



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 035 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, November 29, 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, November 29, 2002

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

•(1005)

[*English*]

NUCLEAR SAFETY AND CONTROL ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-4, an act to amend the Nuclear Safety and Control Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (for the Minister of Natural Resources) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Monday, December 2 at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

* * *

KYOTO PROTOCOL

The House resumed from November 28 consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the ratification of the Kyoto accord, but I do have some concerns. The updated climate change plan for Canada that our

government released last week is certainly an improvement on the earlier version.

[*Translation*]

Governments around the world need to reduce greenhouse gases. We have all seen the evidence of climate change: temperature change, and an increase in the number of natural disasters, including flooding, ice storms and drought.

There is clearly a cost associated with these phenomena. One might initially think that reducing or eliminating greenhouse gas emissions would benefit Canada's agriculture sector—although this sector has been noticeably silent on this matter.

[*English*]

We need to take action on greenhouse gases. The question before us is whether or not the Kyoto accord is the right mechanism for Canada to achieve this objective. There is absolutely no point, in my opinion, in signing the Kyoto accord if Canada cannot meet the targets and timetable implicit in the accord, that is, the lowering of greenhouse gas emissions to 6% below 1990 levels by 2008-2012. This is an ambitious undertaking and perhaps why the current Canadian plan is still short by 60 megatonnes out of a total of 240 megatonnes that Canada must achieve by the agreed date.

Why sign an agreement if the objectives cannot be achieved? To show leadership? To demonstrate environmental sensitivity? This is not enough in my view. We should sign the accord if it makes sense for Canada and if, and only if, we can achieve the commitments we undertake within the accord. Otherwise, a strictly made in Canada solution is required.

Canada seems to be leading with her chin on greenhouse gases. The U.S. government is not proceeding with the Kyoto accord. The Kyoto targets for the Europeans are hardly stretch targets for them. The closure of a number of outdated and environmentally insensitive factories, in what used to be East Germany and a conversion of coal fired plants in Great Britain to gas fired plants, means that moving from the 1990 levels to the 2008-2012 targets would not be as demanding for the Europeans as it would for Canada. In a sense it is easier for them to achieve their commitments under Kyoto.

Then we have countries like China, Russia and others which are major contributors to greenhouse gas emissions. They would be required to do nothing until 2012. Even then it would be difficult for the international community to force these countries to honour their commitments beginning in 2012.

Government Orders

What are we left with? The Americans with a made in U.S.A. solution, the Europeans with a made in Europe approach and the Chinese, Russians and others with an approach to Kyoto that meets their needs, and Canada marches on convinced that we must ratify the Kyoto accord. I would prefer a made in Canada solution.

The House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance visited Calgary recently as part of our prebudget consultations. I asked business leaders there whether they believed that a negotiated solution to Kyoto was possible in Canada, that is, a negotiating set of greenhouse gas reduction targets somewhere between those outlined in the Kyoto accord and some stretch targets for Canada, beyond those initially payable by the provinces and industry. The response was yes, such a result was possible in their view. We should strive for this.

Should we be concerned that the U.S. government will not ratify Kyoto? We should not be afraid to embark on a path that is different from our U.S. neighbours, certainly not. But we cannot ignore their position on this important matter because 87% of our exports are to the U.S. market.

As an Ontario MP I am concerned that companies in my province and indeed across Canada which are competing with companies in the U.S.A. would have greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that exceed those of their competition across the border. Will their added costs impact their competitiveness and risk plant closures and job losses? We are told that although the U.S. government is not ratifying the Kyoto accord, many U.S. states are taking action on greenhouse gases, states like Oregon, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and California.

While I understand the need to avoid paralysis by analysis, what do I tell companies in my riding of Etobicoke North which are shipping most of their production to Michigan or New York? What are those states doing? Will the companies in Etobicoke North be at a competitive disadvantage and have to cut jobs or shut down? Surely these are important questions.

The free trade agreement and NAFTA resulted in some major industrial dislocation in my riding of Etobicoke North, and in the rush to sign and implement that agreement there were few, if any, mechanisms to assist employers and employees during the transition period.

We are told that ratifying the Kyoto accord would result in Canada becoming more innovative. It would accelerate the development and adoption of new low emissions technologies. This in itself would result in new economic activity, we are told, and productivity enhancements and would offset many of the negative impacts on the so-called old economy.

●(1010)

[*Translation*]

Well, certainly some of these developments will occur. However, we must recognize four important points.

First, there is a considerable gestation period between the time that technologies are identified and the time that they are commercialized—often up to ten years. In other words, this pushes us to 2012 for some of these ideas to be implemented.

Second, some of the knowledge and equipment would need to be imported, which certainly does nothing to stimulate job creation in Canada.

[*English*]

Third, we were told in Calgary that a number of clients in Canada are currently employing state of the art emissions reducing technologies. The Kyoto targets they would be handed would require these plants to go beyond where they are today with the latest technology. What are they supposed to do other than buy emissions credits at a cost?

Certainly improving energy efficiency and conservation is a laudable goal that we should strive for in Canada. Improvements in these areas would be good for the environment and the economy. Not all emissions reducing enhancements would result in productivity enhancements. There would be a cost associated with their implementation and in many cases with no corresponding economic benefit. Environmental benefits are positive by themselves but we should not delude ourselves about the economic consequences of our actions.

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions would require changes in behaviour by Canadian businesses and consumers. I am not sure that Canadians would support ratification of the Kyoto accord until they understand it.

Fully 28% of greenhouse gas emissions in Canada are derived from the transportation sector, that is, emissions from cars, trucks, airplanes, trains and others. We would need to deal with this by travelling less in traditional modes and using more public transport, which would be a good thing, and by employing different fuels that may cost more, by driving vehicles that use less fuel, and by taking a variety of actions with these in concert with one another. Would this happen naturally and without any cost? No, it would not and Canadians need to understand this.

●(1015)

[*Translation*]

Our government will need to provide policies, signals, incentives and disincentives to facilitate these changes. Some of these will be incorporated into the February 2003 budget—and therein lies the rub.

We do not, and cannot, know what these will be until the budget is tabled. Many of these economic instruments will determine whether or not we have a chance to meet the Kyoto targets. We are being asked, however, to approve the ratification of the Kyoto accord in advance of the budget.

Government Orders

[English]

Many less onerous solutions to the problems associated with greenhouse gas emissions are being ignored by governments at all levels. An example is municipal solid waste and landfills which emit huge amounts of methane gas into the atmosphere. Methane is 20 times more dangerous in terms of greenhouse gases than CO₂.

We must deal with greenhouse gases aggressively. However we must be responsible and realistic in our approach. We should not ratify the Kyoto accord unless we can meet these commitments. To do less would be dishonest.

I am hopeful that we can find a way to aggressively attack greenhouse gases in Canada. Let us hope and pray that we will find the wisdom to do so.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the member on a speech that goes along with exactly what we have been talking about and that is a made in Canada solution. The member mentioned the U.S. It is not that the U.S. is not doing anything because there are some 39 states that would probably beat the Kyoto targets and actually accomplish something. We must recognize that but unfortunately it is not talked about very much.

Is the member aware of what the penalties are if in fact we were to ratify Kyoto and then not implement it and not achieve our targets by 2012?

Mr. Roy Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I put that very question to the minister yesterday. I was concerned that there had been a lot of discussion about us signing the accord and if we did not meet our commitments, would be some wiggle room. I wanted him to clarify that for me.

As I understand it, if there is some shortfall in the megatonne reduction, those megatonnes would be somehow factored into the next phase. There would not be a financial penalty but there would be a penalty of megatonnes. I was also told by the minister that there would be a negotiated approach. If the targets were too ambitious in the first phase, that would tell us something about the second phase, and those would be negotiated at the time.

I come back to the view that if we sign the accord, we should commit to those results and should not count on failure. I know our government is not counting on failure but I just hope we have the wherewithal.

With all the stakeholders involved, another concern I have is how we effect change when we have this state of play in Canada, where major stakeholders, many provinces and many industrial sectors are not on side? Once the accord is signed, the really tough job will be to implement it. We need to have people on side.

I have cited certain examples of corporations where the CEO has said "here is your target and you tell me how to get there". That is a good aggressive management style and it is appropriate. However it starts out with a premise that the original target is within the realm of feasibility, possibility or achievement. At this point in time I am not sure that we have the facts or the information to make those conclusions.

• (1020)

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I noticed my colleague went to considerable lengths to refer to greenhouse gases. It is quite common just to refer to CO₂, but he is right, there are many gases.

There are all sorts of other things that human beings put into the atmosphere which have poisonous and greenhouse effects. They include particulate matter, nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, organic compounds such as benzene, toxic metals such as mercury, ground level ozone, a greenhouse gas, and various other hydrocarbons, dioxins and furans. As a result, in many parts of the country our atmosphere is very poisonous. Last year in Ontario our children had to stay either in the classrooms or in their homes for 23 days. They were not allowed out because the air was so toxic.

I know the member is from an urban area but the odd thing is that the focus of a lot of this poison is around the shores of the Great Lakes where our people go to recreate themselves. Ground level ozone has increased most in rural areas and it reduces crop production.

Does the member not agree with me that everything we do to reduce the poisons in the atmosphere and improve our health is what we should do to avoid the dangers of climate change?

Mr. Roy Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I have a concern about the air quality in Toronto where I live and where my constituency is. If the Kyoto accord addressed that I think it would be a relevant question.

The Kyoto accord deals with greenhouse gases. I understand his point about low level greenhouse gases. I am not a scientist but in terms of the main issue of air quality and smog in Toronto, the Kyoto plan will only peripherally affect air quality in Toronto and in other major cities.

I have had this discussion with many constituents. I think many Canadians are confused on this point. When we get into gases other than CO₂, we are entering into a favourite topic of mine and that is methane. We have all these landfills. Toronto now is shipping landfill to Michigan. Originally it was going to ship it up to northern Ontario, it was going to sit in a big pile and the methane gas, which is 20 times worse than CO₂, was going to evaporate into the atmosphere. Right now we have certain collection and flaring systems around Canada. If we just implemented that technology across Canada, we could get to 20% to 25% of our Kyoto targets.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to the Kyoto protocol. A lot has been said about it to this point but his needs to be debated much longer so the facts can get out. I do not believe that will happen because the government does not have a plan.

Under the Kyoto protocol, Canada has to commit to reducing its emissions by 134 megatonnes below the current levels by 2008 and 2012. Canada will have to reduce its emissions by 30%. Canada is only responsible for 2% of the world's emissions so what we do will not have a gigantic impact. That also begs the question as to whether mankind is causing the global warming or are there other reasons. I will get into that in just a minute.

Government Orders

My riding of Selkirk—Interlake is a rural riding and is agriculture based. A lot of farmers these days are very well educated. One gentleman in my riding, by the name of Randall Stefanson, has a bachelor of science in environmental studies. He has spent 30 years at this and he also farms. He is a very well educated, common sense fellow from the Arborg area of Manitoba. I will be referencing some of his material in my speech.

Canada should be going after the whole issue of pollution. Pollution is causing health problems in the country and it is causing smog problems, particularly in the big cities. However that smog and pollution does not just stay in the big cities where it is created. It drifts around and contaminates a lot of the countryside. We had the issue of acid rain years ago and that is still with us to a certain extent. We know that up in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories the pollution from the industrialized world is contaminating the wildlife food supplies of the people.

Canada is looking at committing to the Kyoto protocol. However what about countries like China, India and other underdeveloped countries that are not in it but put out massive amounts of pollution? We need to look at that area. We need to not only clean up the pollution in the first world industrialized countries, but we also need to help the third world countries to industrialized and improve their economies in a clean manner.

What is the Prime Minister getting us into? He is assuming, on what basis we do not know entirely, that by reducing CO₂ gases that somehow will greatly improve the environment of the world. The jury is a long way from reaching a conclusion as to whether CO₂ gases are the problem.

As I mentioned, as far as global warming mankind is responsible for such a small amount of the CO₂ gases produced. Nature is far ahead of mankind. I think that nature will be seen in the future to be the main driver of global warming, if it continues.

In dealing with the pollution issue, I have heard other members in the House speak on this, from the government side and on our side. In the Selkirk—Interlake region where I live, we had a proposed project. It was the Eastern Interlake Regional Co-op recycling facility. I believe this effort went on for eight or ten years.

• (1025)

The municipalities got together and said that there was a better way than just filling up a landfill. They suggested a recycling cooperative where the garbage from all the municipalities would be brought to a central point, probably located north of Winnipeg, within about 15 or 20 miles. It was meant to service rural areas, not Winnipeg. This recycling cooperative would have not only sorted the garbage, but it would have created a gas that could have be used to generate some electricity as well. By doing this, it would not go into the landfill and create methane forever; that gas would enter the environment.

The problem with the project was this. Across all political lines, the municipalities approached the provincial and federal governments to help. They said that they had a good idea and asked if the government could help fund the project. The federal government put in a few thousand dollars and the province put in some.

This is a very viable idea. This type of facility is used in the United States, in Europe and in other countries. However could they get any real support for it?

When the Prime Minister rams this CO₂ Kyoto agreement through, hopefully there will be some positive silver lining to the cloud and that in fact projects like this will get funded. They could be a real demonstration to the rest of the country on how garbage from municipalities could be handled.

I talked about nature, global warming and how changes in the environment happened. It is pretty presumptuous of mankind to think we can control nature, the firmaments and the heavens. I suppose some day the government would, if it was in power, say that it wanted to change the environment or the moon or whatever.

My question to the government is basic. If global warming is taking place, is it happening as a result of mankind or is it something else? That question depends on the time scale being used. It is a fact that climate change has been going on since the beginning of time. Natural cycles of warming and cooling have been going on before man walked on the planet. Had the earth not warmed 10,000 years ago, the ecology of Manitoba would certainly not exist the way it is today. We would still be under a two mile sheet of ice.

NASA data does not support the warming theory. The United States is not supporting this agreement. I think it is based both on science and the fact that it wants to use its money for its priority, fighting pollution. When we fight pollution, we in fact reduce CO₂ gases. However, by doing it the other way around, fighting CO₂ gases, we will not be doing very much about actual pollution. That point was not lost on the Americans or the Australians. However, it sure has been lost on the Prime Minister and the environment minister who are dragging Canada kicking and screaming into this bad agreement.

Just as a little aside, the Prime Minister and cabinet apparently have the full authority to ratify this agreement without any vote in the House of Commons. That of course brings us to the operation and authority of Parliament but I will not go there today. It is a pretty sad fact when Parliament does not have the final say on some of these international treaties which will affect us so deeply.

Global warming will affect the United States more than us. Is there something I wonder that President Bush knows that we do not know? I think the scientific analysis being done in the United States, just through the resources that it has, will clearly show that concentrating on CO₂ gases is a misguided effort.

• (1030)

On the agriculture side, I would also point out that we have not had any estimates of costs from the government nor have we been told what actually will happen. The estimates that have been put out are pretty questionable. The United States says that the cost impact on its agriculture would be in the \$30 billion to \$40 billion range. When we look at the net income for farms right now, we can see that these folks are just getting by, with some making a little more than the poverty wage and others who are below that. The last thing we need is much higher costs being put on our agriculture in a dubious cause.

Government Orders

The theory of carbon dioxide causing atmospheric warming apparently was originally conceived to rationalize the high temperatures on the planet Venus, whose atmosphere is composed mainly of carbon dioxide. That theory is no longer in vogue for explaining the high temperatures on that planet. The rationale of those who support Kyoto is that man produces carbon dioxide and releases it into the environment, and therefore it must be causing some of the problem and the problem should be warming because it is a greenhouse gas.

Of course the question is, does that have any basis? Carbon dioxide is perhaps the least noxious product that man has ever produced and released into the environment. Carbon dioxide has never been put on trial to determine whether its concentration is critical in causing warming or cooling cycles. This amounts to a chicken and egg style of debate. The fact is that increased levels of carbon dioxide are associated with warming trends in climate. The fact is that the climate warms the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere and it increases only slightly. This increase does not cause the warming, but is a consequence of warming. If carbon dioxide were put on trial, I think we would find that it is not the major cause of global warming.

These models everybody is talking about are at best just estimates and guesses as to what would happen. We know that depending on what criteria and measures are put on a model that we in fact can get the answer we want out of it.

Should warming be taking place directly driven by mankind and should man's carbon dioxide release be contributing to that warming, then the question that must be asked is whether this is a benefit or a detriment to our society.

As I say, I contest whether or not carbon dioxide is actually significantly changing global warming. If there are plants and forests, for instance, growing in areas that currently do not have it, we know that plants use photosynthesis and the carbon dioxide is used up in that process, so there again, without good scientific evidence it is a little presumptuous to suggest that some warming is going to be bad for the world overall. I think the case can be made just as easily that some global warming will have an overall benefit for the world.

In Manitoba, the premier has been saying that we should in fact be supporting Kyoto. That is the position he has taken on behalf of Manitobans. His eyes, of course, are on the next provincial election and he simply wants to work with the Liberal government for some reason. The big issue in Manitoba is that our economy has not progressed particularly well under the NDP watch. It has always been the idea that if we could get that Conawapa dam going up in northern Manitoba, it would produce some 1.3 million watts of electricity, which we would then be able to export. It would take 10 years to build that dam and that would create a lot of jobs and so on. This proposal was put forward about 10 or 15 years ago and the idea then was to have a transmission line in Canada, particularly down to Ontario, that would buy the electricity from Manitoba.

●(1035)

Now I guess the premier is jumping on the idea that the Kyoto agreement is going to facilitate this somehow. To go back to that time 10 or 15 years ago when Ontario was trying to make some

decisions on hydroelectricity, it rejected clean energy from Manitoba. Now, of course, I think there are some serious discussions on the go about building that transmission line and getting it operating. If that is an incidental byproduct of the Kyoto agreement, that will be a good thing for Ontario and for Manitoba, but there again the priorities are all wrong. We are going to be spending and wasting an awful lot of money on the Kyoto agreement and the massive costs it is going to have for individual Canadians, when this hydroelectric project could well have gone ahead without Kyoto.

Ontario could have saved itself all the hydroelectric problems it has now if it had tapped into Manitoba's hydroelectric project. It will probably still be done, but in addition to having to borrow all the money to build and pay for this massive Conawapa dam, and there is only one person paying for all this, the Canadian taxpayer, the taxpayer is going to have to pay for the foolish side of Kyoto as well as for the good projects. I have mentioned two here in a really positive light today: the Conawapa dam in northern Manitoba and the recycling effort that could be made for garbage in my own riding.

These things all cost money and the government has to prioritize where it spends its money. Those two good projects certainly should receive money. I am sure there are many in other provinces that would be the same, but what is the government going to do? It is going to make it harder to fund those projects because we are going to go into the foolishness of this Kyoto agreement, trying to cut down on CO₂ gas specifically instead of going after pollution, as I said at the start of my speech. That will have a secondary effect if pollution from other gases and other particles besides CO₂ gases is reduced. Then obviously we would end up with a much better solution and it would be, to a certain extent, market driven. It would be responding to an actual demand in the country for more energy, for cleaner energy. This is where we should be going.

From my speech members can tell that I do not intend to support or vote for this ratification. I would urge the government members who are thinking seriously about this to also vote against it and give a message to the Prime Minister that before he and the cabinet ratify this they really should have some second thoughts.

I do not have much time left and I would like to take a moment now to move an amendment to the amendment. I move:

That the amendment be amended by inserting before the word "costs" the following: "detailed".

●(1040)

The Speaker: I am afraid that the hon. member has concluded his speech by moving an amendment. I find the subamendment to be in order. The question is on the subamendment.

Government Orders

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Jacques Saada (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, discussions have taken place between all parties and there is an agreement pursuant to Standing Order 45(7) to re-defer the recorded division requested earlier on report stage of Bill C-4 until Tuesday, December 3, at 3 p.m.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

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

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to this debate, especially the four days of debate delivered by the hon. member for Red Deer, I have been astounded by one observation. It is that those who are speaking against the Kyoto agreement and who are speaking with caution about it seem to fail to recognize that there are a few things that are being ignored in the debate. They are these words: imagination, innovation, vision, creativity and willingness. As long as we ignore those things we will be stuck in the naysayer rut.

I would ask my hon. friend who just spoke, does he not realize that when Canada entered the second world war we entered it with no plan but it produced some of the greatest technical innovation that has ever occurred on the face of the earth?

When the oil crisis came on in the 1970s and the spot price went to \$50 a barrel in Chicago and the projections were that it was going to go to \$120 a barrel, it created a crisis. Does the hon. member not acknowledge that it precipitated the greatest voluntary conservation effort in the history of North America?

I beg the naysayers to acknowledge that the people of Canada have thrived on innovation, vision and creativity. We have a plan, but most of this accomplishment, I am sure the hon. member must concur, will be achieved with the innovation and creativity of Canadians.

• (1045)

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I can say that I do not agree with one connection that the member made. What the Liberals are proceeding on is opposite to what we are proceeding on. They intend to jump over a cliff with a blindfold on and see where they land. The Canadian Alliance is basing its position on common sense. Common sense is an analytical assessment of the situation and what should be done about the situation.

I have laid it out very clearly in my speech that pollution is a major problem in North America and in the world. We should be doing something about pollution. We should not be wasting our time, effort and money on some hypothetical argument over whether global warming is caused by mankind or whether it is an act of nature or a natural occurrence in the world situation. I think the

evidence very clearly is that the heating and cooling of the world over the eons is precisely what is happening now.

So I think I will stick with the Canadian Alliance's common sense. We are concerned about the average Canadian. We are concerned about the Canadians with very low incomes. Many live in my riding. We do not have buses or trains that will take us from our farms and ranches to areas where there are medical doctors and we can obtain services. Our people cannot stand massive increases in fuel taxes or for vehicles that are going to be fighting CO₂ gas emissions. That will add mammoth costs for people who cannot afford it.

There is a better way and a right way to do this, and that is the Canadian Alliance way, which is based on common sense and a concern for the economic well-being of people in this country.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to my colleague from Selkirk—Interlake and I know that he has a big interest in agriculture.

I would like to ask the member to consider the following points. Agriculture in Canada is a big user of energy by its very nature. It is also in a difficult position because so many other countries are subsidizing their farmers so heavily. Farmers in Canada can compete on the basis of the market, but they have difficulty competing against the subsidized products and treasuries of other countries.

Considering that energy is such a huge cost of agriculture, I would like my colleague from Selkirk—Interlake, and the agriculture critic for the Canadian Alliance, to explain what kind of position this will put the Canadian grain and oilseed industry in if we see massive increases in energy costs.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question which brings us to one of the key points for a sector like agriculture. The cost of energy is a direct cost in the use of tractors and trucks that are used out in the fields. It is also a cost in the production of fertilizer and many of the inputs that farmers have to buy to raise the food that we need to live.

The Kyoto protocol would add cost to our food production which would raise the price for people on fixed incomes trying to buy food. It would also impact on our exports. We know other countries have a lot of subsidies so some of their costs are borne by society as a whole, but our subsidies are small and limited.

What is the impact if we were to increase the cost of raising grain, beef and all other agriculture exports? The member for Peace River has mentioned that it would make us less competitive in our exports of food and raw commodities.

Once we are less competitive, we would sell less on the world market. What does that mean? That means we would have less hard foreign currency being earned and coming into the country, less ability to pay for health care and education, and less ability in fact to pay for the Kyoto agreement that the government is pushing us into, especially if we would have to buy credits from countries like Russia or others that have this deal to sell credits.

This whole plan would simply make our standard of living even poorer. It would reduce the productivity of Canada as a whole. We already know that productivity is much less than it should be. It is much less than our main competitors in the OECD countries.

Our party is basing its position on common sense, rational thought, and not a belief in some mythical walk in the snow by the Prime Minister. It was probably a walk in too much heat that caused him to come forward with this plan.

•(1050)

[Translation]

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will begin by saying that it is an honour for me to take part in this debate on the ratification of the Kyoto protocol.

First, I would like to explain to all members, to Canadians and to Quebeckers who are listening to the debate or who will read the transcript that, in my riding, which has over 100,000 residents, the vast majority of my constituents support the ratification of the Kyoto protocol.

A large number of them took a close look at the whole issue and they feel they have enough facts to justify their support for ratification. I want to mention a few of these groups.

[English]

First, there is NDG 2020 which is an umbrella organization comprised of over 10 community groups, the majority of which work on the environmental front. It's members are scientists as well as committed residents. It has a solid understanding of Kyoto and what the ratification would mean for Canadians. Second, Eco-quartier GRAME, which is an environmental group that works on alternative energy sources.

I wish to thank my parliamentary intern Jake Wilson for all the assistance he has provided me over the last several months on gaining a better understanding of greenhouse gases, the Kyoto accord, and the implications of ratification by Canada of this particular accord. I am wholeheartedly in favour of ratification.

I would like to read into the record two short letters from two constituents which are representative of the literally hundreds of letters that I have received since I was first elected in 1997.

Dear Ms. Jennings, I'm writing to commend you in your enthusiasm for the Kyoto protocol, which I understand you support. I urge you to be as vocal as possible when the debate comes up very shortly. I am on the verge of urging my children not to have kids!! Please help me not to have to think this way. Katherine Addleman, PhD.

Dear Marlene Jennings, We urge you to vote for the ratification of the Kyoto Accord in Parliament this year. Sincerely, Judith Beny and Gordon Masten

Those two letters are short examples of hundreds of letters that I have received from my constituents. The overwhelming majority of them have said that Canada must ratify Kyoto as quickly as possible. Since the Prime Minister's announcement that it would be ratified before the end of 2002 I have received letters in support of that decision.

We have heard a lot from the opposition, particularly Canadian Alliance members, on how Canada should not ratify Kyoto and how we need a made in Canada plan. That is quite interesting. I would like to commend the hon. member for Red Deer, who is the Canadian Alliance critic for the environment, for his vigorous attempts to heap criticism on the environment. I would like to commend a number of other critics of Kyoto who have advanced the ludicrous argument that we should not ratify Kyoto, but implement a

Government Orders

made in Canada plan instead as if the ratification of Kyoto would preclude and exclude a made in Canada plan.

The government will proudly ratify the Kyoto protocol which binds other nations to compliment our efforts. We will create a made in Canada plan to implement those changes. We must do both and we will do both.

Do we need an international agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? What is wrong with a made in Canada solution? We do need a made in Canada solution. Climate change is a global problem. Carbon dioxide emissions do not obey geographical boundaries. The consequences of climate change are not confined to heavily polluting countries. That is one of the reasons why we need a global accord on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The atmosphere is around the entire planet and even the Canadian Alliance would agree with that statement. We need to build a global framework to reduce carbon dioxide buildup in the atmosphere. That is what Kyoto is all about. It is a global framework to deal with climate change and it requires global targets.

•(1055)

However, what the opposition does not want to tell Canadians but what the Liberals proudly tell Canadians is that Kyoto would allow each country to develop its own method of emissions reduction. Kyoto is not a plan. Kyoto is an objective and there is a big difference with that. It is up to each country to come up with its own national solution.

The beauty of Kyoto is that it does require a made in Canada plan for reducing emissions. Having a made in Canada plan does not exclude ratification of Kyoto. In fact, ratification of Kyoto would require a made in Canada plan for reducing the greenhouse gas emissions because Kyoto is not a plan, it is an objective. That is very important.

It is no different from two people who decide that they have an objective: they wish to have a family, they wish to have children. That is an objective. How they achieve that objective may take different routes. It may be by natural insemination, it may be artificial insemination, it may be by adoption, or it may be by fostering. The plan is how to achieve the objective. The objective is to have a child.

Kyoto is an objective to reduce greenhouse gas emissions globally and the plan will be made in Canada. With over 10 years of discussion and exchanges with the provinces and territories, ordinary Canadians, scientists and industry, we have gone a long way to achieving—

•(1100)

The Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. She will have 12 minutes remaining in the time allotted for her remarks after question period.

S. O. 31

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

HIV-AIDS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is Canadian HIV-AIDS Awareness Week. Launched in 1991, the goal is to increase awareness of HIV-AIDS, challenge HIV-AIDS related stigma and discrimination, and promote prevention efforts.

The United Nations AIDS agency reported that 42 million people are living with HIV and 3.1 million people have died of AIDS this year. In Canada today more than 50,000 Canadians are living with HIV or AIDS. The epidemic is not over, but the UN AIDS agency reports that prevention programs work. Countless Canadians are working hard to develop new and better HIV prevention programs, and at fostering understanding and support for people living with and affected by HIV-AIDS.

I ask all hon. members to join me in saluting them and to wish everyone involved a very successful Canadian HIV-AIDS Awareness Week.

* * *

QUEEN'S JUBILEE MEDAL

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 1, 2002, it will be my honour to present the Queen's Jubilee Medals to 20 very worthy people from across the riding of Edmonton—Strathcona.

The recipients are: Dr. John Elliot, Mrs. Agnes Jelhof-Jensen, Dr. Norm Kneteman, Dr. Greg Korbitt, Mr. Frank Kozar, Dr. Jonathan Lakey, Mrs. Diana McIntyre, Miss Katherine McLean, Mr. Dennis Miller, Mr. Dan Novak, Captain Jonathan Perry, Mr. Thomas Quigley, Dr. Ray Rajotte, Mrs. Dorrell Robertson, Dr. Edmond Ryan, Dr. James Shapiro, Mr. John Simpson, Mr. Paul Welke, Mr. Harold Williams, and Mr. Walter Wynnyk.

My sincere congratulations go out to all the Jubilee Medal recipients.

* * *

DIABETES AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the month of November has been Diabetes Awareness Month. More than two million Canadians have diabetes and that number will reach three million by 2010.

It is important for all of us and especially diabetics to have a well balanced diet which gives our bodies the proper nourishment they need. As well, physical activity, which can include walking, biking and all sorts of exercise, will help lead to a healthy lifestyle and allow us to make healthy choices.

Being more active and having a better diet will not only reduce the number of Canadians who have this disease, but also reduce the costs to our health care system.

CURTIS MYDEN

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased today to recognize a great Canadian athlete from Calgary, Alberta, who two days ago announced his retirement from the world of competitive swimming.

Mr. Curtis Myden has been a member of Canada's National Swimming Team for over 10 years, a period of time in which he established himself as one of Canada's best all time swimmers. Over the course of his distinguished career, Curtis won medals at all the highest levels of competition: the Olympic Games, the World Championships, the Pan Pacific Championships, the Commonwealth Games, and the Pan American Games. He is a three time Olympian and is the holder of three Olympic bronze medals.

Just as important, Curtis has long been recognized as both a leader and a model of fair play and sportsmanship. Curtis now moves on to new challenges outside the pool. He will soon be embarking upon a career in medicine, an objective he has had for several years.

I know all hon. members will want to join with me in wishing him much success in his new field of study as well as hearty congratulations for an outstanding athletic career.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CARDIOPULMONARY RESUSCITATION

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to remind the House that November is Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation, or CPR Awareness Month.

CPR saves lives by ensuring a sufficient supply of oxygen until emergency medical attendants arrive. CPR is a simple technique that can be learned in under four hours, but despite this, fewer than 3% of Canadians know how to perform it.

This month, the Heart and Stroke Foundation is advising Canadians to learn to recognize the warning signs of heart attacks and strokes and to phone immediately in the case of an emergency.

I invite members to support the initiatives and programs planned during CPR Awareness Month, and I urge all Canadians to take the time to learn it.

* * *

● (1105)

[*English*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, when the aboriginal affairs minister took over the management of Manitoba's Dakota Tipi First Nation, he paid off all the public sector accounts but he left over a quarter of a million dollars owing. Like thousands of other private sector businesses negatively impacted by the government's policies, my constituents are very saddened by the unfairness of this approach and it is hurting people.

A local hardware store has laid off two people and it will not fill a third position. A local plumber is owed \$10,000; a grocery store \$3,500.

Jocelyne Durand, who owns a local dry cleaning firm, wrote to me:

I am a widow running a business on my own since my husband's death in February of 2001. I have six employees and I am responsible for paying their wage. I don't want to let them down.

This heartless approach the government is taking hurts local businesses and it hurts band members too, because it threatens the relationship between them.

Christmas is approaching. My constituents and other small businesses affected by the government's policies are not asking for the minister to continue to be a grinch. Nor are they asking him to be Santa Claus. They are simply asking him to pay what these people are owed.

* * *

LIVESTOCK GENETICS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, diversity of species is a critical foundation of the success of life on the planet. In the same way, genetic diversity of livestock, cattle, hogs, poultry and so on in Canada, is the foundation of the quality and security of our food supply.

While Canada is doing a good job of nurturing the genetic diversity of food plants, we are doing little to preserve and promote livestock diversity. As a result we are depending upon fewer and fewer strains of farm animals. For example, most dairy cows in Canada are very closely related to each other. This is a dangerous situation in terms of risks of disease and future development of livestock varieties.

I urge that livestock genetics be given special attention in the budget. We need a national centre for the conservation of our research into livestock genetics like the one we have for plants in Saskatchewan. Let us listen to the Canadian Foundation for the Conservation of Farm Animal Genetic Resources and act soon on this before it is too late.

* * *

[Translation]

WORLD AIDS DAY

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, World AIDS Day, which is held every year on December 1, has chosen as its theme stigma and discrimination, which remain the main barriers when it comes to preventing HIV/AIDS and dealing with it effectively.

Too many people continue to refuse treatment for AIDS or refuse to publicly acknowledge that they carry HIV for fear that they will suffer discrimination.

However, the statistics are alarming: three million people have died of AIDS in 2002; five million new cases have been reported, including two million cases among women, and 800,000 involving children under the age of 15; 42 million people around the world are now infected and if nothing drastic is done, more than 68 million people will die from AIDS by 2020.

By focussing on stigma and discrimination, World AIDS Day encourages people to break the silence and remove the barriers to

S. O. 31

preventing and dealing with HIV/AIDS effectively. The fight against HIV/AIDS will only be won when—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Laval West.

* * *

PEACEKEEPING

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House of the outstanding work of a Laval resident, Clémence Lacroix, who was awarded the Canadian Peacekeeping Service Medal for her work in Egypt, where she served with the Canadian Forces.

Peacekeepers like Ms. Lacroix make it possible for Canada to carry out its role in peacekeeping around the world.

I ask for the support of my parliamentary colleagues in congratulating people like Clémence Lacroix for their work in peacekeeping.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have a few words of advice for the provincial health ministers. They should not hold their breath waiting for real cooperation from the government in fixing our health care system. If they think the Prime Minister is sincere when he says he will work with the provinces to come up with a plan, think again.

When it comes to cooperation with the provinces, the government gets a failing grade. Just ask the energy and environment ministers how much cooperation they got trying to come up with a workable Kyoto plan.

The energy and environment ministers got so sick of the Liberal government's arrogance they postponed a meeting which was supposed to happen last week and they cancelled the meeting that was supposed to be held today.

Beware, provincial health ministers. Get ready to be ignored.

* * *

● (1110)

LANDMINES

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the House that next week we will mark the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Ottawa convention banning anti-personnel mines.

Tomorrow, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Cooperation will participate in a plaque unveiling ceremony in the Lester B. Pearson building. This plaque will be a permanent reminder of the leading role that Canada played in this historic treaty. This event will also mark the opening of an international symposium organized by Mine Action Canada.

S. O. 31

A hundred and thirty countries have ratified the landmines treaty and, partly with the help of a \$72 million grant from CIDA, millions of hectares of land have been cleared of mines. We must remember, however, that the tragedy of anti-personnel landmines has not ended. They continue to kill indiscriminately long after the conflicts themselves have ended. We must remember that in countries which have not yet been cleared of landmines they continue to pose a major obstacle to physical and economic reconstruction.

* * *

ELECTORAL REFORM

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I look forward to legislation being introduced on electoral reform and party financing. I expect to see a ban on corporation and trade union donations to political parties, as well as strict limits on individual donations. This will be undoubtedly based on Quebec legislation introduced a quarter of a century ago by René Lévesque, a bill, which he said after he left office, of which he was most proud. Premier Gary Doer has implemented similar legislation recently in Manitoba.

Given the string of pratfalls by the government in rewarding companies with rich government contracts after they donated handsomely to the Liberal party, this is welcome news indeed.

Since being drummed out of cabinet last spring, the MP for LaSalle—Émard has expressed concern about the democratic deficit in Parliament, and indeed in Canada. If this legislation is as complete and fulsome as it should be, the member for LaSalle—Émard may end up with far more democracy than he will be able to handle.

* * *

*[Translation]***AGROPUR PLANT**

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, until very recently, the Agropur plant processed millions of litres of milk produced by farmers in my region. Following an administrative decision, all of the processing operations will be moved outside of the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean.

The survival of a region like ours depends on this ability we have to process our own raw materials in our own region. These are special circumstances and they require special support measures.

However, the minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for the Regions of Quebec is unable to provide speedy assistance. This is another example of the federal government's lack of interest when it comes to the survival of businesses in the regions of Quebec.

For the secretary of state and the Liberal government, it is clearly out of the question to help workers of the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean area.

* * *

MARGUERITE MAILLET

Mr. Serge Marcil (Beauharnois—Salaberry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Acadian author Marguerite Maillet will receive the title of Officer of the Order of Canada from Canada's Governor General.

At the same ceremony, 30 Canadians will be invested as Companions, Officers or Members of the Order of Canada.

Madame Maillet is a major Canadian literary figure. Her work is known throughout the Americas and Europe. She is a source of inspiration for Acadia and for Canada.

She has long been involved in promoting literature through research and teaching as well. She is also the co-founder of Bouton d'or d'Acadie, a publisher of children's literature in French, English and Mi'kmaq.

My sincere congratulations to Marguerite Maillet on this richly deserved honour, as well as to all the others who will be honoured at the same investiture.

* * *

*[English]***LOWER CHURCHILL PROJECT**

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, there is growing evidence, on a daily basis, that the province of Newfoundland and Labrador and the province of Quebec may be close to signing the Lower Churchill deal, consisting of a 2,000 megawatt generating facility at Belle Island. This is a \$4 billion project.

In spite of the fact that massive amounts of power will be developed, we are still faced with the prospect that no provision may be made to make power available for industrial development in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador because this power may be developed for export only.

If this indeed the case, then I would caution Premier Grimes to go slowly and listen attentively to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador who are saying that it is better to leave this project undeveloped for the time being than to make hasty decisions today that will be regretted for generations to come.

* * *

●(1115)

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Carleton, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, for months the Liberal government has been unlawfully charging the goods and services tax on Hydro One's debt retirement charge. A debt payment is neither a good nor a service and therefore is not eligible to be taxed. In fact, debt is by definition a deferred tax. This makes the GST on the debt retirement charge an unconstitutional tax on a tax. That is just the start.

As a result of the decision of the Ontario government to refund all higher than expected electricity bills retroactive to May, the federal government is now in receipt of millions of dollars in GST revenue on electricity charges that have been retroactively cancelled. When a customer returns a good or service to a store and gets a refund, the GST on the cancelled good or service is always returned to the customer. That should be true in this case too, but the federal government has been strangely silent about the millions it has collected in GST on the refunded portion of Ontario's hydro bills.

Oral Questions

The return of these millions of dollars to Ontarians across the province is a legal obligation of the government. Why will the government not do what is right—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Halifax.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, public commissions can build nations and create legacies or gather dust and achieve nothing. “A commission is only as good as the government it's advising”, the first nations voice of experience said yesterday.

The 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples was supposed to be about gathering strength. Instead it has been gathering dust. Of 400 recommendations, only four have been fully implemented. Meanwhile aboriginal families lives are ravaged by poor health from birth to premature death.

AFN national chief reminded us yesterday that aboriginal Canadians have been waiting for years to move their third world health to 21st century Canada.

Our commitment to improve health for all Canadians will be measured in the improved health of our aboriginal peoples.

The Prime Minister is committed to working in full partnership with the provinces and territories to implement Romanow. This ignores the critical health commission recommendation that aboriginal health will only be improved by working in full partnership with first nations. This needs to start with first nations inclusion in the upcoming first ministers talks.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, after a day of reflection on the Romanow report it looks like the government's agenda all along was to shut down alternative delivery options.

We believe that health care should combine the efficiencies of the private sector and the equities of public insurance.

Is it the government's intention to shut down alternative deliveries by the provinces?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said on a number of occasions, our publicly financed health care system presently contains a mix of delivery modes. I have no reason to believe that will not continue.

However, my obligation is to ensure that in the delivery of health services there is respect for the five principles of the Canada Health Act. In fact, if there are delivery modes that call into question any one of those five principles, clearly that is a problem for me and I will be raising it with my provincial or territorial colleagues.

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, delivery of care is clearly a provincial jurisdiction. While the federal government walked away from its obligations to

adequately fund health care, the provinces have introduced reforms to improve patient care and to save the system.

Does the government think that a public monopoly is the only way to provide quality timely health care to all Canadians?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, it is very clear that Canadians want a publicly financed system that is accessible, timely and delivers high quality care.

I have also made it very plain that the delivery of health care is a provincial responsibility. There are presently different modes of delivery. My obligation is to ensure, in delivering health care, that the provinces are respectful and in fact live up to the five principles of the Canada Health Act. I will continue to discharge that obligation.

Mr. Rob Merrifield (Yellowhead, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the lack of timely access to health care services is the number one problem that Canadians face.

Mr. Romanow rejected any patient guarantees. If health care is a service, then certain standards of quality and timeliness should be expected.

There are a million people on waiting lists in the country. Does the minister think Canadians deserve guarantees for timely service?

• (1120)

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): In fact, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that provincial and territorial health ministers and I have taken up. Clearly there are different points of view among the provinces and territories themselves and among recent reports, be it Senator Kirby's report or Commissioner Romanow's report.

I think the one thing that we can say is that timely access to high quality service is absolutely key to Canadians and Canadians have the right to expect that. How we ensure that I believe is a matter that will be discussed fully by federal, provincial and territorial health ministers.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, no one is going to quibble with Romanow's suggestion that more money for medicare is necessary. After all, it was the Liberal government that started the health care crisis by cutting over \$25 billion from health care transfers to begin with.

Since Romanow's report calls for \$15 billion in new spending and the projected surplus is \$14 billion, and that is for spending of all kinds, how can the government possibly pay for this wish list without increasing taxes?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague, the Minister of Finance, has been very clear that Canadians do not want their taxes increased, whether that is for health care spending or other matters.

Oral Questions

In fact, I think one of the issues that provincial and territorial colleagues, finance ministers, first ministers and I will be talking about is the amount of new money that the health care system needs and the timeframe in which that new money goes into the system. I anticipate that those will be vigorous and very important discussions among provincial, territorial and federal governments.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that several provinces have outright rejected the Romanow report and several others have expressed serious concerns.

It is no wonder. They have seen this sort of thing from the Liberals before. They propose vast new programs, start them off with a big bang and then saddle the provinces with the fallout. It is for the very same reason that not a single province would sign on to the last Liberal effort, which was a national day care plan. No one trusts the Liberals to follow through.

Why does the government not start to fix the existing health care system by increasing the funding but then working with the provinces instead of imposing impossible new programs on them?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the government is doing and will continue to do.

The accord of 2000 was entered into by all provincial and territorial premiers as well as the Prime Minister of our country. In fact, in that accord one found a commitment to do that which the hon. member speaks of, which is to renew our health care system, to do those things that are necessary to ensure that we are delivering accessible, timely, high quality care within a publicly financed system.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after severely weakening the health care system by slashing funding, the Prime Minister is now saying that the federal government will be forced to impose conditions upon Quebec and the provinces for any reinvestments in health.

Does the Minister of Health, she who so loudly praises the virtues of cooperation, realize that the best way for Ottawa to avoid squabbles is to inject massive amounts into health, with no strings attached, as physicians, nurses, CLSCs, unions and all of Quebec's political parties are demanding in the best interests of patients?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out yesterday in response to a question from the Bloc Québécois, this federal government has invested extensively in the health care system in Quebec and all provinces and territories. We intend to continue to work in collaboration and partnership with all provinces and territories.

I do not think I could be any clearer than I was yesterday. It is not the intention of the federal government, nor is it our constitutional authority, to micromanage the health care system in the country. Provinces administer and deliver health care but we are there to act as partners with them.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in Quebec the Romanow report has already rallied universal opposition. All

stakeholders, whether in politics, the labour movement or the health care field, are worried on behalf of patients that the federal reinvestment has strings attached. The Prime Minister's statements confirm their fears.

Will the Minister of Health admit that imposing conditions, to which everyone in Quebec objects, also means a delay in federal reinvestment in health, whereas patients could benefit immediately, if there were no strings attached?

• (1125)

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have already pointed out, we were able to work successfully with the province of Quebec coming out of the accord of September 2000, where the province of Quebec accepted some hundreds of millions of dollars, both in relation to the improvement of medical equipment in the province and in relation to moving forward its primary health care reform.

I anticipate that we will, when we sit down together, provincial, territorial and federal health ministers, be able to continue and build upon the constructive relationship of partnership we have enjoyed so far.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is unanimous opposition to the Romanow report. All political parties are denouncing the conditions that the federal government is preparing to impose on funding for the health care system. Quebec's minister of health has said the conditions are unacceptable. Jean Charest has said that it is not up to the federal government to set priorities and Mario Dumont described the report as a "trap".

How can the minister have us believe that her main concern is the best interests of patients, when she is planning on imposing conditions on the funding for the health care system, against the wishes of the majority of the political parties in Quebec?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my main concern is to ensure that we have a health care system that is based upon the values that have been expressed by Canadians.

As I have said before, we have been able to work effectively with the Government of Quebec. I anticipate that we will be able to continue to work in partnership and collaboration with them and with all provinces and territories.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when does the minister plan on responding to Dr. Yves Lamontagne, the president of the Collège des médecins, who said that the Romanow report has been a costly exercise with no direct benefits for patients? He added that the new bureaucracy would delay the implementation of concrete solutions.

What does she have to say to this?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. It is not the intention of the government to create new bureaucracies. It is my goal to ensure that every cent of new money goes toward providing an enhanced and renewed health care system for all Canadians.

I can again say no more than I already have, which is that we have worked effectively with the province of Quebec in the past and I anticipate that we will be able to do so in the future.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the test of one's values is not in the saying but in the doing. Instead of "gathering strength", the 1996 royal commission on aboriginal peoples has been gathering dust.

No Canadian wants to see the Romanow commission do the same, least of all aboriginal peoples who suffer third world health conditions in 21st century Canada.

To redress this double injustice, will the federal government today make the unequivocal commitment to work in full partnership with aboriginal peoples, starting with their inclusion in the upcoming first ministers meetings dealing with the future of Canada's health?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can do no better than to quote the Prime Minister, who said last night, "The Romanow Report will not gather dust on the shelf. We will move quickly".

He went on to say, "There will be a first ministers meeting in late January to agree on a comprehensive plan to modernize medicare".

He went on to say further, "And I can assure Canadians that after a successful meeting, we will be there with the federal share of the money to finance that long term plan".

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as I said in my preamble, the test of one's values is in the doing, not the saying.

I heard what the Prime Minister said. What the Prime Minister said specifically excluded any representation of first nations at the table when first ministers meet in January.

I repeat my question, and I ask whatever representative of the government speaks for the government on this issue, will first nations people be represented in those critical partnership talks to take place in January?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is probably aware, we work in partnership now with Canada's first nations and Inuit people. I have every intention of continuing to do so. Obviously there is a primary obligation upon me, as Minister of Health, and the Government of Canada to work with Canada's first nations and Inuit people.

We know the challenges they face in terms of the quality of health care and the health outcomes we see that are lower than those for the rest of Canada. It is my goal to renew the partnership with Canada's aboriginal peoples so that we can provide a quality health care system for aboriginal Canadians wherever they live.

● (1130)

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General.

It is my understanding that a formal criminal complaint has been lodged against two officials at the Dorchester penitentiary in New Brunswick for unlawfully destroying evidence filed under the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and that there is an RCMP investigation under way as of today.

Could the minister responsible for Correctional Service Canada confirm that there is an RCMP investigation into these serious accusations?

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm or deny the allegation, but certainly we will look into it and report accordingly.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the minister should be able to confirm it because he was notified on October 23 in complete detail about the charges.

This is a very serious matter and we want to ensure that the investigation goes ahead fairly, thoroughly and unfettered.

Since the Solicitor General is in charge of both the RCMP and Correctional Service Canada, will he assure the House today that the RCMP will be allowed to perform a full, thorough and completely unfettered investigation about these criminal complaints into the Dorchester penitentiary situation?

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that we look into all matters in a thorough and deliberate fashion and this will be no different.

* * *

TERRORISM

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today there are reports that Lebanese Hezbollah was involved in the double terrorist attacks in Kenya yesterday.

Last week we discovered that four Canadian synagogues are under threat of bombing by hate groups like Hezbollah.

Today we learned that B'nai Brith is taking this government to court in order to compel it to ban Hezbollah.

My question is for the foreign minister. Just why is it that Canadian citizens have to sue their government in order to protect their own safety?

Mr. Lynn Myers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all let me thank the B'nai Brith for the very good work it does not only in Canada but throughout the world.

Oral Questions

I want to point out that the government of course does not respond to opposition allegations or newspaper reports, or groups for that matter. Rather, we work diligently to ensure the safety and security of all Canadians.

The Solicitor General this past week announced the listing of six additional groups and of course that is an important step. It is a work in progress in all cases. The listing of entities is a work that is done with great deliberate and thorough care.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, federal tax collectors continue to squeeze the Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League for every dime, but these are non-profit teams. They do not pay salaries and they operate in the red.

Last week the minister said she had the responsibility to review this situation.

Why is the revenue minister bodychecking these teams into bankruptcy?

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course that is inaccurate. We have a responsibility at CCRA to help to determine the employee and employer status relationship. We often look at the results of court decisions in order to determine that. I have to tell the member opposite that while I cannot speak to individual cases, we do review not only court decisions but requests from all members of the House to ensure that what we are doing is fair and reasonable.

We recognize the importance of hockey and sports for our young people. We also recognize the need to support young people.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for years health care stakeholders have denounced the system's chronic underfunding. According to Andr e Gendron, director of the Association des CLSC, targeted funds will set off more discussions, which will delay the money. She says they cannot wait any longer.

Does the minister realize that any conditions linked to transfers will cause unacceptable delays and that this demonstrates that the political aspect is more important to her than the interests of patients?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in fact we have put considerable new dollars into the health care system on the basis of the September 2000 accord. As it relates to the province of Quebec specifically, that accord has provided an additional \$5 billion in CHST transfers over five years, \$239.3 million for medical equipment and \$133 million for primary health care reform.

If the hon. member is suggesting that the system will require more new money, yes, the member will find no disagreement from our side and we will be there to do our part.

●(1135)

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to hear from people involved in direct patient care.

What the Romanow report is promoting is a wall to wall system, managed by bureaucrats in Ottawa. The spokesperson for the Qu bec Federation of General Practitioners is asking whether or not putting a Canadian slant on everything is a wise idea.

Could the minister tell us how ignoring the specific needs of each province is going to serve the best interests of patients?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, far from overlooking the individual needs of provinces, we draw strength from the flexibility that we see province by province, territory by territory.

The provinces are responsible for delivery of health care. The provinces are innovating. The provinces are meeting their local circumstances. Of course our health care system must have flexibility. Nothing else would make any sense.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, for almost two years the government has been telling Canadians that it has the softwood lumber file under control.

Clearly it does not and because of the lack of leadership on this issue, the united Canadian front is starting to crumble. The only initiative the government has come up with recently has been to insult the President of the United States.

Why is the government insulting the United States rather than saving Christmas for thousands of Canadian softwood families?

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will not go into everything the member said because she is just trying to pour oil on the fire and is really trying to make a picture that we do not get along well with the United States. That is absolutely wrong.

We work very well with the United States. We have 85% of our international trade with the United States, almost \$2 billion of trade every day with the United States. This is an extraordinarily successful relationship. I appreciate the collaboration I get from Don Evans, the secretary of commerce and Bob Zoellick, the United States trade representative.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources has turned his back on the softwood lumber workers and their families.

With Christmas fast approaching and negotiations at a standstill, laid-off softwood lumber employees need to know how they will pay for the Christmas turkey.

The Canadian Alliance has a plan to help these workers. Rather than talking about doing more, why does the minister of natural disasters not just get his SUV in gear and actually do more?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that the government has already come forward to assist the softwood lumber industry, the families, the plants and the workers to the tune of \$340 million.

As the Minister of Natural Resources has said, if more needs to be done, the government will look at doing more.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government must realize that there will be no positive outcome whatsoever in Quebec for patients who have been waiting years for funding to be restored, if it decides to set conditions. As Jennie Skeene of the Fédération des infirmières et infirmiers du Québec pointed out “—one of the problems we foresee involves the targeted funds, which are liable to cause petty squabbles and delay payment”.

If the minister has the patient's best interests at heart, as she claims, why does she not try to convince the Prime Minister to set aside the conditions on the transfer payments and pay the money directly to the provinces?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister has been clear and others have been clear. We do not anticipate any delay in implementing this report.

Health ministers will be meeting next week. Finance ministers are meeting in the middle of December. A first ministers meeting will be held toward the end of January. We are going to be working very quickly and one hopes in effective partnership with the provinces. I see no delay necessary in this area.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, all observers question the government's true intentions and fear potential squabbles. The minister knows this, because she also stirred things up over the young offender issue. This is the concern of Louise Chabot of the Central des syndicats du Québec. She asks “Why stir up squabbles by dictating to the provinces the priorities and conditions tied to federal funding?”

Could the minister tell us just how the patient's best interests can be served if there is one squabble after another between the provinces and the federal government, when it would be so much simpler to hand the money over to the provinces, period?

Does she have a fondness for squabbles?

• (1140)

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing Canadians regardless of where they live have made absolutely plain, it is that they want the bickering between federal, provincial and territorial governments to stop. They want us to work together to ensure that they have accessible, timely, high quality health care within the framework of a publicly financed system.

Oral Questions

I have every reason to believe that my counterpart from the province of Quebec will be at the table next week when federal, provincial and territorial ministers sit down to begin discussions around a plan for the renewal of our health care system. I see no reason for delay. I think those discussions should go very well.

* * *

AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, children must be protected from sexual abuse by adults, regardless of the relationship between them. Now the justice minister says that protection is only needed for so-called trust relationships.

Selective protection is not good enough for Canadian children. When will the minister commit to protect all of our children by raising the age of sexual consent for all adult sexual relationships to at least age 16?

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very interested in looking at the entire area of sexual exploitation of children and vulnerable people. We are not simply going to zero in on that particular aspect. We are going to look at the broader aspect. We do have some ideas and we do have some legislation. We are going to bring those forward to the House. We are going to solve that problem.

* * *

YOUNG OFFENDERS

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago in my riding, Colleen Findlay, a 39 year old mother of three, was tragically murdered in her home. Her car was stolen and her house was set on fire. A 15 year old has been charged with first degree murder. Crown prosecutors and community members are calling for him to be raised to adult court.

Will the justice minister change the law to ensure that all 15 year olds charged with murder are tried in adult court?

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been reviewed in the House at length in looking at the youth justice act. The fact is that although there are examples of this nature, we do leave them to the courts to make that decision. The court is the appropriate place for the decision to be made as to whether they should be raised to adult court.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian producers are currently receiving only 70% of their share of the federal program for income that helps Canadian farmers. Could the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food tell the House when those farmers could expect the balance of the funds to come to them so they can feed their families turkeys like my other colleagues were asking?

Oral Questions

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, the Canadian farm income program is an ad hoc program that continues to be in place to assist farmers when their incomes drop precipitously. Each year we start out so that we can ensure that all farmers receive equal percentages of it.

We started out this year at 70% and I am pleased to announce that we are raising that as of today to 100%. Those who have received cheques will get the top-up. Those payments from here on out will receive firsthand 100% of the federal share.

* * *

HEALTH

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today the health minister refused to give a clear response to how health services should be delivered in Canada. Romanow was clear. A publicly funded, publicly delivered health system is the way to protect medicare.

The minister did acknowledge that public financing is essential, but why would she not clearly state as Romanow has that private, for profit delivery must be rejected? What will it be, public delivery or private, for profit delivery?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that Commissioner Romanow has called for the outlawing of private, for profit delivery in this country. He obviously expressed some concerns about that, as have I, in calling for evidence based decision making in relation to that which works best for Canadians around the delivery of health care.

I have made it absolutely plain in the past that there is a mix of delivery modes in this country today. I presume that will continue. My obligation is to ensure that the five principles of the Canada Health Act are respected.

* * *

CANADA CUSTOMS AND REVENUE AGENCY

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the CCRA is at it again. First it was going after people with disabilities and now it is targeting low income parents who get the child tax benefit.

The questionnaire sent out to thousands of parents is an invasion of privacy and is insulting. The CCRA has no right to ask how a parent has "provided guidance and companionship" or "have you regularly encouraged good health habits with your child". This is a tax agency for God's sake.

Will the minister rescind this offensive questionnaire and tell the CCRA to butt out of parenting? It is no good at it.

• (1145)

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, CCRA has a responsibility to determine who is the primary caregiver of a child because the goal of the child tax benefit is to see that it actually goes to the child for the care of that child.

We continually review the questionnaires we send out. I have asked my officials to review this particular questionnaire. I want to ensure that while we live up to our responsibility of ensuring that the

dollars go to the child for the benefit of that child, we want to do so in a way which is compassionate and appropriate.

* * *

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Rex Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls, PC): Mr. Speaker, while the Liberals collect millions in taxes on airline tickets, user fees, security taxes and fuel taxes, none of this is being reinvested into rural areas. Rural Canada needs access to affordable air travel in order to encourage investment and tourism access.

Gander airport became known around the world last year, but because of the monopoly in the airline industry, ticket prices are making it unaffordable for tourists to fly to my riding.

Yesterday the Minister of Transport had no time to meet with tourism industry officials who wished to discuss this very issue. When will he make the time to reveal the Liberals' plan to save rural airports?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to raise the issue of the member's constituents who wish to meet with the Minister of Transport. The Minister of Transport is one who is known to be very accessible to a number of Canadians. He cares very much about ensuring a proper and competitive airline industry in Canada. He has stated that and he has worked very hard on that issue, as we all know.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has hinted at providing federal assistance to Manitoba to develop a \$5 billion project at Conawapa.

The Minister of the Environment said Ottawa is examining the feasibility of federal support for a \$1.4 billion transmission line to get the generated power to Ontario. We support this initiative.

Why has the federal government refused to assist the province of Newfoundland and Labrador to develop the Lower Churchill project?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the position of the federal government is clear. We are looking at a range of measures that could help achieve reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Where there are proposals from the provinces or from the hydro corporations of the provinces to improve transportation systems, we will certainly look at them regardless of where they come from.

*Oral Questions***FIREARMS REGISTRY**

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the justice minister bragged that the gun registry was worth \$1 billion but his actions contradict his words.

The minister refuses to permit aboriginal hunters to buy ammunition without a firearms licence. Can the minister explain why his government delivers thousands of rounds of ammunition to reserves and hands the ammunition out to aboriginal hunters who are not in possession of a firearms licence?

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are doing our very best to administer this program. As the minister said yesterday in the House, there are challenges in starting up a new program and we are working, and have worked in the past, with our aboriginal communities to try to make their life better, and in particular the waiver of fees when, for example, their hunting is for sustenance.

We believe we are doing a good job and we are going to proceed with that which is founded in good public policy.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, my constituents are irate about the blatant waste of their money being used for “in your face” government advertising at the Grey Cup.

Businesses advertise their products and services to increase business but no one is worried about the Government of Canada going belly up. The deductions on our paycheques are reminder enough that we are Canadians.

How much did the Grey Cup advertising cost? Why does the government waste these millions advertising itself instead of spending on health care?

• (1150)

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 would be happy to provide the normal details with respect to this matter to the hon. gentleman in response to an Order Paper question. I will provide him with the full breakdown. I would report that we have our advertising arrangements with the CFL on a full annual basis, not just the Grey Cup game, but throughout the year. I am happy to report as well that the contract was concluded this year without the assistance of an external advertising agency.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the vice president of the CSN echoed the thoughts of other stakeholders from Quebec when she said, in reference to the Romanow report, that it ran the risk of paralyzing any chance of applying concrete, innovative and urgent solutions to current problems.

Will the minister acknowledge that the only solution is to transfer the money required promptly, and without any strings attached, in order to avoid hampering the efforts of stakeholders, who have the interests of patients, rather than structures, at heart?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Health explained quite well that we have in the past agreed with the province of Quebec. There was an agreement in 2000. We did not paralyze anything.

I do not see why Minister Legault would be offended by our proposal to help fund home care when the province of Quebec spends less per capita on home care than any other province.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the response given by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is ironic. The president of the FTQ added his voice to the consensus by stating that the required funding must be injected immediately without any further studies or discussions.

Will the minister admit that the way to avoid discussions is to transfer the required money without any strings attached, since Quebec knows best when it comes to health care?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every survey indicates that Quebecers want their governments to work together.

The Government of Canada will work with the Government of Quebec to improve health care in Quebec. It is not simply a question of money. Even Premier Landry has said so. It is about what approach should be taken, and we will agree on identifying the right priorities.

The ministers of health will be meeting next Friday. We have no intention of dragging our feet when it comes to helping Canadians.

[*English*]

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in the health committee, a Health Canada official would not say whether donated semen coming from the United States to Canadian fertility clinics was from prisoners or not.

Is the health minister able to guarantee Canadian couples that they are not receiving semen from American prisoners?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I am able to guarantee is that all donor semen that comes into this country and is used must meet stringent standards imposed by Health Canada. I have no reason not to presume that all donor semen meets those high standards.

Mr. Larry Spencer (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Romanow's former finance minister, Janice McKinnon, is quoted today as saying, “If we are struggling to fund the health care system now, how can we afford to expand it?” She also argued that present spiralling medical care costs threaten to divert money from other important programs.

Oral Questions

The Romanow report suggests a massive expansion. Given the finance minister's Peace Tower promise of no new taxes, what cuts will he make to finance the spiralling costs and the proposed Romanow expansions?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance has said and as I have said, obviously our health care system needs new money. The exact amount of that new money and the funding profile of that new money is something that will to be negotiated between federal, provincial and territorial governments.

However let me reassure the hon. member, as a health minister I am very sensitive to the fact that my colleagues who sit here have their own priorities and their own program initiatives on behalf of Canadians. What we need to do is ensure that we can meet the needs of all Canadians.

* * *

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government floated a trial balloon yesterday proposing a ban on corporate and union donations to political parties. It would replace this money with government subsidies.

The Liberals have cancelled three fundraisers in the last six months. The Prime Minister's clinging to power has diverted resources away from the party coffers and made the public trough look attractive.

Why is the government designing public policy around its party's financial needs?

• (1155)

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am the person responsible for the Elections Act. I have not introduced any legislation in the House of Commons yet. I have indicated in the House of Commons that it was my intention, and it still is, to introduce it before Christmas, and the hon. member should not heckle his own question.

* * *

COAST GUARD

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, next week the Auditor General will report on the state of marine communications in Canada. It ought to be a shocker.

Since 1995, the Coast Guard has experienced amalgamation, downsizing and cross training. What committee found when we toured MCTS coastal facilities was appalling: failed transmitters, service interruptions, cancelled training programs and dedicated officers under great duress.

In this day of heightened worldwide alert, surely watching our coast ought to be a top priority. Will the minister commit to correcting the chronic million dollar budget shortfall right now?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to receive these requests for more spending from the Alliance members because they cover a wide

range of areas. Generally, we have worked out on this side of the House that it is about \$3.6 billion a question period.

I certainly agree with the hon. member that we must ensure that the Coast Guard has the resources it needs to continue to protect our coast as it does. It is an excellent service. It needs some money, and I am sure in the budget allocations that we have talked about it will be given great consideration.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Romanow Report proposes certain mandates for federal public servants. These include: setting common indicators and benchmarks, measuring and tracking the performance of the health system, consultation and coordination, and of course reporting.

How, with all this red tape and bureaucracy, can the government think it is going to give people faster access to a physician or emergency care?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, there will be no new red tape and no new bureaucracy.

However the hon. member raises a very important issue. Canadians want their health care system to be accountable to them. This September we saw the very first issuing of performance indicator reports, and the province of Quebec participated in that endeavour.

I hope the hon. member is not suggesting that she is criticizing the work that has been done in Quebec and other provinces and territories to inform the public in the country around the performance of their health care system.

* * *

[Translation]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a number of different issues to be settled as far as skills training is concerned. This is the case in the community of Etobicoke, of course. The Canadian population is greying and many skilled workers are approaching retirement age.

[English]

Recognizing that there are many players involved in this challenge, including business, what concrete steps are being taken through partnerships between government and industry to ensure young Canadians have the skills they need?

Oral Questions

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that the Minister of Human Resources Development is today participating in the launch of a career information kit which is called "The Future is Wide Open". This kit is the product of a strategic partnership between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Automotive Repair and Service Sector Council.

Skills and learning are the foundation of Canada's innovation strategy. We need to ensure that young people have the opportunity to participate fully in the economy.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, to assist the Minister of Health in her earlier question in debate about public versus private for profit, Mr. Romanow did say that Canadians view medicare as a moral enterprise, not a business venture. He also advocated a new national drug agency.

While recognizing that this requires negotiations with the provinces and territories, is the Minister of Health open at least to the idea or the concept of a national drug agency and formulary?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, federal, provincial and territorial governments are already working together in a number of areas around drugs and pharmaceutical utilization. As the hon. member is aware, the Government of Canada's Department of Health is responsible for drug approval. That is a very clear regulatory process.

We are in the process of reviewing how we go about approving drugs in this country. The Speech from the Throne made the commitment that we would be a country that regulates in a smart way. That is why we are reviewing that process.

Certainly, if the provinces and territories want to sit down and talk about ways we can cooperate further in the—

● (1200)

The Speaker: The hon. member for St. John's West.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment said that the federal government is interested in clean energy projects and will support such projects in the provinces, if asked.

Has the province of Newfoundland and Labrador asked the federal government to get involved in the development of the Lower Churchill project?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there has been a number of communications from the government of Newfoundland and Labrador on a wide range of energy issues, including, I understand, the Lower Churchill. However the way the hon. member has raised the question is a little misleading.

We have said that if there are clear climate change benefits from projects, we will look at them. However the climate change issue is not an opportunity for every provincial project in every area that may have a minor climate change element at a high cost to be funded by the federal government. That is a matter that we cannot obviously accept.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the decision by the Minister of National Defence to use the exploits of the JTF2 as poster boys for increased funding to the military is being undermined by the minister's own department with the directive to harass local homeowners around the Dwyer Hill JTF2 location.

If the minister has not considered moving the expanded JTF2 to a more practical location, why not?

Mr. John O'Reilly (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is not something on which the Government of Canada will comment. As far as JTF2 is concerned, it is a unit that operates in complete privacy. It is there to protect the Canadian public, not harass the Canadian public, as the member has said.

It continues to do an excellent job and has done an excellent job. It is coming home soon. Perhaps the member could come and meet some of them.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the more we listen to the government, the less we are convinced that adding federal public servants and controls, as the Romanow report proposes, will do anything to help doctors and nurses with day-to-day patient care.

How does the Prime Minister think that adding structures and bureaucrats in Ottawa will make any significant improvement to the quality of emergency services?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know from where all these questions are coming. The government has not indicated that we have any intention of creating a new bureaucracy in Ottawa. Our commitment is to work with the provinces and the territories on a plan to renew the health care system in keeping with Canadian values. It could not be any simpler.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[Translation]

CANADIAN LANDMINE FUND

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am pleased to table, in both official languages, the Report on the Canadian Landmine Fund, 2001-2002.

[English]

Canada has made a positive difference in the world in leading to eliminate these terrible weapons and bring relief to their victims. We will continue with this important program which is of such benefit to people around the world.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mrs. Karen Redman (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to five petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FINANCE

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee of Finance, entitled "Canada: People, Places and Priorities".

* * *

● (1205)

[Translation]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-319, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I introduce this bill with great pleasure as well as a great deal of emotion. It has already been debated in the House, and here it is again.

The purpose is to amend the Canada Labour Code in order to ensure that all women workers, particularly those who are pregnant or nursing, in areas under federal jurisdiction and therefore covered by the Canada Labour Code, may take advantage of preventive withdrawal.

It is high time that this possibility was made available to women by this government. As we know, the birthrate in Canada is not very high. We need to ensure that all women give birth to healthy babies.

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

* * *

[English]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

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

have been consultations among parties and I believe, if you were to seek it, you would find unanimous consent to adopt the following motion. I move:

That, on December 2, 2002, the House shall continue to sit after 6:30 p.m. until 10:30 p.m. for the purpose of considering Government Orders, Government Business No. 9.

For the benefit of hon. members, that is the Kyoto resolution.

The Speaker: Does the hon. government House leader have the unanimous of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Garry Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of petitions. The first one comes from people throughout the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and B.C. The petitioners draw attention to the fact that Canadians are suffering from debilitating illnesses and diseases, such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes, cancer, muscular dystrophy and spinal cord injury, and that Canadians support ethical stem cell research, which has shown encouraging potential to provide cures for these diseases.

Non-embryonic stem cells, which are also known as adult stem cells, have shown significant research progress without immune rejection and the ethical problems associated with embryonic stem cells. The petitioners ask Parliament to focus its legislative support on adult stem cell research to find the cures and therapies necessary to treat the illnesses and diseases of suffering Canadians

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Garry Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the second petition has quite a large number of signatures as well, mainly from the northern part of my riding. The petitioners call attention to the fact that the use of child pornography is condemned by the clear majority of Canadians. The courts have not applied the current child pornography law in such a way that it is clear that such exploitation of children will always be met with swift punishment.

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

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to present four petitions. The first one is from people in Vancouver and North Vancouver who draw attention to the fact that the Government of Canada has uncritically offered support for the ongoing bombings of Iraq and Yugoslavia, and has supported the attacks on Afghanistan. The petition calls upon Canada to return to foreign and defence policies that have a full respect for and full compliance with international law and the UN charter.

• (1210)

MISSING PERSONS

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my second petition is from Canadians who are very concerned that there is an increase in the number of young adults, older men and women who are missing or have been abducted. It calls upon Parliament to establish a national clearinghouse for missing and at risk or endangered adults.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is from Canadians who are very concerned about the increase of child pornography. It calls upon Parliament to protect children by all necessary steps.

HOUSING

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the fourth petition is from petitioners who call upon the government to recognize that there is a serious shortage of affordable housing in our country. It calls upon the Canadian government to adopt the 1% solution put forward by the Toronto disaster relief committee to eliminate this national disaster as it relates to homelessness in our country.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Tony Tirabassi (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present four petitions today from the constituents in my riding of Niagara Centre.

Three of the petitions ask that Parliament protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Tony Tirabassi (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fourth petition deals with the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who suffer from debilitating illnesses such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes, cancer, muscular dystrophy and spinal cord injuries. The petitioners ask that Parliament focus its legislative support on adult stem cell research to find the cures and therapies necessary to treat the illnesses and diseases of suffering Canadians.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions. The first petition draws the attention of the House to violence against Hindus in Bangladesh. It says in part that the Hindu organization from the greater Toronto area expresses its grave concerns regarding the latest series of organized and sustained

Government Orders

violent attacks. It calls upon Parliament to request that the Government of Canada undertake a review of the foreign aid that it provides to the government of Bangladesh in view of these violations of human rights.

MARRIAGE

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition pertains to the definition of marriage and the settlement in law that marriage is the union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others. It asks that it be resolved that we as citizens find that definition to be the definition in law.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition deals with stem cell research. It points out that thousands of Canadians suffer from debilitating diseases. These Canadians support ethical stem cell research and call upon Parliament to focus its legislative support on adult stem cell research to find the cures and therapies necessary to treat those illnesses.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the final petition deals with child pornography. The petitioners ask Parliament to protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mrs. Karen Redman (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

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

The Speaker: The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine has 12 minutes left for her remarks.

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 12 minutes is not a lot, but I will try to condense all I want to say on this matter of ratifying the Kyoto protocol into that amount of time.

[English]

I would like to address several myths that opponents to the ratification of the Kyoto protocol have been disseminating in the public and even in the House.

Government Orders

Myth number one is that we have not consulted with industry and the provinces on Kyoto. The fact is that since 1997 under the national climate change process the federal government has worked with more than 450 experts from different levels of government, industry, academia and non-governmental organizations. These experts who have been consulted have produced tens of thousands of pages of analysis. They have spent thousands of hours in ministerial meetings, public consultations and technical workshops.

As well, stakeholder meetings were held in every province and territory in Canada in 2000 and then again in 2002. During the 2002 stakeholder meetings, over 600 experts from across Canada, including 152 from civil society, 232 from industry, and 186 from provincial, territorial and federal governments, were consulted on Canada's plan to implement the Kyoto protocol. Through these consultations, the federal government has learned that stakeholders want as much flexibility as possible to decide for themselves how best to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. That debunks myth number one.

Myth number two is that the Kyoto protocol will irrevocably harm the Canadian economy. It is the myth that the Kyoto protocol will cost Canadians their jobs. Over the past 10 or 12 years, there have been various estimates of what ratifying the Kyoto protocol will mean for the Canadian economy. The most credible numbers come from the analysis and modelling working group, or AMG, of the national climate change process, the process I just talked about.

The AMG is comprised, as I mentioned previously, of officials from every province and territory, and it also consults widely with experts from industry, academia and the environmental community. Its most recent analysis indicates that when Canada ratifies Kyoto, Canada's GDP will be 30.4% bigger in 2012 instead of 31% bigger. In other words, we may forgo \$17.2 billion of growth over 10 years, or about \$24 per year per Canadian. These estimates of AMG have focused on cost. They have not, however, examined the positive impact: increased rates of investment, innovation and efficiency as a result of implementation of the Kyoto protocol in Canada. Let us look at that.

It was reported on September 25, 2002, that implementing Kyoto in Canada could cost 200,000 jobs. This estimate is close to the high range of potential effects on employment recorded by the AMG in the discussion paper on Canada's contribution to addressing climate change. It is important to be clear. This is not 200,000 jobs lost. Rather, it is 200,000 jobs, and that is only the estimated high end, that will not be created over the next 10 years. To put this in perspective, Statistics Canada reported that 59,000 jobs were created this past August alone. Already this year 386,000 new jobs have been created in Canada. As well, this estimate of 200,000 jobs not created between now and 2012 does not consider the creation of new jobs as a result of our innovative actions to stop climate change.

• (1215)

For instance, Industry Canada estimates that if Canada ratifies the Kyoto protocol, investment in renewable energy could grow fifteen-fold, to over \$7 billion per year. Ontario Premier Ernie Eves recently stated, "I'm not planning on losing any jobs in the province as a result of any reduction of greenhouse gas emissions", and acknowledged that Kyoto could end up boosting the economy in the long run

through the development and use of environmentally friendly technologies. Those are the words of Premier Ernie Eves, not necessarily the biggest friend to the environment and to the ratification of Kyoto.

Several innovative companies see action to fight climate change as an economic opportunity. For example Sterling Pulp Chemicals Limited has reduced greenhouse gas emissions by almost 95% in its facility in Buckingham, Quebec, by turning waste into fuel. After an initial investment of \$1.1 million, the company now enjoys a \$2.28 million per year saving in lower energy costs.

Clearly, fighting climate change can be both: good for the environment and good for profits.

Let us look at the oil and gas industry. There are major oil and gas companies that also recognize the economic benefits of fighting climate change. British Petroleum and Royal Dutch/Shell have made a long term commitment to make the transition out of fossil fuels and are spending large amounts of money on renewable energy. BP's new slogan is "Beyond Petroleum". BP has reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 9 megatonnes in just three years and has added \$650 million U.S. to the value of its operations through energy efficiency.

Action to reduce climate change and action to implement the Kyoto protocol in Canada will have a beneficial impact on industry and on our economy.

Let me come back to the so-called job losses. Who says that ratification of Kyoto is going to involve or necessarily create job losses? Let us see what some people who disagree have to say. The Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada, CEP, called for the federal government to provide transitional funding for ratification. Energy workers support Kyoto. It is the corporate executives, or rather some corporate executives and politicians like Ralph Klein and unfortunately like hon. members on the opposite side of the House who belong to the Canadian Alliance, who are raising the alarm about jobs.

• (1220)

It is also important to look at general trends in the oil and gas sector. Although the fossil fuel industry has experienced massive production increases over the past recent years, more than 80,000 Canadian jobs were lost in this sector over the last 10 years. These cuts were made for profit, not to stem environmental problems, and there was no national outcry and certainly no lobbying by Ralph Klein or by the Canadian Alliance about these job losses.

Government Orders

I find that interesting. When job losses are created solely out of the profit motive, there is no outcry, but if there is a potential that job creation growth might not be as big as we expect over the next 10 years, and not that it is negative growth, but not as big as we expect, there is an outcry on the part of the Canadian Alliance, the hon. member for Red Deer and Ralph Klein and his cohorts.

Canadians want ratification of Kyoto. Quebeckers want ratification of Kyoto. Montrealers want ratification of Kyoto. The residents of my riding of Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine want ratification of Kyoto and we do not want it in 10 years from now. We want it before the end of this year, that is, before December 31, 2002.

That is the commitment the right hon. Prime Minister has made and that is what we will do. The House of Commons will support ratification. I will support it. I have supported it from the very beginning. I will continue to support it.

After we have supported it, I will be rolling up my sleeves, as hundreds of thousands of Canadians, millions of Canadians, will be doing, to do my part in achieving the targets that we will have committed to under the Kyoto protocol accord. I will do it, my colleagues on this side of the House will do it, and a significant number of my colleagues on the other side of the House will do it as well, like the members of the NDP caucus.

Let me close by saying that the Kyoto protocol will be ratified before the end of this year and it will be a good thing for Canada. It will spur economic development and it will improve the health of every Canadian.

• (1225)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have high respect for the member from the Liberal Party. She is very eloquent. She is an excellent communicator and often expresses clearly some very good ideas. I would like to challenge her in one particular area. That is on the area of basic assumptions.

A number of years ago a guy came to my door and said that the old, ugly wooden siding on my house should be replaced because it was cracked and not thermally efficient. He offered to put on new siding for me. He said it would have insulation in it and it would be very good siding. Unfortunately, I signed onto it, not knowing that the guy was a charlatan. He took me for a ride. He overcharged me. He took my money; the trusting person that I am, I gave it to him because he was going to do this work for me.

Without going into the details, I really got taken on that particular job. It was a good learning experience. A lot of guys pay \$10,000 for a university education, but I got mine that day.

At any rate, I mention that because I made the assumption that what that person told me was true and I also made the assumption that he would do proper and satisfactory work technically in applying the new siding.

The members opposite who talk about their avid support for Kyoto are making a lot of assumptions. So are, I believe, the constituents who are supporting them. One of those assumptions is that the Kyoto accord has to do with the reduction of pollution. Frankly, I am not an expert in chemistry; I am a math physics major and I studied some chemistry. However, when I look at what Kyoto

really addresses, which is greenhouse gases, which are primarily carbon dioxide and secondarily water vapour, that which most of us recognize as clouds in the sky, I think we are being asked to follow on those assumptions and say that is going to reduce pollution.

Most of us are in support of the reduction of pollution. I am and the member over there is. I cannot imagine any Canadian saying that he or she thinks we should increase the pollution in our atmosphere, water or soil. No one would say that. We are all interested in reducing pollution. I recently purchased a very efficient vehicle. Part of the reason, not all of it but part of it, is that I want to do what is right for the environment.

Kyoto, on the other hand, is going to decoy a bunch of money not to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases, certainly not to reduce noxious oxides. Instead a whole bunch of money will be transferred to other countries in order to continue at our present rate. It is not going to have a significant difference on the worldwide emission of greenhouse gases.

Add to that the fact that Canada's population is one-half of one per cent of the world's population. I think the assumptions are very big when one thinks that the Canadian people collectively can do anything about this. If we were all to die and to stop using energy and to stop the man-made part of pollution, at best it would reduce it 2% worldwide.

I would like the member to comment on that and to consider carefully, as the legal mind that she is, whether it might be possible that some of the assumptions she and others are using may be wrong.

• (1230)

Mrs. Marlene Jennings: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the question asked by the hon. member from the Canadian Alliance.

I would first point out that it sounds like he did get taken in by a charlatan. I strongly recommend the next time he needs to do home repairs or car repairs that he check with the Better Business Bureau in his local municipality to ensure that the person is registered, is a qualified technician or belongs to whichever building trade, and that no complaints have been filed against the individual. He might also want to go down to the courthouse and check the small claims court to see whether or not any claims had been filed against the individual.

I can assure the member that the over 2,000 scientists and experts who were used are not charlatans. They are highly qualified people who graduated from university. In many cases they have post-doctoral degrees. They are world renowned as experts in their field.

Addressing the issue, let us look at who has been establishing that greenhouse gases are causing climate change. The targets that have been set in the Kyoto protocol will in fact reduce greenhouse gas emissions and will improve the lives and health of hundreds of millions of people around the world and millions of people here in Canada.

Government Orders

Over 10 years ago the United Nations environment program and the World Meteorological Organization—they are pretty credible—established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The IPCC recently completed an assessment of global climate change involving 2,500 scientists and scholars from around the world. Their assessment concluded that human activities are changing the climate and that the changes consistent with climate change are already occurring in areas of the planet.

The IPCC conclusions have been endorsed by more than 100 Nobel laureates, by 17 national scientific academies and by most of the world's governments, including the United States. Did members hear right? The United States recognizes that there is climate change and that climate change is caused in large part by greenhouse gas emissions. I do not think the Canadian Alliance is aware of that. Let us also look at a couple of other facts.

What are some of the activities that contribute to climate change as established by these experts? One, the activities that contribute to climate change also contribute to smog. Clean air and climate change are linked by transportation, electric power generation and the oil and gas sectors. These sectors are major emitters of both greenhouse gases and air pollutants.

Actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will help achieve Canada's clean air goals. This includes reducing emissions of particulate matter, nitrogen oxides and sulphur dioxides from emitters like thermoelectricity plants, refineries, and pulp and paper mills; reducing traffic congestion in our cities; and reducing emissions from homes and buildings.

Fossil fuel combustion accounts for 80% of the greenhouse gas emissions and for 85% of nitrogen oxides. About 35% of primary emissions of fine particulate matter are linked to aggravated heart and lung diseases such as asthma, bronchitis and emphysema. They are also due to fossil fuel combustion. Fossil fuel combustion also accounts for about 40% of emissions of sulphur dioxides which contribute to particulate formation and acid rain.

•(1235)

The case has been clearly made by the experts. I am not an expert. I have not trained in these areas, but I have enough sense to look up the credentials of those who are considered experts in order to determine whether or not they are. There are thousands of scientists who have signed on and support the ratification of Kyoto. The government will ratify Kyoto before the end of 2002.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Palliser.

It is a great pleasure to speak in strong support of the Kyoto protocol. First I want to say that it is about time. This has taken so long. I heard with interest the comments of the government member and the energy she had to speak in defence of the Kyoto protocol.

I have to question why it has taken the government so many years of foot dragging under the guise of consultation that now after 12 years we are still waiting for the accord to be approved. Finally, this very important debate is happening, to meet our targets of a 6% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the 1990 levels.

Millions of Canadians suffer daily from the effects of smog. The estimated cost to our health care system is in the billions. Add to that the cost to farmers who are suffering from the effects of unpredictable and often catastrophic weather conditions. All of it is caused by global warming.

We must recognize that as Canadians, we consume more energy per capita than any other country in the world. We use more total energy than the 700 million people on the African continent. We in the NDP understand that this is not just a Canadian issue; this is an issue about global justice.

After 12 years of waffling and inaction by the Liberal government, Canadians have every reason to be very skeptical about what the Liberals are really up to here and whether or not they will deliver on their promises on the environment. Since coming to office in 1993, they have failed to deliver on their environmental commitments. In the Liberal red book, for example, in 1993 there was a promise to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20% from 1988 levels by 2005. Well, the Prime Minister abandoned that one long ago.

One thing that has been really disturbing about the whole debate around Kyoto is the campaign of fear that has been undertaken by corporations and provinces like Alberta and even my own province of British Columbia. I have seen the full page ads in the *Globe and Mail* and other publications. I have seen the letters, the advertising campaigns and the TV ads.

I received something in the mail from the Canadian Coalition for Responsible Environmental Solutions. I thought that was interesting because it is easy for everyone to say that they want to reduce pollution and smog and enhance our environment but it is another thing to actually make the changes.

I was very interested to know who was in the coalition because it said, "We are concerned about a rush towards a decision to ratify the Kyoto protocol without due consideration". I thought that was really strange because we had already had 12 years of debate. When I read further, I saw that the letter was signed by none other than the president of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, the president and CEO of Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters, the president and chief executive of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, and the president of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce.

This was nothing more than propaganda put out by corporations which have tried to create fear among Canadians and among workers that they have something to lose by ratifying Kyoto rather than that we have a tremendous amount to gain.

I was also very disappointed that in my own province of British Columbia the new premier, Gordon Campbell, sent all MPs a letter in which he said:

—the federal Kyoto implementation plan is not the right plan by any stretch. As a result, being opposed to Kyoto is not the same as opposing efforts to prevent climate change. We must have the courage to realize that Kyoto is not the only way to go.

He never spelled out what is the other way to go. What he further did in his letter was to instill fear in people that jobs would be lost, between 11,000 and 37,000 jobs in British Columbia. This obviously would create a lot of fear.

● (1240)

By contrast to these kinds of fear campaigns and the foot-dragging by the Liberal government, we have seen real leadership on this issue come from peoples' organizations and the environmental community. I have had hundreds of e-mails and letters and phone calls from my constituents who believe very strongly that the future of their children and of our communities depends upon adopting Kyoto and being very clear that we are prepared to make changes. We should be prepared to make drastic changes to improve the health of our children and the health of our environment.

I am very proud of the fact that the Canadian Labour Congress and the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada, as a couple of examples, have been very strong on this issue and have made it very clear that they wholeheartedly support the ratification of Kyoto.

In fact in terms of CEP, a major union that represents many workers in the energy field, I was very proud when I read that members of the local in Calgary who work in the oil industry passed a resolution in September calling on the government to ratify Kyoto. They understood that all the propaganda from the corporations in Alberta, the oil and gas interests that were trying to pose that they were interested in the security of jobs for workers, had nothing more to do than their fear about losing profits. That was the bottom line for them.

I want to congratulate the CLC and CEP for having the courage to speak the truth and to stand up and defend our environment.

The same can be said for the Western Canada Wilderness Committee, that just a couple of months ago spoke out and made it very clear that oil and gas drilling near the Queen Charlotte Islands had to be stopped. We have had a moratorium on oil and gas drilling. It has pointed out very clearly that if that moratorium is lifted, as the B.C. government would like to do, it will have a tremendous impact on defeating the whole principle and integrity of Kyoto. I would like to congratulate groups like the Western Canada Wilderness Committee and the Living Oceans Society for speaking out.

We have also seen groups like the David Suzuki Foundation and the Climate Action Network Canada. I have attended forums on Parliament Hill which they have organized to point out again and again that the shift to a low carbon energy efficient economy offers significant opportunities to every region of Canada in terms of industrial innovation, greater energy self reliance, public health benefits, rural economic development and urban renewal.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities has also pointed out that promoting the idea of well funded public infrastructure in Canadian cities, for example public transit, would go a long way to meeting our commitments under Kyoto. These cities are desperately

Government Orders

hurting from pollution and smog. Kids end up in emergency rooms because of asthma.

We in the NDP have consistently stood up for our environment and for the adoption of the accord. We have called on the government to adopt a plan, including a requirement of a 20% green energy in all federal departments in five years, requiring government vehicles to use alternative fuels, creating a dedicated transit infrastructure fund, redirecting tax incentives to sustain and encourage renewable energy and legislating a mandatory blend of ethanol in gasoline.

We have also been very clear that we need a green jobs fund to ensure there is a just transition, as called for by the CLC, so that attention is paid to the security of workers.

Kyoto offers significant opportunities and benefits. It is something that we should be embracing. We should be willing to make change for the future of our planet and for the future of our children. For members who have the gall to stand up and say that they want to deal with climate change but they will not support the accord, I say shame on them. They are playing a very dirty game with the Canadian public and the Canadian public has made it quite clear that it supports the accord.

● (1245)

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague gave an excellent speech. My sense is that she obviously is very supportive of the Kyoto accord, but she has some doubts about the particular framework that might be implemented in Canada. Would she care to comment on the value of simply having a framework?

I was involved in the introduction of the blue box for recycling in Ontario. At the time, industry and business opposed it. They argued very well, and we can still argue, that the blue box was not the most efficient way of recycling, particularly not the most efficient way of reducing.

It seems to me that the greatest impact of the blue box in Ontario is not the recycling it has accomplished but the way it has changed people's mindset, so that every week people think about what they can put in the blue box. Meanwhile behind that, they think out what they buy.

It seems to me that one of the values of having a frame of reference like we have for Kyoto is exactly that. Once a frame of reference is in place, even if that frame of reference is flawed in one or two ways, it will make us behave differently. We will make different decisions on how we fix up our homes, how we travel and things of that type.

I would be grateful for the hon. member's comments on that aspect of the value of the Kyoto accord.

Ms. Libby Davies: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to respond to that question. I agree with the member that the blue box program, while it has been successful, probably the most important thing is that it has helped changed people's attitude.

Government Orders

My concern and skepticism, like many other people, is why it has taken the Liberal government so long to catch up to what Canadians want, which is aggressive leadership and action on implementing Kyoto.

For example, Greenpeace and the Sierra Legal Defence pointed out in a study in February that we could improve our urban air quality and meet one-third of the Kyoto commitment if we had stronger vehicle emissions legislation for example covering SUVs. If there was any greater example of where people are saying one thing but still carrying out business in a way that is contributing to global warming, surely it is on that issue. I would really query and question the federal government's commitment on this, because SUVs have been spewing out all kinds of noxious emissions.

While we have to change public attitude, we want to see the government implement a clear plan, a framework and legislation that will ensure that those emissions will decrease and that we will not see a greater contribution to global warming.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue with this individual about assumptions.

Again, everyone of us in the House would certainly favour doing what we can to ensure that our atmosphere, our water and our soil are kept clean and pure for ourselves, for our children and grandchildren and for other people around the world.

The question is this. Are we assuming that Kyoto will achieve this? One feature of the Kyoto accord is that we can buy credits. In other words, if we have businesses that do not meet the standards, all we have to do is send some money to some other country where the amount of emissions is less and they can continue to do this. That aspect of the Kyoto accord will not reduce pollution, it simply moves it to another place on the planet.

Furthermore, when we consider—

● (1250)

The Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt, but I know that when members split their time, it also has an impact on the period for questions and comments. In fairness in this case to the member replying, there is only limited time left, less than a minute, and I try to divide that as evenly as I possibly can.

Ms. Libby Davies: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my reply. I am appalled at the position put forward by the Canadian Alliance. It has offered no clear alternative. It is so easy to for Canadian Alliance members to say that they support the environment, but they have not offered any concrete action. It has contributed to the debate with fear and misinformation which I think most Canadians have now realized is just a complete smear campaign.

If Canadian Alliance members truly listen to their constituents and look at what is going on across the country, they would know that people want to see Kyoto approved.

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in debate in the House of Commons, specifically on ratifying the Kyoto protocol. As the member for Vancouver East indicated, the New Democratic Party is very pleased to support this motion. We believe it is the right thing to do, not only for ourselves but for all generations that follow us.

We recognize that we have a lot of responsibility in terms of cleaning up our own backyard. The member for Vancouver East talked about our pollution being the same as on the continent of Africa. We are energy pigs, to put it less politely than she did, and we have to do something about it and do something about it quickly. There is a limited amount of time, less than a century, we are told. It is breathtakingly short period of time in which to get our environmental house in order.

Recently the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops wrote to the environment minister and urged him to ratify Kyoto. They said:

Signing the Kyoto protocol is both a necessary responsibility and a symbol of Canada's commitment to the health of our world.

We certainly agree with the Canadian Council of Catholic Bishops on that point.

There is widespread agreement among the world's pre-eminent climatologists, that the climate is warming, that our time to adapt is, as I indicated, growing short and that we must do something about this, and soon. We have only one earth and it is not a flat earth as some people here would have us believe. We cannot do a controlled experiment here. We have to get it right and we have to do it right now.

The International Panel on Climate Change, surely the world's most renowned group of experts on this matter, tells us that global warming is occurring, that it is due to greenhouse gas concentrations and that the prudent thing to do would be to act on it immediately.

A group of church leaders in the United States, many of them evangelicals, went earlier this month to the big three automakers in Detroit to meet with them and to tell them that climate change is a moral issue. They want those companies to develop more fuel efficient vehicles.

The organized interests who want us to delay or entirely avoid any action on climate change talk only in dollars and with no sense. Those interests are concentrated in the petroleum and carbon industries and they have as their errand boys members of the Alliance Party, a few Liberal backbenchers and Premier Klein in Alberta.

As a member of the New Democratic Party, I get relatively little opportunity to rub shoulders and exchange ideas with senators but I was delighted to be read yesterday an interview that appeared in the *Hill Times* this week by retiring Alberta Liberal Senator Nick Taylor.

I do not know Senator Taylor personally but I do know that he comes from the oil industry in Alberta. He has just reached the mandatory retirement age. He had a number of interesting things to say, starting with:

The Esso group through Syncrude because they are the biggest heavy-oil producers, and Petro-Canada, good old Petro-Canada, with the Maple Leaf. They have had the most influence on Ralph Klein and Alberta.

He prefaces this by saying that not all oil companies are opposed, as we heard from the member for NDG a few minutes ago, and the parliamentary secretary.

Government Orders

Senator Taylor goes on to say:

So it's an Esso type of thing, Standard Oil of New Jersey-thinking which bought these old dirty refineries from McColl-Frontenac and had gone ahead with a great deal of the tar sands development. Credit to them, they were the pioneers in heavy oil at the tar sands, but now they are the ones who are going to have to get in the inhibitors and clean up things a little.

He then was asked the question by the journalist as to who in cabinet was opposed to Kyoto. The senator, who sits in on national Liberal caucus meetings I assume, indicated that the Minister of Health and another minister from Alberta were listening carefully to the oil people.

• (1255)

In reference to the Minister of Health, he said:

She used to be minister of energy, ...one of the architects, along with [the member for LaSalle—Émard] of the rejuvenation of the tar sands. They changed the tax laws so that there is a tremendous advantage for large oil corporations to get into the tar sands. She looks to the tar sands as one of her favourite children, possibly being made to bear a bigger weight than the others right now.

Senator Taylor also said:

The oil and gas industry always raises [heck] for any new environmental thing—acid rain, salt water disposal or natural gas. Take salt water disposal. We used to dispose of it on the ground, to get rid of weeds and the dust, now we pump it back into the ground to get out more oil. Natural gas we used to flare off to get at the oil. They made us stop. Now we collect it, and sell it. Big pipelines. Lots of profits.

Here is one person who has worked in the industry, knows a little about it, a lot more than I do, and feels very strongly. He concluded:

I think the government has done a very poor job indeed [of selling Kyoto]. First of all, by shilly-shallying and wondering and dilly-dallying, they gave the flat earth society people the time to get organized and get going. After all, this was a treaty that was signed in 1997 following a voluntary agreement in 1992... People who were worried about CO₂ had since '92 to do it. The debate [in the House] now should be how to put Kyoto in place, not whether to join it.

One of the things to which insufficient attention has been paid in this whole debate is the notion of retrofitting. I had the opportunity in August of this year to attend the conclusion of the Canada-Saskatchewan infrastructure program. More than \$600,000 had been put up to retrofit six municipal buildings in the great city of Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan.

We were told at that final conference that the savings alone on reducing energy costs as a result of that retrofit were in excess of \$200,000 annually, which meant that in three years all of that retrofit would pay for itself. Incidentally it created jobs in the process, and it probably has a shelf life of a minimum of 50 years. We could anticipate tremendous savings over half a century with those kinds of projects.

Those are the things about which we in the House do not talk often enough. We hear gloom and doom, that if we ratify Kyoto the sky will fall, we will not be able to do it, and we will lose jobs. People totally forget to think about what the opportunities are. Yes, there are challenges and some sectors probably would be hurt. The oil and gas sector may be hurt somewhat but there are opportunities with this initiative. If the Americans want to slow walk this, I say even better, because it is an opportunity for us to develop some interesting new technologies that can be sold and exported to other countries around the world. We have the capacity and the capability of doing that.

This party fears that the interests opposed to Kyoto are trying to prevent necessary action. They insist on a complete blueprint for the future regarding our plans on Kyoto. Many of the members who are asking where the blueprint is for Kyoto are the same members who, in 1988 and 1989, were telling us to take a leap of faith on free trade, that we did not have all the studies but it would be good for Canada. Now they are telling us to hold on a minute and are asking for a blueprint.

The proposition being put forward by the opponents of Kyoto actually would allow a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions when we need a significant decrease. This is not a realistic option and Kyoto is the best and only instrument we have.

• (1300)

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to what my colleague had to say. The Canadian Alliance has been casting doubt on the science of climate change. Nobody disputes that it is much warmer now than it was 50 or 100 years ago. The doubt comes when we project forward, as to whether it would continue to get warmer.

There has been an increase in CO₂ which no one denies. There have been increases in particulates in the atmosphere such as nitrogen oxide, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds such as benzene, toxic metals such as mercury, ground level ozone which is a powerful poisonous greenhouse gas, and various other things.

Those things are in our atmosphere. They are causes, which someone questioned, of climate change. People say not to worry, that the effect is not serious enough yet to project forward. The world population would likely double in the next 30 or 40 years, so we would be up to 12 billion people. People say it might be twice as bad.

However, with the present technology, what if countries like India and China, with roughly a billion people each, come up to our level of consumption? We are not talking about inputs compatible with today's 12 billion people. We are talking of inputs compatible today in 30 or 40 years for 50, 60, or the equivalent of 80 billion people if the technology remains the same. Then the doubts over here about whether human beings are having sufficient effect to change the climate would disappear. I would be grateful for my colleague's comments on that.

Mr. Dick Proctor: Mr. Speaker, let me begin by passing a compliment to the member for Peterborough. I did not realize that he was one of the initiators of the blue box in Ontario until it was mentioned earlier in debate today. That has had a significant impact across the country and I congratulate him for his involvement on it.

With regard to the fact that we do consume a tremendous amount of energy in North America we recognize that we do live in a cold climate and our energy costs are undoubtedly higher. It has been pointed out that in European countries there is a lot more technology and a lot more effort put into ensuring that houses can be cooled and heated by natural currents and the movement of air.

Government Orders

What the member is alluding to is the footprint that we would leave as a world population on the environment if countries like China and India become as big consumers of energy as North America. If we were to take the lead and show other countries that it could be done, that our environmental footprint could be a whole lot less than it is now, that would be the way to go and that would be the way to preserve the world for a long time to come.

• (1305)

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Ottawa—Vanier.

I would like to take a more skeptical view of Kyoto. Some of my thoughts are taken from a book entitled *The Skeptical Environmentalist* by Bjorn Lomborg.

There is little doubt that over the last 100 years there has been a rise in temperature. Some say it is about 0.6%. There is little doubt that Canadians see strange weather patterns happening and wonder what is going on. There is also little doubt that there are legions of people who are prepared to tell them what is going on, some with more religious zeal than others, both of whom are prepared to sketch out terrifying scenarios which preclude rational debate.

It is valid to claim that there is extra CO₂ in the atmosphere. About 80% of it comes from fossil fuels and 20% from deforestation. Of that extra CO₂ about 53% is reabsorbed by northern forest regrowth. Increasing CO₂ emissions and the concentration have really started to take off lately and that is what has alarmed the environmental community. The extra or man made greenhouse effect is called anthropogenic.

The argument however gets trickier as to how to attribute all of the increase in the CO₂. Do we attribute it all to human activity? Our first problem is records. Records prior to 1850 are a little sketchy. There are alternative ways to construct data from polar ice caps and tree rings, and things of that nature, but they are not as good as hardcore data. When we are trying to analyze temperature, data is extremely important. Unfortunately for the data, other sources of increase, such as sun radiation increases, also affect the data.

Therefore, how much is human and how much is simply natural cycles? In other words, if this is entirely due to sun spots, there is nothing we can do about it. We might as well get into our bathing suits and go home.

For the purposes of the argument however, let us allow that almost all if not all of this increase in CO₂ is directly attributable to human activity. What will be the consequence? The only sure thing that will happen is that there will be change. Some of it will be good and some of it will be bad.

Clearly agriculture would be affected. Some areas would be drought stricken and some would receive more precipitation. When we put CO₂ in the air we also put up other particulate matter. That matter forms into precipitation and cloud cover. No one seems to know whether the cloud cover would increase or decrease.

About 65% of the earth's surface is covered by cloud cover at any given time and it is a both a sword and a shield. It literally shields us from the sun's radiation and therefore reduces temperature, but it also traps gases and therefore increases the temperature on earth.

It also creates precipitation. One of the predictions is that there would be more rainfall which, when combined with CO₂ acts as a natural fertilizer. The effect of more natural fertilizer is more plant matter growth, literally more like a greenhouse, both in temperature and in consequence. The effect is that the earth would be greener. Some say that the biomass would increase by something like 40%. I find that a far-fetched figure. However, as I say there would be winners and losers in temperature increase.

Another area of concern is health. The greenhouse effect would likely cause more deaths and sicknesses related to heat which is true, but we also must keep in mind that twice the number of people in the United States die from cold than heat. If the number is twice as many in the United States, it is probably three or four times in Canada. Again, there are winners and losers. What would one rather die from, freezing or frying?

Another problem among a myriad of problems with the protocol is that various countries have various interests.

• (1310)

I do not know whether anyone has ever had the privilege of travelling in China, but when people step out of an airplane in Beijing their lungs are immediately assaulted by air pollution. A World Bank report states that 8% of China's GDP is lost due to pollution, while abatement measures would be at about only 1% or 1.25%. Therefore, the Chinese government has rightly focused on reducing sulphur emissions.

This is where it gets a little bizarre. Sulphur agents or sulphur aerosols act as cooling agents in the climate, the very thing we want to dampen down the temperature. China will actually be adding to global warming while dealing with its huge smog problems. If we think about that, 1.2 billion people in the PRC will be adding to global warming while 30 million Canadians hopefully will be detracting from global warming by emphasizing CO₂ as opposed to SO₂. It does leave one a little confused.

I must admit that I have a bit of trouble keeping track of the winners and losers in global warming. Last week we saw pictures of polar bears and a reduced polar ice cap. That, on the face of it, appears to be worrisome and leads one to conclude that there are increased water levels. Someone living in New Orleans or Alexandria, Egypt, should be worried and maybe should even be making some plans to move.

It is factually true that water levels are rising. In the last 100 years levels have risen by about 10 to 25 centimetres. In the next 100 years levels are predicted to rise by between 31 and 49 centimetres. However, 75% of the increase is due to the increase in temperature, which expands the volume of the water, and only 25% is due to glacial melt. While in New Orleans people may or may not go under water, people in California will be appreciative of any increases in water. Again there are winners and losers.

Government Orders

The changes in weather patterns are difficult enough to assess, but the economics of this matter literally leave everyone gasping for air, pun unintended. The simple answer is that someone who is skeptical about the environmental impact should really be skeptical about the economic impact. The argument is that as sea levels rise, sea level cities will be devastated. On the face of it, that is true. The problem is that human behaviour is quite unpredictable. Everyone takes risks in life. Insurance companies make a fortune assessing risk.

If we go back to the New Orleans example, if in fact the sea level rises people will move or take mitigating action. If it rises dramatically there will be loss of life and property damage. Either way, it is a risk assessment. If insurance companies determine that New Orleans or sections of New Orleans are disproportionately at risk they will factor the risk and charge a premium accordingly. If it is too risky, they will not insure at all and it will be abandoned. That is the consequence of global warming.

At best, Kyoto will have a marginal impact on climate change. In the bigger picture, Canada's 2% contribution is frankly quite microscopic. To maximize the benefit to the environment and ignore emissions trading, we really should invest something like \$350 billion U.S. or 1.5% of global GDP.

The problem with the economic modelling is that both sides of it cannot predict how new technologies will affect it. How will solar, wind and fusion affect the increase of CO₂ into the atmosphere? People are left in some confusion, not only over what the inputs are but also over what the outputs might be.

I hope that over the course of my brief talk here I have raised some questions that should be on everyone's minds while they assess this. I have a lot of sympathy, frankly, for the government's efforts on this file. It has a variety of provinces to deal with, some of which have dramatically opposing views. I am also aware of the enormous political support for this treaty in my riding and elsewhere in the country. I am also aware that there are businesses in my riding that will be adversely affected by the costs of implementation.

•(1315)

I hope, however, that I have made the case that there will be winners and losers as global warming accelerates, that Kyoto will be a tiny break in this trend but that on balance there is merit to ratification, and that we should be under no delusion that this is a panacea, but we should start with ratification and encourage the reductions as early as possible.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I think the member has shown a lot of common sense and certainly has read Mr. Lomberg's book, *The Skeptical Environmentalist*. Mr. Lomberg is an environmentalist who has never owned a car in his life. He is a 37 year old Dane who really believes in the environment. I think that he brings out a lot of questions.

Based on the member's comments, I wonder if he would not agree on developing a program involving countries like China, India, the U.S. and so on where we go after two things, pollution and climate change, and as the science is perfected we develop it. Would he not agree that this might be a better approach than signing Kyoto, the rather Eurocentric sort of bureaucratic thing that it is?

Mr. John McKay: Mr. Speaker, the first point I would like to make is that developing any program on a global basis is extremely difficult because there are interests that are diametrically opposed to each other, so I congratulate the drafters of the treaty who have come thus far.

With regard to the second point, the developed world has to lead the way. I cannot really expect nations in the Third World to be leaders in this endeavour. I would like to think that this is a part of a more holistic approach, but I have some appreciation for the difficulties. There are difficulties with the assessment of the environmental impact. There is difficulty with the assessment of the priorities of the environmental impact. There is an even greater difficulty with the assessment of the economic impact of environmental initiatives.

In some measure, I agree with the questioner, but I appreciate that there are, as I have said, winners and losers in this entire process.

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at my colleague quoting from that particular reference. Just to use his comments on the measurement of CO₂, it is the gas that people mainly have mentioned, but it has been measured since the middle of the 19th century. True, methods of measurement have improved, but the measuring site was in the middle of the Pacific, far away from human effects. If a change could have been detected there from the middle of the 19th century to the present time, it certainly offsets any changes in measurement.

He also mentioned other things such as nitrous oxides, for example. Although they do not really sound like it, they are greenhouse gases and are far more powerful greenhouse gases than carbon dioxide although lesser in quantity. Generally speaking, they are also poisonous. The member mentioned particulates as a kind of sidebar to the production of CO₂, which also seriously affect human breathing. I have mentioned ground level ozone. It is a poison and in Ontario has increased to the point that it costs tens of millions in reduced crop production alone.

From a public policy view rather than a science point of view, what is the difference, whether one believes in climate change or not? We should clean the atmosphere, which kills hundreds of people in Ontario every year and kept our kids last year inside school on 23 smog days. What would we do differently in cleaning that atmosphere and in tackling climate change, which might be debatable?

Government Orders

Mr. John McKay: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Our problem is that we are within the limitations of the treaty. What we are debating is Kyoto. Kyoto is a focus on CO₂ and only a focus on CO₂. The other gases that my colleague mentioned are contributors to smog. Regrettably, even with the maximum implication of Kyoto, we will simply reduce CO₂ and we will not be touching the other gases. I would actually agree with him. I would like to see the treaty extended to other gases so that the greenhouse effect is reduced. In that respect we are in agreement.

• (1320)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on ratification of the Kyoto protocol. I will do so in both official languages and will address it under three heads, essentially: Why Kyoto? How? Why now?

[*English*]

First, why Kyoto? I think it is becoming self-evident that the environmental sciences have given us a picture of our world as it is and what perspectives we can expect as it changes. By combining those two, scientists have basically warned us about the current conditions and the trend that our world faces. All experts agree that our climate is changing. Most agree that this change is not good. It is in that context that Kyoto was born.

As we know, the protocol addresses global climate change, a problem affecting the entire planet. No country, no matter how large, how small, how rich, how poor, no matter what resources it has to exploit, no matter what its emissions are, is exempt from the effects of climate change.

One of the principal factors contributing to this climate change is the presence of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere. While these gases do form naturally, humans are responsible for adding much of them.

Most of the things we do to stay alive, to live our lives, involve the consumption of energy. Be it to heat our homes, to heat our businesses, to transport ourselves or goods, or to power our industries, these contribute in one way or another to the production of greenhouse gases. Science informs us that there is a direct link between rising atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations, global warming and more frequent extreme weather events.

Scientists have also noted the effects of global warming on our variable Canadian climate. According to a group of scientists in Alberta, in a letter written to Premier Ralph Klein:

...considerable warming has already taken place on the western Prairies. Increases in temperature since the early 20th century have been from 1 to 3C at various prairie locations...The resulting increases in evaporation have without doubt aggravated the drought conditions that currently plague the western Prairies.

This is but one example. We also know that our forestry, our fisheries, our coastal communities and even our water resources are or will also be affected.

Scientists are not alone in noting these changes. Everyday folks are noting them as well. If anyone has spent a summer day in one of our large urban centres, especially those in central Canada, in Toronto or even in Ottawa, it can be noted that we have had more and more frequent smog warnings. We have to warn people who

suffer from asthma. We have to warn the very young, our children, and the very old to stay indoors during the grand days of summer. Climate change affects not only our resources; it affects our health.

There are very few absolutes in life. In this case it is not an absolute. Not every scientist in Canada and not every scientist in the world agrees that the severe weather situations we have experienced are the direct effect of greenhouse gases. I do believe, though, that somewhere around 85% to 90% of scientists do concur with that view. There are those who do not and will not, and down the road we may find out that they are right. I do not think so. Most of the scientists do not think that way, but we cannot discount that 100%.

I have had constituents write to me about this. There is one response that I will quote which pretty well explains my position on this. It is a letter that I sent to Mr. Ronald Mace, whom I have had the pleasure of meeting. We have had very civilized, very constructive discussions. He has been quite reasonable in his approach and sometimes quite convincing. However, I had to say this in my letter:

Dear Mr. Mace:

I have taken note of the material you sent me on October 10th regarding the scientific underpinnings of the Kyoto Protocol.

Consensus does not entail unanimity. Indeed, unanimity is seldom, if ever, attained in many areas of scientific endeavour; especially one as young, vast and complex as the environmental sciences.

However, I do believe that far more scientists—and I could supply you with forests of paper to that effect!—concur with the need to be concerned about global climate change.

Perhaps those scientists who do not agree with this concern are right; perhaps not. If I am to err, then I will err on the side of caution. I will support ratification of the Kyoto Protocol.

The plan—yet to be finalized—to give effect to our commitment must be realistic and equitable to all regions of Canada. Therein lies our true challenge.

• (1325)

This is the approach I believe the government is taking, one of being cautious, one of being responsible, and one of addressing something that must be addressed. In the end, to govern is to choose. The government has chosen to ratify the Kyoto protocol before the end of the year, something I wholeheartedly support. I believe it is doing the right thing. As I have said in writing to my constituents and as I have said in interviews, I intend to vote in favour of ratification of the Kyoto protocol.

That begs the question of how to implement Kyoto. There has been and there will continue to be tremendous debate on the plan to implement the protocol. I am convinced that we collectively in Canada will make errors and mistakes as we proceed. We will change the plan, we will improve it, and we will correct it as new technologies are perfected. We will find out at times that we are not going as fast as we should and that we have to be more aggressive in reaching our targets.

There is not a single individual or family in Canada who could state categorically and establish a 10-year plan without having the ability to change it as they proceed. That is what Canadians will do as we embark on reaching our targets once we have ratified the protocol.

I would like to give a good example of that ability to change. In today's *Globe and Mail*, the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, one of the associations that has been dead set against the ratification of Kyoto, has now floated an idea. It has suggested that companies which do not meet their gas emission reduction targets be compelled to contribute to a green fund which in turn would be used to develop new technologies. It has suggested that these companies should be compelled to buy into this green fund instead of buying carbon credits as had initially been lobbied to be done.

That is great encouragement in this change of approach by an association that has been steadfast in its opposition to the ratification of the Kyoto protocol. It realizes that Canadians can and will find ways of reaching these targets if we put our minds to it.

[Translation]

There is one other point I would like to raise. It comes from page 35 of the plan.

[English]

There is a little part that we should focus on:

The Council of Energy Ministers instructed officials across governments and departments to develop terms of reference for an expanded analysis to identify institutional, regulatory and economic constraints to new regional transmission development in Canada, and to set out options to address these constraints. This work is to take into account the evolving competitive and integrated nature of North American electricity markets.

[Translation]

It would be extremely advantageous to consider making the necessary investments to develop some way of transmitting our electrical energy from east to west and vice versa. The province of Quebec has an impressive hydroelectric capacity and exports a considerable amount of its energy. I believe it might be appropriate for the Government of Canada to participate in developing the means of exporting this energy from east to west.

[English]

The province of Manitoba also has excess hydro capacities. We should consider seriously investing infrastructure money to develop an east-west grid. That would go a long way to help Ontario, for instance, which will need some additional electrical capacity to meet its commitments and to supply the energy that its citizens need.

• (1330)

[Translation]

In a householder I sent out this fall, I indicated that I would be supporting ratification of Kyoto. The reaction of those who took the time to phone or write me indicates clearly that 75% to 80% are in favour of ratification. They are delighted that I have taken that position. I believe it is important to proceed with that ratification now.

On December 11, that is 12 days from now, it will be the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Kyoto accord protocol. Five years since the protocol was signed. It is high time it was ratified. I feel that five years of consultations, five years of analyses, five years of discussions, have brought us to the point now that we are prepared to ratify this agreement for the sake of our future and that of our children, and so that we can live in harmony with our planet.

Private Members' Business

POINTS OF ORDER

[English]

OFFICIAL REPORT

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, when one speaks without notes, one occasionally makes errors and I do not want to ever be accused of not knowing what I am talking about.

On page 2032 of yesterday's *Hansard*, it is recorded that I spoke of the world's population saying that Canada's population is one-half of 1% of the world's population and in the immediate paragraph before that, on page 2032, I said 2%. I believe I probably said that, but I would like to correct the record in case I am ever cross-examined.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair thanks the member for his intervention which has been duly noted.

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]

USER FEES ACT

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.) moved that Bill C-212, an act respecting user fees, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to the House about my private member's bill, Bill C-212, an act respecting user fees.

The intent of this legislation is to bring greater transparency and accountability and parliamentary oversight to federal government departments and agencies when they attempt to recover costs through user fees.

User fees take many different forms. They are meant to defray some or all of the costs of a service provided by government, presumably in the public interest, but which also provides a specific service to a client, for example, licence fees, registrations, et cetera.

[Translation]

I would like to say at the outset that I support the government objective of recovering the costs it incurs by charging fees for users of property and specialized services. The bill that I introduced deals with the following issues:

Private Members' Business

[English]

The bill addresses the need for more parliamentary oversight when user fees are introduced or changed; the need for greater stakeholder participation in the fee setting process; and improved linkages between user fees and federal department and agency performance specifications and standards. There is a requirement for more comprehensive stakeholder impact and competitive analysis when new user fees or fee increases are contemplated. The goal is increased transparency with respect to why fees are applicable, what fees are charged, what costs are identified as recoverable and whether performance standards are being met.

[Translation]

There also needs to be a dispute settlement mechanism to resolve complaints or grievances from user fee payers, and an annual report that lists all of the user fees that are in effect. This report would be tabled in the House and referred to the relevant committee of the House, which might be the finance committee.

[English]

Our government has embarked on a very ambitious innovation agenda. We need to ensure that our regulatory environment supports and encourages this very important objective. The government recognized this connection when it launched the smart regulation initiative in the recent throne speech. The government announced that it will “move forward with a smart regulation strategy to accelerate reforms in key areas, to promote health and sustainability, to contribute to innovation and economic growth and to reduce the administrative burden on business”.

I would suggest to colleagues in the House that the government's cost recovery user fee policy runs counter to the innovation agenda and should be a major part of the smart regulation initiative. Bill C-212 does just that, in my view.

It is time for parliamentarians to take greater ownership of user fees. What began as a legitimate attempt to more fully recover costs for proprietary services and goods has developed into something that is beyond that which was contemplated.

User fees currently bring in \$4 billion annually in revenues for the federal government. There is a systemic bias for federal government departments and agencies to increase user fees. Departments and agencies of the federal government have in many cases expanded the concept and introduced user fees, and increased user fees, beyond what is reasonable and more often than not without any reference to service or performance.

It is not that federal civil servants are bad managers. We have some of the best in the world. But we do know that individuals will respond to incentives that are built into the reward and recognition system. It is only natural. If they are rewarded for increasing user fees, if this assists them in their budget building process, they will respond accordingly.

Let us keep in mind that these are monopolies increasing their prices. If a company wishes to have a drug approved, for example, it cannot shop around if the price charged by Health Canada is excessive.

The fact that certain of these user fee revenues accrue to what are referred to as net votes may be a motivating factor as well. A net vote is one where user fee revenues are credited directly to the budget of the government entity. They do not accrue to the consolidated revenue account of the government as general revenues.

The result of user fee revenue that is credited to net votes is that the budgetary requirements of the department or agency are reduced because the fees are deducted from expenditure budget requests. Even where user fee revenues find their way to consolidated revenue and not to a net vote, this additional revenue implemented by departments and agencies is seen as a positive measure by Treasury Board, and the Treasury Board Secretariat, the body that recommends annual budgetary appropriations for these organizations for inclusion in the annual budget and budgetary estimates.

● (1335)

[Translation]

This practice strongly encourages departments and organizations to charge user fees and increase them above the amount originally planned. There is now incentive to systematically multiply these fees. The time has come to make this practice more transparent.

[English]

Companies in my riding of Etobicoke North, companies like BASF Canada and Bayer Canada which are exposed to such fees for drug approvals or approvals of chemical products, do not argue about the appropriateness of user fees for proprietary services. They understand that this is required. What they believe is seriously eroding their competitiveness however are increasing fees with no corresponding increase in service or performance. Since fees have been on the rise in most cases, there has been no corresponding improved service or response times.

In Canada for example, it takes an average of 750 days for a drug to be approved. In the United States the corresponding time is 500 to 550 days. In Europe the timeframe is less. User fee charges however are as high or higher in Canada when compared with these jurisdictions.

With drugs and chemical and agricultural products, competitive advantage often depends on being the first mover to the marketplace. It is easy to understand why our Canadian companies are seeing their competitive position eroded.

[Translation]

In the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia, user fees are tied in some way to the service provided and the quality of that service. The Government of Canada has not yet implemented this type of measure. In Australia, drug reviews must be carried out within the time period set out in legislation, and if not, the authorities lose up to 25% of their user fees.

Private Members' Business

• (1340)

[English]

In the U.S.A. written performance goals tied to the fee collecting authority were negotiated with the industry. The Medicines Control Agency in the United Kingdom sets targets for clearance times.

Bill C-212 would potentially affect Canadians from coast to coast because it would apply to federal government departments, agencies, boards, crown corporations, commissions or any other body that has the power to fix a user fee or a cost recovery charge under the authority of an act of Parliament. Thus, individuals paying fees to visit a federal park, passengers paying the air traveller security charge, individuals paying a fee to the passport office for a passport, or provincial or territorial authorities paying fees to the Canadian Coast Guard for ice breaking services, would be affected by the bill.

I have introduced the bill because of a certain level of frustration with the lack of progress on this issue. The House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance some two years recommended significant changes to the cost recovery user fee policy, but progress to date has been minimal. In fact there are concerns by stakeholder groups that the policy may be moving in the opposite direction.

Bill C-212 would require that before a federal regulating authority introduces increases or expands the application of, or increases the duration of, a user fee, it must consult meaningfully with affected stakeholder and client groups.

It must take reasonable measures to notify clients and other regulating authorities with a similar clientele of the proposed user fee changes. That is because some of these user fees become incremental in nature. Different departments and agencies are adding these fees and, in totality, they become quite burdensome.

The regulating authority would be required to give all clients or service users a reasonable opportunity to provide ideas or proposals for ways to improve the services to which the user fee relates.

The regulating authority would be required to conduct an impact assessment to identify relevant factors and take into account its findings in a decision to fix or change the user fee.

The regulating authority would need to explain to clients clearly how the user fee is determined and identify the cost and revenue elements of the user fee.

Finally, the regulating authority would be required to establish an independent dispute resolution process to address a complaint or grievance submitted by a client regarding the user fee or charge.

To some, these provisions may appear completely reasonable; to others, they may appear to be quite onerous.

I will acknowledge that these measures would not simplify life for these regulating authorities. I make no apology for that. I believe that all these steps are necessary because these fees could have an enormous impact on companies and individuals in Canada. These groups may have some constructive ideas about how the service could be improved, especially if they are paying more for the service.

It is important to understand what costs are proposed to be recovered with the proposed user fee or fee increase. How expansive or limited is this definition? To what extent are direct and indirect costs, like departmental or agency overheads, included in the cost recovery formula? How costs are defined can make a major difference in the level of the user fee. We need more transparency and accountability in this area as well and Bill C-212 would provide that transparency and accountability.

Parliamentarians need to understand how departments and agencies define what is a public good and what is a private good. These definitions are usually not easy, to be sure. These definitions are typically not black and white, and some are easier than others to define. However, these are important considerations because user fees could only be charged for proprietary goods and services, and parliamentarians need to be involved in these debates. Bill C-212 would allow for that to happen.

Every user fee proposal under Bill C-212 must be tabled in the House of Commons and referred to a committee of the House by the relevant minister. That proposal would, first, explain in respect of what service, facility, authorization, permit or licence the user fee is being proposed. Second, it would state the reason for any proposed change in the user fee rate. Third, it would outline what performance standard is being proposed, as well as the actual performance level that has been reached. Fourth, it would provide an estimate of the total amount that the regulating authority would collect in the first three years after the introduction of the user fee, and identify the costs that the user fee would recover.

• (1345)

Should the amount of the user fee being proposed be higher than that existing in another OECD country the minister would be required by Bill C-212 to give reasons for the difference.

These questions are very important for the competitiveness of Canadian business. A case in point is the new substance notification program. Chemical companies in Canada, when they introduce a new product into the domestic market must appropriately obtain approval from the federal government prior to launching the product. The federal government reviews the application and makes a determination as to whether or not the product is safe and effective. To cover the cost of this approval process companies must pay a user fee. Companies have no difficulty with this.

They do question, however, why our government will not recognize assessments and approvals from our major trading partners, particularly the U.S.A. Questions such as this would attract more scrutiny from the House of Commons and the relevant committee.

Bill C-212 spells out what the requirements are when adjustments in the application of user fees are proposed. This provision is necessary because broadening the application of a fee can have as large an impact as a fee price increase.

Private Members' Business

If a regulating authority wishes to amend the definition of persons subject to the application of a particular user fee for the purposes of maintaining fairness or covering additional cost, the regulating authority may implement the amendments, but the minister must, within 40 days of their implementation, seek the committee's approval for the new measures. Failure to do so would invalidate the adjustments and any change must be consistent with the principles laid out in the act.

Despite this provision a regulating authority may not fix, increase, expand the application of, or increase the duration of, a user fee unless the result gives an additional benefit to clients.

The committee of the House would review every user fee proposal and make recommendations to the House of Commons as to the appropriate fee. Although this step would result in a large volume of work, at least initially, the committee of the House would design the appropriate mechanism to handle the volume of proposals. The formation of a user fee subcommittee or some type of exception reporting system are two such possibilities.

We currently have a number of examples where committees handle a regular volume of like matters and they institutionalize certain mechanisms to deal with that. There would clearly be a learning curve and a bulge of work at the launch of this initiative because many user fees have had limited or no scrutiny by Parliament. This work would become more regularized over time.

Early indications are that Bill C-212 has broad support across a wide spectrum. Support letters are continuing to come into my office and many more are expected. If members would like to see those letters they are more than welcome to come to my office.

The bill is supported so far by the Business Coalition on Cost Recovery. The coalition is made up of representatives of leading Canadian business organizations representing large, medium and small businesses in a diverse range of sectors of the Canadian economy, from agriculture and cosmetics to marine transportation.

The combined membership employs over 2.2 million Canadians and is directly responsible for over \$330 billion in economic activity annually. The business coalition members include: Animal Nutrition Association of Canada; Canadian Animal Health Institute; Canadian Association of Chemical Distributors; Canadian Chemical Producers' Association; Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association; Canadian Drug Manufacturers Association; Canadian Federation of Independent Business; Canadian Association of Importers and Exporters Inc.; Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters; Forest Products Association of Canada, which by the way represents 3% of Canada's GDP; Medical Devices Canada; Nonprescription Drug Manufacturers Association of Canada; and Rx & D, Canada's Research Based Pharmaceutical Companies.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business, which is a member of the Business Coalition on Cost Recovery, represents over 103,000 small and medium sized businesses and it has told me that supporting Bill C-212 is at the top of its public policy agenda and priority list.

• (1350)

Other supporters of the bill include: CropLife Canada, Canadian Medical Device Technology Companies, the Industry Coordinating

Group for the Canadian Environmental Protection Act which includes, in addition to some of the members I have previously mentioned, the following: Adhesives & Sealants Manufacturing Association of Canada, Canadian Paint & Coatings Association, Canadian Petroleum Products Institute, Canadian Plastics Industry Association, Canadian Steel Producers Association, Canadian Textiles Institute, Ecological & Toxicological Association of the Dyes & Organic Pigment Manufacturers, Industrial Biology Association, and the Soap & Detergent Association.

Other organizations include: Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association, a \$14 billion industry which employs over 11,000 Canadians. Many companies also support Bill C-212, like Bayer CropScience; BASF Canada; Provel Animal Health, a division of Eli Lilly Canada Inc.; Engage Argo Corporation; and Crompton Company.

These are serious organizations employing thousands of Canadians across Canada. These organizations support the bill because it is the right thing to do. It would encourage companies to make investments and create jobs.

I ask colleagues to support the bill. It would enhance Canada's competitiveness and advance our country's innovation agenda.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today to take part in the debate on Bill C-212, the private member's bill that talks about the criteria for user fees. I want to remind the House that this problem has been around a very long time. I will quote the auditor general from 1993 when he said:

We are concerned that Parliament cannot readily scrutinize the user fees established by contracts and other non-regulatory means. There does not exist a government-wide summary of the fees being charged, the revenues raised and the authorities under which they are established.

I submit that this was the reason that the member for Medicine Hat introduced a private member's bill on this same topic in 1997, Bill C-205. I know he intended that the private member's bill he introduced would be an opportunity to fulfill those concerns which were raised by the auditor general of the day.

I do not think anybody is against the idea of cost recovery. We certainly are not in the Canadian Alliance. In fact we think that user fees are a good way to go, but the user fees have to reflect the actual cost of doing business and they have to be established in coordination, conjunction and cooperation with the different groups that will be subject to them.

I think of the example in Alberta a few years ago where there was a fairly severe economic downturn. I know it was not only in Alberta but I know about it from being there at the time. The housing industry for example was devastated. I think it was as a result of the NEP at the time, where there was a massive raid by the federal government on the treasury of Alberta.

However the effect of that was a severe recession in Alberta but the bureaucracy of Alberta did not change. Although there were no homes being built during that period, the number of regulators remained the same. These people were supposed to be monitoring and giving authority to the housing industry on things like inspection on plumbing, heating and natural gas fitting in homes for example. As a matter of fact things got worse. The few people who were actually building houses in those years were subjected to harassment from all these bureaucrats who did not have anything to do. They had to justify their actions by going out and making somebody pay the price.

The reason I raise that example is that it is important to have a user fee system that is reflective of the situation in which the economy finds itself.

I know the member for Etobicoke North has raised a number of interesting areas and key points that need to be addressed. We agree with him, when he calls for the need for more parliamentary oversight when user fees are introduced or changed; the need for greater stakeholder participation in the fee setting process, which is part of what I just spoke about; the improved linkages between user fees, the federal department and agency performance specifications and standards; the requirement for more comprehensive stakeholder impact and competitiveness analysis when new user fees or fee increases are contemplated; the goal of increased transparency addressing these fees where applicable; the need for independent dispute resolution process; and the need for annual reporting outlining all user fees. Those are all very important aspects and we support the member in his request to have this changed.

However in addition to having parliamentary scrutiny on user fees, we submit the following principles should apply.

First, the fee must be based on the actual cost of providing the service. They are not necessarily set that way now unfortunately. Some fees are much higher than the cost of the service being provided.

Second, services must be cost effective. This is a key point. In many cases we believe the services are not being provided in a cost effective way and we have to ensure they are.

The member raised the point that there is \$4 billion coming into the federal treasury in user fees. If that cost is reflective of the program that needs to be put in place to administer that in the way which has just been outlined so the different groups are not paying costs which are not their own or not inflated, then that is fine. However, in many cases we believe those costs are exaggerated, and it is another hidden tax on the industry itself.

●(1355)

Third, administrative costs must be low and the documentation requirements must be there in the operation of business.

Fourth, there should be no cross-subsidization of services for commodities or regions. That is an important point. We have seen too much of this kind of thing in the past. We have seen too many cases where there costs are borne by one area that should have been borne by another sector, another industry or another part of the country. Cross-subsidization should not be occur.

Private Members' Business

Fifth, wherever possible fees should be directly applied to prevent fee inflation to indirect application through the service provider.

Sixth, there must be a system in place for tracking the overall incidence of fees and the effect on industry with a process for consultation.

Simply put, we do not mind the idea of user fees or cost recovery. We think that is important. However the user fees must reflect what is a reasonable amount of cost recovery to actually do the job and should not bear out an over-inflated bureaucracy that does not adapt quickly to where that individual sector is itself.

In the case of the housing sector that I talked about, if it were the case that user fees had been set and the sector was in decline and it did not need that many staff to provide that service, that quickly would have to adapt. That means there would have to be consultation with the industry so that those user fees would be reflective of the current situation in terms of the economic well-being of that particular sector of the economy. Otherwise it becomes a cost that is too high and can affect their overall well-being and even competitiveness.

It is important to have a process that can quickly adapt. We believe that the member's bill, if adopted in its entirety, will do just that. We are supportive of it and wish him luck in furthering the cause of the auditor general from 1993, as well as furthering the cause of the member for Medicine Hat when he introduced his private member's bill. Perhaps this thing will move on. I think all parties in the House are in support of it. We would like to see the government pick this up and make it its own bill or pass this quickly to support our industry across the country.

It is important that these industries be allowed to function. We have a tough time already. Taxes are pretty high in the country. We have to compete internationally. Our productivity has fallen against that of the United States for about 25 years and we have to look at ways to cause that to change.

My party had some hearings across Ontario over the last few years. We were told that regulation was just as big a cost to businesses, especially small businesses, as taxation is. In fact it is disproportionately higher for small businesses because they do not have the people dedicated specifically to complying with regulation or people who are administering these cost recovery programs on them. Regulation is a huge cost. I think there were some studies done by the Fraser Institute that suggested it was a \$100 billion cost to industry annually in Canada. That is a huge cost and it hurts them in terms of being competitive, and their bottom lines are affected.

It is important that we get this user fee regime right. This is a step in the right direction and I suggest that the members in the House should support this bill.

Private Members' Business

•(1400)

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is very important that the member for Etobicoke North has brought forward Bill C-212 today. Having listened to the debate and some of the rationale, it is good that this debate is taking place. The issue of user fees and the way the government provides services is rarely debated. This is a very important opportunity for us to put an area of government that is rarely examined under the microscope and shine a spotlight on it.

From the perspective of the NDP, we have very serious reservations about user fees in principle. The hon. member listed all the organizations that support his bill. I note that they are all business organizations. Obviously there is concern in the business community about how user fees creep in and how they increase and increase.

From our perspective, we also want to raise a broader issue, and that is how user fees have become so prevalent everywhere in society, particularly on individuals. One only has to look at the debate on medicare and the issue of user fees. One only has to pay a visit to the ATM or to a bank. Everywhere we go there are new user fees.

I take the member's point very well when he says that there is absolutely no relationship, whether in government or in private sector, between the amount of the user fee and the cost of the service that it is supposedly being provided. We get charged for using ATM machines and dinged a second time when the transaction goes through the bank.

We appreciate the fact that this issue has been raised but we want to broaden the debate and the understanding about this and put it in the context of the role that user fees play in our society.

User fees are a kind of sneaky, back door way of taxation. I can remember when I was a member of Vancouver city council back in the eighties. The mayor at the time was Gordon Campbell with whom I am sure most members are familiar. He is now the Premier of British Columbia. He was infamous in Vancouver for publicly saying on the one hand that he wanted to hold the line on taxes, but then the other hand, under his administration, he brought in massive user fees throughout the whole municipal arena. It was insidious and it happened quietly year after year. If people had examined what had taken place, they would have found that it was a massive tax increase on municipal taxpayers, whether they were developers seeking development permits or small businesses wanting to open up shops or something like that. It is a very insidious form of taxation and is something we should be very vigilant about.

The other problem with user fees, particularly as they apply to individuals, but also as they apply to businesses, is that they disproportionately affect low income people or small businesses. Compare a large corporation with more resources to pay user fees to a small business, or an individual or someone on low income. We will find that a much greater weight is being borne by people with less resources or living on a lower income. For that reason as well, we are very concerned about the expansion of a user fee philosophy.

With respect to the bill itself, I never knew the amount of revenue we were talking about, in terms of the federal government, until the

member outlined it today; \$4 billion annually. That is quite horrendous. If we added in all the other kinds of user fees in the private sector, that amount would also be quite massive.

I agree with the member that there is a systemic bias within departments to just merrily go on their way and increase user fees.

•(1405)

There is no accountability. There is no scrutiny. There is no transparency. There is no one checking what is going on. These user fees continue because it is in the interest of the department to keep rolling them in.

When we talk about the issue of accountability, let us be very clear that while we can look at it as an issue of systemic bias in any department that the member has raised, without a doubt there is also pressure on that department. If its funding is falling as a result of the public debate that takes place here and there are government cutbacks, and the Liberal government is responding to the pressure from the Canadian Alliance, it actually reinforces that kind of systemic practice of a department to increasingly rely on user fees instead of being up front with people and telling them the services it delivers and the costs of the services.

If we want to maintain high quality, public, accessible services, then we have a progressive taxation system to provide the revenue that comes in. I would much prefer that we take that route philosophically and politically than having a sneaky, backdoor way of bringing in money.

This is the first hour of debate on the bill. It is a votable bill. Certainly insofar as the bill does bring greater transparency and accountability to the user fee system that exists, it is something that is very supportable for the New Democrats. I would like to make it clear that we actually see it in a much bigger picture. Our concern also extends to the impact of user fees on individuals in our society, particularly where it involves the provision of public services.

I thank the member for bringing the bill forward. We look forward to the ongoing debate on it. We will have discussions within our caucus but we are generally supportive of it. Maybe there will be opportunities to raise further issues on the bill. Maybe there will be amendments but it is a bill that is very worthy of debate and support. It deals with a very important area of government operation.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to this bill. We support the bill and we commend the member for bringing it forward. It is very comprehensive. It seems very fair and well thought out. It addresses not just user fees per se but many other aspects of the user fee issue.

Private Members' Business

I just wondered, as I sat here and listened to the debate, how the user fees that we face now would be different had this bill been in place. What comes to mind is the airline industry. On our airline tickets there is now a user fee for Nav Canada. It was always included with the Department of Transport expenses and it was not charged to people. Now there is a charge right on the ticket for Nav Canada air traffic control services. There is usually a fee for airport improvement. There is another fee now for airport security and one for a fuel surtax, which is not government.

I am sure that if the member's bill had been in place when the proponents of those user fees brought them in, they would not be as they are now and perhaps they would not be there at all.

For a Liberal bill, it is certainly a very good one. I compliment the member for bringing it forward. We will be supporting it when it comes to a vote.

Air traffic fees are the ones that come to mind. There is a toll highway in my riding. It is the only toll highway in Canada on the Trans-Canada Highway. It is the only section of the Trans-Canada Highway that is tolled. It was originally to be funded through a federal-provincial agreement, but a federal minister and a provincial minister in Nova Scotia decided to take some of the money out and move it to an area of their own riding. They even had the agreement changed. The funding was supposed to be specifically for national highways. The funding was there for this highway, but a former minister of transport a few years ago and a minister of transport in Nova Scotia decided to redirect the money. In the end we ended up with a toll on a section of the Trans-Canada Highway instead of being properly funded by the federal-provincial agreement.

This is simply a user fee. It costs \$3.50 to go one way or the other. It is going to be \$4.50 if the predictions are right about increases next year. What that means for the people where I live in Amherst who drive to Truro in the centre of Nova Scotia on a four lane highway and back is they have to pay \$9 in user fees. However, for people in Pictou who drive the same distance to the same town on a four lane highway that is provided by the government, it is free. People in Halifax can drive to the same town of Truro on a four lane highway and back and it is free. It is just the people who live in my community in Cumberland County, Amherst and Springhill in Nova Scotia, who must pay a user fee. It is completely inconsistent. It is an aberration. It is not fair. That is the way it is with many user fees.

If this bill had been in place, I would say that the user fee would never have been allowed to stand. The requirement under the original funding agreement would have been imposed and the highway would have been paid for. It was a federal-provincial agreement with no user fee required.

It is the inequity in the system that is so unfair. Most people in my province of Nova Scotia can drive on a four lane highway for free. There is just one small group that has to pay \$9 to go back and forth on a four lane highway. It is exactly the same as the other highways. It goes to exactly the same places. It serves exactly the same purpose. It is owned and operated by the province of Nova Scotia. However because there was no scrutiny, because there were no regulations, because there was no accountability, this user fee was imposed on that highway. It has been a thorn in my side from the beginning and it continues to be a thorn in my side.

The air costs are certainly imposing a great burden on the smaller airports and the smaller distance flights. The member for Gander—Grand Falls was telling me how the flights are being reduced so much because of the extra surcharges. Because of the surcharges the number of passengers is down. When the number of passengers is down, the flights are discontinued. To go home tonight he has to fly to St. John's, Newfoundland, stay overnight and then fly to Gander tomorrow because of the reduction in flights. That is a direct result of user fees being charged.

● (1410)

Again, I do not believe those user fees would be in place the way they are now had this bill been in place. All this bill does is it allows for accountability. It requires that there be scrutiny. It requires the proponents to explain and justify what they are doing. That was never done on the toll highway that I mentioned, the aircraft security fee or the Nav Canada fees. There was no scrutiny. There was no discussion and no debate. They went through and each is simply a tax.

These user fees are a dedicated tax that are focused on one specific group of people. If there is a tax imposed on Canadians, it should go through the House. It should be subject to committee scrutiny. It has to be justified, but by calling it a user fee, everything seems to slide right through, no questions asked.

We support the bill just the way it is. It is probably not perfect, but it is a heck of a lot better than what we have now. When it comes time to vote on the bill, we will be voting in favour of it, because again, it is simply accountability, fairness, equity and justification.

I hope all members look at this. I hope people on all sides think about this, realize how important the bill is and what a good move forward it would be. It will not cost; it will save. It will make people think. It will make people accountable and ensure that they do the right thing. It will force federal government departments, all departments, agencies, boards, crown corporations, departments of highways, ferries and everything else to apply to Parliament to justify their fees, their raises and whatever they plan to do. It will make them subject to committee scrutiny. Right now there is no such scrutiny. They just decide what they want to do and they do it. There is no accountability, no transparency and no justification.

In fact my colleague, the Conservative member for Kings—Hants about five years ago brought up the same kind of issue. He said that the government should implement its regulatory budget parallel to the traditional spending budget which would detail estimates of the total cost of each individual regulation, user fees, including the government enforcement costs as well as the cost of compliance to individual citizens and businesses, and include a risk benefit analysis of each regulation to enable cost benefit analysis of regulations for parliamentarians.

Private Members' Business

It differs a little in form and substance, but the same goal is there, the same philosophy is there to add some accountability to this loosey-goosey arrangement. Even though the member for Kings—Hants presented that five years ago prior to many of the user fees that have been brought in since then, it is certainly even more applicable now and is reflected in Bill C-212.

The underlying principle is simply more transparency and accountability. What could be more appropriate than that? It is something we talk about all the time.

The bill, if enacted, would provide parliamentary scrutiny and approval for federal user fees. It would provide greater transparency in the fee setting process. It would ensure public consultation, and there is none now, prior to introducing or amending these fees.

I have a list of organizations that support the bill. I will not repeat them because the member has done a good job of outlining them. One is the Canadian Federation of Independent Business which represents 103,000 small and medium size businesses. They are the people who end up bearing the brunt of many of the user fees that are in place now. Surely we should be listening to these small businesses, which are the backbone of communities like mine, the small and medium size towns in rural Canada.

If the government fees continue to go unchecked, they will continue to hurt small business. They have made this message very clear. In turn, this will impede job creation and hinder our country's overall productivity and ability to compete. In my area, every single cent is important. Every cost reduction is important. Everything that provides a hurdle for competitiveness is very painful for us and it costs us a lot in jobs.

I commend the member for his bill. Canadian taxpayers want value for their money. They want transparency. They want accountability and they want fairness.

Again, I go back to that toll highway. It should never have been a toll highway, but just because it was easy to do, even though there was a federal and a provincial contribution, the way it was handled resulted in a significant toll that will just go up. I believe if that issue had come back to the House, it never would have happened. Under the member's bill that whole issue would have been here. It would have been debated. It would have had public scrutiny. It would have gone to committee and it never would have happened. It is eminently unfair.

● (1415)

I have a lot more thoughts on this. Maybe I will have another chance to share them later on, but essentially we applaud the member for bringing forth the bill. We will support it just the way it is.

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to enter this debate on Bill C-212 put forward by the member for Etobicoke North. I respect the member. We have been great colleagues for a long time and we share many functions on various committees. I know how much this issue means to him. Indeed, I am very interested in this issue as well because of course the government brought in user fees a number of years ago and sometimes people think that we just do not have it quite right.

I would like to report that the Treasury Board in fact is abreast of the issue. It has undertaken a change, a policy framework process, and has dealt with industry in trying to bring forward a revision to the policy. It is not here quite yet and that is partially what my argument would be: that the bill is somewhat premature because there is work and progress going on. However, the member opposite is very concerned that it is not going fast enough, and so maybe he should be.

I must state that the government is opposed to the bill for a number of reasons. Today I would like to describe these reasons as well as provide the House with some additional information on cost recovery and user charging.

Bill C-212, despite its good intentions, would be detrimental to the effective functioning of government. It contains a number of constructive measures, but these are already in place in existing federal policies. I believe that accountability and transparency can be better strengthened through improving these existing policies and existing mechanisms for reporting to Parliament and the public.

Currently, pursuant to the authorities granted them by Parliament, individual ministers are responsible for establishing and amending fees. As such, ministers are responsible for evaluating and responding to the many factors relevant to charging decisions. They are accountable to the public and to Parliament. Ministerial accountability is a fundamental principle in all parliamentary democracies. The Treasury Board cost recovery and charging policy supports this legislative framework by setting out the conditions and factors ministers are to consider when users are charged.

This bill would change Canada's approach. It would establish a standing committee to scrutinize and make recommendations to the House of Commons for the approval or rejection of all federal user charges. I know that all of us who serve on various standing committees look forward to the possibility of a another standing committee and wonder how we could provide our time accordingly.

The bill's additional provisions would create an unprecedented overlap in responsibilities and accountabilities between ministers, the standing committee, the House, undefined independent dispute mechanisms and ultimately the courts. This would dismantle the existing ministerial responsibilities, and existing parliamentary oversight would in fact be supplanted.

Ironically, the sum effect would be to undo the worthy objectives of the hon. member's bill. I say this because it would skew accountability by replacing existing lines of authority with a process that would be very complex, costly and unwieldy.

First, the bill's proposed approval process would require the House of Commons to approve, reject or amend all user charge proposals upon consideration and recommendation of the House committee. This would stray from the current practice and philosophy that Parliament delegates questions of application and detail, such as fee setting, to the executive, which is done in the name of efficiency. In other words, the bill would require the Parliament of Canada to in fact micromanage this whole file.

Private Members' Business

For example, let us imagine that a small agency under Health Canada is seeking approval of a minor change to its fee schedule. In this example, the proposed fee change is intended to simplify the fee structure and process. The bottom line, or the public purse, would not be affected by this change. The proposal is deemed to be revenue neutral. Is this really the type of proposal that requires a separate committee and the House to spend time reviewing? I think not, but the bill would capture this type of transaction

● (1420)

Second, as an act, the provisions of the bill will be enshrined in law. The ultimate arbitrators of issues regarding its interpretation and implementation, then, will not be parliamentarians or the executive, but rather Canada's court system. Complainants dissatisfied with the departmental position or simply seeking to delay fee implementation are liable to avail themselves of the court process to argue potentially frivolous technical issues. In other words, we can actually visualize people starting a court action simply to avoid the possible imposition or increase of a fee.

For example, paragraph 4(1)(a) of the bill requires that "Before a regulating authority fixes" or amends a fee, "it must take reasonable measures" to notify clients of the user fee proposal. Paragraph 4(1)(b) adds that the regulating authority must also give "all clients or service users a reasonable opportunity to provide ideas or proposals for ways to improve" the fee-related services.

With no definition as to what constitutes "reasonable" in these cases, complainants lose nothing by contending in court that the *Canada Gazette* and the Internet were not reasonable means of notification in their case or, for example, that a four week opportunity to provide ideas was not reasonable as it coincided with a busy period in their work cycle, et cetera.

We can imagine the caseload on an already overburdened court system. We must consider the time delays on implementing potential fee proposals and the delaying effects this would have on the courts' ability to hear more serious cases, and we must consider of course, the court and legal costs.

Third, paragraph 4(1)(e) calls for each charging authority to "establish an independent dispute resolution process to address a complaint or grievance submitted by a client regarding the user fee or change".

The bill does not establish whether the ruling authority of such a process would supersede that of the minister responsible for the charge or, for that matter, the authority of the committee. Nor does the bill define what constitutes "a complaint or grievance". The government is well aware that complaints can range from fairly practical questions of application to those that challenge the right or rationale for the department to institute a charge.

Fourth, the bill would extend the reach of this approval process more broadly than perhaps was intended. We note that it would also apply to crown corporations. Their ability to quickly respond to their clients would be subject to the delays created by this new process. That contradicts the reason Parliament granted them a reasonable degree of independent authority: so that government could be more businesslike.

The operational independence granted crown corporations has long been considered an integral part of making government more effective and responsible. Much hard work has been done here in Parliament to create crown corporations like Canada Post so that we could make these organizations more efficient and reduce the red tape burden on the delivering of these services to Canadians. Why would we undo that work? Why place new limits on these organizations after directing them to be more businesslike? Yet that is what the bill would do.

Furthermore, I note that the bill states, "This Act applies to all fees fixed by a regulating authority", and the bill defines a regulating authority as "a department, agency, board, Crown corporation, commission, or any other body that has the power to fix a user fee or a cost recovery charge under the authority of an Act of Parliament."

As worded, the bill also could apply to private sector entities such as Bell Canada and Shaw Cable, whose prices are "fixed by a regulating authority" like the CRTC. The repercussions for these businesses would be yet another round of hearings and the expense associated with them. The added delay implied by the effects of the bill, creating various layers of parliamentary, judicial and independent oversight, would be far reaching and potentially very serious for firms who rely on faster, not slower, decision making authorities, which in turn would affect their bottom line.

● (1425)

Fifth, the proposed approval process would also require fees to be justified in comparison to those of other OECD countries. This risks putting pressure on Canada to establish fees at an international lowest common denominator. Canadians feel strongly about their government's role in protecting public health, safety and security. They expect better of their government than an unsophisticated comparison when so many economic, social and political factors determine the level of service people want and the amount they are willing and able to pay.

I wish to convey a strong message that the government is committed to the values of transparency and accountability and is acutely aware of their importance in the user fee environment. It is very serious about making substantive improvements to the current policy on cost recovery.

The government is presently in the latter stages of a balanced and comprehensive review of this policy. Extensive consultations have been held with internal and external stakeholders. Based on the comments received, the government has proposed, in the form of a draft revised policy, a number of changes. Following comments on these proposals, the government is considering further refinements.

Private Members' Business

The proposed changes will strengthen the accountability of the fee setting process to Parliament, stakeholders and the public and bring about more consistency in the implementation of the policy. This is in response to the previous recommendations of the Standing Committee on Finance and the Auditor General. The proposed changes will provide more explicit guidance to departments that charge.

It is important to note that the government is still in consultation with industry representatives and departments, but there are differing perspectives and competing objectives to consider. Not every issue will be resolved to the satisfaction of all stakeholders. We will continue to listen and to explore ideas for addressing concerns before concluding this review. As we are still consulting—

●(1430)

The Deputy Speaker: I regret interrupting, but the Chair has already been more than generous. Then again, I have never found it to be to anyone's benefit to begin a speech for one minute, then adjourn, and then come back the next time this matter comes before the House, so the time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired and the item is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

[*Translation*]

It being 2.30 p.m., this 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

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

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

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. PIERRE BRIEN

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

HON. DON BOUDRIA

MR. LOYOLA HEARN

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland and Labrador	PC
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
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, Hon. Wayne, Solicitor General of Canada	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Efford, R. John	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Art	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	CA
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	CA
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John, 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	St. John's West	Newfoundland and Labrador	PC
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	CA
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	CA
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CA
Hinton, Betty	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	British Columbia	CA
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	CA
Jennings, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Cooperation	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce— Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CA
Jordan, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CA
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, The Deputy Speaker	Stormont—Dundas— Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Hon. Gar, Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau— Mirabel	Quebec	BQ
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lanctôt, Robert	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	Ind.
LeBlanc, Dominic	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Leung, Sophia, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Ontario	Lib.

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
Vanelief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CA
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (4)		
Barnes, Rex	Gander—Grand Falls	PC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Efford, R. John	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	PC
Matthews, Bill, 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 (101)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Hon. Jean, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald, The Acting Speaker	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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	Lib. Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada.....	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon.....	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies.....	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.....	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup— Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre.....	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable.....	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville.....	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick.....	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles.....	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf.....	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans ..	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Frulla, Liza.....	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec.....	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel.....	Champlain	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de- Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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 November 29, 2002 — 2nd Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:	Raymond Bonin	Vice-Chairs:	Nancy Karetak-Lindell Maurice Vellacott	
Gérard Binet	John Finlay	Inky Mark	Brian Pallister	(16)
Serge Cardin	John Godfrey	Pat Martin	Benoît Serré	
David Chatters	Yvan Loubier	Anita Neville	Brent St. Denis	
R. John Efford				

Associate Members

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

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
Louis Plamondon
Dick ProctorBob Speller
Paul Steckle
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Rob Anders
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
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 DoyleJohn Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald KeddyJason Kenney
Mario Laframboise
Robert Lanctôt
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
James RajotteScott 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
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairs:

Jim Abbott
Paul Bonwick

Sarmite Bulte
Rodger Cuzner
Claude Duplain
Liza Frulla

Christiane Gagnon
John Harvard
Loyola Hearn

Betty Hinton
Wendy Lill
Dennis Mills

Caroline St-Hilaire
Chuck Strahl
Tony Tirabassi

(16)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Joe Comartin
John Cummins

Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Rahim Jaffer

Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Dick Proctor
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Suzanne Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs:

Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Jerry Pickard

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Assad
Yvon Charbonneau
Antoine Dubé

John Godfrey
Steve Mahoney
Inky Mark

Grant McNally
Anita Neville
Joe Peschisolido

David Price
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Bill Blaikie
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins

Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill

Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
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
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:
John Herron
Karen Kraft SloanRoy Bailey
Bernard Bigras
Serge Cardin
Joe ComartinNancy Karetak-Lindell
Rick Laliberte
Gary LunnBob Mills
Karen Redman
Julian ReedAndy Savoy
Hélène Scherrer
Alan Tonks

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Paul Crête
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
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim JafferDale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Yvan Loubier
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott ReidJohn 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 HarrisScott Brison
Rick Casson
Roy Cullen
Albina GuarnieriRahim Jaffer
Sophia Leung
Maria Minna
Shawn MurphyLorne Nystrom
Pierre Paquette
Charlie Penson
Pauline PicardGary Pillitteri
Tony Valeri
Bryon Wilfert

(18)

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

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Tom Wappel

Vice-Chairs: Rodger Cuzner
Peter Stoffer

Sarkis Assadourian
Andy Burton
John Cummins
R. John Efford

Reed Elley
Georges Farrah
Loyola Hearn

Dominic LeBlanc
Bill Matthews
Joe Peschisolido

Yves Rocheleau
Jean-Yves Roy
Paul Steckle

(16)

Associate Members

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

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

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

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

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:	Bernard Patry	Vice-Chairs:	Stockwell Day Diane Marleau	
Sarkis Assadourian	Irwin Cotler	John Harvard	Pat O'Brien	(18)
Stéphane Bergeron	John Duncan	Marlene Jennings	Deepak Obhrai	
Aileen Carroll	Art Eggleton	Francine Lalonde	Svend Robinson	
Bill Casey	Mark Eyking	Keith Martin		

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:	Reg Alcock	Vice-Chairs:	Paul Forseth Tony Valeri	
Carolyn Bennett	Liza Frulla	Pat Martin	Andy Scott	(16)
Scott Brison	Robert Lanctôt	Gilles-A. Perron	Alex Shepherd	
Roy Cullen	Steve Mahoney	Gerry Ritz	Paul Szabo	
Ken Epp				

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES PROCESS

Chairs:	Gerry Ritz Tony Valeri	Vice-Chair:		
				(2)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE RENEWAL

Chairs:	Roy Cullen Paul Forseth	Vice-Chair:		
				(2)

HEALTH**Chair:** Bonnie Brown**Vice-Chairs:** Stan Dromisky
Réal MénardCarolyn Bennett
Diane Bourgeois
Jeannot Castonguay
Brenda ChamberlainHedy Fry
James Lunney
Rob MerrifieldHélène Scherrer
Judy Sgro
Carol SkeltonYolande Thibeault
Greg Thompson
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(16)

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

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Judi Longfield	Vice-Chairs:	Eugène Bellemare Monte Solberg	
Libby Davies	Peter Goldring	Gurbax Malhi	Diane St-Jacques	(18)
Norman Doyle	Jim Gouk	Serge Marcil	Alan Tonks	
R. John Efford	Monique Guay	Raymond Simard	Suzanne Tremblay	
Raymonde Folco	Tony Ianno	Larry Spencer		

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Carolyn Bennett	Vice-Chair:		
Mauril Bélanger	Norman Doyle	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Anita Neville	(9)
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Reed Elley	Wendy Lill	Tony Tirabassi	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

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

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:

Walt Lastewka

Vice-Chairs:Dan McTeague
James RajotteAndré Bachand
Larry Bagnell
Paul Crête
Nick DiscepolaBrian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Jocelyne Girard-BujoldSerge Marcil
Brian Masse
Andy SavoyBrent St. Denis
Paddy Torsney
Joseph Volpe

(16)

Associate Members

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

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

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

LIAISON

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

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Paul Forseth	Derek Lee	David Price
Eugène Bellemare	Yvon Godin	Diane Marleau	Marcel Proulx
Paul Bonwick	Mac Harb	John McKay	James Rajotte
Chuck Cadman	Richard Harris	Dan McTeague	Monte Solberg
Murray Calder	John Herron	Réal Ménard	Peter Stoffer
Rodger Cuzner	Howard Hilstrom	James Moore	Yolande Thibeault
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Dale Johnston	Carolyn Parrish	Tony Valeri
Stockwell Day	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Beth Phinney	Maurice Vellacott
Nick Discepolo	Karen Kraft Sloan	Jerry Pickard	Elsie Wayne
Stan Dromisky			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Reg Alcock	Bonnie Brown	Walt Lastewka	Tom Wappel	(8)
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Andy Scott	John Williams	

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:

David Pratt

Vice-Chairs:
David Price
Elsie Wayne

Rob Anders
Claude Bachand
Colleen Beaumier
Leon Benoit

Robert Bertrand
Cheryl Gallant
Joe McGuire

John O'Reilly
Janko Peric
Louis Plamondon

Carmen Provenzano
Peter Stoffer
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
Stan Dromisky
John Duncan

Reed Elley
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
Wendy Lill
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Dan McTeague
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson

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

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:	Mauril Bélanger	Vice-Chairs:	Yvon Godin Yolande Thibeault	
Eugène Bellemare Gérard Binet Sarmite Bulte Jeannot Castonguay	Christiane Gagnon John Herron Rahim Jaffer	Jason Kenney Dan McTeague Massimo Pacetti	Scott Reid Benoît Sauvageau Raymond Simard	(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson André Bachand Roy Bailey Rex Barnes Leon Benoit Stéphane Bergeron Rick Borotsik Garry Breitzkreuz Scott Brison Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters Joe Clark Joe Comartin John Cummins	Stockwell Day Norman Doyle John Duncan Reed Elley Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Paul Forseth Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Stephen Harper Richard Harris Loyola Hearn Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton	Dale Johnston Gerald Keddy Yvan Loubier Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Keith Martin Philip Mayfield Grant McNally Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Lorne Nystrom Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Charlie Penson Louis Plamondon James Rajotte John Reynolds	Gerry Ritz Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Larry Spencer Guy St-Julien Darrel Stinson Chuck Strahl Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Vic Toews Suzanne Tremblay Maurice Vellacott Elsie Wayne Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich
--	---	--	---

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Peter Adams	Vice-Chairs:	Dale Johnston Carolyn Parrish	
Rick Borotsik	Yvon Godin	Geoff Regan	Werner Schmidt	(16)
Pierre Brien	Michel Guimond	John Reynolds	Guy St-Julien	
Marlene Catterall	Joe Jordan	Jacques Saada	Tony Tirabassi	
Wayne Easter				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson
Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	Betty Hinton	Marcel Proulx
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
André Bachand	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	Gerry Ritz
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gary Lunn	Carol Skelton
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	James Lunney	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Kevin Sorenson
Stéphane Bergeron	John Godfrey	Inky Mark	Larry Spencer
Bill Blaikie	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Caroline St-Hilaire
Garry Breitzkreuz	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Darrel Stinson
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Larry McCormick	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
David Chatters	John Harvard	Bob Mills	Elsie Wayne
Joe Clark	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Randy White
John Cummins	John Herron	Lorne Nystrom	Ted White
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	John Williams
Libby Davies	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Marcel Proulx	Vice-Chair:		
Rick Borotsik	Michel Guimond	Chuck Strahl	Tony Tirabassi	(6)
Yvon Godin				

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

John Williams

Vice-Chairs:Mac Harb
Beth PhinneyRobert Bertrand
John Bryden
Odina Desrochers
John FinlayPaul Forseth
Gerald Keddy
Sophia Leung
Pat MartinPhilip Mayfield
Val Meredith
Shawn MurphyGilles-A. Perron
Joe Peschisolido
Alex Shepherd

(17)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Stockwell DayBev Desjarlais
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard HilstromBetty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Grant McNally
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott ReidJohn Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Darrel Stinson
Peter Stoffer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
Lynne Yelich

TRANSPORT

Chair:	Joe Comuzzi	Vice-Chairs:	James Moore Marcel Proulx	
Rex Barnes	Jim Gouk	Stan Keyes	Alex Shepherd	(16)
John Cannis	André Harvey	Mario Laframboise	Raymond Simard	
Bev Desjarlais	Ovid Jackson	Robert Lanctôt	Lynne Yelich	
Roger Gallaway				

Associate Members

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Chair:	Paddy Torsney	Vice-Chairs:	Carole-Marie Allard Randy White	
Bernard Bigras	Mac Harb	R�al M�nard	Kevin Sorenson	(13)
Libby Davies	Dominic LeBlanc	Jacques Saada	Greg Thompson	
Hedy Fry	Derek Lee			

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROCEDURES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Chair:	Bob Kilger	Vice-Chairs:	Don Boudria John Reynolds	
Bill Blaikie	Michel Gauthier	Loyola Hearn	Dick Proctor	(11)
Norman Doyle	Monique Guay	Stan Keyes	Werner Schmidt	

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chair:

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Michael J. Forrestall
Jean Lapointe

Yves Morin
Vivienne Poy

Mauril Bélanger
Carolyn Bennett
Robert Bertrand
Rick Borotsik
Marlene Catterall
Marcel Gagnon
Deborah Grey
Grant Hill

Jim Karygiannis
Wendy Lill
Jerry Pickard
Louis Plamondon
Jacques Saada
Guy St-Julien
Darrel Stinson
Andrew Telegdi

(21)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Garry Breitkreuz
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
John Cummins
Libby Davies
Stockwell Day

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

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

John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Larry Spencer
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Gurmant Grewal
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair: Derek Lee

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron
Elizabeth Hubley
James Kelleher

Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin
Gérard Phalen

Paul Bonwick
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Liza Frulla
Michel Guimond
Paul Harold Macklin
John Maloney
Pat Martin

John McKay
Lynn Myers
Caroline St-Hilaire
Greg Thompson
Maurice Vellacott
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(24)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bachand
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitreuz
Pierre Brien
Scott Brison
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Clark
Stockwell Day

Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
John Herron
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton

Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Robert Lanctôt
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister

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

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILL C-17, PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

Chair: Bob Kilger

Vice-Chair:

Diane Ablonczy
Sarkis Assadourian
Claude Bachand
Rex Barnes

Robert Bertrand
Bev Desjarlais
Mario Laframboise
Derek Lee

Steve Mahoney
James Moore
Lynn Myers
Anita Neville

John O'Reilly
Andy Savoy
Vic Toews

(16)

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panel of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

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

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
Hon. David Collenette	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. John Manley	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance
Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Health
Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Industry
Hon. Wayne Easter	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
Mr. Steve Mahoney	to the Minister of Transport
Mrs. Karen Redman	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Paul Szabo	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Ms. Sarmite Bulte	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Bryon Wilfert	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Lynn Myers	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Alex Shepherd	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Paul Harold Macklin	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Ms. Raymonde Folco	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Bill Matthews	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Pat O'Brien	to the Minister for International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Larry McCormick	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Mr. Benoît Serré	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. John Finlay	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Ms. Sophia Leung	to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Mark Assad	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Carmen Provenzano	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Minister for International Cooperation
Mr. John O'Reilly	to the Minister of National Defence

CONTENTS

Friday, November 29, 2002

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Nuclear Safety and Control Act

Bill C-4, Report stage	2041
Motion for concurrence	2041
Division on motion deferred	2041

Kyoto Protocol

Motion	2041
Mr. Cullen	2041
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	2043
Mr. Adams	2043
Mr. Hilstrom	2043
Amendment to amendment	2045

Business of the House

Mr. Saada	2046
-----------------	------

Kyoto Protocol

Motion	2046
Mr. Reed	2046
Mr. Hilstrom	2046
Mr. Penson	2046
Mrs. Jennings	2047

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

HIV-AIDS

Mr. Harb	2048
----------------	------

Queen's Jubilee Medal

Mr. Jaffer	2048
------------------	------

Diabetes Awareness Month

Mr. Malhi	2048
-----------------	------

Curtis Myden

Ms. Bulte	2048
-----------------	------

Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation

Mr. Cullen	2048
------------------	------

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Pallister	2048
---------------------	------

Livestock Genetics

Mr. Adams	2049
-----------------	------

World AIDS Day

Mr. Ménard	2049
------------------	------

Peacekeeping

Ms. Folco	2049
-----------------	------

Health Care

Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	2049
----------------------------	------

Landmines

Mrs. Jennings	2049
---------------------	------

Electoral Reform

Mr. Proctor	2050
-------------------	------

Agropur Plant

Ms. Girard-Bujold	2050
-------------------------	------

Marguerite Maillet

Mr. Marcil	2050
------------------	------

Lower Churchill Project

Mr. Doyle	2050
-----------------	------

Goods and Services Tax

Mr. Reid	2050
----------------	------

Aboriginal Affairs

Ms. McDonough	2051
---------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Health

Mr. Merrifield	2051
Ms. McLellan	2051
Mr. Merrifield	2051
Ms. McLellan	2051
Mr. Merrifield	2051
Ms. McLellan	2051
Mr. Strahl	2051
Ms. McLellan	2051
Mr. Strahl	2052
Ms. McLellan	2052
Mr. Brien	2052
Ms. McLellan	2052
Mr. Brien	2052
Ms. McLellan	2052
Mr. Ménard	2052
Ms. McLellan	2052
Mr. Ménard	2052
Ms. McLellan	2053

Aboriginal Affairs

Ms. McDonough	2053
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	2053
Ms. McDonough	2053
Ms. McLellan	2053

Correctional Service Canada

Mr. Casey	2053
Mr. Myers	2053
Mr. Casey	2053
Mr. Myers	2053

Terrorism

Mr. Kenney	2053
Mr. Myers	2053

Taxation

Mr. Fitzpatrick	2054
Ms. Caplan	2054

Health

Ms. Guay	2054
----------------	------

Ms. McLellan	2054	Coast Guard	
Ms. Guay	2054	Mr. Lunney	2058
Ms. McLellan	2054	Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	2058
Softwood Lumber		Health	
Ms. Meredith	2054	Ms. Girard-Bujold	2058
Mr. Pettigrew	2054	Ms. McLellan	2058
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	2054	Human Resources Development	
Mr. Vanclief	2055	Mr. Cullen	2058
Health		Ms. Folco	2059
Mr. Loubier	2055	Health	
Ms. McLellan	2055	Mr. Proctor	2059
Mr. Loubier	2055	Ms. McLellan	2059
Ms. McLellan	2055	The Environment	
Age of Consent		Mr. Hearn	2059
Mr. Toews	2055	Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	2059
Mr. Macklin	2055	National Defence	
Young Offenders		Mrs. Gallant	2059
Mr. McNally	2055	Mr. O'Reilly	2059
Mr. Macklin	2055	Health	
Agriculture		Mr. Asselin	2059
Mr. Harb	2055	Ms. McLellan	2059
Mr. Vanclief	2056		
Health			
Mrs. Desjarlais	2056		
Ms. McLellan	2056		
Canada Customs and Revenue Agency			
Ms. Davies	2056		
Ms. Caplan	2056		
Airline Industry			
Mr. Barnes (Gander—Grand Falls)	2056		
Mr. Boudria	2056		
Natural Resources			
Mr. Hearn	2056		
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	2056		
Firearms Registry			
Mr. Breitzkreuz	2057		
Mr. Macklin	2057		
Government Advertising			
Mr. Epp	2057		
Mr. Goodale	2057		
Health			
Mr. Bigras	2057		
Mr. Dion	2057		
Mr. Bigras	2057		
Mr. Dion	2057		
Mrs. Skelton	2057		
Ms. McLellan	2057		
Mr. Spencer	2057		
Ms. McLellan	2058		
Canada Elections Act			
Mr. Anders	2058		
Mr. Boudria	2058		
		ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
		Canadian Landmine Fund	
		Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale)	2060
		Government Response to Petitions	
		Mrs. Redman	2060
		Committees of the House	
		Finance	
		Mrs. Barnes (London West)	2060
		Canada Labour Code	
		Ms. Guay	2060
		Bill C-319, Introduction and first reading	2060
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read first time and printed)	2060
		Kyoto Protocol	
		Mr. Boudria	2060
		Motion	2060
		(Motion agreed to)	2060
		Petitions	
		Stem Cell Research	
		Mr. Breitzkreuz	2060
		Child Pornography	
		Mr. Breitzkreuz	2060
		Foreign Affairs	
		Ms. Davies	2061
		Missing Persons	
		Ms. Davies	2061
		Child Pornography	
		Ms. Davies	2061
		Housing	
		Ms. Davies	2061
		Child Pornography	
		Mr. Tirabassi	2061

Stem Cell Research	
Mr. Tirabassi	2061
Human Rights	
Mr. McKay	2061
Marriage	
Mr. McKay	2061
Stem Cell Research	
Mr. McKay	2061
Child Pornography	
Mr. McKay	2061
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mrs. Redman	2061

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Kyoto Protocol	
Motion	2061
Mrs. Jennings	2061
Mr. Epp	2063
Ms. Davies	2064
Mr. Adams	2065
Mr. Epp	2066

Mr. Proctor	2066
Mr. Adams	2067
Mr. McKay	2068
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	2069
Mr. Adams	2069
Mr. Bélanger	2070

POINTS OF ORDER

Official Report	
Mr. Epp	2071

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

User Fees Act	
Mr. Cullen	2071
Bill C-212, Second reading	2071
Mr. Penson	2074
Ms. Davies	2076
Mr. Casey	2076
Mr. Shepherd	2078

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Publishing and Depository Services

PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5

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

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

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Les Éditions et Services de dépôt

TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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