other financial institution. The idea was that the capital tax would be placed on these firms based on the invested amounts. It would have been presented as a tax on corporations. It would in fact have been a tax on RRSP capital.

The former finance minister floated another trial balloon in early December which did not work out well or meet with a positive reception. He proposed a 1% capital tax on amounts in RRSPs every year. This would have caused average Canadians to pay a total of \$4,141 extra in tax on their RRSPs over the lifetime of the RRSP, with no benefit at the end to reflect the cost. This would have reduced the amount average Canadians had to pay into their RRSPs. It would have reduced their benefits by 36% to give the government a small financial short term benefit as part of its attempt to pay down and eliminate the deficits.

A trial balloon which was successfully implemented was a proposal to raise from 69 to 71 the age at which individuals are forced to roll over their RRSPs into RRIFs. This has a significant impact on people who are still working at age 69 and can reasonably expect to live for many more years and require substantial retirement income.

Second, the attack focused on old age security. Many people have heard that the Canada pension plan has not been properly financed for the past couple of decades. The old age security system suffers from similar problems. The problems are not accounted for in quite the same way and are therefore not as visible and have not received as much publicity. However many billions of dollars of pension income have been promised which may not be deliverable by the federal government.

To deal with this the former finance minister came up with the idea of replacing old age security or OAS with something called the seniors benefit. Fortunately, such a hue and cry was raised by my

own party in opposition, the then reform party, and by seniors groups like the Canadian Association of Retired Persons that the bill was killed. The bill's goal was to raise the clawback, the marginal tax rate paid by senior citizens, on money they received through OAS.

● (1050)

Effectively, billions of dollars would be saved or captured by the government, of course captured in the form of reduced income for Canadian seniors. Moreover it would have had the impact of causing Canadians not yet in their senior years to say there is no point in setting aside money in their RRSPs because when they get to retirement age they can expect to see, depending on their income, as much as 90% of the money they put in taxed back by the government through its new hidden clawback disguised under the name of the seniors benefit. That was the second wing of the former finance minister's effort to change the purpose of our pension system from providing the best possible income for Canadian seniors and on to other government priorities like deficit reduction.

His third attempt was the changes to the Canada pension plan. That process was started in 1997 with an act that was passed by the minister raising the payroll tax significantly and creating the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board. The process is being completed today with the current legislation. I want to give some examples of the things that the new board's mandate will cause it to invest money on a basis other than producing the best possible return on investment.

In an article in the *Financial Post* on July 17, 2000 we read that a number of people were being appointed to the board, including some with excellent credentials, such as a past chairman of the Investment Dealers Association of Canada, John MacNaughton. The article praises that appointment but adds:

The investment board opens the door to demands that collective equity funds be used for collective equity goals—

Collective equity funds are funds in the Canada pension plan investment plan.

—to meet ethical criteria, stabilize the stock market or develop an industrial strategy. And if the politicians so desire, Mr. MacNaughton can be replaced.

No sooner had Mr. MacNaughton announced the board's splendid returns than the NDP finance critic was urging the finance minister to intervene in the board's decision making. He recommended it be instructed not to invest in companies that profit from human rights abuses or threats to health. Mr. Martin replied that Mr. Nystrom's concerns were to be taken "quite seriously". That is the beginning of a process we are going to see of CPP funds being restricted in how they can be used, being tapped for other uses and when necessary, individuals being appointed to the board who will be compliant in that process.

Another example has been on the former finance minister's mind for a long time. This is from the *Toronto Star* of January 26, 1990 dateline Halifax.

The Canada pension plan should be broken up, and its money used to set up regional funds to back promising businesses across the country, Liberal leadership candidate Paul Martin says.... Money now going to the Canada pension plan should be channelled into a chain of regional funds across the country.

The following is a direct quote from the former finance minister who was a Liberal leadership candidate then as now:

Take the savings of Atlantic Canadians, kick-start it with federal government money and allow the money to back Nova Scotia entrepreneurs who are going to create jobs, Mr. Martin told students.

●(1055)

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Speaker is a very knowledgeable parliamentarian and he will know that in the last minute or so the member has used the names of MPs as opposed to their ridings or their portfolio. He will know that is not acceptable parliamentary language.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair is not in a great position to pass judgment or rule on the intervention of the hon. member for Palliser but I would ask the co-operation of the hon. member for Lanark—Carleton if in fact the possibility someone might have been named instead of a riding. We are all familiar with the practices of the House and I am sure we will all want to abide by them.

Mr. Scott Reid: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Palliser for his insightful intervention.

Let me continue to give a number of citations from the former finance minister. The next one is from September 26, 1997. This is very important because it indicates the direction in which he and this legislation are planning to take this vast pool of hard earned Canadian money. I quote:

I have always been an apostle of the Caisse de dépôt and I think having a Canadian Caisse de dépôt to manage the savings of Canadians is very important.

That was stated by the former finance minister as he was setting up the board that we are now seeing put into place. The Caisse de dépôt et de placement in Quebec manages the Quebec pension plan. This is the model he is looking at. This is the model he has been leading up to in all these quotes.

What is the result of the use of this model? The result is poor returns on investment. The Caisse de dépôt et de placement has produced returns according to the chief actuary—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I am always hesitant at this time to interrupt members during their interventions but before we get to question period we have statements by members. I would like to proceed with them at this time.

I might add that the hon. member for Lanark—Carleton will have approximately 20 minutes remaining in his intervention.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

OTTAWA INTERNATIONAL AIR SHOW

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is the weekend for the Ottawa International Air Show.

There will be ground aircraft displays and flying displays by the Canadian forces Snowbirds and the United States air force Thunderbirds. The air show provides an opportunity for the pilots to display their skills and professionalism. The participation of the Thunderbirds is also a gesture of the international goodwill on the part of the United States.

S. O. 31

This weekend people will also see the Skyhawks parachute team, water bombing displays and many other flight demonstrations.

I encourage all citizens in and around the national capital region and elsewhere to enjoy this weekend's air show.

* * *

AFRICA

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, six million people are about to die in Zimbabwe as a direct result of the actions of President Robert Mugabe to cut off the food supply to everyone but his most rabid and violent supporters. In the Congo two million people have died over the control of diamond fields. A further two million have died in the Sudan.

In two weeks the G-8 leaders will meet to discuss Africa and the new partnership for African development. At the meeting the Prime Minister must put the NEPAD to the test. He must ask African and G-8 leaders if they are going to side with brutal dictatorships like Robert Mugabe or if they are going to side with the rights of innocent civilians. The Prime Minister must make it clear that we are only prepared to work with governments that adopt good governance and the rule of law and that we will not work with governments that act with brutality and corruption.

This month we have a chance to save millions of lives and stand against the forces of evil like President Robert Mugabe. The choice is ours. Let us not miss this golden opportunity.

* * *

●(1100)

SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Canadian Space Agency and MD Robotics of Brampton, Ontario for yet another Canadian accomplishment in space. This week the in orbit crew of the international space station and of the *Endeavour* space shuttle completed the installation of the Canadian made mobile base system on the station's rail system, with the help of Canadian astronauts Bob Thirsk and Steve MacLean both working at mission control in Houston.

The mobile base system which was developed by MD Robotics is touted as a complement to the Canadarm2 and will allow the arm and other maintenance and construction equipment to move along the entire station and to continue its assembly.

Thanks to developments such as these, Canada has acquired an enviable reputation in space robotics. I commend again the Canadian Space Agency and MD Robotics for this most recent feat of technology. I thank them for helping maintain Canada's reputation in this field.

S. O. 31

I wish the crew of the *Endeavour* a safe landing which is scheduled for next Monday.

* * *

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, economic development is vital to my riding of Malpeque with its mix of large and small communities. Community economic development is a priority of ACOA. The \$135 million strategic community investment fund is designed to help communities create an environment that encourages the development of strategic sectors.

In my riding alone, three projects will have a positive impact on the economic well-being of the communities of Cornwall, Kensington and North Rustico. The town of Cornwall will acquire a fire rated water supply to service its light industry. The town of Kensington will build a new industrial complex to encourage business investment in the area.

I am proud that the Government of Canada is investing over \$1.15 million from the strategic community investment fund. It will assist the long term prosperity of Prince Edward Island and the Atlantic area.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HIGHWAYS

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for some years I have been visiting the territory of Nunavik in Quebec, the land of our Inuit friends.

My fondest wish is to see a highway system in place which would enable us to start from Radisson on James Bay and travel to Kuujuarapik, Umiujaq, Inukjuak, Puvirmituq, Akulivik, Ivujivik, Salluit, Kangiqsujuaq, the Raglan mine, Quaqtaq, Kangirsuk, Aupaluk, Tasiujaq, Kuujuaq and Kangiqsualujuaq, then heading to the Brisay generating station, then finally reaching the James Bay highway to Matagami, Amos, Val-d'Or and southern Quebec.

The governments of Canada and Quebec need to take this magnificent project seriously, with a view to enhancing relations between the people of Nunavik and the people in the south of Quebec and of Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

CINTEC INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Cintec International is a winner at this year's prestigious Queen's Award for Innovation.

The company's North American headquarters is located in Nepean. The chief operating officer, Robert Lloyd-Rees, is justifiably proud of this recognition.

The Queen's award, by the way, is the highest honour that can be bestowed on a company.

The company specializes in bridge and building reinforcements using an anchor system which is installed entirely within the

structure leaving no visible change to the exterior. This process is ideal for historic buildings. Its services have been used interestingly at Rideau Hall and right here in our parliament buildings.

Congratulations to this innovative and now highly honoured company.

* * *

STRATFORD FESTIVAL

Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to pay tribute to the Stratford Festival in Stratford, Ontario.

As this renowned festival enters its 50th season, it is difficult to imagine that what we now recognize as one of Canada's premier cultural attractions began in a tent. Things have changed significantly in a half decade.

This season the Stratford Festival boasts four beautiful theatres carrying 15 plays. This morning it will officially celebrate the reopening of the historic Avon Theatre, the result of two years of extensive renovations. The Prime Minister is there to mark the occasion with the people of Stratford.

The success of the Stratford Festival is a testament to the vitality of the performing arts in Canada. Richard Monette, the festival's artistic director, said it best and I will leave the House with his words:

In our 50th season we celebrate not just a milestone of our history, but the enduring human impulse to create art and what that impulse represents: the continuing triumph of life and civilization.

* * *

● (1105)

[*Translation*]

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Madam Speaker, Pachtoun Hamid Karzai was yesterday elected president by the Loya Jirga, and will thus head the transition authority to govern Afghanistan for the next two years. The Loya Jirga is a traditional grand council, and has the task of redefining the political system of Afghanistan.

One of the surprise elements in this election was the candidacy of Massouda Jalal, the first woman candidate for the post of head of state in the history of Afghanistan.

The Bloc Québécois wishes to extend its warmest greetings and admiration to all of the delegates to the Loya Jirga, the people of Afghanistan and their new head of state.

This is an historic moment for Afghanistan; the international community has a duty to clearly demonstrate its support as the delegates to the Loya Jirga work to reach agreement on the way the transitional government will operate. In the words of the new head of state, "we must not let this opportunity slip by".

[English]

BARD ON THE BEACH

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday Vancouver's arts community will launch the 13th annual Bard on the Beach festival.

This open air Shakespeare festival takes place each year for 15 weeks on the waterfront against Vancouver's beautiful downtown skyline. It is considered one of the great successes of Canadian theatre.

The performances, often sold out in advance, include a wide range of Shakespeare's works including comedies and tragedies and much loved and lesser known plays. This year's program will open with *Twelfth Night* and *Henry V*.

This festival is a shining example of the talent and success of the Canadian arts community. I encourage anyone visiting Vancouver this summer to take part in this unique festival.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind the House that last September I brought to the attention of the minister responsible for employment insurance that department's inability to meet the service delivery standards it had promised in Kanata and other parts of eastern Ontario affected by the downturn in the high tech industry.

It is now eight months later and benefit delivery is still taking six to eight weeks, exactly what was happening before. The promise had been service delivery on benefits in 28 days. I know of nowhere in eastern Ontario where the service delivery standards are being met or are even seeing improvements in performance.

Yet the government demands immediate payment from taxpayers. Anyone who is late paying their taxes or program premiums for employment insurance can expect the swift imposition of interest charges and penalties.

It seems the government feels it can hold itself to a lesser standard than that which is expected of contributors to the very program from which it is now denying benefits. Canadians deserve more.

* * *

GOVERNORS GENERAL OF CANADA

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this weekend Governor General Adrienne Clarkson will celebrate 50 years of Canadian governors general with a concert at Rideau Hall. It was 50 years ago that the Right Hon. Vincent Massey became the first Canadian born governor general.

This concert is to celebrate the accomplishments of Canadians over the last 50 years. Twenty-five thousand people are expected for the concert called "Live From Rideau Hall". For two hours crowds will be thrilled by over 16 Canadian musical acts from across the musical spectrum, from Stompin' Tom Connors to the National Arts Centre orchestra.

S. O. 31

I encourage Canadians who will be in the national capital region this weekend to attend the concert and to celebrate the variety and excellence of Canadian artists.

* * *

[Translation]

LA SOIRÉE DU HOCKEY

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, francophone Canadians watched the last broadcast of *La Soirée du hockey* on the CBC's French television network.

It is now francophones who are in the penalty box, but they are there for an indeterminate period of time.

It is truly outrageous that a public corporation can no longer continue a quasi-cultural tradition that goes back 50 years.

In my riding, hundreds of homes will be deprived of an evening that had become a family ritual. With their low income, these families will never be able to afford cable and will be unable to continue to support their favourite team.

I urge the Minister of Canadian Heritage to step in to get this decision overturned and ensure that francophones will not be once again the big losers because of this decision.

* * *

● (1110)

WHARF MAINTENANCE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I never would have thought that a region of Quebec could be the object of such contempt on the part of the federal government.

Yesterday, the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord and Parliamentary Secretary for the Minister of Transport—a department whose negligence resulted in the Les Basques ferry season being put on hold—dared to say that workers and tourists would be able to take the ferries in Rivière-du-Loup and Rimouski, without showing any concern for the devastating impact on the regional economy of Les Basques and Les Escoumins of the Department of Transport's incompetence.

Yet, 52 municipalities in the riding of Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques warned the department, over a year ago, that the wharves would be dangerous if the minister did not have them repaired.

The federal government must accept the Quebec government proposal and transfer the wharves to the municipalities, pay for the repairs and let stakeholders clean up the mess created by Ottawa.

* * *

[English]

WAR VETERANS

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today more than 200 veterans from the province of New Brunswick will be honoured for their role in liberating the Dutch from Nazi occupation during World War II.

S. O. 31

In presentation ceremonies being held in Fredericton and Sussex, the Dutch government, with the assistance of the Royal Canadian Legion, will present these Canadian war heroes with a medal appropriately entitled the "Thank you Canada" medal. In an effort to present these medals to every Canadian who served in Holland, the Dutch government is planning five more ceremonies around New Brunswick before mid-July.

Canada has a long and proud military history. Whenever called upon, the Canadian forces has served with distinction, pride and honour. In 1945 thousands of Canadian soldiers fought for freedom from tyranny and today more than 50 years later the Dutch government is saying thanks to our Canadian veterans.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC): Mr. Speaker, the quality of our health care system is a top priority for Canadians. The system is subject to all sorts of pressures, not the least of which is the ability to get new drugs that are capable of saving lives to market.

Canadians are concerned about the government's lack of responsibility on a number of fronts. There has been no shortage of examples of late where we have seen the government spend money without having the necessary safeguards in place.

These two elements combined lead to a clear lack of responsibility when it comes time to approve new drugs.

More specifically, there is within Health Canada a complete review and approval process for drug registration so that these drugs can be marketed and made available to those who really need them. While the approval period is supposed to be 345 days, in fact, it is 714 days, one year more than in the United States.

We need answers. That is why the minister must table an annual report to parliament containing the number of drugs that were approved, the periods required for approval and explanations for any delays. This is a matter of health for all Canadians.

* * *

CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, June is Cardiovascular Disease Awareness Month.

Every year, some 50,000 Canadians die or suffer a severe disability as a result of this disease. Cardiovascular disease is the greatest cause of extended disability among adults and leads to close to 17,000 hospitalizations every year.

The direct annual cost related to cardiovascular disease is approximately \$2.7 billion, including hospital care, drugs, medical consultations and research. There are also enormous indirect costs, such as the loss of productivity due to death or short or long term disability.

We are proud of the work done by through the Canadian Stroke Network, and by others to encourage Canadians to adopt a healthier

lifestyle. All of us can, and should, call on all of society to invest in the prevention of cardiovascular disease.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, as the proceedings in the House wind down for the summer, many MPs will return home for a well deserved break from the daily grind in Ottawa. Although I am looking forward to the next few months in my riding, I dread witnessing the despair and loss of hope given the serious drought in my constituency.

Provost, Consort, Wainwright, Camrose, Stettler, Hanna, Drumheller and Oyen, as well as other parts of central Alberta have had no rain prompting many constituents like Kurt and Lynn Cole to write. They said:

—depression is written on people's faces as they are forced to sell their cattle and as they consider what they are going to do about their land that is drying and blowing away... intelligent hard working people simply cannot compete...there just is no release. As we sit and listen to you guys in parliament...our dear neighbour has taken his cattle that's been in his family for two generations to market.

For the sake of my constituents and all Canadian farmers, I beg the government to do something to restore hope and to address this serious and devastating situation.

The government should do more than flip a coin with the hopes of farmers: heads, government wins; tails, farmers lose.

* * *

● (1115)

[*Translation*]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a study done by the Pembina Institute for the Canadian Climate Action Network and released yesterday concluded, on the strength of several studies done throughout the world on the economic impact of the Kyoto protocol, that ratifying the protocol was certain to be cost-effective.

The research indicates that environmental pressure stimulates innovation, improves the competitiveness of businesses and encourages the development of several industrial sectors.

The study follows on the heels of a recent report by the David Suzuki Foundation, which concluded that ratifying the Kyoto protocol would produce net job gains and competitive advantages for Canada.

In the meantime, the federal government is refusing to ratify the protocol, is launching a new series of consultations, and is dragging its feet.

Let us remember that after the European Union ratified the protocol, Japan recently announced that it had done likewise. It is time for Canada to realize that signing the Kyoto protocol will have not just environmental benefits, but economic ones as well.

Oral Questions

I therefore urge the Prime Minister to keep his promise, to join forces with the coalition formed by the Bloc Québécois, and to ratify the Kyoto protocol as quickly as possible.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am sad to report we have another one of these ad scams again. This time it is Polygone. We will probably remember this one as Polygone, money gone. This time this crew was paid twice for a fishing show of which it only had one show.

I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works and Government Services this. Is this another one that will go to the RCMP?

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, all files with respect to Polygone projects are under review. On this allegation, which has to do with the potential of double payment for some advertising work, a preliminary inquiry, and I stress the word preliminary, shows that the work appears to be both separate and incremental. Nevertheless the review is ongoing as promised.

In addition, as I previously said, my predecessor already acted on this matter to eliminate such advertising as an eligible activity for the future under the sponsorship programs, and I have suspended all sponsorship activities with the firm.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are frankly sick of this ethical mess. Let us kind of review. What is the RCMP total now? One, Groupaction with missing reports; two, Communication Coffin; three, VIA Rail cheque delivered for Lafleur; four, street safety CD-Rom; and five, Polygone missing show.

How many RCMP investigations will it take before the minister recognizes the ethical mess that he is in?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the Prime Minister to deal with certain issues within Communication Canada and within Public Works Canada.

A variety of steps have been taken, including a departmental review by my department, a complete examination which will begin shortly by the auditor general, police references when there is any legal question that arises, an overall examination of governance issues and management framework issues by the treasury board and of course the work of the public accounts committee.

Action is moving forward on all fronts.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, literally every day another ad scam is revealed. Canadians will probably never know how many RCMP investigations have been

ordered but this is what they do know. They know that the government has smeared the ethical reputation of the country.

When will we get a public inquiry so that Canadians do not have to face this water torture of ad scam sleaze?

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, in the appropriate course of events it is important for public officials to do their jobs. In this case the auditor general will be conducting an examination across government having to do with all advertising sponsorships and polling. In the meantime, when there are any matters that require appropriate investigation by police authorities, the references to the police occur automatically.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is time for the minister to put an end to the corruption. The drip, drip, drip of ad scams is torturing taxpayers. He has tried valiantly to reassure us that he has the matter under control but the evidence mounts that it is not.

It is time to take a bold step. Will the minister convince us he is serious by ordering a government-wide freeze and get taxpayers out of this needless advertising racket entirely?

• (1120)

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the second day that I was minister in this portfolio, I indicated that there was a freeze on future sponsorship activities until I was in a position to examine the criteria for the programs and examine if all the projects were in compliance with those criteria. That review by me, which began immediately upon my taking office, has been proceeding.

In the meantime there have been representations from virtually every party in the House to find a means to restart the programs so the community organizations are not disadvantaged.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the sponsorship program has been exposed as a kickback scam. The Prime Minister blames the bureaucrats. The officials blame the minister. The auditor general blames everyone, and the number of RCMP investigations keeps mounting. Canadians deserve better.

At some point there will be a public inquiry into all this. Why will the minister not admit that it is necessary and set one up right now?

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, my job is to identify where errors have been made in the past and to ensure that those errors are not repeated in the future. Accordingly a whole series of activities have been undertaken, as I have outlined to the House over and over again.

Oral Questions

What I am encouraged about is not the harangue that comes from the opposition, but the daily comments that I have received from Canadians from coast to coast to coast saying that this file is being properly handled.

[Translation]

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in Winnipeg recently, the Prime Minister admitted that several million dollars might perhaps have been stolen in the sponsorship scandal. Last evening the PM attempted to minimize the situation by stating that a few mistakes have been made.

How can the Prime Minister pass off so lightly all the scandals that are piling up, when the taxpayers' money is being pillaged and handed out to the cronies of the Liberal regime?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's treatment of this matter has been anything but light. He has indicated in this House and publicly that where there are mistakes in administration, they will be corrected; where there are overpayments, they will be recovered; and if there is any trace of illegal activity, that will be investigated and prosecuted. That is not light treatment.

[Translation]

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government's strategy is to protect itself by making light of what went on or by referring the cases to the RCMP one by one.

However, what the public has figured out is that the government is trying at all costs to avoid having to explain what really went on.

Does the Minister of Public Works and Government Services understand, as the scandals pile up, that the least the government can do is to cast light on all of this by referring the sponsorship program to an independent and public inquiry?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again I fail to see how referring matters to the RCMP is trivializing the subject matter. We are investigating the situation internally from a departmental point of view. We are pursuing our obligations with respect to the auditor general. Police inquiries are underway. The treasury board is doing its job with respect to governance and management, and of course the public accounts committee is doing its job too. On all fronts this matter is being properly pursued.

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wonder when the minister is going to realize that the population needs a government with a moral stand.

Once again yesterday, new cases were reported by CBC and there will be more to follow next week.

Why will the minister not admit that, at the stage we are at now, it is absolutely imperative that there be a public inquiry, that one must be ordered and set up immediately?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that have been explained in the House before, there are a number of investigations and inquiries already fully underway.

My department is examining all those files between the period of 1997 to 2000 yet again. The Prime Minister has charged the President of the Treasury Board to review the governance and management framework. That work is underway.

The auditor general has indicated that she will conduct a government wide audit with respect to all advertising sponsorships completely independently. Of course there is also the work of the police where that is necessary.

• (1125)

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the real problem is that the entire strategy put in place by the Prime Minister prior to the 2000 election was a cover-up, so that the system could continue to function as it has from the start.

Now that the government has had the lid taken off its strategy, is it not time for a public inquiry, an honest one this time, to be set up in order to bring right out into the open the buddy system that holds this party together?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the year 2000, at the instigation of the former deputy minister of public works, the government conducted a solid internal audit with respect to the sponsorships program to identify where the procedural and documentation errors were within that particular program.

Since that time an action plan has been taken to address the errors and mistakes of the past. That action plan was implemented on a step by step basis and a further verification this spring indicated that corrective action had been taken.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after announcing that he will delay the release of the DND ombudsman report, the defence minister announced that the report of the investigation of the so-called friendly fire deaths of Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan will not be available until the Americans say so.

A report made by Canadians for Canadians should be released when it is ready. Why is the minister withholding information from the families of the soldiers killed until the Americans give their okay?

Oral Questions

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are in constant touch with the families but the issue here is really a no brainer. We do not know for sure but it is possible that the Americans will want to take disciplinary action against one or more individuals. We also know that if we release our report in advance it might jeopardize the Americans' ability to go after the individuals who caused the death our soldiers. Is that what the opposition wants?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister is saying the first thing that comes into his head. He would have us believe that a report produced by Canada, for Canadians, would impede the course of American justice. This is ridiculous.

Why is the minister refusing to release the report? Can the government guarantee that the Americans will not see the Canadian report before it is becomes public in Canada?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reports are completely independent. There is no question of the Americans influencing our report. None at all.

As I have just explained, we do not wish to jeopardize the Americans' ability to take disciplinary action against certain individuals.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, last night the Prime Minister offered some partial predictions about what he called the rest of his mandate.

In the rest of that mandate how many more millions of dollars does the Prime Minister expect will be stolen in the sponsorship and advertising programs? How many more ministers does he expect to have to put in witness protection programs in Denmark or elsewhere? How many more public servants will be advised by their lawyers not to testify when parliament is seeking the truth?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the language used by the right hon. member in this case. He is a man of great experience. He has smeared an entire government and a Prime Minister who has served this country with distinction for eight years.

We have led this country through difficult times. The Prime Minister has been there. He has been one whose integrity cannot be impugned.

The right hon. member should withdraw those comments and withdraw them right now.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, this government smears itself day after day.

The government gave Groupe Polygone \$330,000 for a sports show that never took place. Now CBC reports that the government paid Polygone twice to place ads in a magazine Polygone owns.

The minister of public works said last week that he would use every means available to force Polygone to repay money it received improperly. Would he consider asking his colleague, the minister of

immigration and former vice-president of Polygone to go to his former employers and ask them to pay the public's money back?

• (1130)

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the methodology suggested by the right hon. gentleman is obviously not appropriate.

I have indicated to the House that I intend to get to the bottom of these matters and to pursue all legal means available to the Government of Canada. Those means are likely to be more effective than that suggested by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ran Quail, the former deputy minister at public works, said yesterday at the public accounts committee that the \$40 million spent every year on the sponsorship program was not on the radar screen and did not pop up as a problem area. It was too small for him.

Forty million dollars may not matter to the Liberal government but it sure matters to hard working Canadians who have squeezed till they squeak to come up with the cash.

My question for the minister of public works. How many millions of taxpayer dollars have to be wasted, lost, funnelled to loyal Liberals and so on before it shows up on his radar screen?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if one were to do a very simplistic analysis it would appear that the sponsorship programs represents less than half a percentage point of the business transacted in my portfolio.

However, whether it is large or small, regardless of the size, it demands the highest standards of transparency, accountability and value for money. That is my responsibility and I intend to deliver on that responsibility.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, as the minister said, the highest amount of integrity, accountability and so on.

We heard testimony yesterday at the public accounts committee that these people may even have received a raise while they were breaking every rule in the book.

Can anyone imagine that by breaking every rule in the book they get a raise and performance bonuses for doing that?

Does the minister agree that there is something rotten in his department if he hands out raises to his staff who break every rule in the book?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously serious errors have been made with respect to the sponsorship program. Those were first revealed through an internal audit that was conducted by my department. Corrective actions were begun in the year 2001. They have accelerated through the year 2002. These problems are serious, they must be corrected and I am determined to find the answers that will satisfy Canadians.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after the example of Groupe Polygone, we could give another example of this marvellous system of related companies billing each other.

Media IDA Vision was responsible for authorizing payments made to its sister company in Groupe Everest.

The latter pocketed a commission of 12% for the daily management of the sponsorship, and could also hand out subcontracts to related companies, while taking an additional 17.65% commission.

Since Media IDA Vision was already being paid 3% to defend the interests of its client, the government—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry but the question has exceeded the time allowed. The hon. Minister of Public Works and Government Services.

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think I know the direction in which the hon. gentleman was heading with his question.

There are two basic answers. I have already indicated that for work of this nature I do not like the commission system and that I will in future be developing a system that will allow this kind of a program to function without the intervention of outside agents.

With respect to the combined ownership, my predecessor already took action to deal with that.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in boxing terms, we could say that the minister was saved by the bell. But the question remains.

Since Media IDA Vision was already being paid 3% to defend the interests of its client, the government, what would make anyone think that it could effectively defend the government's interests and, at the same time, authorize payments to its sister company in Everest?

That is really helping yourself.

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status

Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again I would say that my predecessor took steps to begin addressing this issue of joint ownership among companies.

The real solution for the future lies in what I have said to the House on many occasions, beginning on, I think, the very first day I was in this portfolio, which is that we need to develop a delivery mechanism for the sponsorship program that does not use outside agencies.

* * *

• (1135)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government has massive governance difficulties. It has a tendency toward secrecy. It has a centralized power structure. It has questionable accountability practices. It has an enthusiasm for rewarding friends.

Today Canadians will be subjected to the humourous spectacle of the government telling aboriginal leaders how they should govern.

We acknowledge that there are challenges for first nations governments, and so do first nations leaders, but this government has failed for a decade to get its own house in order.

I ask the government: Is this not a great example of “Do as I say, not as I do?”

Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it just shows how weak the Alliance is. It has not even read the bill and yet it has already passed judgment.

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I think that shows how weak the government is.

The vast majority of Canada's first nations leaders share the Canadian Alliance concerns about improving governance. They have taken specific steps and real measures to improve governance. Yet the Liberals showed absolutely no respect whatsoever for democratically elected aboriginal leaders in its so-called consultations that led to this act.

The Canadian Alliance wants to work in partnership with aboriginal leaders. We want to build on a foundation of mutual respect. Why did the government choose to disrespect—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure you recall Nisga'a as well as I do, where we spent almost two days voting on frivolous amendments by the Alliance Party. I do not think this party and this government has to take any lessons from that party over there.

Dealing with aboriginal rights and improving the quality of life of the aboriginal people is exactly what the government intends to do.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, over the past two years, the vast majority of senior managers at the Department of Public Works and Government Services have received performance bonuses. Yet, the 2000 internal audit report contained devastating conclusions about the incompetence of managers and irregularities in the sponsorship program.

Will the Minister of Public Works and Government Services explain to us the exact criteria that are used for these bonuses?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously in connection with the sponsorship program some very serious mistakes were made. The government started the process of identifying those mistakes in the year 2000 with an internal audit that was ordered by the deputy minister of public works.

Ever since that time corrective action has been taken to further identify the problems and to make sure they do not happen again.

My mandate is to make sure the issues are resolved and that the program functions on a proper basis that respects the public trust.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister is talking about mistakes when there are criminal investigations underway in some of the cases. My supplementary question for him is about the performance bonuses.

Given the devastating conclusions in the 2000 report and the fact that the problems are far from being solved, can the minister assure us that those in charge of the program, including Pierre Tremblay, did not receive bonuses for 2000-2001 and subsequently?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all appropriate studies and inquiries are underway, both internally and externally, by my department, by treasury board, by the auditor general, by the police where appropriate and even by the public accounts committee of the House.

Canadians can be assured that this matter will be thoroughly ventilated.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, is it not strange that in the very same week the Prime Minister announces his new, nine years in the making, ethics package he also announces plans to force first nations to govern more ethically?

Aboriginal Canadians do not have guaranteed voting rights, mandatory access to information and equal protection under the secrecy act.

Would the Prime Minister set aside the spin and the buzzwords and answer a simple question? Does this legislation guarantee aboriginal people the right to vote in band elections?

Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the member waits for another 20 minutes or so he will get his answer.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I thought the minister might have an idea what it contained by this point in the day.

The Canadian Alliance and aboriginal people are concerned about poverty, health care, crime and economic development issues. An aboriginal single mom with three young children to feed has higher priorities than bureaucratic downloading.

Why has the government failed to address these fundamental issues, tinkering with perception and ignoring the real problems?

Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that over the last eight and a half years that the government has been in power the department of Indian affairs and the programs that go to first nations citizens have never been cut. They have always been increased because we recognize the importance of building on that particular initiative of quality of life for first nations citizens.

* * *

● (1140)

[Translation]

MUNICIPALITIES

Ms. Hélène Scherrer (Louis-Hébert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of discussions recently on the future of municipalities and the fact that the Government of Canada was not paying much attention to them.

Given that cities represent the vitality of our country, will the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister tell the House what the government plans on doing to assist municipalities?

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Infrastructure and Crown Corporations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question.

[English]

While the opposition simply continues to throw mud, the government is breaking ground. We have had three major infrastructure programs since elected totalling over \$6 billion: strategic highway investments, \$600 million; affordable housing, \$680 million; money for homeless, \$752 million; cultural spaces Canada, \$80 million; and green municipal investments, \$250 million. Are we helping cities? You bet we are.

*Oral Questions***ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first nations people from across Canada are gathering in Ottawa today because they want positive and progressive changes to their lives and their communities and oppose the minister's heavy-handed first nations governance initiative that has proven to be so divisive.

In light of this widespread opposition, why will the minister not agree to delay the tabling of this governance act and instead take the summer to repair the considerable damage his "my way or the highway" approach has created?

Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am confident that once the leadership of first nations and the citizens and the NDP get a chance to read the bill they will see that the improvements we are making are good for people in Canada.

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 13 months ago this Indian affairs minister promised that his department's consultative process on this initiative would reach every aboriginal person in Canada.

It has proven to be 99% wrong in the province of Manitoba, where only 1% of the aboriginal population in that province has participated.

What assurances could the minister give today to skeptical first nations people and ourselves that this top down initiative will in no way jeopardize the current framework agreement?

Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): First, Mr. Speaker, some 3% of first nations citizens who wanted to participate in consultations did. If we factor that into something like health care across Canada, that would work out to a million people who would participate in consultations on health care. I think that is a lot of people participating in consultation.

Having said that, let me say that there are also going to be consultations in the second phase when the bill is introduced, as it will go to committee before second reading. I think that will give aboriginal people an opportunity to make input and give us their suggestions on improving the bill. That is a good process.

* * *

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of heritage.

The Acadian village of Beaubassin was established in 1650 and then burned down in 1750. The English then established a village and a fort on a nearby site. Recently the exact site of Beaubassin was confirmed, including 40 foundations of the original Acadian village.

A local historical society requires financial assistance to acquire and protect this valuable piece of property that reflects English, French and our native history. Does the government, in principle, support the preservation of this property and will it help financially?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the hon. member for his question. In fact, he has been very active on this file. As he knows, it is a file that

we certainly support in principle and we want to work with him on to see come to fruition.

I would like to point out in the context of this file that the direct expenditures of the Government of Canada for culture in communities across the country have gone up by 20% over the last three years. I think it is really important that we respond to the communities, not just in the capital cities across the country, but communities wherever they are.

I want to congratulate the Beaubassin historical society for its incredible initiative in this area.

* * *

● (1145)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, a report today says that one-third of the missions of a Sea King helicopter in the Arabian Sea were cancelled due to mechanical breakdowns.

The defence minister has said "Because of their age, they do need more maintenance than otherwise". It sounds like he is talking about the Prime Minister, not helicopters.

Why is the government replacing 20 year old low maintenance jets for the high maintenance sultan of Shawinigan and sending 40 year old broken down helicopters into active duty in the war against terrorism?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly true that older helicopters need more maintenance than younger helicopters.

This maintenance, however, is being carried out with the result that safety is not an issue. In my short time at defence I know the culture of the place is such that safety always comes first. We are working actively as we speak to get these new helicopters ordered as soon as possible, but it is a complicated process.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Pope & Talbot company has been running successful sawmills in B.C. for 30 years. Between 1996 and 2001, the trade minister unfairly and consistently downsized its softwood lumber export quotas. The only remedy available to the company was under NAFTA chapter 11. The NAFTA judgment was scathing about government actions and awarded the company \$700,000.

Since the NAFTA ruling, the company has expressed ongoing concern about harassment. When is the minister going to stop this vindictive behaviour?

Mr. Pat O'Brien (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the award to Pope & Talbot was a very small percentage of the money it had asked for. The reality is that the government has taken the appropriate action in this case. Considering that this was a very small percentage of the award that was asked for by Pope & Talbot, I think the judgment speaks for itself.

Oral Questions

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that is poor logic. It is not the cost; it is what this government did.

When it comes to the U.S. farm bill, the government is not keeping its promise to farmers to launch a WTO-NAFTA challenge, but when it comes to maintaining confidentiality of the minister's harassment and intimidation of a B.C. sawmiller, the government is prepared to launch appeals ad nauseam.

When will the minister stop harassing a good corporate citizen?

Mr. Pat O'Brien (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course that is a silly comment for the hon. member to make.

The reality is that the government will take whatever action it considers necessary to protect the interests of the softwood lumber industry, as he refers to that, and if he is talking about the U.S. farm bill, we are prepared to work with our Cairns partners. Just as soon as there is the slightest opening that this farm bill may contravene the WTO obligations of the United States, the government will act.

* * *

[Translation]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok said that the government knew 11 months before the official announcement by Noranda that Murdochville's smelter, Mines Gaspé, would shut down.

The federal government did not even deign to pass this information on to the Quebec government or to the mayor of Murdochville.

Does the secretary of state for regional development not find it unacceptable and irresponsible that the government should keep to itself information that was critical to the fate of a whole town, since this resulted in missed opportunities to preserve the future—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. secretary of state.

Hon. Claude Drouin (Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it must be remembered that following the closure of the mine, in 1999, there were already rumours that the smelter might shut down.

In view of this, we took action and we have since invested \$500,000 to help Murdochville's recovery.

We created a \$35 million special program for the Gaspé and we set up a regional branch in the region with a staff of 13 to help Murdochville's recovery.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok knew 11 months ago what would happen.

Therefore, does the minister not agree that this way of doing things is irresponsible and that the federal government does not care about the development of the Gaspé?

Hon. Claude Drouin (Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, through all the actions that we have taken and that we are continuing to take, we are working on developing potential projects to help Murdochville's recovery. We will continue to do so, and we on this side of the House care about this issue. Instead of criticizing, members opposite should propose initiatives to help Murdochville's recovery.

* * *

• (1150)

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister for International Trade said:

We have been working with many countries around the world that precisely object to the U.S. farm bill...We will continue to work with our partners to see whether the farm bill in its present shape respects the WTO obligations.

The reality is that so far the government has accomplished nothing. There is no action plan. There is no analysis. There is no strategy. The government has known the details of the U.S. farm bill for months.

It has the slightest opening, as the parliamentary secretary just mentioned. How long will it take for the government to make up its mind on whether it is going to challenge the U.S. at the WTO and NAFTA?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is extremely short on knowledge of what has happened.

The farm bill was just put in place a very few weeks ago. The United States has not even yet notified the WTO on how it is going to apply the farm bill. The analysis is taking place on the potential, the ways in which they are so doing. They have not yet put in place the implementation and we certainly cannot take people to court or take them to the WTO until they have taken an action on which we can base that appeal.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Canadian farmers and western Canadians in particular are used to being flipped off by these Liberals. First, one of their prime ministers flipped western Canadians the bird, and now the Prime Minister wants to flip a coin to decide agricultural funding.

Grain producers are sick and tired of being treated with absolutely no respect by the government. They do not deserve to pay the price for a cabinet meltdown.

When will the government begin to deal seriously with its own agricultural and trade failures?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will give an example to the hon. member on how the federal government supports agriculture, for example in the province of Saskatchewan. Last year the federal government invested in agriculture in Saskatchewan moneys equivalent to 33% of the gross domestic agricultural product in that province. The provincial government invested 13%.

Oral Questions

The federal government invested two and a half times more in the agricultural industry in the province of Saskatchewan than his own province did. That shows where the federal government is.

* * *

ETHICS

Mrs. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Ajax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 11 the government released its ethics and integrity package.

Could the government House leader tell Canadians what actions have been taken to begin implementation of the measures announced by the Prime Minister?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since the release of the Prime Minister's excellent ethics and integrity package, with which we are all familiar, notice of a motion for the creation of a special committee has been put on the order of the House.

Consultations have been taking place between other political parties in order to establish a code of conduct for parliamentarians. We are looking forward to all party co-operation. I have also written to all House leaders seeking their views on measures touching electoral financing and political parties.

Finally, I intend to consult during the summer months with academics, provincial ethics counsellors and others so that we can be fully ready with the implementation—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Crowfoot.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, CSIS failed to locate and identify Ahmed Ressam. Now we learn that it erased more than 200 tapes of intercepted conversations of Air India bombing suspect Talwinder Singh Parmar.

For the solicitor general, how can Canadians feel safe given the numerous breaches in security and the repeated errors by CSIS?

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that CSIS and the RCMP work very, very hard in this country to ensure that these matters are well in hand.

We on this side of the House continue to support them in these very important areas.

I would suggest that the opposition do likewise.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we know that CSIS and the RCMP work hard. The problem is with this government and the level of resources it has made to them with the drastic cutbacks. CSIS and RCMP are starved for resources. The paltry dollars that have been allocated to CSIS and to the RCMP are simply not enough to effectively staff our police and intelligence forces.

I ask the acting prime minister, when will adequate dollars be allocated so that Canada can effectively fight the war on terrorism?

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we need not take any

lessons from the opposition over there in terms of CSIS and the RCMP. We have added additional tools and additional resources, millions and millions of dollars, to CSIS and the RCMP, so that they can effectively carry on their work. That is precisely what Canadians expect of them.

I suggest that the opposition should applaud CSIS and should applaud the RCMP and make sure that they too support what is in the best interests of Canada. It is time for the opposition to stand up for Canada for a change.

* * *

● (1155)

[Translation]

GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT

Mr. Marcel Gagnon (Champlain, BQ): Mr. Speaker, every day numerous scandals break that prove that the government is pillaging public funds for the benefit of its cronies. In the meantime, the most disadvantaged of our seniors have been deprived, over the past eight years, of \$3.2 billion in guaranteed income supplement payments.

Does the minister intend to set this right by giving these seniors full retroactivity? Do we have to go through Polygone to get our money?

[English]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister of public works has laid out his decisive action plan to deal with the matters that have been raised by the House. If there are administrative problems, they will be corrected. If there are overpayments, they will be recovered. If there are legal questions, they will be referred to the appropriate authorities.

* * *

[Translation]

BIOTECHNOLOGY

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week the Bio 2002 International Conference & Exhibition was held in Toronto. Canada is one of many countries with a strong biotechnology industry and we are engaged in significant research. We need to retain our competitive edge, however.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health inform the House on the steps the government is taking to ensure that Canada retains a lead role in biotechnology R and D?

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is very much aware of the importance of research. It is committed to ensuring that talented researchers have the resources and training they need.

This is why the Minister of Health announced earlier this week \$88 million in funding to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research to train Canada's future health and biotechnology researchers.

Oral Questions

I believe that this investment will help consolidate Canada's position in the biotechnology industry as the second largest in the world, a position which should be a source of pride to us all.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the inescapable optics are that a delayed ombudsman report could be edited and co-authored by the minister and possibly even the Prime Minister. By delaying the report, the minister is playing hide and seek with our military and with our public's confidence.

The report's integrity and transparency are seriously at risk. Will the ombudsman report be released now, before parliament rises for the summer and before public confidence in the report's integrity has expired?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the notion that I would amend a report is utter nonsense. As I explained yesterday, I simply wanted time to read it. I have instructed my department to indicate the actions it is taking to deal with these matters. I will have a report from the department on Monday. My plan is to table the report in the House on Tuesday of next week, before the House rises, unless the opposition changes its mind.

* * *

[Translation]

SHIPPING

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the drop in shipping traffic on the St. Lawrence River is worrying shipowners and their clients. The shipping industry has come up with a proposal for a long term agreement with the coast guard regarding service fees.

Why is the government not responding seriously to the shipping industry's proposal, in order to encourage Quebec's regional economic development?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all of the fees will be examined by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and myself. The situation facing the industry on the St. Lawrence River is very serious.

I would like to assure the hon. member that the government is concerned about the situation and that we will act.

* * *

[English]

FISHERIES

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans released a unanimous report outlining its concerns and offering recommendations on foreign overfishing off the 200 mile limit of the Flemish Cap and the nose and tail of the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. Instead of waiting for a response from the government, the fisheries minister, in such a flippant

manner, completely disregarded the report and even admitted that he had not read the report.

My question for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is this. Why would he so blatantly and in such a callous manner disregard the report when he has not even read it?

• (1200)

Hon. Robert Thibault (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the members of the fisheries committee for the outstanding job that they continually do. I have nothing but the greatest of respect for chairman of the committee, the member for Malpeque, and even the member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore.

I have not responded to the committee's report yet. I will in due course and in full fashion. However I did state to the press my position and the government's position on the unilateral imposition of custodial management, the same position that I have outlined in the House many times and when it was even of interest to the member of the Conservative Party during the byelections in Newfoundland.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, what a flippant, dismissive minister we have there. My question is for the Minister of National Defence. There has been a continuing stream of evidence and inquiry into depleted uranium exposure suffered by soldiers who served in the gulf and various peacekeeping missions abroad.

Captain Terry Riordon's official cause of death was recorded as gulf war syndrome. Other men, like Leading Seaman Perry Holloway, and their spouses continue to struggle daily with the symptoms of a system that frustrates and fails to treat them.

Will the Minister of National Defence and DVA please address this tragic situation and guarantee coverage of all the costs of bone biopsies and treatment for the presence of depleted uranium for exposed Canadian soldiers?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will definitely look into this case today and get back to the member. In general however, as I said earlier today, it is deeply embedded in the culture of the military to put the safety of its fighting forces first.

Over the past several years, under the influence of my predecessor, the human condition of the armed forces was his top priority. As a consequence we have put large additional resources into taking care of our military and treating stress disorders.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[English]***FIRST NATIONS GOVERNANCE ACT**

Hon. Robert Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-61, an act respecting leadership selection, administration and accountability of Indian bands, and to make related amendments to other acts.

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

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the government could give us some indication when in fact the bill will be brought back for second reading?

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, that information was made part of the business statement I made yesterday. I am sure the hon. member listened to it very carefully. In the unlikely event that he is not familiar with it, the bill will be called for reference to committee before second reading on Monday.

* * *

*[Translation]***COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE****HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

Mrs. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Ajax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

[English]

The report is entitled “Promoting Equality in the Federal Jurisdiction: A Review of the Employment Equity Act”.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members of the committee for their work on this report and to commend the many witnesses that appeared before us. I would also like to say special thanks to our clerk, Danielle Bélisle and to our researchers, Kevin Kerr and Bill Young for their tireless efforts on our behalf. We could not have done it without them.

● (1205)

*[Translation]***FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 22nd report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee is tabling this report, entitled “Strengthening Canada's Economic Links with the Americas”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, your committee requests that the government provide a comprehensive response within 150 days of the tabling of this report in the House of Commons.

[English]

I also want to thank all our witnesses and the committee members from all parties who worked very diligently on this report. In particular I want to thank the clerk, Mike MacPherson, as well as the

very capable research team, Peter Berg, Michael Holden and Jay Sinha.

*[Translation]***OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the standing orders, I have the pleasure to table in the House, in both official languages, the 12th report of the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages entitled “The Justice System and Official Language Communities”.

We too ask that the government provide a response within the 150 day period.

I would like to thank our researchers. I say researchers, in the plural, because there were two of them. This was the last report for Ms. Françoise Coulombe, as she is retiring. We are deeply grateful to her for her work.

We would also like to welcome Mr. Marion Ménard, for whom this was his first report, as they worked together. We appreciate their work.

*[English]***AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD**

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I move that the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food presented on Tuesday, June 11, be concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to talk about the report which has been submitted by the agricultural committee. We did a lot of work on this. It was tabled on June 11. First, I would like to thank the staff members who travelled with us and who spent so much time working with us, particularly our researchers J.D. and Suzanne for their work on this report and with our committee.

Last fall we talked in committee about travelling across Canada to hear what Canadian producers had to say about agriculture. We decided that we would hear from as many people as we possibly could. There was some pressure on us to hear only farm organizations but some of us insisted, and the committee agreed, that we hear from as many producers as possible so we could get as wide a spectrum of information on what was going on in the agricultural part of Canada.

I thank the chairman for supporting that suggestion. We heard a lot of witnesses. In western Canada we heard over 100 witnesses in a two day span and what we heard was very interesting. We travelled across the country from Springside to Kamloops, from Brandon to Grand Bend, from Miramichi to Vulcan, Alberta. Presentations were made on virtually every agricultural issue. We heard from people involved in 4-H. We also heard from fruit growers, organic farmers, cattlemen, processors and young people who were trying to get into farming.

Routine Proceedings

When we decided to put this project together and pursue it, I questioned whether we would listen to what people had to say. I have been very skeptical over the years of a lot of the work that has been done in government. A lot of the committees have travelled around and supposedly conferred and consulted with people but then it seems like nothing gets done, or worse, the committee has not listened to the people.

I was happy that early on committee members decided that they would report what they heard from the farmers and producers across Canada. We decided that we would make an effort to keep this report from becoming biased so it would have no relevance to agricultural producers. Overall I think the report has very good balance to it. I guess none of us agree totally with all the recommendations of the report but there are some very good ones. Because there were no minority reports submitted, I would suggest that we have a good report here and one which the government should look at seriously and implement as much as possible. It is important that we express the interests of farmers whether we agree with them or not.

I have laid out some excellent recommendations. As I have said, we did not agree with all of them but farmers made it very clear to us that there were a number of things they wanted. I will spend a few minutes talking about those. First, I want to take a few minutes to talk about the recommendation we think is the most important and which would have the biggest and most positive impact in western Canada, the area from where I come.

Recommendation 14 of the report reads:

Whereas additional on-farm activities and local value-added processing are an excellent way to give farmers more influence in pricing, the Committee recommends that the board of directors of the Canadian Wheat Board authorize, on a trial basis, a free market for the sale of wheat and barley, and that it report to this Committee on the subject.

The majority of farmers in western Canada have wanted this for a long time. From our perspective and from the perspective of others, including the Canadian Wheat Board, none of the other recommendations are as far reaching in consequences as is recommendation 14, and that is absolutely true, because it has the potential to do a lot of positive things for western Canada, things that have not happened for decades.

Recommendation 14 is a tremendous breakthrough in a number of ways. The Alliance has had the position for years that we need a voluntary market to give our farmers some extra opportunities. I was excited to see that the members from the other party, with the exception of one member to be fair, were on side as well. Everyone agreed with this and we think the recommendation is a good one.

We support this recommendation because so many producers have asked us for the opportunity to market their own grains in western Canada. They told us that there were a couple of reasons why they wanted to do this. One was they wanted to be treated equally across Canada. I will talk a little later about some of the differences between Ontario, Quebec and western Canada. However we clearly heard in western Canada and in Ontario that producers wanted to be treated fairly and that they were not afraid of what would happen if they were treated fairly.

●(1210)

A second opportunity that the implementation of recommendation 14 would bring is that it would give people the opportunity to sell into niche markets. A number of farmers have been in contact with me. I have lived beside them and talked to them. They really want to pursue some identity preserve sales.

They would like to make contracts with companies and even other countries where they would grow small lots of grains and then sell container loads or a few carloads. A group of farmers could perhaps go together and make the deal to sell these identity preserves, these special grains, and receive an advantage from the market by doing that.

Right now the entire system prevents that from happening or discourages it from happening. Farmers are becoming impatient with that because they want to do that. They have already developed a lot of the contacts but are not allowed to carry through with the process.

People would like a fair and uninterrupted opportunity to begin to process their own products. We still grow more wheat on the prairies even though the percentage of it is going down because of our marketing system. We grow more wheat than any other product. Farmers have constantly told us that they would like an opportunity to value add to that and to do something with that.

I found it interesting when we met with a Chinese agriculture delegation about a month ago. The head of the delegation was the chair of the agriculture committee from China. One of the things he indicated was that they were going to take their land out of low value production and put it into crops that they can begin to value add to. He suggested that they were going to buy cheap raw bulk product from somewhere else. They were willing to do that.

It was fascinating to me that the Chinese have now moved ahead of western Canadians in terms of what they are going to do with their land. They insist that they value add to it. I am told that in 1995, for example, the Chinese had absolutely no processing capabilities for soybeans in their country. By last year they processed 14 million tonnes of soybeans in China. They have made an extensive commitment to benefit their economy by doing that.

In western Canada there has often been an illusion that China would be a threat to us if we were able to market our own grain. One of the highlights for me on this whole trip was being able to talk to the Ontario wheat board directors about how they have set up the operation in Ontario. They are excited about it. They have six marketing choices within that board.

One of them is direct marketing where they are allowed to sell a certain percentage of the total production of wheat into the market. It is 20% of the total production in Ontario. The farmers themselves voted to raise that to 30% and they told me they expect it will be 100% within the next few years. The 20% is on a first-come, first-served basis. They can book a certain number of tonnes if they want and then sell it into the market. Farmers are required to use up the exemption they have. If they do not, they have to return it to the board.

Routine Proceedings

They seem to be happy with that. They are excited about the opportunities and also excited about the processing opportunities that are developing in their areas and rural constituencies. The producers themselves in Ontario have voted, and are actually allowed to vote, to move toward more freedom in their marketing. That is something that has prevented the western Canadian producers so far.

It was also interesting to hear Quebec producers talk about their opportunity to sell and export their wheat without interference. The wheat board tells us there is a requirement for Quebec farmers to get licences from the wheat board. In talking to people there is no evidence that is taking place or being enforced.

The questions that farmers are asking are: Do we want our communities to grow? Do we want to have a chance to succeed? Many people tell me they are tired of the agriculture community continually going back to the government asking for funding again and again. We must be able to give farmers an opportunity to move away from having to do that.

I was looking in one of the local newspapers which had a special article called "Forty years ago". There was a picture of an MP who was going to Ottawa to ask for money for agriculture funding. This has gone on long enough. There is another way. We do not have to keep going down the road we have been on for so long.

There are a number of other exemptions that are given out. The wheat board gives exemptions for things like kamut for some of the organic products. There are exemptions in the Creston area of B.C. There are exemptions from the wheat board's application in Ontario, British Columbia, Quebec.

●(1215)

To the credit of government members they listened and saw this was an important opportunity for western Canada. They were probably under a lot of pressure because the minister responsible for the wheat board seems to be absolutely uninterested in changing. He is not willing to change the wheat board. That is the position he has taken.

Members of the committee heard farmers consistently say they wanted some choice and they saw this as an important opportunity. I must thank the members of the committee for having the courage to talk to producers of all stripes and then support this recommendation. Others in the government have not been this visionary or willing to accept the word of the people when they have heard them say that.

There is an easy way to implement recommendation 14. The Canadian Wheat Board gives no cost buy backs regularly. It gives them to Ontario and Quebec farmers. It can do it with a stroke of a pen. It would be simple for them to give Western Canadian farmers no cost buy back licences that other producers in the country receive. We could set that up and have the trial basis that is called for in the recommendation.

Farmers must have some options and more opportunities. The government's farm program will not be a solution. We hear different sets of numbers being used but it becomes evident that the additional money will not be enough to make a major difference in western Canada. It is starting to look like this new APF is more of a public relations program than it is an agriculture policy.

There is a lot of PR involved. The consultation process was highly advertised but was a total disaster. The government talked about consulting with people but it has not chosen to do that. The different parts of the agriculture plan seem to be bringing in a lot more bureaucracy, regulation and cost to farmers rather than helping them out.

There were other good recommendations in the report as well. I would like to speak to some of them. One called for all programs to be available to all farmers. The committee had some discussion about that but we felt it was only fair.

Another recommendation suggested that there could be some improvements to the NISA program. We need to have some improvements there. It is seen by most witnesses as a good program and one that should be expanded. We called for stronger government involvement in it in terms of funding and more flexibility for farmers who want to be able to access the program.

I have always thought that the crop insurance program is one that we could make a cornerstone of our agricultural policy. The committee called upon it to be more flexible and effective with increased funding to give it more realistic coverage.

Recommendation number two called for the establishment of a new disaster fund that could grow, but would be capped at \$1 billion. It would accommodate the natural disasters that we see coming up every so often, such as drought and flooding. Flooding in Manitoba occurs regularly and would be the type of emergency that would be applicable to this disaster fund.

The committee had a number of recommendations calling for tax incentives to help rural development through value added processing and tax incentives to aid biofuels and renewable fuels. Tax incentives were recommended for agri-tourism, which is a popular, growing industry that needs to be developed.

Tax incentives were recommended for inter-generational transfers. We heard a number of times how important it is that we set things up so that the next generation can move into farming and do it successfully. We heard about the need for some tax incentives for co-operatives, allowing them to capitalize more efficiently and also for co-operative and other corporate structures that farmers would use on their farms.

We called for adequate infrastructure spending, especially for roads. That is an issue in my home province. A number of people in my area have said that if the government would just give them the road structure they need they could develop the economy. They could be successful if they had the infrastructure the government could provide.

The committee called for a number of areas for regulatory protection. These include protecting access to producer cars, which are important in western Canada. They include setting organic standards with industry. The government needs to set one standard for organic products. We need clearer transparency in our international trade agreements so that we can have a little more efficiency in them and the government can be more effective in dealing with these trade agreements and trade disputes.

Routine Proceedings

•(1220)

There was a call, and we heard this regularly, that we need more control over the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. It established a serious presence on the prairies setting up a number of science centres. We have biologists all over the place and they are taking their work too seriously in that they began to interfere with RMs. They have been extending their influence to even things like irrigation ditches. There needs to be some more regulatory control over the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

We called for regulations to deal with the ongoing concerns regarding the Pest Management Regulatory Agency, things like the appointment of an ombudsman, a performance audit, funding for a research and analysis program similar to the United States to approve minor use products and to co-ordinate our activities with the United States.

There was a call for compensation for farmers. We had a lot of debate the other day over Bill C-5 about the compensation in the species at risk bill. The Alliance has taken a strong position that the call for compensation needed to be directly in the legislation. The government chose to say that it would give us the regulations that at some point may give us compensation of some sort. That is not good enough.

The agriculture committee called for compensation to farmers for any kind of environmental measures that are affecting agriculture. The Alliance continues to take the position that the compensation needs to be at fair market value. That is only fair to the people who are being affected by these measures.

We called for some funding to agriculture education and training, particularly to universities, veterinary colleges and faculties of veterinary medicine. We heard that they have been underfunded and are having trouble keeping their accreditation so that they will be able to work with the United States, and work on a continental basis in terms of animal safety. That is important to them so we have called for an increase in funding to allow them to keep their accreditation.

We called for funding on public education on foods, farm safety programs and education for farmers about environmental farm programs which in parts of the country have now become a reality. In other parts of the country people want nothing to do with them. We called for compensation of fair and reasonable amounts. The Canadian Alliance would call that market value.

One of our recommendations called for funding for trade injury damage, for trade subsidization penalties. We would like \$1.3 billion committed to that. That is a figure that the farm organizations have used fairly often. The unfortunate thing is that the government is messing this up. It has not consulted properly and does not seem to be getting much co-operation.

We have provincial governments that are furious at some of the agriculture organizations. The agriculture organizations perhaps have been making agreements or decisions apart from consulting some of the people with whom they should be working. It is another example of the federal government's policy regarding agriculture where it tries to divide and conquer, to split up the organizations and

provinces so they are never on the same page and it allows the government to get out of fulfilling its responsibilities.

The government is now heading toward putting all of the farm programs into one package so the disaster relief, safety net programs and trade dispute money seems to be all going into one package. We suggested that is not appropriate because the U.S. farm bill has been passed and targets farmers specifically. There needs to be a trade injury package that deals with that situation. The government will not get away with throwing all that money into one package and then trying to pretend that it is new money.

The estimates for this year are actually \$670 million less in safety net funding than was spent last year. The bureaucrats told us that it was because we spend some in estimates and some in supplementaries. The reality is that when the numbers are added the totals that are projected right now are \$670 million less than the government spent last year on the safety net funding. We are pointing out to people that the first \$700 million of new money that would be going into agriculture brings the funding up to last year's levels.

I am not so sure that the agriculture policy framework is not on its way to a wreck. I mentioned before that there will be a lot more regulations on farmers. There is more bureaucracy and the government is trying to get out of supporting farmers with that program.

I want to return to recommendation 14. I want to talk about some of the consequences of opening up the wheat board and the positive things that could happen.

My office over the last few months, and the young lady who is working for me as an intern for the summer, has done a lot of work in the last couple of months on this project. We went to Saskatchewan with a survey. We set three primary goals in our survey. The first was to provide a precise analysis of the value added crop processors in our part of the world. We interviewed a number of the specialty crop processors to find out what kind of economic benefits they bring to their communities.

•(1225)

We went through the current wheat board and flour milling capacity situation in western Canada. We tried to estimate how well the specialty crop producers were doing in Saskatchewan and extrapolated that to determine if we could do the same things with wheat, what the results would be in western Canada. We surveyed specialty crop processors and looked at the current processing and wheat milling that exists in western Canada. Then we tried to look at the potential, what could really happen in western Canada.

Routine Proceedings

We found that we could have an impact of up to \$1 billion in Saskatchewan if the wheat processing was opened up to allow local communities to do their work. If the same number of communities put up processing plants as there are now in specialty crops, the benefit to western Canada would be in the neighbourhood of \$1 billion plus.

I was very disturbed at the wheat board's reaction in the press release it put out. It could have looked at this positively. Canadian farmers have told us consistently that 60% to 80% of western Canadian farmers want to open up the Canadian Wheat Board. They want to have some options.

Earlier on the wheat board was looking at this. It seems to have retrenched which is unfortunate.

I look forward to the government taking the initiative on this issue. It has been nine years now that it has shown no movement on it. I would love to see the government take the initiative on this recommendation, move forward, give western Canadian farmers the opportunity to do some niche market selling, to do some value added, and bring prosperity to our dying communities. It would give western Canadian farmers the same opportunity that eastern Canadian farmers have had. It would give them the same opportunity to have that type of success.

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am really not surprised by the member's comments especially with regard to recommendation 14.

The Canadian Alliance in its policy and the member opposite have been trying to undermine the ability of the Canadian Wheat Board to do its job ever since they came to the House.

The member said that for nine years the government has done nothing in terms of the Canadian Wheat Board. He said that 60% to 80% of farmers want changes to the wheat board. Those facts are wrong.

When I was a member of the agriculture committee the committee held extensive hearings on the Canadian Wheat Board. We established an elected board of directors made up of farmers in which they would be given management and governance authority. It is up to the board of directors made up of farmers to decide what it wants to do about the Canadian Wheat Board's future. It is not the place for the committee to be making those recommendations.

I know there are opponents trying to undermine the board. We knew this would happen when we passed the legislation. They wanted to weaken the board at that time.

We put in place a board of directors in which farmers would have the opportunity to elect their own to that board of directors, which they did. Of course pro wheat board people were elected. Even the open market people when they were elected to the board recognized the value of the board and became strongly in support of it. Now they are trying to find sneaky ways to undermine it further through the recommendation of the committee.

I have a couple of questions to ask the member in this regard. The recommendation states:

—that the board of directors of the Canadian Wheat Board authorize, on a trial basis, a free market for the sale of wheat and barley, and that it report to this committee on that subject.

Could the hon. member tell me how long this trial basis would be? Can he assure me that when it is proven, as it will be, that the open market returns less to the primary producers than does the Canadian Wheat Board, that he will then commit his party's support for the Canadian Wheat Board? Will he ensure that once the trial basis is given up, his party will come fully on side and support the Canadian Wheat Board in terms of its marketing initiatives?

I am a strong supporter of orderly marketing of which the Canadian Wheat Board is and I am a strong supporter of supply management. The hon. member did not speak about his position on supply management. Basically he is asking for a trial basis which will ensure the Canadian Wheat Board is done away with over time.

There is no such thing as dual marketing when it comes to open market and single desk selling. We cannot have both.

Is that party really in effect not asking for the same thing when it comes to supply management that we do that on a trial basis as well?

● (1230)

Mr. David Anderson: Madam Speaker, as we know the member has taken a position over the years. It has been interesting. He lives in eastern Canada. He was the head of one of the left wing farm groups a number of years ago. He was only too happy to try to keep western Canadians under the thumb of the Canadian Wheat Board—

Mr. Wayne Easter: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, we have been travelling across western Canada for many years—

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

Mr. David Anderson: Madam Speaker, that is an example of the dictatorial attitude that we find so often.

We went out to western Canada and we talked to farmers. In fact 60% to 80% of the farmers do support change. The wheat board did its own survey which it would not release when it found out that over 60% of the farmers wanted some change. That was leaked.

The member can go to the Canadian Federation of Independent Business surveys if he likes, where it was found that 80% of the farmers wanted some choice in marketing their grain.

It is interesting. I am not sure why 20% to 30% of the farmers should hold the other 70% captive. That is the situation right now in western Canada.

The member mentioned the board. It is true that there is a board to which some are elected and some are appointed. We have a great concern when just a couple of weeks ago up to 10 employees and directors of the board were spending money to go to a government fundraiser. They paid \$400 a plate to go to a fundraiser. They said it was to meet with some Liberal members. It is interesting that none of those members are on the agriculture committee. They have not been on the agriculture committee since I have been here. The wheat board has had very good access to the agriculture committee. In fact it was just here to see us in the last couple of weeks. That just does not hold.

Routine Proceedings

We cannot have western Canadian farmers being held captive by a politically active board. When members of the board were here the last time we were told that they would be moving more and more into political activity. They feel that lobbying and moving into those areas is important for the Canadian Wheat Board.

We are saying that the Canadian Wheat Board is supposed to be marketing grain. It is moving into a ton of other areas. It does not have the authority to do that. The board does not have the mandate to do that. It is supposed to be marketing grain.

As the share of grain that it markets has continued to drop, it has moved into a number of other areas but the costs of running it has not gone down. The farmers are getting a consistently poorer deal. There is less grain being sold. We are not getting a premium for it. The cost of running that board continues to rise.

In spite of the fact that the member opposite may like the Canadian Wheat Board, that is irrelevant because Canadian farmers are telling us that they want some choice. The vast majority of western Canadian farmers are saying that.

● (1235)

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Cypress Hills—Grasslands for his hard work on the agriculture committee and also for serving as the wheat board critic.

We recognize the concerns of Canadians, western Canadians, rural Canadians, especially in my riding where there is a huge drought.

There are individuals in my riding who believe in the principle of freedom, the freedom to market their grain and the freedom to sell to whomever they would choose. There are a number of my constituents who may be facing shackles and may be willing to pay the price because of the freedom that they believe in.

In Alberta a very select number of people have been brought into Edmonton to speak about the Kyoto accord, not the openness and transparency that the government had promised, not the consulting of the public that the government had promised, not the grassroots individuals coming forward that the government had promised.

On the other hand, with the agriculture committee, was it that same kind of consultation? Did it meet with the public? If it did indeed meet with the public across western Canada, why then would the government try to hold back and suppress the very report that a true consultative process undertook?

Why is it the government is so afraid to give people and western Canadians the right to their livelihood and the right to market the grain as they would see fit?

Mr. David Anderson: Madam Speaker, there were a couple of issues contained in my colleague's question.

I mentioned earlier that I was skeptical about this whole process at the beginning because I have seen committees go across the country. One went out last summer to western Canada and no one heard about it. It claimed to have some authority with the Prime Minister. That committee came out with such vague recommendations that there is really nothing we can do with them other than get a good fuzzy feeling about them.

Our committee listened to people. In a two day stretch in western Canada we heard from over 100 witnesses. We heard witnesses from one end of the country to the other. The committee has done an honest job in putting forward its recommendations and suggestions from farmers. If members of the government and those with other political philosophies want to prevent the implementation of these recommendations, then I guess they will go ahead and do that.

This is part of an ongoing attitude that we saw when a number of government departments, national revenue, justice, the wheat board and the RCMP got together and began raiding western Canadian farms. One gentleman was locked up for seven months and strip searched in jail seven times because he tried to get his wheat across the border. That is unacceptable.

Western Canadian farmers are mature enough to market their own grain, to process their own grain and to receive some of the benefits that Ontario and Quebec producers enjoy. Ontario producers told us they were excited about the new processing opportunities they have had since direct marketing became one of the options available to producers in eastern Canada.

Last year Canada imported \$150 million worth of pasta. Whose durum is that pasta made from? That of western Canadian farmers. The durum is shipped out, it is processed, the pasta is shipped back in and we pay top dollar for it. We need to do that here.

● (1240)

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I was hoping I would get the opportunity to raise another question but the member for Crowfoot said that my first one was so bad why would I get the opportunity to ask another.

I will say that in his loaded question to his colleague from Cypress Hills—Grasslands he talked about the issue of freedom and freedom of choice. The party over on the other side, the Canadian Alliance, always talks about law and order.

With respect to the individual that the member for Crowfoot talked about, he was arrested of course because he broke the laws of the land. We cannot have it both ways. When we have a law, we have a law. The laws are decided for the majority of the people. The law was broken and of course the legal authorities had to act.

I want to talk a fair bit about the report but I also want to get into recommendation 14. However, before I do that, the member opposite basically suggested that I do not have the right to speak on western agricultural issues. I refute that allegation.

Just for the record, I spent 17 years in the farm movement, 11 of them as president of the National Farmers Union with its head office in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. There is hardly a community in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Peace River block that I have not been in. I have fought over the issues of grain transportation and marketing for most of my life. I continually keep in contact with western farmers. I am disgusted with what the Canadian Alliance members bring forward as if they are representing western Canadian agricultural interests. They are not representing the majority.

Routine Proceedings

The other thing I should point out has to do with the hon. member's remarks about the board of directors of the Canadian Wheat Board being here for what he called lobbying. Do farm leaders elected to a board of directors give up the right to come in and talk to the minister of agriculture and leaders of the country in terms of the interests of the industry they are supposed to represent? I hope not. I am sure the member opposite is not saying that the grain companies should not come in here to lobby and try to undermine the Canadian Wheat Board. He certainly would not be applying the same principles to them. He tries to let on that it is a principled party over there.

I want to now deal with recommendation 14. I am not a member of the agricultural committee but I wish I had been on the agricultural committee when this particular recommendation had come forward because I would have fought tooth and nail against it. I cannot understand how the Canadian Alliance, in bed with the big merchants of grain and the grain companies, in its ability to give greater profits to the grain companies and less profits to farmers, managed to bamboozle the members of that agricultural committee into accepting this kind of recommendation.

The recommendation is worded "on a trial basis, a free market". What a myth. Once we let the genie out of the bottle it is out of the bottle forever. The Canadian Wheat Board would be virtually destroyed.

The Canadian Alliance members have found another way. They have been talking for years about the fact that we need a dual marketing system and choice. When farmers strongly support the Canadian Wheat Board as a single desk selling agency they do so on the basis that they know a single seller in the marketplace can maximize returns back to primary producers.

• (1245)

It is difficult in these kinds of times when the European community, the United States and others, through subsidies and through export enhancement programs, are driving the price of grain down. When the price of grain is driven down then there are less returns for farmers.

The party opposite and the opponents of the Canadian Wheat Board try to make it look as though it is the Canadian Wheat Board's fault. It is not the Canadian Wheat Board's fault. The Canadian Wheat Board is able to maximize what is in the marketplace but it is not able to turn the marketplace on its head.

Let me make a couple of important points about the Canadian Wheat Board. I am glad we are having this debate today because I, for one, as a member of parliament and as a former farm leader, will be arguing strenuously with the government to absolutely reject recommendation 14 of this report. It destroys the Canadian Wheat Board marketing agency that farmers support.

Earlier in a question to the member, I said that we had a standing committee on agriculture in the first term of the government which I sat on. We held hearings about the Canadian Wheat Board across western Canada. We compromised and decided to put in place a board of directors that would be elected by the farmers in the country so they could determine their destiny and have the authority over the management and the governance of that particular board.

The farmers should be determining their own destiny. However, because those members over there are in bed with the grain companies, they are trying to undermine the ability of the elected farmers of western Canada to do their job. Those members are trying to confuse the issue. They are trying to undermine the ability of the Canadian Wheat Board's duly elected board of directors to do their job. That is sad. I thought they believed in some democracy but I guess I was wrong.

In his remarks the member opposite did talk about the Ontario Wheat Marketing Board. Yes, the Ontario Wheat Marketing Board does have greater flexibility but it has no real authority as a single desk seller. It does not have the authority to maximize returns to primary producers. The farmers who would give up the Canadian Wheat Board to move to an Ontario Wheat Marketing Board type would be able to enjoy greater flexibility, yes, and for the satisfaction of being able to do that they would enjoy lower returns.

I want to see farmers receive higher returns. I sat on the Prime Minister's task force on agriculture, which I will talk a little bit about in a moment, but what farmers really need out there is income.

This recommendation, supported and fostered by the Canadian Alliance, would undermine that. It would lower the returns for farmers. I cannot understand that kind of thinking.

The Canadian Wheat Board decided to do a benchmark study. This has been in dispute by opponents to the wheat board for a number of years. When there is an open market out there and there is a single desk selling agency it is difficult to determine what the best prices are.

The Canadian Wheat Board decided, which it has done in the past as well, to do what it called a benchmark study to try to determine the value the single desk marketing systems adds for farmers. It is interesting that the member opposite never spoke about that.

In 2000-01 the board initiated a process to help determine the value of the monopoly for wheat producers. The board focused the process initially on the wheat pool itself. The board hired Dr. Richard Gray, an economist and professor of agriculture economics at the University of Saskatchewan. He developed the methodology, et cetera.

• (1250)

The board had it audited. I do not want to spend a lot of time on this point but the important point is how financially valuable the Canadian Wheat Board was in the year 2000-01 to primary producers, to wheat growers. The benchmark showed that the value added by the current single desk system in western Canada was \$160 million.

Routine Proceedings

What does recommendation 14 really mean? We have a committee and a party talking about increasing income and using other programs to increase income because farmers direly need the money and they came up with a recommendation that will take \$160 million out of farmers' pockets and give it to the grain companies? I do not think that is helping primary producers one bit, not at all. They should be ashamed of themselves for coming up with that kind of a recommendation.

They talked about flexibility. As I mentioned a moment ago, there is no evidence at all that the flexibility granted to the Ontario Wheat Marketing Board has increased prices. No studies have been done. However, as I said earlier, there is an opening here for the grain companies, those that do not give a hoot about primary producers' income, to use parties like the Canadian Alliance to subtly undermine the Canadian Wheat Board by saying to some of the primary producers that prices are low and they should blame it on the wheat board.

The real problem, and everyone knows it, is the international grain subsidies, the United States farm bill and the common agricultural policy in Europe. That is what they should be trying to address rather than destroying an institution that assists farmers in maximizing returns that are in the international marketplace.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: If it is so great get Ontario to join.

Mr. Wayne Easter: Is the member saying that we should extend the Canadian Wheat Board to all of Canada? I am in favour of that. If he wants to make a motion to that effect in the House I will welcome it because other farmers in the country need the opportunities the Canadian Wheat Board can give them.

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Order, please. Colleagues, I know it is Friday, but it is very hard for the Chair to hear the speaker when everyone is talking at the same time.

Mr. Wayne Easter: Madam Speaker, I would appreciate a two minute warning when I get that far.

This is indeed a very serious issue. I spent so much time on recommendation 14 because of the seriousness and subtlety of it and, I think, the ingenuity of the grain trade to find a way through the Canadian Alliance to undermine grain farmers, especially wheat and barley producers, to find another way in which to lower their incomes to the advantage of the grain companies. It is sad indeed, and I am saddened that some members on our side also supported that recommendation. I do not know how they got the wool pulled over their eyes, but they did.

However, the advantage is that western Canadian grain growers can now see directly how far the Canadian Alliance Party will go in terms of misrepresenting their interests and undermining their ability to have decent incomes. It is all smoke and mirrors from the Canadian Alliance Party most of the time.

The rest of the report, to a great extent, is very good. It is too bad that this one recommendation, which is against the farm community, is undermining the report as a whole.

Recommendation 3 states that Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada establish a permanent compensation fund capped at \$1 billion. This

would form a contingency fund to provide farmers registered for crop insurance with full compensation covering the loss of the estimated gross revenue. The annual minimum contribution would be \$500 million, subject to a ceiling of \$1 billion.

That is an extremely important recommendation, because we talk to farmers in western Canada, we look at the newscasts these days and we have heard for years about the problems of drought and the problems of flooding in some cases. Farmers are the staple of this country. Maybe I should give the facts, because all too often Canadians do not realize how important farmers are to the foundation of the country. It is too bad that Canadians do not want to pay them decent prices for the food they produce. The industry is in serious trouble and we should not hide those facts.

The census showed that employment in agriculture is down 26% since 1998. That is the largest decline in 35 years. We have also seen in the last three years the largest decline in practising primary producers themselves. Although farm income is up, it is up only slightly. It was up to \$2.6 billion in the year 2000 and that is a fraction of the high of \$11.1 billion that was in place in 1975.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: It discourages the value added.

Mr. Wayne Easter: The member opposite is trying to say that the problem is the wheat board. That is the kind of game they have been playing. It is misrepresentation of the facts. I would recommend that the member opposite read the Gray report and understand that the position members over there are taking is going to take \$160 million out of western farmers' pockets, and they claim to represent them? Come on, give me a break.

The other fact is that realized net farm income is at a low of \$13,700. Neither you, Madam Speaker, nor any member of the House would want to live on \$13,700. Why should farmers in this country be asked to live on that kind of low income? There are ways and means. One of the good ways and means of increasing that income would be to deal with the international trade wars that are going on right now, to negotiate through WTO and to get the kinds of arrangements in place so that we would not have these ridiculous subsidies.

• (1255)

Another one of the ways would be to strengthen supply management even more. I hope the member will move a motion to this effect to extend the Canadian Wheat Board to all of Canada. Canadian farmers are responsible for a great percentage of the GDP in this country. We need to accept most of the recommendations in this report. We need to maintain the current safety net program. We need to keep in place the freeze on cost recovery. We need to share the costs with the consumers for food safety and environmental protection. We need to have targeted assistance for organic farmers. We need to strengthen the ability of organic farmers in terms of research and development and assistance for the marketing of their products. Where we can, we need to be using centres of excellence to improve the research in the country.

Routine Proceedings

There are a number of other good recommendations. The report states that we should invest more in the road system in western Canada. Definitely we should. I have fought this issue in the west. The railways basically said let us do away with those branch lines, let us get rid of them and we will go to bigger, high throughput elevators. What have they done? The roads have been worn down to the point where people think they are on a roller coaster on western Canada's roads. Did the railways return any of that increased profit they made as a result of farmers hauling longer distances? Of course not, but I expect those members likely supported that too.

Agriculture training is talked about in the report. That is of high importance. Advances in technology are important. The agricultural industry is one of the most technological in the world.

● (1300)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): On questions and comments, the hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, that was an interesting, anti-democratic, incredible rant. The member's name is on the report, by the way, but he says that the 32 recommendations are good because he agrees with them. He says the committee did a good job on 32 recommendations but that the one he personally disagrees with is terrible. I wonder if anyone in the House or out in TV land can see that there is quite an inconsistency there.

He is anti-democratic in a number of ways. He is mad at us for listening to the farmers. We went to western Canada and heard from the farmers. He is mad at his colleagues because they listened to farmers. It was not the Canadian Alliance that pushed through this report. We agreed with what we heard from the farmers. This recommendation happens to be consistent with our policy, but to be fair to the members on his own side, they were willing to listen to the farmers and put in the recommendations that farmers asked for.

I thought it was interesting when he said that they even had to compromise when he was on the committee. He called it a compromise. They had to compromise in order to put in even a partially elected board. I would not call that a compromise unless someone did not want to do that in the first place and I do not think he should be talking to us about democracy.

I brought up the point about the Ontario wheat board. As a matter of interest, because the Canadian Wheat Board news release said that Ontario farmers get a lot less money than western Canadian farmers, I went to the wheat board website to check the PROIs, their predicted returns on investment. I checked them against the cash prices that the Ontario board was getting and there was no difference in those prices. For some of them Ontario's are higher and for others western Canada's are a little higher, but there is no benefit that we can see from the great Canadian Wheat Board in terms of returns to farmers.

That brings me to the benchmark study. The member talks about it as though it is gospel, the scripture for western Canada. In reality that study is very suspect in a number of areas. The criteria that the gentleman used, and which I suspect the wheat board suggested he use, puts the wheat board in a positive light in virtually every one of them while it puts the Americans in a negative light. The benchmark study is set up and they are going to try to use it in years from now as

what they will call their benchmark, but the thing was not done fairly or at least evenly anyways.

I am also surprised that at the beginning he talked about how people should be arrested. Of course we do not have problems with people being held accountable for the law, but a number of gentlemen took a load of wheat across the border and some of them spent up to seven months in jail being strip-searched in prison cells. A number of others have been harassed. There was a trial the other day, which the member for Crowfoot mentioned. Years later these people are still being harassed by the Canadian Wheat Board, the justice system and others. I do not think that is a fair response to someone taking a load of grain across the border.

I would like to ask the member a question about pasta production. I am a producer in western Canada and have been for a long time. One of the reasons we need choice is that when I grow a crop such as grain and I want to do something with it, I have absolutely no choice but to sell it to the Canadian Wheat Board. I turn over the grain to the wheat board and it sells it back to me at a higher price. It never leaves my bin. It stays in the bin, but I am obligated to go to the wheat board. I am obligated to sell that grain at a higher price and then buy it back at what is commonly called the buyback price.

That buyback price has consistently taken the profits out of western Canadian farmers being able to process their grain. There were a number of major projects that would have gone ahead in western Canada if they could have even had the buyback removed on their own grain in their own projects, but that was not allowed. We consistently hear from small millers and people who are trying to start processing that the biggest impediment to business development in rural Saskatchewan in terms of wheat processing is the Canadian Wheat Board and its buyback process. I suggested during my speech that an easy way to give people a free market trial is to give them no cost buyback licences, which are given out to Ontario and Quebec farmers all the time. All we need is to have western Canadian people treated the same as people outside the designated area.

My question for the member is, why can western Canadian farmers not be allowed to process their own grain in their own communities?

● (1305)

Mr. Wayne Easter: Madam Speaker, there were a lot of questions in the hon. member's little speech. I will clear the record a bit. The hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands said my name was attached to the report. I will clearly state for the record that I am not a member of the committee. I was not involved in the discussion of the recommendations. As a member of parliament it is my right—

An hon. member: You signed it.

Mr. Wayne Easter: The hon. member says I signed it. No, I did not sign it. I was not asked about it.

Routine Proceedings

I would not use a prop, especially this report and the recommendation because it would be a bad prop. However it clearly says other members who participated, which includes me. The day I participated was the day officials from Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada were at the committee. I went there to outline my concerns about the way the deputy minister, officials and others were handling the agricultural file. They were not taking seriously enough the low incomes of producers in Canada. I hope that will turn around and there will be a new package to assist farmers. The Prime Minister talked about it extensively last night.

The hon. member tried to refute the Gray study. He should go back a few years and look at the Hartley Furtan study and others done in the 14 year period that ended in 1996 or thereabouts. The Hartley Furtan study and two others concluded that the wheat pool account increased returns to primary producers by \$265 million per year versus the open market. These guys are trying to take money out of farmers' pockets and give it to the grain companies. It is hard to believe. The hon. member had better go back and look at the record. He could read some of the debates of the House concerning the Canadian Wheat Board.

I cannot imagine that the hon. members opposite do not believe in democracy. I have concerns about spending in terms of Canadian Wheat Board elections because there are not enough rules. The grain companies buy advertising to get their people elected. It is an electoral process where primary producers are elected to the board. I have always thought that when primary producers are in charge they should be allowed the right to govern their agency and do their marketing. In light of its recommendation, this crew obviously does not think farmers should be in charge of their own destiny through an electoral process. I am surprised.

The hon. members talked about value added. Value added is extremely important. The Canadian Wheat Board recognizes this and is working toward finding ways to improve value added in western Canada. However we do not want the flexibility to be such that we end up with lower prices for primary producers. I am a strong supporter of adding value. However one of the difficulties with the value added situation is that instead of adding value to the raw primary product it lowers the price of the primary product which in turn lowers the return to farmers.

Farmers should be paid their production costs plus a reasonable return on their investment. That is what they need. This would make the economy and the country more healthy. Value could then be added to that. However because of the monopoly power of the retail and wholesale trade and the grain companies they end up backing down the prices to primary producers. That is not the answer. We must find ways of adding value, but in the process we must add income for primary producers. Doing this would result in a better economy and better lives for those in rural Canada.

• (1310)

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, members of the Liberal rural caucus told farmers and their constituents they were strongly opposed to Bill C-15B. They promised amendments would be made in the Senate. This week on the Stirling Faux radio show in Saskatchewan Senator Joan Fraser admitted that when she spoke to the minister she learned there had never been any such agreement.

Can the Liberal member opposite explain why he and his party misled constituents and the farmers of Canada into believing that the Liberals were a farmer friendly party, that amendments would be made in the Senate, and that an agreement had been made when in fact—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The hon. member for Malpeque.

Mr. Wayne Easter: Madam Speaker, we are a farmer friendly party and will be increasingly so. I do not know what Bill C-15B has to do with the report, but the chair of the rural caucus did his best to ensure the bill would be changed. I expect that when the Senate gets around to it Bill C-15B will be changed to ensure current farm practices relative to cruelty to animals—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The hon. member for Palliser.

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased if somewhat surprised to be taking part in the debate today. I welcome the opportunity nonetheless.

As a member of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food I too want to say at the outset that with the exception of recommendation 14 this is a good report. The report was issued after the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food had travelled to virtually all the provinces of Canada to hear directly from farmers, consider and weigh their concerns and produce a report. The report became public this past week.

The previous speakers have gone through a lot of the comments. They have pointed out the good things in the report such as its recommendations to enhance crop insurance, improve the net income stabilization account and introduce a trade injury compensation package to offset the negative effects on our primary producers of things like the U.S. farm bill and the common agricultural policy in Europe.

A number of things in the report are worthy of comment. Recommendation 14 has been the focus of debate, as it deserves to be. I will read what it says for the record and then note the objection that has been added at the bottom. It reads:

Whereas additional on-farm activities and local value-added processing are an excellent way to give farmers more influence in pricing, the Committee recommends that the board of directors of the Canadian Wheat Board authorize, on a trial basis, a free market for the sale of wheat and barley, and that it report to this Committee on the subject.

The bracketed comment at the bottom by the critic, myself, says:

I object strongly to any suggestion that the Canadian Wheat Board be asked to authorize use of an open market for the sale of wheat and barley, even on a trial basis. This would undermine the Board's effectiveness as a single desk seller, it would reduce returns to farmers, and eventually it would destroy the Canadian Wheat Board.

Routine Proceedings

I have a great deal of respect for the hon. member for Malpeque. He is extremely knowledgeable. As a former president of the National Farmers Union he has spent years in the trenches, has met with farmers and understands the Canadian Wheat Board and marketing of grain far better than I. He indicated in his remarks that he was disgusted. That was the word he used.

At the same time I think the hon. member would admit, at least privately, that he is a bit embarrassed about what has happened. What has transpired, unfortunately, is that some members of the Liberal government on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food have been snookered by members of the Canadian Alliance into doing this on a trial basis.

I will provide some background. As Canadians know, there are not a lot of Liberal members from western Canada in this parliament. Despite the Liberals' large majority, there is but one Liberal member from western Canada on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food. I am not native to western Canada. It is not where I grew up. However it is where I have lived for some time and I have come to understand, at least a bit, the importance of the Canadian Wheat Board.

● (1315)

In this instance what transpired is that we had two standing committee treks to western Canada to meet with farmers. We met with them in 1999 and then we went out again in February 2002. There is a crisis on the prairies in agriculture, especially in the grain and oilseeds which is the bulk of what happens in the eastern prairies. Some members of the committee felt that because there was no improvement from 1999 to 2002 it was important to look at doing something different and more radical. When recommendation 14 came along, and before we got to discuss it, some members on the government side were already thinking that the Ontario Wheat Board seemed to be working all right. There was not a lot of criticism.

Yes, we heard criticism of the Canadian Wheat board when we met with farmers. We also heard compliments about the work of the board, the fact that the status quo does not exist with the board and it is prepared to make some changes and to look at changes. Some members on the government side thought it was time to shake the pot and stir things up and do this on a trial basis, as recommendation 14 says, with the assumption that if we did not like what we found out in the trial, we could revert to standard operating procedure.

As the member for Malpeque notes, we cannot put the genie back into the bottle. Once it is out, it is out. As western Canadians know there have been nine attempts by the U.S. government to derail, sidetrack and eliminate the Canadian Wheat Board. It has failed on every one of those occasions. With this recommendation that has now been approved by the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, if the wheat board were foolish enough, which it will not be because it has already indicated that this is a non-starter from its perspective, it would never be able to go back to business as usual after any kind of trial period.

The Canadian Alliance members on that committee, and I have respect for them, have duped some members on the government side on this particular issue. There is no question in my mind that the goal of the Canadian Alliance members is to eliminate the Canadian Wheat Board. That is not what they say. They say they see a role for

the Canadian Wheat Board but they also believe in freedom of choice and to do that, they think that there should be dual marketing.

Dual marketing is the thin edge of the wedge because we cannot have orderly marketing with single desk selling at the same time as we have dual marketing. When we open it up on a trial basis it is impossible to reverse the process, particularly when the Americans are as adamant about state trading enterprises such as the Canadian Wheat Board. They would never allow that to happen.

The reality is that on the current composition of the board we do have some regional realities. There are also some tensions within the cabinet itself on this issue. It may be, for example, that the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board was perhaps not informed about this recommendation in time to have an influence with the backbenchers who sit on that committee. The minister of agriculture may not be as opposed to this so called trial period. That is telling and unfortunate in this instance.

Again, regional politics creeps into this. The minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board does hail from one of the great grain growing areas in western Canada. The current minister of agriculture comes from the province of Ontario and he feels that perhaps the Ontario Wheat Board, with the freedom of choice, is more palatable and worthy of a trial basis.

● (1320)

If we check with farmers on the Ontario Wheat Board, and the member for Malpeque was correct, they are not achieving the premium pricing. Yes, they do have flexibility but if we were to check with them, when they are selling on the spot market, they would not be receiving a premium price for the product. The Richard Gray study is accurate on this, \$160 million comes in value added to the Canadian Wheat Board and flows through the Canadian Wheat Board to our farmers.

Shortly after I was first elected I had the opportunity to visit Chile. The member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands made reference to it. It was at the time when some of our farmers had been put in jail for violating and crossing the border to sell their product in the United States. I got into a discussion with an adviser to the Chilean minister of agriculture.

We were talking about grain and selling Canadian Wheat Board grain. He made two comments. His first comment was that he did not agree at all that Canadian farmers should be jailed for attempting to cross into the United States to sell their product. He felt that was wrong and I concur with that.

The other thing he said was of great interest. He had gone to various millers in Santiago and asked them why they would pay a premium price to buy wheat for milling purposes from the Canadian Wheat Board when they could buy it cheaper from the Cargills, the ADMs and the Louis Dreyfus companies. The answer he received was because they could sleep better at night as business people.

The millers know exactly what they are getting when they buy through the Canadian Wheat Board. If the wheat board says the product is $x\%$ protein, $x\%$ gluten and all the other ingredients, that is what it is. Whereas when they buy an American product it is less certain about what it is that they will receive. They are interested in satisfying their consumers on this front. It is important they get the product they want in order to bake goods to the best of their ability. That for me, as someone who does not hail from the prairies originally, was an important piece of news and one that I carry around with me.

The other reason there will be Liberal members who will be unhappy with this recommendation is that it is the opposite of what is in the interim report of the Prime Minister's task force. Recommendation eight in the report favours orderly marketing and single desk selling. Obviously recommendation 14, which calls for a free market on a trial basis on the sale of wheat and barley, is not orderly marketing. Given that the Prime Minister's task force only came out with its report a month ago and there are members on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food who are also members of the advisory task force, it is hard to fathom how they managed to be on both sides of this issue in two separate reports.

I feel the cat is among the pigeons as a result of recommendation 14. I mentioned the nine trade disputes that the Americans have launched against state trading enterprises and I have spoken of the \$160 million in benefits.

There are a couple of conflicting principles. The member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands who brings a lot of credibility to the standing committee because of his experience as a grain farmer talked about the need for value added. We can all identify and agree with it.

• (1325)

The problem we have when it comes to the board is that the other principle the board has is to maximize the return for farmers. As the member for Malpeque indicated we cannot sell lower to an individual or a group of individuals to make it attractive for value added and at the same time maximize the returns for everyone else. Those two principles are in conflict. We have been aware for several years that prairie pasta plants have been trying to get started in western Canada to ship more product out as value added rather than to ship bulk to Thunder Bay or to Vancouver.

The wheat board is working on that issue. It has not resolved it. It is a work in progress. It would have to be conceded by everyone that there are two conflicting principles and it is tough to square that circle.

The concern is that to some extent we have thrown the baby out with the bath water with this trial period. It will be used against the Canadian Wheat Board. There is no question that the opponents of the wheat board, and there are many, not just the Canadian Alliance but the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association and a number of others groups, will use this report. They will waive it around and say that this is the way of the future.

We cannot have an open market on a trial basis. NAFTA chapter 11 is clear. If we turn over wheat and barley marketing, and the profits that go with it, to transnational grain companies we cannot

Private Members' Business

reverse that decision unless we pay hundreds of millions of dollars in compensation to those companies for lost future profits. The open market is not a path that Canadian grain farmers can go down and look around. It is more like a cliff that they can jump off. It will either be the Canadian Wheat Board or it will be Cargill, ConAgra, Archer Daniels Midland and there is no going back.

All the evidence we have shows that the wheat board does not decrease prices paid to farmers, it increases prices. The recent benchmark study by the board, the auditor general's report, the Kraft, Furtan and Tyrchniewicz study of a few years ago on wheat marketing, and the more recent grain report on barley marketing, every credible independent study demonstrates that the board increases the incomes of farmers.

Furthermore, the vast majority of farmers consistently vote for a strong, effective wheat board with its single desk selling power. That is an extremely important point.

The board has elections every two years on a regional basis. There will be elections coming up, for example, again this fall. It will be up to the farmers themselves to vote. If they vote for an open market system then that is what Canadian grain farmers will get. So far they have continued to vote by a majority for single desk, orderly marketing. That is the current law. That is where it should be. It should be with the farmers and not with politicians as to what happens in that regard.

* * *

• (1330)

[Translation]

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Madam Speaker, discussions have taken place between the leaders of all the parties in the House and I believe you would find consent to adopt the following resolution. I move:

That, during the summer adjournment in 2002, if the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages has completed a report, it may cause the report to be deposited with the Clerk of the House, whereupon it shall be deemed to have been laid upon the Table.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

INDEPENDENT PUBLIC INQUIRY

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance) moved:

Private Members' Business

That this House appoint a committee to conduct an independent public inquiry into Canada's sentencing, corrections and parole systems for the purpose of identifying measures to provide meaningful consequences for offenders, reinforce public safety, and instill public confidence.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to speak to my motion, Motion No. 387, pushing for much needed justice reform.

This motion is quite broad in scope. It is a call for a reform in the way we handle criminals from the point they enter the corrections system at their sentencing to the time that they leave it through the parole process. Although the process can be broken up into segments, it needs to be dealt with in a unified manner as is evident from the haphazard setup that currently exists.

The motion calls for an independent inquiry. The question of corrections reform seems to have reached a stalemate in this place a long time ago with debate degenerating into partisan wrangling. A process needs to be set up that enables those of us in government to learn from the wisdom of concerned citizens and experts across the country and to do so in a format which ensures that their input will contribute to a process of real reform to the corrections system.

The motion reflects a recommendation made by the Canadian Police Association and also the Ontario Police Association as they push for improvements to Canada's corrections system. Canada's police forces are increasingly frustrated at the present system. They put their lives at risk every day as they go to work, yet the criminals they catch are treated so lightly that it makes some officers wonder why they should risk their lives to pursue them in the first place.

I suspect that most of these fine public servants feel that it would be unprofessional and inappropriate to express such a sentiment too vocally or too publicly. On the other hand, I would contend that it is completely inappropriate to use their professionalism against them by pretending that they should not speak out and by pretending that police morale is not a concern simply because they do not give aggressive voice to it.

Of course, there are tragedies of police officers being killed in the line of duty by dangerous offenders who have been released on some form of parole. If the government sets up some kind of public inquiry, as I suggest here, and does so in a way committed to pushing forward with real reforms, it can be sure of the support from Canada's police officers.

The motion focuses the inquiry on the primary functions of the corrections system or what should be the primary functions of the system, in other words, providing meaningful consequences for offenders, reinforcing public safety and instilling public confidence.

It is really very unfortunate that I have to speak on these issues in this place today. Just a brief scan over *Hansard* records from the past decade shows how frequently these concerns and these themes have already been raised, yet so little actual movement has taken place to bring about some constructive reforms and to bring those forward.

Members of parliament have repeatedly expressed the need for change, documenting the many failures of the current system. The general public has made its concerns known as well, perhaps most obviously in polling data which has shown an increase in the level of fear that Canadians have regarding violent crime. There has also

been widespread criticism over the imbalance that exists between the rights of criminals and the rights of victims. There are also numerous organizations that exist to lobby for reforms. Many of them are victims rights groups.

I have already referred to the Canadian Police Association, yet its concerns, the concerns of victims groups and various lobby groups seems to fall on deaf ears. That is why it is necessary that some type of independent public inquiry be set up, a process that has real teeth, a process that will hear from a wide spectrum of Canadian viewpoints and a process which the government commits to respecting when it comes to amending the current system.

I want to speak briefly about the ongoing petition drive by the Canadian Police Association and the Ontario Police Association which they have called "No More Club Fed" campaign. It is very unfortunate that they feel the need to launch a public campaign like this against current government policy but they raise real concerns that are felt far beyond their own membership. In other words, the purpose of the campaign is to make the government see the need to bring an end to the club fed culture of Correctional Service Canada. They say:

It is time to instill meaningful consequences for offenders, reinforce public safety, and instill public confidence in our criminal justice system

● (1335)

They focus most of their campaign on the problems associated with parole and early release, and not without cause considering the growing list of police officers who have been killed and injured by non-rehabilitated violent offenders who are back in the community.

On March 10, 28 year old OPP Constable Dan Brisson was shot near Cornwall, Ontario. His assailant, Daniel Lamer, was being sought for violating day parole while serving a lengthy prison sentence for trying to kill another police officer back in 1991. Thankfully, Brisson survived the attack.

In February Manitoba officer Mike Templeton was also shot by a parolee. He is also fortunate to have survived.

Prior to that, RCMP Constable Dennis Strongquill was killed in Manitoba. He was shot four days before Christmas last year, leaving behind a wife and five children. The suspects were brothers who were out on parole and were wanted for parole violations. The 21 year old younger suspect had been denied parole three times previously. Prison officials had described him as "unstable, impulsive and violent", but he was out on parole after serving two-thirds of his sentence.

One of the latest outrages is that of Conrad Brassard who is guilty of multiple counts of murder and attempted murder. The National Parole Board qualified him for release. While out on day parole, one of those incremental release programs that the government says is essential to effective reintegration of convicts into society, he raped and killed again.

Private Members' Business

The solicitor general has told the House that the National Parole Board and Correctional Service Canada have promised to conduct a thorough investigation of the parole board's decision. People are being drawn from various places for this very necessary investigation, but it is still under the auspices of the parole board itself.

As the member for Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert has pointed out however, it is most unusual to have the offending organization investigate itself. She has pointed out that whenever a police force makes a blunder the investigation is never conducted by that force. In my view this is an appropriate comparison of the growing concerns that Canada's police officers have about their own safety and the priority given to them by the government and its current legislation. These police officers who put their lives on the line in the service of the public are feeling increasingly taken for granted by a government which has other conflicting priorities when setting sentencing, corrections and parole policy.

Has the parole board learned its lesson? That investigation is not yet completed. In fact, it has probably hardly been started. What did the National Parole Board do? On June 10, it granted day parole to yet another convicted murderer by the name of Sonny Head, who was convicted of second degree murder in the death of a woman in 1994. He was part of a group of four youths who broke into the woman's apartment and stabbed her to death when she awoke and discovered them in her home. He was sentenced in adult court to life in prison with a minimum of seven years. What does life with a minimum of seven years mean anyway? It is an absurd concept to begin with. At any rate, he served only eight years of this potential life sentence for murder. He is already out on day parole. The day parole is only supposed to last for six months before he graduates to full parole.

Perhaps Head will be okay. Perhaps he will not be. However the very fact that the parole board has the authority to make such decisions even without the completion of its review of the Brossard decision is outrageous and demonstrates the systemic problems that currently exist in Canada's parole system.

I am confident that an independent public inquiry, as this motion suggests, would shed light on the way Canadians feel about such a situation. It is not something that encourages confidence in the system or in public safety.

Those who support the current system say "Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater. Gradual release works", and I do not disagree that we have to try this. However, when one looks at the bald-faced facts of the Brossard case, one has to do some tremendous intellectual contortions to understand what would give the parole board members the idea that this man should have qualified for day parole. The fact that he did shows that there are serious problems with the qualification process and the criteria considered under the present system.

People might insist that these incidents do not happen very often. Those words ring rather hollow because these kinds of incidents are happening with increased frequency today. The victims are not always police officers.

According to National Parole Board, recidivism data of 1,800 full parolees which ended in 2000-01, about 25% were unsuccessful,

9.7% of parolees were convicted of new offences and 16% had their parole revoked for violating their parole conditions. Of 3,500 federal day parolees, 5% committed a new offence and 12% were put back in jail after breaching parole conditions. Of the 4,900 offenders released on statutory release, almost half had problems, almost 50%, 14.4% were convicted of new offences and 26.7% had their releases revoked for failing to abide by the conditions of their release.

● (1340)

The Canadian Police Association is reporting a recidivism rate of up to 40% for offenders released through the accelerated parole process and statutory release.

Some members have observed that Canada's recidivism rate is low compared with other countries. That is pretty small consolation to the victims and family members of victims. There is still plenty of room for improvement under our system. I have always been under the impression that improvements are not made by comparing ourselves with people who are doing worse at any given task or project. We strive for a well-defined and achievable ideal.

I am not sure what the benefit is of making comparisons with other countries that are pretty suspect on a whole range of human rights issues when it comes to corrections reforms. That really attempts to dodge the hard questions.

No doubt many of the reforms that are necessary will cost money, particularly in terms of increasing staff so as to reduce the workload for corrections and parole board employees and to ensure that there are enough corrections workers to monitor the growing number of prisoners being released on parole. This is one area where the government should receive the full support of opposition members, at least among the official opposition, for increased spending.

I know money is available. Just several months ago the government announced its commitment to allocate \$500 million in renovations to the condo style luxury accommodations for women in prison. Earlier this week we learned that the government was the beneficiary of a much larger budget surplus than anticipated. Sadly, initial reports of the priorities of the Prime Minister for this money do not include corrections reform.

One area where reforms are needed in the parole system is the accountability structure for releasing convicts into the community. The "No More Club Fed" campaign points out that despite the responsibility of the National Parole Board for examining convicts to determine their eligibility for parole, Correctional Service Canada makes a couple of options available which do an end run under the radar and bypass that system.

It gives out temporary absence passes and there is the work release program. "These forms of release may occur prior to any form parole eligibility and without any review of the offender's suitability by the National Parole Board" says the Canadian Police Association. These kinds of things can be unsupervised absences.

Private Members' Business

A policy like this demonstrates that there is no inherent connection between offender behaviour and the parole process. There is no inherent obligation on convicts to demonstrate that they have achieved a certain level of rehabilitation before they will be considered eligible for parole. In fact, offenders who are serving their first federal sentence and who have not been convicted of a violent crime or serious drug offence may be released on day parole at one-sixth of their sentence under an accelerated parole review. The onus is on the National Parole Board to demonstrate why an offender should not be released under this program.

There are conflicting statements on the record about whether or not a quota system exists to push convicts back into the community as quickly as possible. Whether or not there is a quota system in name, corrections policy certainly suggests that one exists in principle.

Full parole eligibility is available for most offenders upon serving just one-third of their sentences and almost all offenders, exemptions being those sentenced to life or to indeterminate periods of incarceration, become eligible for automatic statutory release after completing two-thirds of their sentences.

According to a February article in *The Report* magazine, of about 14,000 inmates in federal prisons yearly, only 200 are deemed so dangerous that they serve their entire sentence.

According to the National Parole Board, about 43% of federal prisoners obtain full parole each year, while 72% are granted day parole.

Rehabilitation does not automatically happen. Therefore it seems absurd to defend Canada's parole system as part of an effective rehabilitation concept, yet that is what some of the government members in the House in particular seem to do.

There has been a lot of criticism. That is why the motion is here today. I would like to ask at this point if I could have unanimous consent, because I think there is great concern exercised on the part of the government as well as a number of the backbenchers, for this motion to be given the status of being votable.

• (1345)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join in the discussion on Motion No. 387 respecting sentencing, corrections and conditional release.

I understand the concerns that motivate the hon. member for Saskatoon—Wanuskewin to make these proposals. For hon. members opposite, inquiries or system reviews are code words for let us get tougher, lock up more people for longer periods and throw away more of the keys. The government is equally concerned about providing additional safeguards to protect the Canadian public, but we are not ready to change a system that works simply because the official opposition thinks maybe that is where the votes are.

The hon. member wants to appeal to this electorate by making sentences more onerous and by delaying or eliminating conditional release in all its forms for particular categories of offenders that he considers most threatening. He just will not come out and say it.

That being said, even if we take the motion at face value, the proposals contain no ideas. Again and again during the consideration of private members' business and particularly when issues of public safety and criminal justice are involved, I am reminded of the response sometimes heard in question period: the hon. member just cannot take yes for an answer. The parties opposite insist on replaying questions which have been answered, making demands that already have been met, and in some cases bringing up matters that were resolved years ago.

Motion No. 387 proposes an inquiry into the correctional system that was reviewed thoroughly just a short time ago. The Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights made a thorough statutory review of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the government responded by accepting almost all of the recommendations less than two years ago. Would the initiative proposed by the hon. member for Saskatoon—Wanuskewin enhance public protection, prevent crime or even save lives?

As far as the area of sentencing is concerned, I simply would state that the idea of examining this is redundant. The Department of Justice is sensitive to emerging needs and continually monitors existing legislation. As far as the get tough ideas, the Alliance would like to see us push forward through another consideration of the justice system.

The Criminal Code of Canada has been toughened repeatedly to respond to demands for more stringent treatment of particular categories of offenders. To touch on a few examples, the code provides for the designation of dangerous offenders who are then subject to mandatory indefinite sentences. Upon conviction of serious harm offences, the courts may specify that the offender must serve one-half rather than one-third of his or her sentence before even being considered for parole.

Further, courts may invoke the long term offender provision created in 1997 that entails up to 10 years of community supervision after the normal sentence has been served. The hon. member from Saskatoon has not made it clear what sentencing measures he might recommend, or for that matter what he considers wrong with those that are in place, or how his proposals would create safeguards beyond those already available.

It is apparent from his comments in this place that his presumption is that the law should be able to prevent every crime. We will continue to proceed in a manner that would lead us in that direction. There always will be crime unfortunately with tragic consequences, but these are the rare exceptions to the overall successes of our criminal justice system.

Private Members' Business

The police, courts and correctional system deal with social misfits who have demonstrated a disregard for the law. I am sure that common sense would lead to the conclusion that it is quite likely some of them will break the law again no matter what their sentence might turn out to be.

Over the last decade parliament has pursued a series of measures that have increased penalties and restricted releases. On the sentencing end of things it is sufficient to say that there has been considerable movement over recent years toward the punitive end of the scale.

I would now like to look at the correctional implications of these get tough proposals that are disguised by the hon. member as a call for an inquiry.

• (1350)

Would the administration of the sentences be made more efficient? Would there be measurable improvement in the supervision and control of offenders? Would Canadians benefit in any way?

In answer to these questions I would like to devote my allotted time to sharing with the House and with all Canadians some thoughts about public safety, the correctional system and conditional release as it now exists to provide a basis for our consideration of the changes in this area proposed by the motion before us.

It may be helpful for members to know something of the conditional release process and the roles and responsibilities of the correctional agencies of the ministry of the solicitor general, Correctional Service of Canada and the National Parole Board.

In each of these debates it becomes clear that some hon. members do not hear or do not wish to hear the true state of affairs in this important area. These agencies within the solicitor general's portfolio as part of our criminal justice system deal with two fundamental issues that lie at the very heart of what defines the quality and nature of the culture of the country.

The first of these is public safety, an issue that is of paramount importance. The passage by parliament of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act in 1992 enshrined in law the principle that the protection of society should be foremost in the minds of those entrusted with the administration of court imposed sentences in the federal correctional system.

The second issue is the importance of human freedom as emphasized in the correctional system by the deprivation of that freedom. This is the most extreme sanction the courts can impose on Canadian citizens. There must be a rationale for applying this penalty that is based not only on denunciation and the desire to punish but also on a fair assessment of the results of incarceration.

The correctional service is responsible for the administration of court imposed sentences of two years or more in ways that contribute to the safety of the public. Its employees, both in federal institutions and the community, deal with more than 20,000 offenders each day of the year and must carry out the responsibility in a society which places an enormous importance on the rights and freedoms of all of its citizens.

How the correctional services and parole board go about their business is a matter of concern not just to a small minority but to all Canadians. Nobody should think that a decision by the National Parole Board to release an offender to the community is made lightly. The decision making process is objective, careful and thorough. It is quite obvious that any release decisions are framed by court imposed sentences.

Correctional staff who make these assessments and recommendations and the parole board members who independently consider release decisions are our neighbours. Their children walk the same streets and attend the same schools as our children do. They are as unlikely as any of us to put an offender's desire to be free ahead of public safety. They apply their training, common sense and grasp of the detailed information before them to each application for conditional release. It is not in their interests to release individuals likely to commit violent offences or those whose victims might be children.

We hear from the party opposite and its supporters in the media that the government favours the rights of offenders over the rights of victims. As I pointed out, this is absurd. The government consists of people trying to do the best job they can. No right thinking human being, politician or not, would take the position of favouring offenders over the protection of their own families.

There is some evidence that what we are doing is right. The rate of violent reoffending by released offenders has dropped a full 45% during the last seven years. This proves that our approach is right, not perfect, but is moving in the right direction.

What I have been saying about offenders applies to most within the correctional system. They come from our own communities and most will return to be our neighbours. It is in our interests to be more thoughtful about how we administer their sentences, not simply to make sure that their sentences are long and miserable.

All of this being said, we will continue to work to improve the criminal justice system but this motion is not necessarily the way to go.

• (1355)

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to support this timely motion put forward by my colleague from Saskatoon—Wanuskewin in view of his concern about a problem in Canada. I commend my colleague for bringing it forward. The motion reads:

That this House appoint a committee to conduct an independent public inquiry into Canada's sentencing, corrections and parole systems for the purpose of identifying measures to provide meaningful consequences for offenders, reinforce public safety, and instill public confidence.

That sounds like a worthy goal but the parliamentary secretary completely dismissed the idea of bringing forward an independent inquiry to look at sentencing.

The last time the government attempted to amend the criminal code with regard to sentencing was almost seven years ago. In June 1995 Bill C-41 was rammed through the House of Commons much like Bill C-15B and Bill C-5 were rammed through this spring. The government attempted to pass legislation and then recessed for the summer. That is the way Bill C-41 went through the House.

Private Members' Business

Before I proceed, for the record I would like to state my opposition to the blatant disregard for democracy that the government has shown. To cut off debate on Bill C-5 and Bill C-15B as mentioned by the member from Yorkton an hour ago was nothing more than a cowardly act clearly demonstrating the government's desperation to have these contentious bills dispensed with given the growing opposition and the swelling dissent from within the Liberal ranks as well as the strong opposition from the Canadian Alliance.

Bill C-41 as stated earlier amended the criminal code providing an express statement regarding the purpose and principles of sentencing. Contained within that legislation were provisions for alternative measures, alternatives to prison for adult offenders. Bill C-41 contained conditional sentences where offenders sentenced to two years less a day could serve their sentences in the community under supervision rather than in prison.

The Canadian Police Association, an authority that even justice ministers often cite as law enforcement experts, commented on Bill C-41 but the commentary was anything but complimentary. In a brief submitted to the standing committee on justice the Canadian Police Association said:

Bill C-41 with few exemptions, is unwieldy, complicated, internally self-contradictory, duplicitous and what is worse in almost all of it, completely unnecessary for anyone with any knowledge of or use for the common law heritage of Canada.

The police association went on to say:

While it would attempt to codify basic sentencing principles, eliminating this most basic judicial discretion, at the same time it would bestow huge new discretionary powers to a whole range of persons within the justice system. The common thread in those new powers is that all are to the benefit of the offender in the sense of non-custodial consequences for criminal actions.

Where sentencing reform calls for protection, this bill offers platitudes. Where it calls for clarity it offers confusion and outright hypocrisy. It will almost certainly cause the already skyrocketing criminal justice budget to expand further still.

I could not have summed up what Bill C-41 accomplished better than what the Canadian Police Association did.

The government has a pathetic record when it comes to tightening the screws of justice. Conditional sentences are a prime example.

Since the introduction of Bill C-41 members of our party have requested amendments and subsequently asked that the criminal code be amended to restrict the use of conditional sentences. We have had ample reason to be concerned about the release of violent offenders, including rapists, back into our society and on to our streets. Pretty good reasons would be our daughters, wives and mothers and unfortunately, now we can even say our sons.

• (1400)

Sex offenders have the highest rate of reoffending. They have the highest recidivism rates and pose a serious risk to our safety and to the lives of our families. However, despite our repeated requests, successive justice ministers have refused to limit conditional sentences. As a direct result we see rapists walking free. We have numerous examples to prove this fact.

This afternoon I would like to mention a number of the appalling examples. On January 26, 1998, a Quebec court judge granted 24 year old Patrick Lucien and 23 year old Evans Sannon 18 month

conditional sentences for sexual assault. The judge granted these lenient sentences although the crown recommended prison terms of five and four years for their heinous crimes. A community sentence was totally inappropriate and unacceptable for those two individuals who took turns raping an 18 year old victim while the other one held her down.

When questioned in the House about this case, the former justice minister said that she was satisfied to leave it in the courts. She was satisfied to leave that case and similar controversies to the courthouse rather than deal with the law here in the House. She was not prepared to amend the criminal code limiting the use of conditional sentences. We had then and still are requesting that happen.

The Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights is planning to review conditional sentences, hopefully to an end of finally making them off limits for violent and repeat offenders, as we have been recommending for seven years.

Two weeks ago Chatham speech pathologist Larry Hyde was convicted of possessing some 5,000 images of child pornography on the hard drive of his computer. In the ruling the presiding judge described the images as very vile and yet Hyde was given an 18 month conditional sentence and ordered not to associate or communicate with anyone under the age of 18 unless he was accompanied by another adult.

Following the Hyde case, one newspaper said that conditional sentences for possessing child pornography seemed to be the norm across Canada. It is normal now. That is what we have come to in the country. It is normal to put these perverts back out on the street as quick as we can.

Last September, Daniel Isaac Sichel of New Brunswick was handed a six month conditional sentence for possession and trading of child pornography on the Internet. In December, Richard Blumhagel was sentenced to a nine month conditional sentence in a Windsor court for distributing videotapes of child pornography.

The only comforting news in the Hyde case is that the Chatham police have placed his photograph on the provincial sex offender registry.

Daily in the House we see members presenting petitions asking the government to make it a criminal offence for the sadomasochism of children and child pornography and yet we watch our courts put them back out on the streets with conditional sentences. It is a shame. Shame on the court and parole systems that allow such individuals to be walking our streets.

Limiting conditional sentences is only one of many changes that must be made to ensure offenders receive meaningful consequences. The other way, and perhaps one of the most important in my mind, is limiting parole and eliminating statutory release. Although the Canadian Police Association does recognize that there is a place for the conditional release of offenders, it believes that parole must be earned and not be an automatic right as is currently the case.

We completely agree with the Canadian Police Association. Criminals must earn their right to parole by the way they conduct themselves in prison and whether or not they better their lives by gaining a skill while in prison. Their right to parole should not be an inherent right.

National Parole Board statistics for 1999-2000 show the number of incidences committed by offenders on conditional release has increased. A corrections performance report states that the number of escapes from minimum security prisons are increasing.

Recent and all too frequent high profile people, such as police officers, as the member for Saskatoon—Wanuskewin mentioned, have been murdered by those who have been out on parole. Police officers who uphold the law and peace in the country have been shot and killed by individuals who have been out on parole. This is wrong.

• (1405)

We need a government with the will to make changes. The parliamentary secretary talked about reviewing the CCRA. The government accepted 48 of the recommendations two years ago but has failed to implement them.

Studies that are not accepted and nothing is done with them may as well be thrown in the fireplace. They do no good.

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Madam Speaker, I did not expect to take part in this debate, but I cannot help myself. After being here for eight years, I find it difficult not to get involved, particularly after what I just heard from my Canadian Alliance friends.

In politics, it is easy to engage in some demagoguery and this is not always done in bad faith. These people are not always aware that they sometimes promote outrageous ideas, or that they focus on just one side of the coin. I often say that, regardless of how thin the coin may be, there are always two sides to it.

This is why I am speaking out. I understand and I fully agree with my colleagues. We have examples which show that there are always some who fall through the cracks. These are not necessarily the least important ones, but there are isolated cases. However, the danger is in making generalizations about this kind of situations.

There are also examples in Canada. The number of these examples is on the increase, with the new evidence allowed, such as DNA and so on. We find an increasing number of judicial errors that were made in Canada.

We all remember a young man—who was no longer young when he was released—one David Milgaard, who served 24 years of a prison sentence although he was completely innocent. Even before definitive evidence could be produced that he had had nothing to do with the crime for which he was charged, public opinion, as I recall, wanted to see him handed an even tougher sentence.

I also remember a resident of Mont-Laurier in Quebec who was accused of a crime. He served his sentence in prison, but continued to proclaim his innocence when he got out. For more than 20 years, this man has tried every legal recourse to prove his innocence.

Private Members' Business

Recently a resident of the riding of Terrebonne—Blainville was charged with rape. The woman retracted her statement; she was no longer sure that it was him; she then changed her mind and said that she had been mistaken and that now she was sure that it was him. The case dragged on and finally, the system ruled that this woman had a few problems, at least in her perception of things. So the man was released. He was an electrician, a family man who led a completely respectable life. But his life was ruined because of all this.

There are more and more cases where teachers are being charged. Recently in Lac-Saint-Jean, a man's life was literally ruined by a young girl who falsely accused him and this was entered in evidence. But it took eight or nine years before definitive proof was established. The judge even sentenced the young girl to 20 years and a few months in prison for giving false evidence and making a false accusation.

The present judicial system is not perfect. It could always be improved, particularly when people are released conditionally and not kept under any supervision. The cell doors are thrown open and they are told "You are free to go now. We are no longer keeping an eye on you. We are no longer watching what you are doing. We are no longer even wondering what you are up to". This should also be watched.

But to go from there to making generalizations and wanting a prison system so inhumane that the only hope left for the accused or the inmate is suicide or something equally horrible will not be any improvement, whether inside or outside the prisons.

I do not think that the prison system should be a means of vengeance, but a means of protecting society, a means of educating those inmates who want to participate in programs, who are willing to try therapy.

• (1410)

This is, unfortunately, a necessary evil in our society, but must not be based on vengeance alone.

This, unfortunately, is what has always bothered me somewhat about my friends in the Alliance. I remember when we were first here, back in the days of their first leader, Mr. Manning—whom we can now refer to by name—when several representatives of his party, the Reform Party at the time, were given the mandate to go to one of the Asian countries to investigate its use of corporal punishment and to report back on it. I have forgotten which country it was. People will recall this, as it made all the newspapers. It generated plenty of headlines.

These are not necessarily examples to be followed, however. I think that what should be taken as an example is the best of our society, what works best in our society, and we should try to adapt it to suit a variety of situations. Let it be clearly understood, I am not in favour of just any prisoner being let go unconditionally if that person is not likely to fit back into society.

Some people sentenced are not fit to be reintegrated into the community, even at the end of their sentence. When their sentence is over, however, they are released without any follow-up. This is a practice that needs to be prohibited, and we must take steps to improve the situation.

Private Members' Business

My brother recently became a guard in a provincial detention facility, where the inmates are sentenced to less than two years. There are inmates there who committed absolutely odious crimes, but who were lucky. People who, for whatever circumstances, because of the mood of the judge or deals made between lawyers, ended up getting a prison sentence of less than two years and therefore ended up in a provincial institution. Yet, they fully deserve to be in a maximum security federal institution for a longer period.

There are all kinds of injustices. It is up to parliamentarians, those who are interested in this work, to co-operate, to work together in committee, everyone, government and opposition together, to try to find solutions that will benefit society and reduce the risks.

However, it is not necessarily true that locking tons of people up without any contact with the outside will reduce risks for society. There are risks within prison walls. There are the risks associated with the working conditions and the safety of prison staff. There will be other risks. If these risks are not on the streets, they will end up behind prison walls. These risks can be found just about everywhere.

I do not wish to go on forever on this topic, but I would like to congratulate my colleague, and I want to make sure that he understands me. I have nothing against his motion. I find him to be a sensible and serious man. He has the interests of his fellow citizens at heart, but the means that he is proposing are not necessarily the means that I would advocate.

While I recognize his hard work, perhaps he should raise this issue with one of the committees, such as the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, to be debated, to debate the solutions that he is proposing before a broader audience than the House.

When I see members focusing on something absolutely revolting and making a play for our emotions as they have done in the past—I am not referring to the member who put forward this motion—I think that it verges on grandstanding. It is sad, but it does not necessarily shed any light on things or contribute to any useful solutions.

I invite the member to try to put forward his motion in another forum, a parliamentary committee or somewhere else—the choice is his—so that it can be debated and we can try to find solutions which will benefit our society in the short, medium and long term.

● (1415)

[*English*]

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak on Motion No. 387.

The fact is that there is sufficient evidence, some anecdotal, but widespread enough evidence, that there are significant flaws in our criminal justice system, in our penal system and in our parole system such that the Canadian public is quite rightly concerned and fearful of the ramifications of a system that is so important to the protection of individual Canadians in their homes and in their communities. They are legitimately concerned.

A full, independent public inquiry into the parole system and the corrections and sentencing system to provide a more objective and educated perspective and analysis of this very important area is indeed warranted and would provide a lot of answers for Canadians.

It may in fact identify not just what is not working in the system but what is working. I would hope that we would take the time to look at best practices models from other countries and find ways to incorporate some of them, so that it would not be simply an inquiry into what is wrong with the Canadian system but would actually take time to work on and identify some of the successes in other countries in this regard in terms of reforming our system. We could look at it from a very positive perspective.

The Liberal government is singularly incapable of that kind of analysis, proactivity and vision. It is a government that is paralyzed by leadership intrigue, which is ironic because we do not see leadership in anything else. The fiscal deficit may be gone but there is a vision deficit on the other side. The government has not been able to tackle any of the major issues facing Canadians, whether they are economic issues, trade issues, agriculture issues or justice issues. In every case this is a government that delays, dilly-dallies and denies that problems even exist.

In fact I wish that the justice committee and the House of Commons could be more fully engaged in studying this issue and that as parliamentarians we could address it. The fact is that the Prime Minister, the cabinet and the government have done so much to reduce the roles and authority of committees and individual members of parliament to do so that I think nothing less than a full public inquiry is necessary. I agree with the hon. member on this motion.

We could spend a great deal of time reviewing some of the individual cases and some of the stories of people in Canada whose lives who have been changed irrevocably, people who have lost loved ones or have been brutally attacked and had their lives changed in terrible ways by repeat offenders who ought not to have been freed to relapse into crime.

The fact is that there is enough anecdotal evidence to suggest that a systemic problem could very much be the case, so our party and I support this private member's motion. Any analysis of or any shining of light onto this issue by an independent inquiry would be very helpful. It would help this place, parliament, to deal with the issue with more information. We cannot simply deal with some of the information; we need all of the information to build good public policy. Good public policy is built around reality, not perceptions. I agree with the hon. member that there are some fundamental flaws in our criminal justice system now, but we need to have the facts before we proceed. The only way to have those facts is through this kind of inquiry.

● (1420)

I commend the hon. member for his motion. As I said, we support it and would hope that the government, instead of in a very pithy and partisan way denying the legitimacy of the motion and claiming that everything in the criminal justice system is working very well, would embrace a solid idea from opposition, as I think it ought to, and demonstrate some level of transparency, openness and commitment to reforming Canada's criminal justice system or at least identifying some of the fundamental flaws. The government itself ought to support the motion instead of denying that any problems that exist.

I would also argue that on numerous issues, whether it is on health care or economic issues, the government has really tried to deny problems and tried to delay implementing solutions, to the extent that it has created irrevocable damage for Canadian competitiveness, quality of life and standard of living. This is in stark contrast to the Mulroney government, which studied and analyzed situations and was not afraid to take bold visionary steps to correct problems and to embrace opportunities.

The best example of that in a completely different area of public policy was what the Mulroney government did with the Macdonald commission report. Donald Macdonald was a Liberal and a former finance minister under the Trudeau government. His commission on North American trade issues recommended that Canada spearhead efforts to enter into a free trade agreement with the U.S. The Mulroney government, in which my leader the right hon. member for Calgary Centre was the foreign minister and played a leadership role in this area, took the advice of that commission. It proceeded with and embraced the advice and the vision of that commission and took huge political risks, but it actually changed the country, changed the continent and improved significantly the standard of living of Canadians.

Donald Macdonald said in a speech I heard about a year and a half ago that he did not believe that the current government, the Liberal government, this cruise control, do nothing, dilly-dallying government, would have done anything with that report. However, this is the kind of vision we need now, whether it is on criminal justice issues or economic issues.

• (1425)

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Kings—Hants for his comments. It occurs to me that he is the only member in the House who has spoken, other than my colleague from Crowfoot, who actually read and was aware of the content of the motion.

The motion basically asks for a public independent inquiry. I may differ with the Bloc member and with the Liberal member but I will express my point of view, as have many other people. As the Progressive Conservative member just pointed out, there is a lot of anecdotal stuff out there and it is growing. There is some statistical stuff and so on. We get all this information on the table and see where it goes from there.

I want to touch on a couple of other things, particularly with respect to the police association's campaign that is going on now. The whole issue of the treatment of prisoners is also a serious concern and it is where the club fed rhetoric came from. There is a growing dissatisfaction with the luxurious living standards that many prisoners now enjoy. That kind of easy living is now being enjoyed by violent offenders as well as less dangerous criminals.

I want to be clear that I believe convicts are human beings and should be treated as such. Their dignity and capabilities should be nurtured and strengthened even while in prison to increase their chances of successful reintegration into society after being released. That idea should be basic to the correctional system's commitment to public safety.

Private Members' Business

However, at the same time, and this must be the priority, historically and long held, criminals must also face and feel serious consequences. We can call it punishment if we want, which is all right by me, but they must feel that. Simply putting a prisoner behind bars is not sufficient to get the message across that the person has committed a terrible act that society considers unacceptable. Just being behind bars does not do that.

Other consequences must also exist, including most obviously the deprivation of the pleasures of life. I do not believe Canadians are particularly impressed with giving prisoners, including murderers and rapists, access to golf courses, big screen televisions, fishing and horse stables. I am quite sure that most Canadians would not consider appropriate the availability of pornography, easy access to drugs and the facilitation of sexual liaisons as priorities for prisoners.

Real rehabilitation involves character development and skills training, teaching convicts to accept responsibility for their actions, helping them to develop a mentality that enables them to share the values of the majority of the Canadian citizenry out there as to what is and what is not acceptable behaviour, and of course, very importantly, making them employable.

Instead, the priority of Correctional Service Canada seems to be that of making prisoners feel good, to boost their self-esteem but going about it in a backward way. Prisoners can develop good character and become employable. I have had contact through prison ministries and so on with people like that. I am convinced that self-esteem is a byproduct of those other attributes that are developed and built into an individual. We do not create self-esteem directly. We create it with other kinds of conditions where the byproduct is self-esteem.

If Correctional Service Canada would focus on the important issues and frame its rehabilitation policy accordingly, self-esteem would follow. It is a natural corollary of that, and Correctional Service Canada would have a better track record than it does today.

I should also make mention of the whole issue of sentencing as time moves along. I have introduced a private member's bill, Bill C-467, that would make amendments in that direction. It would require that any person found guilty of an indictable offence committed while out on conditional release must serve the remainder of the original sentence and at least two-thirds of the new sentence. The member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough introduced a similar bill and it has come up from time to time.

The issue of concurrent sentences needs to be examined and looked at seriously. The Canadian Police Association recommends that offenders who commit more than one murder or serious sexual assault should receive consecutive parole ineligibility periods. The faint hope clause needs to be looked at. According to the National Parole Board, 80% of offenders making application under this clause have been successful. Mechanisms like the faint hope clause re-victimize the families of slain people and therefore I think are unacceptable in a modern corrections model.

Private Members' Business

●(1430)

The sentencing system also needs to make real room for the role of the victims and the inclusion of victim impact statements. In some small ways attempts have been made at that, but not in a serious way. That must be done as victims deserve better. They need to be provided with victim impact statements and know that they would be used. Victim impact statements would be on file and may help in the rehabilitation of convicts if they are willing to be a part of that. Victims should be able to receive closure by knowing that the one convicted for causing them harm is being punished effectively.

I and other members of the Canadian Alliance are supportive of restorative justice if it is not premised on a soft on crime philosophy—

[Translation]

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

[English]

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

(The House adjourned at 2.30 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. PIERRE BRIEN

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

HON. DON BOUDRIA

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CA
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Quebec	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

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

First Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

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

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Lib.
QUEBEC (71)		
Allard, Carole-Marie	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans ..	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la- Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Frulla, Liza	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	BQ
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	BQ
Marcil, Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Lib.
Martin, Hon. Paul	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Denis, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister for International Trade	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
Scherrer, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Lib.
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Anderson, David	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CA
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CA
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Wascana	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Lib.

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

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of June 14, 2002 — 1st Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:	Raymond Bonin	Vice-Chairs:	Nancy Karetak-Lindell Maurice Vellacott	
Larry Bagnell	David Chatters	Richard Marceau	Brian Pallister	(16)
G�rard Binet	John Finlay	Inky Mark	Beno�t Serr�	
Serge Cardin	John Godfrey	Pat Martin	Guy St-Julien	
Jean-Guy Carignan				

Associate Members

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

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Charles Hubbard

Vice-Chairs:
Murray Calder
Howard HilstromDavid Anderson
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Claude DuplainMark Eyking
Marcel Gagnon
Rick LaliberteLarry McCormick
Dick Proctor
Bob SpellerPaul Steckle
Suzanne Tremblay
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
Paul Crête
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed ElleyKen Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Robert LanctôtGary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
Joe PeschisolidoJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Jean-Yves Roy
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair:	Clifford Lincoln	Vice-Chairs:	Jim Abbott Dennis Mills	
Paul Bonwick Sarmite Bulte Rodger Cuzner Claude Duplain	Christiane Gagnon Roger Gallaway John Harvard	Loyola Hearn Betty Hinton Wendy Lill	Caroline St-Hilaire Chuck Strahl Tony Tirabassi	(16)

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SPORT

Chair:	Dennis Mills	Vice-Chair:		
Rodger Cuzner John Harvard	Loyola Hearn Robert Lanctôt	Serge Marcil Dick Proctor	Hélène Scherrer Chuck Strahl	(9)

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs:

Diane Ablonczy
Jerry Pickard

Mark Assad
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
John Godfrey

Art Hanger
Steve Mahoney
Inky Mark

Anita Neville
David Price
Stéphan Tremblay

Tony Valeri
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
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
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido

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

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairs:
Karen Kraft Sloan
Bob MillsRoy Bailey
Bernard Bigras
Joe Comartin
Marcel GagnonJohn Herron
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Rick LaliberteGary Lunn
Karen Redman
Julian ReedAndy Savoy
Hélène Scherrer
Alan Tonks

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Bev DesjarlaisNorman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald KeddyJason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Clifford Lincoln
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
James RajotteScott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
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
Richard HarrisCarolyn Bennett
Scott Brison
Roy Cullen
Albina GuarnieriRahim Jaffer
Sophia Leung
Yvan Loubier
Grant McNallyMaria Minna
Shawn Murphy
Lorne Nystrom
Charlie PensonPauline Picard
Gary Pillitteri
Bryon Wilfert

(18)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
John DuncanReed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Hedy Fry
Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Pierre Paquette
Gilles-A. Perron
Joe PeschisolidoJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Stéphan Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair:

Wayne Easter

Vice-Chairs:
John Cummins
Paul SteckleSarkis Assadourian
Andy Burton
Rodger Cuzner
Georges FarrahLoyola Hearn
Dominic LeBlanc
James LunneyBill Matthews
Lawrence O'Brien
Jean-Yves RoyPeter Stoffer
Suzanne Tremblay
Tom Wappel

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
G rard Asselin
Andr  Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed ElleyKen Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Ghislain Fournier
Marcel Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale JohnstonGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
James Rajotte
Scott ReidJohn Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
Yves Rocheleau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:	Bernard Patry	Vice-Chairs:	Stockwell Day Diane Marleau	
Sarkis Assadourian	John Duncan	Stan Keyes	Deepak Obhrai	(18)
Jean Augustine	Mark Eyking	Francine Lalonde	Pierre Paquette	
Aileen Carroll	John Harvard	Keith Martin	Svend Robinson	
Bill Casey	Marlene Jennings	Pat O'Brien		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stan Dromisky	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Antoine Dubé	James Lunney	John Reynolds
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Peter MacKay	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Ken Epp	John Maloney	Yves Rocheleau
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Preston Manning	Benoît Sauvageau
Claude Bachand	Paul Forseth	Inky Mark	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Hedy Fry	Pat Martin	Carol Skelton
Colleen Beaumier	Cheryl Gallant	Philip Mayfield	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Alexa McDonough	Kevin Sorenson
Stéphane Bergeron	Jim Gouk	Grant McNally	Bob Speller
Bernard Bigras	Gurmant Grewal	Val Meredith	Larry Spencer
Bill Blaikie	Deborah Grey	Rob Merrifield	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitkreuz	Mac Harb	James Moore	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Anita Neville	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Stéphan Tremblay
Serge Cardin	Grant Hill	Brian Pallister	Tony Valeri
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Jim Pankiw	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Betty Hinton	Joe Peschisolido	Randy White
Irwin Cotler	Rahim Jaffer	Beth Phinney	Ted White
Paul Crête	Dale Johnston	David Price	John Williams
John Cummins	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney		

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair:	Mac Harb	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Casey	Mark Eyking	Pierre Paquette	Bob Speller	(9)
Rick Casson	Pat O'Brien	Svend Robinson	Tony Valeri	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Beth Phinney	Vice-Chair:		
Sarkis Assadourian	Bill Casey	Antoine Dubé	Deepak Obhrai	(9)
Colleen Beaumier	Irwin Cotler	Marlene Jennings	Svend Robinson	

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:

Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairs:

 Paul Forseth
 Tony Valeri

 Carolyn Bennett
 Roy Cullen
 Ghislain Lebel

 Steve Mahoney
 Pat Martin
 Gilles-A. Perron

 Gerry Ritz
 Andy Scott
 Alex Shepherd

 Paul Szabo
 John Williams

(16)

Associate Members

 Jim Abbott
 Diane Ablonczy
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Roy Bailey
 Leon Benoit
 Garry Breitkreuz
 Andy Burton
 Chuck Cadman
 Rick Casson
 David Chatters
 John Cummins
 Stockwell Day
 Bev Desjarlais
 John Duncan
 Reed Elley

 Ken Epp
 Brian Fitzpatrick
 Cheryl Gallant
 Peter Goldring
 Jim Gouk
 Gurmant Grewal
 Deborah Grey
 Art Hanger
 Stephen Harper
 Richard Harris
 Grant Hill
 Jay Hill
 Howard Hilstrom
 Betty Hinton
 Rahim Jaffer

 Dale Johnston
 Jason Kenney
 Gary Lunn
 James Lunney
 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
 Werner Schmidt
 Carol Skelton
 Monte Solberg
 Kevin Sorenson
 Larry Spencer
 Darrel Stinson
 Chuck Strahl
 Myron Thompson
 Vic Toews
 Maurice Vellacott
 Randy White
 Ted White
 Lynne Yelich

HEALTH**Chair:** Bonnie Brown**Vice-Chairs:**Reg Alcock
Rob MerrifieldAndré Bachand
Diane Bourgeois
Jeannot Castonguay
Brenda ChamberlainStan Dromisky
James Lunney
Réal MénardHélène Scherrer
Judy Sgro
Carol SkeltonBob Speller
Yolande Thibeault
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(16)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
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 Day
Norman DoyleJohn Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Hedy Fry
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim JafferDale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe PeschisolidoPauline Picard
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Judi Longfield	Vice-Chairs:	Monte Solberg Diane St-Jacques	
Eugène Bellemare	Raymonde Folco	Serge Marcil	Larry Spencer	(18)
Paul Crête	Monique Guay	Joe McGuire	Greg Thompson	
Libby Davies	Tony Ianno	Anita Neville	Alan Tonks	
Reed Elley	Gurbax Malhi	Werner Schmidt		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	Brian Pallister
Diane Ablonczy	Ken Epp	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Jim Pankiw
Peter Adams	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gerald Keddy	Charlie Penson
Rob Anders	Paul Forseth	Jason Kenney	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Christiane Gagnon	Robert Lanctôt	Scott Reid
André Bachand	Marcel Gagnon	Wendy Lill	John Reynolds
Roy Bailey	Cheryl Gallant	Gary Lunn	Gerry Ritz
Carolyn Bennett	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	James Lunney	Jean-Yves Roy
Leon Benoit	John Godfrey	Peter MacKay	Carol Skelton
Rick Borotsik	Yvon Godin	Preston Manning	Kevin Sorenson
Diane Bourgeois	Peter Goldring	Richard Marceau	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitreuz	Jim Gouk	Inky Mark	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Keith Martin	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Pat Martin	Tony Tirabassi
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Philip Mayfield	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Larry McCormick	Stéphan Tremblay
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	Grant McNally	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	John Herron	Réal Ménard	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Joe Clark	Grant Hill	Val Meredith	Elsie Wayne
John Cummins	Jay Hill	Rob Merrifield	Randy White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Howard Hilstrom	Bob Mills	Ted White
Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton	James Moore	John Williams
Norman Doyle	Rahim Jaffer	Deepak Obhrai	Lynne Yelich
Antoine Dubé			

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Carolyn Bennett	Vice-Chair:		
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Raymonde Folco	Wendy Lill	Greg Thompson	(9)
Reed Elley	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Anita Neville	Tony Tirabassi	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

Chair:	John Godfrey	Vice-Chair:		
Libby Davies	Anita Neville	Diane St-Jacques	Tony Tirabassi	(9)
Monique Guay	Larry Spencer	Greg Thompson	Alan Tonks	

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:

Walt Lastewka

Vice-Chairs:
Dan McTeague
James RajotteLarry Bagnell
Stéphane Bergeron
Scott Brison
Bev DesjarlaisBrian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-BujoldSerge Marcil
Joe McGuire
Andy SavoyBrent St. Denis
Paddy Torsney
Joseph Volpe

(16)

Associate Members

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

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Andy Scott	Vice-Chairs:	Chuck Cadman John McKay	
Carole-Marie Allard	Hedy Fry	Peter MacKay	Kevin Sorenson	(18)
Michel Bellehumeur	Ivan Grose	Paul Harold Macklin	Vic Toews	
Bill Blaikie	Jay Hill	John Maloney	Pierrette Venne	
Irwin Cotler	Derek Lee	Lynn Myers		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	James Lunney	John Reynolds
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	Preston Manning	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	Richard Marceau	Svend Robinson
André Bachand	Paul Forseth	Inky Mark	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Cheryl Gallant	Keith Martin	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Monte Solberg
Bernard Bigras	Jim Gouk	Grant McNally	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Gurmant Grewal	Réal Ménard	Darrel Stinson
Diane Bourgeois	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitkreuz	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Suzanne Tremblay
Bill Casey	John Herron	Anita Neville	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Tom Wappel
David Chatters	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Joe Clark	Betty Hinton	Jim Pankiw	Elsie Wayne
Joe Comartin	Rahim Jaffer	Pierre Paquette	Randy White
John Cummins	Marlene Jennings	Charlie Penson	Ted White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Dale Johnston	Joe Peschisolido	Bryon Wilfert
Stockwell Day	Gerald Keddy	David Pratt	John Williams
Bev Desjarlais	Jason Kenney	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Norman Doyle	Dominic LeBlanc	Geoff Regan	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:	Derek Lee	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Blaikie	Lynn Myers	Kevin Sorenson	Pierrette Venne	(11)
Marlene Jennings	David Pratt	Vic Toews	Bryon Wilfert	
Peter MacKay	Geoff Regan			

LIAISON

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	Walt Lastewka	
Peter Adams	Raymond Bonin	Charles Hubbard	Bernard Patry	(20)
Reg Alcock	Bonnie Brown	Ovid Jackson	David Pratt	
Sue Barnes	Charles Caccia	Clifford Lincoln	Andy Scott	
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Judi Longfield	John Williams	
Carolyn Bennett	Gurmant Grewal			

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Brian Fitzpatrick	Steve Mahoney	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Paul Forseth	Preston Manning	John Reynolds
Reg Alcock	Cheryl Gallant	Diane Marleau	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	Yvon Godin	Keith Martin	Jacques Saada
David Anderson	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Jim Gouk	Dan McTeague	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Michel Guimond	Rob Merrifield	Monte Solberg
Bill Blaikie	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitkreuz	Mac Harb	Dennis Mills	Larry Spencer
Pierre Brien	Richard Harris	James Moore	Diane St-Jacques
Andy Burton	Grant Hill	Lorne Nystrom	Paul Steckle
Chuck Cadman	Jay Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Darrel Stinson
Murray Calder	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Yolande Thibeault
Rick Casson	Betty Hinton	Jim Pankiw	Myron Thompson
David Chatters	Rahim Jaffer	Denis Paradis	Vic Toews
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Charlie Penson	Tony Valeri
Libby Davies	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Joe Peschisolido	Maurice Vellacott
Stockwell Day	Jason Kenney	Beth Phinney	Tom Wappel
Nick Discepola	Karen Kraft Sloan	Jerry Pickard	Randy White
John Duncan	Walt Lastewka	David Price	Ted White
Reed Elley	James Lunney	Marcel Proulx	Lynne Yelich
Ken Epp	Peter MacKay	James Rajotte	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	Walt Lastewka	
Jean Augustine	Mauril Bélanger	Charles Hubbard	Judi Longfield	(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Wayne Easter	Vice-Chair:	Walt Lastewka	
Mauril Bélanger	Clifford Lincoln	Judi Longfield	John Williams	(7)
Bonnie Brown				

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:	David Pratt	Vice-Chairs:	Leon Benoit David Price	
Rob Anders	Stan Dromisky	Janko Peric	Peter Stoffer	(16)
Claude Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Louis Plamondon	Elsie Wayne	
Colleen Beaumier	John O'Reilly	Carmen Provenzano	Bob Wood	
Robert Bertrand				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Brian Fitzpatrick	Wendy Lill	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid
David Anderson	Peter Goldring	James Lunney	John Reynolds
André Bachand	Jim Gouk	Peter MacKay	Gerry Ritz
Roy Bailey	Gurmant Grewal	Preston Manning	Svend Robinson
Stéphane Bergeron	Deborah Grey	Richard Marceau	Werner Schmidt
Rick Borotsik	Monique Guay	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Garry Breitzkreuz	Art Hanger	Keith Martin	Monte Solberg
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Pat Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Grant McNally	Darrel Stinson
Bill Casey	Grant Hill	Val Meredith	Chuck Strahl
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Rob Merrifield	Greg Thompson
David Chatters	Howard Hilstrom	Bob Mills	Myron Thompson
Joe Clark	Betty Hinton	James Moore	Vic Toews
John Cummins	Rahim Jaffer	Deepak Obhrai	Maurice Vellacott
Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston	Brian Pallister	Randy White
Norman Doyle	Gerald Keddy	Jim Pankiw	Ted White
John Duncan	Jason Kenney	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Reed Elley	Francine Lalonde	Joe Peschisolido	Lynne Yelich
Ken Epp			

SUB-COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:	Colleen Beaumier	Vice-Chair:		
Roy Bailey	Dan McTeague	Carmen Provenzano	Elsie Wayne	(9)
Stan Dromisky	Louis Plamondon	Peter Stoffer	Bob Wood	

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Peter Adams	Vice-Chairs:	Dale Johnston Jacques Saada	
Rick Borotsik	Wayne Easter	Joe Jordan	John Reynolds	(16)
Garry Breitkreuz	Yvon Godin	Carolyn Parrish	John Richardson	
Pierre Brien	Michel Guimond	Geoff Regan	Tony Tirabassi	
Marlene Catterall				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	James Lunney	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	Peter MacKay	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	John Maloney	Werner Schmidt
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	Preston Manning	Carol Skelton
André Bachand	Paul Forseth	Inky Mark	Monte Solberg
Roy Bailey	Cheryl Gallant	Keith Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Sue Barnes	Peter Goldring	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Michel Bellehumeur	Jim Gouk	Grant McNally	Caroline St-Hilaire
Leon Benoit	Gurmant Grewal	Réal Ménard	Darrel Stinson
Stéphane Bergeron	Deborah Grey	Val Meredith	Chuck Strahl
Bill Blaikie	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Paul Szabo
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Greg Thompson
Andy Burton	John Harvard	Dennis Mills	Myron Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	John Herron	Lorne Nystrom	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Randy White
Joe Clark	Betty Hinton	Jim Pankiw	Ted White
John Cummins	Rahim Jaffer	Charlie Penson	Bryon Wilfert
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Gerald Keddy	Joe Peschisolido	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Jason Kenney	Marcel Proulx	Lynne Yelich
Norman Doyle	Gary Lunn	James Rajotte	

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Marcel Proulx	Vice-Chair:		
Bill Blaikie	Michel Guimond	Val Meredith	Tony Tirabassi	(6)
Rick Borotsik				

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY CALENDAR

Chair:	Marlene Catterall	Vice-Chair:		
Garry Breitkreuz	Pierre Brien	Yvon Godin	Jay Hill	(5)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chair:	John Williams	Vice-Chairs:	Mac Harb Beth Phinney	
Robert Bertrand John Bryden Odina Desrochers John Finlay	Paul Forseth Rahim Jaffer Sophia Leung Pat Martin	Philip Mayfield Shawn Murphy Gilles-A. Perron	Joe Peschisolido Alex Shepherd Greg Thompson	(17)

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 Serge Cardin Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters Joe Clark John Cummins Stockwell Day	Bev Desjarlais Norman Doyle John Duncan Reed Elley Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Richard Harris Loyola Hearn John Herron Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton	Dale Johnston Gerald Keddy Jason Kenney Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Inky Mark Keith Martin Grant McNally Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Jim Pankiw Denis Paradis Charlie Penson James Rajotte	Scott Reid John Reynolds Gerry Ritz Benoît Sauvageau 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
--	---	--	--

SUB-COMMITTEE ON COMBATING CORRUPTION

Chair:	John Williams	Vice-Chair:		
Robert Bertrand John Bryden Odina Desrochers	Pat Martin Philip Mayfield	Shawn Murphy Beth Phinney	Alex Shepherd Greg Thompson	(10)

TRANSPORT

Chair:	Ovid Jackson	Vice-Chairs:	James Moore Marcel Proulx	
Reg Alcock John Cannis Joe Comuzzi	Bev Desjarlais Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal	André Harvey Mario Laframboise Ghislain Lebel	Alex Shepherd Paul Szabo	(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson Roy Bailey Leon Benoit Garry Breitreuz Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Rick Casson David Chatters John Cummins Stockwell Day John Duncan Reed Elley Ken Epp	Brian Fitzpatrick Paul Forseth Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Deborah Grey Art Hanger Stephen Harper Stephen Harper Richard Harris Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton Rahim Jaffer Dale Johnston	Jason Kenney Gary Lunn James Lunney Keith Martin Philip Mayfield Grant McNally Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Charlie Penson James Rajotte Scott Reid John Reynolds	Gerry Ritz Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Darrel Stinson Chuck Strahl Myron Thompson Vic Toews Maurice Vellacott Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich
---	---	--	--

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Chair:	Paddy Torsney	Vice-Chairs:	Carole-Marie Allard Randy White	
André Bachand Bernard Bigras Libby Davies	Hedy Fry Mac Harb Dominic LeBlanc	Derek Lee Réal Ménard	Jacques Saada Kevin Sorenson	(13)

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Carolyn Bennett
Vivienne Poy

Joint Vice-Chair: Deborah Grey

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Jane Marie Cordy

Donald Oliver

Mauril Bélanger
Robert Bertrand
Rick Borotsik
Marlene Catterall
Ken Epp
Marcel Gagnon
Grant Hill

Jim Karygiannis
Wendy Lill
Jerry Pickard
Louis Plamondon
Jacques Saada
Guy St-Julien
Andrew Telegdi

(20)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Garry Breitkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle

John Duncan
Reed Elley
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn

James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds

Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Mauril Bélanger
Shirley Maheu

Joint Vice-Chairs: Scott Reid
Yolande Thibeault

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald Beaudoin
Jean-Robert Gauthier
Viola Léger

Jean-Claude Rivest
Raymond Setlakwe

Eugène Bellemare
Gérard Binet
Sarmite Bulte
Jeannot Castonguay
Christiane Gagnon
John Godfrey
Yvon Godin

Peter Goldring
John Herron
Jason Kenney
Dan McTeague
Bernard Patry
Benoît Sauvageau

(22)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
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
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Richard Marceau
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Jim Pankiw
Charlie Penson
Joe Peschisolido
Louis Plamondon

James Rajotte
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
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

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Gurmant Grewal
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair: Tom Wappel

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Christopher Henderson
Mobina Jaffer

Noël Kinsella
Wilfred Moore

Paul Bonwick
Pierre Brien
Jean-Guy Carignan
Bill Casey
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Michel Guimond
Derek Lee

Paul Harold Macklin
John Maloney
John McKay
Lynn Myers
Lorne Nystrom
Scott Reid
Greg Thompson
Ted White

(24)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Michel Bellehumeur
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
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston

Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Ghislain Lebel
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Preston Manning
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson

Joe Peschisolido
James Rajotte
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Pierrette Venne
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILL C-55

Chair: Bob Kilger

Vice-Chair:

Diane Ablonczy
Claude Bachand
Rodger Cuzner
Bev Desjarlais

André Harvey
Mario Laframboise
Peter MacKay
Paul Harold Macklin

Steve Mahoney
James Moore
Lynn Myers
Anita Neville

David Price
Marcel Proulx
Vic Toews

(16)

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panels of Chairman of Legislative Committees

The The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

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

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

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

CONTENTS

Friday, June 14, 2002

Privilege

Canada Pension Plan Act

Mr. Boudria	12703
Mr. Harris	12703

Canada Pension Plan Act—Speaker's Ruling

The Deputy Speaker	12704
--------------------------	-------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Pension Plan

Bill C-58. Second reading	12704
Mr. Wilfert	12704
Mr. Reid	12706
Mr. Proctor	12709

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Ottawa International Air Show

Mr. Harb	12709
----------------	-------

Africa

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	12709
---	-------

Space Program

Mr. Bélanger	12709
--------------------	-------

Economic Development

Mr. Easter	12710
------------------	-------

Highways

Mr. St-Julien	12710
---------------------	-------

Cintec International

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	12710
--------------------------	-------

Stratford Festival

Mr. O'Reilly	12710
--------------------	-------

Afghanistan

Mr. Ménard	12710
------------------	-------

Bard on the Beach

Ms. Leung	12711
-----------------	-------

Employment Insurance

Mr. Reid	12711
----------------	-------

Governors General of Canada

Ms. Brown	12711
-----------------	-------

La Soirée du hockey

Mr. Godin	12711
-----------------	-------

Wharf Maintenance

Mr. Crête	12711
-----------------	-------

War Veterans

Mr. Pratt	12711
-----------------	-------

Health

Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	12712
---	-------

Cardiovascular Disease Awareness Month

Mr. Castonguay	12712
----------------------	-------

Agriculture

Mr. Sorenson	12712
--------------------	-------

Kyoto Protocol

Mr. Bigras	12712
------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Government Contracts

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	12713
Mr. Goodale	12713
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	12713
Mr. Goodale	12713
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	12713
Mr. Goodale	12713
Mr. Breitzkreuz	12713
Mr. Goodale	12713
Mr. Breitzkreuz	12713
Mr. Goodale	12713
Ms. St-Hilaire	12714
Mr. Goodale	12714
Ms. St-Hilaire	12714
Mr. Goodale	12714
Mr. Lebel	12714
Mr. Goodale	12714
Mr. Lebel	12714
Mr. Goodale	12714

National Defence

Mr. Godin	12714
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	12715
Mr. Godin	12715
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	12715

Government Contracts

Mr. Clark	12715
Mr. Collenette	12715
Mr. Clark	12715
Mr. Goodale	12715
Mr. Williams	12715
Mr. Goodale	12715
Mr. Williams	12715
Mr. Goodale	12716
Mr. Guimond	12716
Mr. Goodale	12716
Mr. Guimond	12716
Mr. Goodale	12716

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Pallister	12716
Mr. Nault	12716
Mr. Pallister	12716
Mr. Nault	12716

Government Contracts

Mr. Loubier	12717
Mr. Goodale	12717

Mr. Loubier.....	12717
Mr. Goodale.....	12717
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Vellacott.....	12717
Mr. Nault.....	12717
Mr. Vellacott.....	12717
Mr. Nault.....	12717
Municipalities	
Ms. Scherrer.....	12717
Mr. Mahoney.....	12717
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Proctor.....	12718
Mr. Nault.....	12718
Mr. Proctor.....	12718
Mr. Nault.....	12718
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Casey.....	12718
Ms. Copps.....	12718
National Defence	
Mr. Brison.....	12718
Mr. McCallum (Markham).....	12718
Softwood Lumber	
Mr. Duncan.....	12718
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe).....	12718
Mr. Duncan.....	12719
Mr. O'Brien (London—Fanshawe).....	12719
Regional Development	
Ms. Girard-Bujold.....	12719
Mr. Drouin (Beauce).....	12719
Ms. Girard-Bujold.....	12719
Mr. Drouin (Beauce).....	12719
Agriculture	
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands).....	12719
Mr. Vanclief.....	12719
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands).....	12719
Mr. Vanclief.....	12719
Ethics	
Mrs. Longfield.....	12720
Mr. Boudria.....	12720
National Security	
Mr. Sorenson.....	12720
Mr. Myers.....	12720
Mr. Sorenson.....	12720
Mr. Myers.....	12720
Guaranteed Income Supplement	
Mr. Gagnon (Champlain).....	12720
Mr. Szabo.....	12720
Biotechnology	
Mr. Proulx.....	12720
Mr. Castonguay.....	12720

National Defence	
Mr. Goldring.....	12721
Mr. McCallum (Markham).....	12721

Shipping	
Mr. Asselin.....	12721
Mr. Collenette.....	12721

Fisheries	
Mr. Stoffer.....	12721
Mr. Thibault.....	12721

National Defence	
Mr. MacKay.....	12721
Mr. McCallum (Markham).....	12721

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

First Nations Governance Act	
Mr. Nault.....	12722
Bill C-61. Introduction and first reading.....	12722
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed).....	12722

Committees of the House	
Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities	
Mrs. Longfield.....	12722

Foreign Affairs and International Trade	
Mr. Harb.....	12722

Official Languages	
Mr. Bélanger.....	12722

Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands).....	12722
Motion for concurrence.....	12722
Mr. Easter.....	12726
Mr. Sorenson.....	12727
Mr. Easter.....	12727
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands).....	12730
Mr. Breitzkreuz.....	12731
Mr. Proctor.....	12731

Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages	
Mr. Bélanger.....	12733
Motion.....	12733
(Motion agreed to).....	12733

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Independent Public Inquiry	
Mr. Vellacott.....	12733
Motion.....	12734
Mr. Macklin.....	12736
Mr. Sorenson.....	12737
Mr. Lebel.....	12739
Mr. Brison.....	12740
Mr. Vellacott.....	12741

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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