



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 139 • NUMBER 025 • 3rd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, March 12, 2004

—

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, March 12, 2004

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (0955)

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from March 9 consideration of the motion that Bill C-12, an act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of children and other vulnerable persons) and the Canada Evidence Act, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this morning on behalf of the constituents of Surrey Central to participate in the debate on Bill C-12, an act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of children and other vulnerable persons) and the Canada Evidence Act.

Contrary to yesterday's assertion by the justice minister, the official opposition cares about protecting children from sexual predators. That is why we are firmly opposed to Bill C-12. We want legislation that makes the perverts who prey upon our innocent children fearful.

Unfortunately, Bill C-12 fails in that regard. This bill has been endorsed by none other than Mr. John Robin Sharpe, the very man who was found guilty of possession of as many as 400 images of children whom prosecutors contended were being exploited sexually.

In March 2002 Sharpe's conviction concerning the images was upheld by the Supreme Court. However, he was ultimately acquitted of related charges that had been filed against him in connection with the stories he had written, specifically because those writings were deemed to have artistic merit. Mr. Sharpe feels that this bill is so poorly crafted that even he could use it to his advantage in the courts.

To quote the nation's most notorious child pornographer, "The interesting thing about the child sex laws is that they may offer some unintended opportunities for the defence". Mr. Sharpe asserts that the federal proposal is a panic reaction to his two successes in challenging the current legislation in court. He further writes, "I am fairly confident that given good legal counsel, and a by-the-book judge who bases his decisions on the wording of the law...I and my stories would again be acquitted under the proposed measures".

The problem with this bill lies in the proposed public good defence. Mr. Sharpe is not alone when he claims that the proposal is too vague to survive court challenges. Many legal experts agree with him. Judges who interpret and apply the law do not consider the many fine speeches delivered in this chamber. They simply look at the words of the laws that we pass in this place.

What does public good really mean? The government has failed to make that clear. What if, as Mr. Sharpe suggests, a judge finds it in the public good to allow possession of child pornography if it prevents convicted child molesters from reoffending again? That certainly is within the realm of possibility.

If Parliament passes this bill, a person would be found guilty of a child pornography offence when the material or act in question does not serve the public good or where the risk of harm outweighs any public benefit. Since the Sharpe case, Conservatives have called again and again on the federal government to eliminate the artistic merit defence, but replacing it with a public good defence is not the solution. We must eliminate all defences that justify the criminal possession of child pornography.

● (1010)

The Liberals need to get their priorities straight. They have brought forward many pieces of legislation, but none of them protect children against child pornography. For years I have been demanding a stop to the sexual exploitation of children, but the Liberals clearly lack the political will to fix that problem for our society.

In fact, during the Liberal government's tenure, family values have been continually eroded. We can talk about any single issue that relates to family values. Those family values have been eroding under the Liberals, whether it is the definition of marriage, protecting children from child pornography, raising the age of consent, taxation laws with respect to single parent families, or giving law enforcement agencies enough resources and laws with teeth.

On every single front, the Liberal government has let families down. It always forgets that the stronger the family, the stronger the community and the stronger our great nation would be. The foundation of this great country is the family, not the social welfare system. We have to strengthen our families. We have to protect children and other vulnerable people.

Government Orders

Canadians want laws with teeth. That is one thing we can do in this chamber. At least we could make laws with teeth and not have just a slap on the wrist or a revolving door criminal justice system. We cannot do that anymore. Why can the Liberals not see that we want deterrents in place, not some sort of motivation for criminal behaviour?

Bill C-12, which we are debating today, will increase maximum sentences or maximum penalties for offences that harm children. I agree, but that is not good enough. How many times has government introduced legislation that increases maximum sentences? What is the good of increasing maximum sentences if the courts will not apply the full force of the laws we already have in place? Increasing penalties is meaningless if the courts do not impose the sentences.

We know from experience that when maximum sentences are raised there is no corresponding pattern in the actual sentencing practices. What is needed? Mandatory minimum sentences. We need truth in sentencing. We need no conditional sentences for child predators. We need minimum mandatory sentences instead of the maximum sentences so that the judges can implement them.

Bill C-12 creates a new category of sexual exploitation that protects people aged 14 to 18. Courts would focus not on consent but on whether the relationship is exploitative based on age difference, control exerted and other circumstances. Again, that is not good enough. It is already against the law for a person in a position of trust or authority, or with whom a young person is in a relation of dependency, to be sexually involved with that young person. It is already in the law. It is unclear how adding such people will add legal protection for young children.

• (1015)

What the Liberals should have done instead was increase the age of consent for any sexual activity. A major shortcoming of the bill is that it fails to raise the age of consent for sexual activity between children and adults. I fail to see the rationale for permitting adults to engage in any sexual activity with children. The government should raise the age of consent, currently set out in section 150.1 of the Criminal Code, from 14 to 16 at least, if not 18.

In Surrey, we are all too familiar with the problem of prostitution. Studies have found that 70% to 80% of Canadian prostitutes enter the trade as children. In particular at that age, the recruitment process for the sex trade in Canada preys on young girls and boys and specifically targets those who are at the current age of consent, that is, 14. According to the Children of the Street Society, the majority of parents who call asking for help from the police have children who are 14 years old and are being recruited into the sex trade by the pimps.

I ask the Liberals, do they think that 50 year old men should be able to target 14 year old runaways for sex, give them a sexually transmitted disease and get them pregnant? What response will Liberals give at the doorstep during the upcoming campaign? I would be very interested to hear from the government members who lack the political will to protect our children from these sex predators.

The results of dozens of studies show the effect of adult sexual contact with children. There is a huge risk of clinical depression,

suicide, post-traumatic stress disorder, and extreme promiscuity and involvement in prostitution. It is vitally important that we do not confuse physical maturation with psychological maturation. The "age of majority" is a term used by lawyers to protect the offender and to describe the time in life after which a person is legally no longer considered a child. In essence, it is an arbitrary time when a child becomes an adult in the eyes of the law.

Why is it that we as a society feel that children are ill-prepared to drive, to drink, even to vote or marry or drop out of school or even watch violent movies, but we feel they are totally ready to decide for themselves with whom they should have sex? It is a pity to have this societal social evil. This makes absolutely no sense.

Raising the age of sexual consent would definitely put us more in line with other western nations. We know that in Denmark, France and Sweden the age of consent for sexual activity is 15. In Australia, Finland, Germany, Holland, Israel, New Zealand, Norway and even the United Kingdom, the age of consent for sexual activity is 16. In Canada, we still have that age of 14. It is time for the Liberals to prohibit adults from having sex with children under the age of 16. This age of 14 is not a good thing for society.

• (1020)

The need to protect innocent and vulnerable children from pimps and other sexual predators is a matter of highest priority. It should not be on the back burner of the government's priorities. How many Canadians are aware that a 14 year old can move into a conjugal relationship with a 50 year old? There is nothing the parents can do, at least legally, to put a stop to such an exploitative relationship. Persons at 14 and 15 years of age lack the mental and emotional maturity to cope with the psychological effects of engaging in sexual activity with older persons.

A survey last summer found that 80% of Canadians, eight out of ten people, believe the age of sexual consent should be raised to 16. So why does the age of consent remain at 14?

I know that the Liberal government is governing the country with polls. It has been looking at the polls for the definition of marriage and now is looking at the polls for when to call the election, but why does it not see this same poll, in which 80% of Canadians demand from this weak and arrogant Liberal government that the age for sexual activity be raised from 14 to at least 16? Why are we depriving parents of the ability to protect their children from sexual exploitation? It is a very important issue. It cannot be ignored.

Government Orders

I talked about minimum mandatory sentences. They are a root cause of the criminal justice system not being effective. Let us take marijuana cultivation as an example. According to a British Columbia police study, on average it takes seven convictions before a person will serve jail time for cultivation of cannabis. In neighbouring Washington State, first time offenders get an automatic three month sentence. Needless to say, we have considerably more grow ops in British Columbia, particularly in my constituency, than they do south of the border.

But what does the government do? It introduces legislation that would increase maximum sentences for larger grow operations. What about the minimum sentences? Minimum sentences are what Canadians need. They send a message to the criminal element in society that we are serious about preventing crime, whether it is child pornography, drugs or any other violent crime.

It is very important that we look into these issues seriously. I talked about Surrey. We know that last year a massive RCMP probe, code-named Project Snowball, tracked more than 2,000 Canadians, including over 406 in British Columbia, suspected of possessing and distributing sexually explicit pictures of children. Out of those 406 identified in British Columbia, 23 were from Surrey.

A quick survey of local Surrey newspapers reveals many cases of adults sexually exploiting children. For instance, there is 32 year old Stephen Smith, who was charged with two counts of sexual assault and two counts of sexual exploitation involving two underage boys he had met on the Internet. Dale Nault, a 34 year old, also from Surrey, was charged with three counts of sexual assault involving a 14 year old boy he met over the Internet and with one count of possession of child pornography.

In all these cases, the government failed to protect the children. I know that my time is almost up, but I would like to say that if the Liberals were serious about protecting our children and making our streets safe for all Canadians, they would strengthen our laws by introducing maximum sentences and ensuring that sentences handed out are actually served. They would give law enforcement agencies the resources they need to fight crime instead of wasting money on a useless gun registry.

● (1025)

Rather than registering sex offenders, the government has been wasting billions of dollars registering guns of law-abiding citizens. We need a comprehensive sex offender registry, tougher sentences for pedophiles, elimination of all legal loopholes for child pornography, a streamlining of the administrative process for convicting sex offenders and the prohibition of all adult-child sexual contact.

In closing, I move:

That the amendment be amended by adding: "and that the committee report back no later than April 5, 2004."

The Speaker: The amendment is in order.

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague touched somewhat on a fact that is very disturbing to me, that there are pedophiles and child molesters who say there are parts of this legislation that they support. A responsible government should take note of that, find the section in the legislation that allows those

creeps to find some benefit in the legislation, and make sure it is changed before it is passed into law.

Time after time we have made suggestions to the government that would allow it to improve the legislation to make it stronger and to really send the message out that if offenders mess with our kids, they will pay a strong price. The present legislation does not do that.

I would like my colleague to comment on the fact that there are parts of this legislation that the people who prey on our children actually support. What does he feel needs to be done to make the legislation stronger than it is?

● (1030)

Mr. Gurmant Grewal: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my speech, it was indicated in the House of Commons yesterday during question period, surprisingly by a Liberal member, who cited John Robin Sharpe as endorsing this bill. How shameless that a Liberal member would stand up and indicate that a notorious pedophile in this country endorses this bill. It indicates so clearly that the bill is good for pedophiles and not for victims and does not protect our children.

Where is the defence for protecting our children? It is completely missing. The underlying cause is the government lacks the political will to protect children from pedophiles.

There are many loopholes in the bill. Previously it was artistic merit and now the government would put in law the public good defence. How good is that public defence when it does not protect children from pedophiles, from child pornography, from sexual exploitation? How good is the public good defence? I cannot understand why the Liberal government is letting it go forward in this form.

I have been watching since the new Prime Minister took power, after many years of backroom stabbing and manipulations, and he has not come forward with a single piece of his own legislation. He is recycling the legislation from the previous Liberal government.

He has missed the opportunity to include in the law the amendments from the official opposition's thoughtful members. Time and again we have raised those issues in the House, to make the law tougher and make the sentences meaningful but the government has ignored us. The Prime Minister has chosen to ignore us again. He has missed that opportunity. The loopholes in the law will continue and people like John Robin Sharpe will continue to endorse the laws made by the weak and arrogant Liberal government.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, does the member know, from media reports and other sources, whether in his part of the country there has been an escalation in that particular area?

Government Orders

As members of Parliament we want to represent and defend for the common good our own constituencies, the interests of people in our own back yard, so to speak. The member has been a hardworking member of Parliament coming up on seven years now. I would specifically like to know whether on his part of the horizon there has been an escalation. Is the need for this legislation now more serious, amended as suggested by the Conservative Party of Canada?

Mr. Gurmant Grewal: Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely true that such heinous crimes have been increasing in our communities.

In the city of Surrey, many children have been kidnapped. There are some famous cases where the kids have been even murdered. I do not want to name those children to respect the privacy of the families. It is certainly very painful to see that happen.

The city of Surrey is considered, unfortunately, the auto theft capital of North America. Break and enters, gang violence, drug related violence and organized crime related violence have been escalating.

One root cause is the government has not been giving enough resources to the law enforcement agencies. Today there are 4,200 fewer RCMP officers on our streets and highways than there were when the Liberals came to power in 1993. Moreover, last year the Canadian Police Association said that the RCMP needs an immediate infusion of \$250 million into the system.

The Canadian per capita average indicates that British Columbia would need 691 more police officers. In Surrey there is one police officer per 893 residents. In Vancouver there is one police officer per 400 people. On a per capita basis, we have just half the police officers.

There are 75 vacancies in the RCMP in the city of Surrey alone. Those positions have been vacant for a very long time. Why? One underlying reason is that the Liberal government is not giving our law enforcement agencies enough resources.

In addition to having fewer police officers, they have the highest number of files per police officer. In Surrey, RCMP officers each handle on average 126 files. We know what the result is from starving the RCMP of resources, officers and vehicles to patrol the streets. Naturally the response time after 911 calls is longer. Naturally there is a shortage of police officers on the street. Therefore crime is on the rise.

We need to take action. I have been calling upon the weak and arrogant Liberal government time and again to do something about it. The Liberals have not done anything. With Bill C-12, the Liberals had another opportunity to make the legislation tougher to protect our children and they have failed.

•(1035)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in this House to take part in this very important debate on Bill C-12.

[*English*]

The bill is one which capsulates, and very much is intended to address, an extremely important issue, that being the proliferation

and possession of child pornography in this country. I am very sad to say that the overwhelming feeling that I and many others, including the previous speaker, have been left with is that a huge missed opportunity is occurring within the pages of Bill C-12.

While the bill attempts to address these critical matters of protecting children in the country, it falls far short. In its final analysis, it is described as a complex and cumbersome bill that will not make it easier to prosecute sex offenders and those who, in many cases, are sexual predators in our community who perpetrate the worst kind of violence on children: sexual abuse, which is tantamount in many situations to a life sentence of turmoil, of complex physical damage, of the type of impact on a person's life from which they never recover.

The responsibility, obligation, upon members of Parliament, those in a position to address the situation, cannot be understated. Here we had a golden opportunity to do something about this egregious situation that is occurring on the streets, in small villages and towns and residences across the country.

The controversy arising in one area of child pornography that came out of the now infamous John Robin Sharpe case, which went all the way up to our Supreme Court of Canada, and the difficulty that remains surrounding the definition of an artistic merit interpretation that was left by the courts allows for a dangerous and broad interpretation of a type of child pornography of which a person might be in possession. This statement not only has allowed but has left open the door for further proliferation of child pornography by individuals like John Robin Sharpe,

There is an important distinction to be made between the types of defences that rely on an exception, if you will, to possession of certain types of materials. I want to be clear in defining that. The courts spoke of essentially three exceptions, artistic merit being one of them, which I personally and many members of the Conservative Party oppose. It also made way for educational, scientific or medical purposes. What we are talking about clearly is anatomy charts, instructional videos for educational purposes that depict a child in a certain fashion.

All of those defences lumped in with artistic merit were, in essence, boiled down by the courts to a single defence of public good. That broad interpretation is what is so dangerous. The former justice minister in the wake of this decision came before the justice committee and essentially admitted that the broader definition of public good defence was still very much one which would leave open the possibility of a person possessing child pornography. He said, and I am quoting from his testimony at the justice committee:

Artistic merit still exists in the sense that a piece of art will have to essentially go through the new defence of public good and through the two stages. Of course, the first question is always this. Does it serve the public good?

That might be the first test, but that second broad category of artistic merit leaves open the possibility that an individual can possess or perpetrate or proliferate child pornography. A zero tolerance definition is needed. No one in any way, shape or form in this country should be encouraged or permitted to possess child pornography, full stop. Yet the bill leaves open that very real possibility. That is the Liberal answer to the John Robin Sharpe case.

Government Orders

I am fearful that any backing away or watering down of a definition such as this will leave that danger out there for young people in this country. There is no excuse for not completely eradicating the flexibility that was left open by the Supreme Court.

• (1040)

That is not to say there are no other elements of the bill that do at least attempt to go further in securing the lives and the safety of children, and I will touch on that in a moment. The fundamental question in this debate must centre around the harm that could be caused to those who are most vulnerable, mainly children.

Underlying this theme, we must give thought to the role of the court in the context of judicial policy making as it pertains to the supremacy of Parliament. We must show how this new legislation would eradicate child pornography in Canada within the context of the artistic merit defence. Bill C-12 comes up short. The legislation does not go far enough. It does not subject the country to the type of ironclad protections that should be available when it comes to protecting children.

One of the often used defences when we see cases like this is that if we were to bring forward amendments in legislation to shut down any further interpretation there could be a constitutional challenge. Well, as sure as night follows day, in a matter like this there will be a constitutional challenge. If we get caught up in the constitutional constipation that we see constantly from the government, we will leave a lot of people vulnerable. On an issue as fundamental as the protection of children that is unacceptable.

The government is letting down the country when it comes to leaving open interpretations such as artistic merit for child pornography. There is an inherent danger in society as a whole when we fail to recognize the detrimental effects of child pornography at a very basic level.

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms does provide sufficient protection for freedom of thought and expression, and surely a common sense interpretation has to follow, but what constitutes a reasonable limit is central to the debate, the so-called Oakes test that applies when it comes to a clash of constitutional rights protected by the charter.

The existing defences of child pornography are outlined in Bill C-12. Artistic merit is grouped in with educational, scientific or medical purposes. That is misleading and unacceptable. They are reduced to the public good definition. I have already referred to the justice minister's admission that the public good is still a wide open interpretation.

In the *R. v Sharpe* case, the Supreme Court also briefly considered the defence of public good. The court found that the public good has been interpreted as "necessary or advantageous...the pursuit of science, literature, or art, or other objects of general interest".

What on God's green Earth does that mean? What are the general interests of somebody so sick as to go out and depict children in a sexual fashion?

The court went on to say:

It might be argued that the public good is served by possession of materials that promote expressive or psychological well-being or enhance one's sexual identity in ways that do not involve harm to others.

Explicitly, child pornography harms children. The making of it, the depiction of children in a sexual fashion, harms children, harms society and tears the social fabric.

The court went on to say:

In some cases this might eliminate some of the more problematic applications of s. 163.1(4). For example, it might in certain cases foreclose the law's application to visual works created and privately held by one person alone, or to private recordings by adolescents of their lawful sexual activity. Nevertheless, the public good defence might not answer all concerns as to the law's breadth. Absent evidence of public good in the particular case, a person might still be convicted for possession of material that directly engages the value of self-fulfilment and presents little or no risk of harm to children. Thus, while the public good defence might prevent troubling applications of the law in certain cases, it would not do so in all.

• (1045)

That admission by the court underlines the problem of leaving the door even slightly open.

We must speak with clarity and strength on the issue. We must call for the elimination of all defences that would justify the criminal possession of child pornography and call for legislation that would criminalize possession of child pornography. Of course the criminal possession of that material would not apply to those in the justice system who have it for the purpose associated with prosecution, for research or for studying the effects of exposure to child pornography, which is consistent with the court's definition of educational and scientific material.

However I would underline again, for emphasis, the fact that through the bill the minister has left the matter open to interpretation by the courts, strikes at the very heart of what we are tasked with in this place.

The intent of the bill should be, first and foremost, to protect children from all forms of exploitation, all forms of child pornography and all forms of sexual exploitation that, in many cases, documented, scientific, anecdotal and otherwise, lead to further abuse. That is something that we should be moving with quickness and with clarity to eradicate.

Definitions of public good that are as vague as the resulting case law, in this case entrenched by the bill, would not leave courts with the sufficient objectivity to decide what is and what is not pornographic.

I would argue strenuously, having appeared in numerous courts, that common sense would prevail and that the judges, given the opportunity to judge on its merits what constitutes child pornography, would find in every case, having run the gamut, that child pornography can be easily identified, and the purpose for which it is being used is the only defence. Allowing that definition of artistic merit to remain in the bill would open a very dangerous element to that interpretation.

I ask rhetorically why the minister would want to leave that interpretation there. Why did the minister and the government wait so long to act? Why did we have to wait, in this instance, for the court to make that ruling?

Government Orders

I know there will be a legion of lawyers lining up to use this defence and I know it will make its way through the courts again. If this bill becomes law, as a result of the flawed drafting that I see, it will very likely wind up back before this place again, so why would we not do it right the first time? Is that not really the goal here, to be efficient, to streamline legislation, to do it right in the first instance?

As my colleague from Lakeland has indicated, that does not appear to be the way the government operates. It is always about waiting to see what the courts will do, or waiting to see what the polls crystallize around, and somehow keeping the political angle first and foremost in its mind. That is not the way a government should operate, particularly on an issue as fundamental as protecting children.

This is an occasion where the government should act with strength, with leadership and with vision on something so fundamental that goes to the very bedrock of our society, protecting our most vulnerable citizens, the children of Canada.

We are left with flawed legislation that could be fixed easily by removing this artistic merit loophole. My colleague from Surrey Central gave a very comprehensive and fact based speech in the House of Commons this morning. He spoke of the need to put resources into policing, the need to help some of the social services that are there, not only to help with the aftermath of violence and sexual exploitation, but to help prevent it. In the cases of policing, he spoke of the shocking figures that exist in some communities where they do not have enough resources for their police.

●(1050)

It is also a telling comment to know that the police do not support this bill. The police forces in Canada have found the bill wanting for some of the same reasons outlined by myself and my colleague from Surrey. They clearly recognize, as do others, the shortcomings.

Similarly, child advocacy groups have found the bill wanting. They recognize that the bill would give no greater legal protection, nor would it assist in the prosecution of these cases.

The bill should be about accountability and about taking steps to hold people to account when these atrocities occur, but further than that, it should also be about deterrence, about setting an example and about holding a person to account. Putting in place mandatory maximum sentences or raising the maximum sentence does not do that because there is no commensurate requirement for judges to follow that sentencing scheme.

It sounds very impressive when we say that the maximum sentence will be jacked up, but there is no requirement in the bill for a judge to follow that recommendation. Mandatory minimums, on the other hand, would. They put in place a minimum sentence.

I would suggest that when it comes to child sexual exploitation there is need for incarceration and for deterrents. Public protection should be first and foremost in the bill.

On the issue of protecting children, I think we could get unanimity in this place if we were to recognize our responsibility to address anything that allows us to further protect society. I am therefore

absolutely astounded that this legislation has left open this artistic loophole.

If we were to step outside this bubble, this political world in which we live, and if we were talk to average Canadians, I think we would find that they too are stunned to find that we have missed an opportunity to protect our children. Why has the Liberal government failed to protect all children? Why did it not bring in a more strident and efficient bill? I cannot answer that question and it is a question that I find extremely troubling.

The interpretation of what constitutes child pornography is something with which the courts are wrestling. Works of a nature that exploit children go against the very fabric of what is acceptable and what is moral in a just society. There can be no denial that there is a direct correlation between the machinations and fascinations of some demented individuals that would harm children and what is actually carried out or perpetrated. Why risk the potential danger when the collective will of the people would see any sort of material that would fall into that definition stricken from existence?

In handing down the Sharpe decision in the first instance, Justice Shaw effectively broadened the interpretation that was there for the current exemption of that defence. Although the Supreme Court wrestled with it, it did not sufficiently close that definition.

While it seems that the minister's lawyers have weighted the rights of the individual and the rights of the child, which is a clash I would say that should be certainly decided in favour of the child, we are once again left with a very mediocre attempt to correct what the Canadian public clearly recognizes is a serious problem. Yet the government is unprepared to step up to that challenge.

By being unwilling to protect the rights of children, and by extension their families, I suggest the government might at the very least have taken the opportunity to present in the upcoming budget steps that would allow for the support of families, the support of policing units and the support of social services, and by that I mean certainly elevating the transfer payments that are there and fixing the fiscal imbalance.

The Conservative Party has been very supportive of past and present laws that protect children, the law enforcement community, victims groups and child advocacy groups that are constantly tasked and struggling with a lack of resources and the overwhelming and, sadly, the increasing numbers of cases that involve children.

●(1055)

This is a sad day when we have legislation as fundamental, as critical as this and the opportunity seems to be slipping through our fingers. I ask rhetorically, why would the government present a flawed legislation on something as fundamental as this? Why do we not just do it right in the first instance? Let us fix the bill because we cannot support it in this flawed state.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will resume this debate with questions and comments for the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough. In the meantime, I would like to proceed to statements by members.

S. O. 31

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

EPILEPSY AWARENESS MONTH

Hon. Shawn Murphy (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House and all Canadians that March is Epilepsy Awareness Month.

Epilepsy is one of the most common neurological disorders in Canada, affecting approximately 300,000 people or about 1% of the Canadian population. Each day in Canada an average of 38 people learn they have epilepsy. People of all ages are affected, particularly the very young and the elderly. A number of known factors can cause epilepsy, but in some cases a definite cause cannot be determined.

Fortunately, epilepsy is often amenable to treatment through medication, through surgery and diet. Unfortunately, it can still be a life altering condition, especially when one has to contend with ongoing discrimination, insensitivity and misunderstanding of those around them about the disorder and its consequences.

One of the primary concerns of persons affected is insufficient public awareness. That is why I would like to commend both Epilepsy Canada and the Canadian Epilepsy Alliance. Their mission it is to enhance the quality of life for persons affected through awareness and public education programs and medical research in this very important area.

I thank them and their numerous volunteers for their dedication. I also wish them continued success in making a difference in the lives of those affected.

* * *

● (1100)

EQUALIZATION

Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Blackstrap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the formula used to calculate equalization payments is anything but equal or fair to the people of Saskatchewan. Constituents in my riding are angry. The province's energy revenues have been clawed back at a rate of more than 100%. The math does not add up.

My province, already suffering from the economic effects of a declining population and the crisis in agriculture, will now see its equalization payment drop significantly. The finance minister says that the equalization program could not possibly fix all of Saskatchewan's financial woes. That is true. We have endured a decade of a failed socialist experiments at the provincial level. Even so, Saskatchewan should get what it deserves.

The complicated formula used to justify this unbalanced tax back is up for renewal. This is the time to do it right for all of the provinces.

* * *

ANGEL HAIR FOR KIDS

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the House and all Canadians about a very special constituent. Megan Leonard, from my hometown of Norval, is six years old and has a big heart.

Last year she watched a show about kids with cancer and learned that wigs can be made from donated hair. Right away she knew she wanted to donate to Angel Hair For Kids. She let her hair grow out and last Friday went to the salon and had her long hair cut off. Now she is sporting a cute pixie style cut.

I would like Megan to know that no matter how beautiful her hair is, the beauty of her heart is even greater. Bravo to Megan, only six years old and making a real difference in the world.

* * *

[Translation]

KIDNEY MONTH

Mr. Jeannot Castonguay (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House and all Canadians that March is Kidney Month.

Kidney disease can strike anyone at any age. It is estimated that some 1.9 million Canadians have chronic kidney disease, and more than 3,000 of them die each year. Most of them do not even know they have kidney disease because the symptoms are silent.

Over the last 10 years, medical research has made it possible to improve the success rate for kidney transplants to more than 85%. Nevertheless, the demand for organ transplants is much greater than the availability. The rate of organ donations in Canada is only 40%. We can all help by remembering to sign our organ donor cards.

Increasing public awareness and encouraging organ donation are both integral parts of the Kidney Foundation of Canada's mission. I would like to congratulate the foundation, its volunteers, and its sponsors for the precious help and services they provide. I hope that Kidney Month will make people more aware of organ donations and other issues related to kidney disease.

I ask everyone to sign their organ donor card today.

* * *

WOMEN PARLIAMENTARIANS

Hon. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to three young Canadian women who are encouraging women to get involved in politics.

Although the number of women serving in Canadian political institutions has increased over the past 20 years, women are still in the minority. Looking at the number of female parliamentarians in the world, we can see that Canada is a long way ahead of most other countries in participation by women. In a list of 181 countries, Canada ranks 37th in the world, with women occupying 21% of the seats in the House of Commons.

[English]

Women bring a different character to the policy making process and should be encouraged to enter politics at every level.

S. O. 31

There are three young women right now who have a wonderful initiative called “Young Women Vote 2004: The 20,000 Project”. Their goal is to have 20,000 women between the ages of 18 and 30 sign a petition pledging to cast a vote in the federal election. Their initiative is grassroots and non-partisan.

I want to congratulate Chi Nguyen, Crystal Graber and Cloe Rowbotham.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the Canadian Wheat Board has marketing experts who do a pretty good job of marketing western Canadian farmers' wheat and barley. However, I am not so sure anymore. Although, the fault may lie with the board. Either way our farmers have lost a lot of money because of this.

Adrian Measner admitted at the House of Commons agriculture committee yesterday that more than \$7 a bushel net to farmers on farm was available in the fall of 2002, and the farmers received about \$4 a bushel. It is unfortunate indeed that \$3 was left on the table and lost to farmers at a time when farmers simply could not afford to lose that money.

It is clearly time for farmers to be given a choice to market through the wheat board or not, as they choose. In any modern democracy this is an accepted right, a right which is allowed to all except western Canadian grain farmers. It is time for that to change.

* * *

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my riding, thousands of people work in seasonal industries to earn their living. The fisheries, tourism, construction, agriculture and forestry are all industries that contribute a great deal to the economy in my province and our country.

Unfortunately, the current employment insurance system does not recognize the variations in weekly working hours. Fish is a perishable resource and it is impossible to predict the catch size. Short work weeks can reduce employment insurance benefits for people in the fish processing industry who rely on this income.

I am very pleased that the new Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development is open to our suggestions about how to correct the injustices of the current system. I thank, too, the Prime Minister for his commitment to this issue, which is so important to my riding.

* * *

WOMEN OF CIUDAD JUAREZ

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since 1993 in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, young women from poor families have been kidnapped, raped, tortured and murdered. To date, more than 350 bodies have been found; 500 other women are still missing. For 10 years, these crimes have remained unpunished and women continue to disappear and be murdered.

The Bloc Québécois joins with the members of the Comité québécois de solidarité avec les femmes de Ciudad Juarez, women's groups and other groups in civil society in speaking out against macho attitudes and the trivialization of violence toward the women of Ciudad Juarez, the incompetency and corruption of local police and the numerous irregularities in the judicial process, and the terrible living and working conditions of women, particularly in the Mexican maquiladora.

During International Women's Week, our sisters in Ciudad Juarez are very much in our thoughts.

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Ottawa—Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the thousands of career federal public servants for their commitment and dedication to public service.

We rely on our public servants for services, security, protection, justice, inspection of food and pharmaceutical products, passports, pension cheques and health research, just to name a few.

Public servants are highly trained people who care and who are devoted to serving Canadians in the various facets of their lives. Whenever or wherever the system breaks down in such a huge organization, we often forget about public servants who make sure that the system is fixed and that the Canadian public is well served.

To all federal public servants, I wish to thank them for choosing a career in the public service, and for their dedication and professionalism.

* * *

FEDERAL ELECTION

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues I have just gone through a long nomination process to be chosen to represent the Conservative Party of Canada in the upcoming election.

I would like to thank all those who supported me and to congratulate my challenger for a well run campaign.

Now I turn my attention to the challengers from other parties. I know the chosen Liberal candidate. He has his work cut out for him because he has to run with a severe handicap. He is running on the Liberal platform, whatever that is. He will have to explain why he is running for a party that has done so much against the values held dear by my constituents. He will also have to explain why he supports a party that has spread the culture of corruption not only throughout the party but indeed throughout much of the federal bureaucracy.

The next election will finally dislodge the Liberals from their arrogant assumption that they have the right to govern. Governing is not a right; it is something that must be earned. The only thing the Liberals have earned is the public scorn for that culture of corruption.

I encourage all our membership to get out and vote on March 20, and keep in mind, we are not just electing a new leader. We are electing the next Prime Minister of Canada.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the maritime softwood lumber industry is unique in Canada. Seventy-five per cent of our softwood lumber production is generated from private lands, and there are no subsidy allegations from the United States against our product. There is no reason whatsoever that trade restrictions on maritime lumber should be included in any deal with the United States.

Recently the Minister of International Trade was in my riding of Kings—Hants to meet with local softwood lumber producers. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the president of Elmsdale Lumber Company, Robin Wilber, for hosting this important discussion.

Mr. Wilber said in the local *Weekly Press* newspaper after that meeting:

What we had was almost unheard of in this area. To have this much federal representation on the ground here in East Hants—it just doesn't happen every day. And what we accomplished was a much as we could have hoped for—assurance that the minister supports our position.

The Minister of International Trade has listened to, understands and is defending the interest of maritime softwood lumber producers, and no deal without a clear exit to free trade for individual Canadian provinces will be acceptable to—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, immigrant and visible minority women in Canada, who experience domestic abuse, are condemned to suffer in silence, yet the government continues to ignore their plight.

This week another study by the Canadian Council on Social Development underlined the acute need for culturally sensitive proactive services for abused immigrant and visible minority women, echoing previous UN criticism of the lack of federal leadership in this area.

Instead of a comprehensive federally led effort to reach out to women in their own languages, women are faced with a patchwork of services that in many communities do not exist at all. This abandonment leaves it up to advocates for women and struggling immigrants to piece together an organized response to fill the void.

One exciting example is in my own constituency of Winnipeg North where the Philippine and Laotian communities are working with the Mount Carmel Clinic to meet the needs in their

S. O. 31

communities and are addressing, with sensitivity, the serious matter of partner violence.

That this responsibility still falls on victims of abuse and already overworked community organizations is appalling. We call on the government—

● (1110)

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

SOCIAL HOUSING

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation estimates that a household is living in core need when it is paying 30% or more of its income for housing, heating and hydro.

In Canada, it is estimated that over 800,000 households, including some 220,000 in Quebec, spend more than half of their income on housing, a situation that forces them to cut back on essentials such as food, clothing and medication.

Currently, affordable social housing units are scarce. There is little availability in residences for low-income seniors, while single parent families are the ones that are experiencing the most serious housing problems.

The Bloc Québécois is asking the Prime Minister to show that social housing is a priority for him by immediately investing close to \$2 billion annually. This is the amount that the federal government must pay to make up for its withdrawal, over the past 10 years, from that sector.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S WEEK

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from March 7 to 13, we are celebrating International Women's Week. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all the women around us and to recognize their role as mentors in our lives.

This year's theme, "She's on a Role", stresses women's role as models. These women have greatly contributed to helping us become who we are. The media have told us about Julie Payette and Louise Arbour, who are models whose achievements are a great source of pride.

However, we must not forget the women who are inspiring us and guiding us on a daily basis. Many Canadian women have accomplished great things in their communities, in their countries and in the world, this in a variety of areas.

While these women sometimes get little recognition for their efforts, they are remarkable examples of tenacity that should encourage young people to pursue their dreams, despite the obstacles and hurdles they may encounter along the way.

Let us sincerely thank all the Canadian women who inspire us and who accompany us every day.

Oral Questions

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the tired Liberal government is recycling a Jean Chrétien piece of legislation and touting it as legislation to protect children.

Bill C-12 does no such thing. Even Canada's most notorious pedophile thinks it is great. Why will the government not put teeth into the legislation so it will truly protect our children? Why will it not remove the loophole allowing for defence based on public good? There must be no defence for child molesters and pornographers.

Why will it not raise the age of consent from 14 to 16 years of age and catch up to the rest of the western world? Why will it not increase mandatory minimum sentences for those convicted of preying on our children? Harsher maximum sentences that are rarely levied are not a deterrent.

Child molesters, pedophiles and the creeps who prey on our children support the legislation. It is obvious to me that it will take a Conservative government to put legislation in place that will send a clear message—do not mess with our kids.

* * *

SOUTH VANCOUVER NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I participated in the opening of the South Vancouver Neighbourhood House. The newly renovated South Vancouver Neighbourhood House was a joint effort of the community, business and government sectors under the Canada-British Columbia infrastructure program.

The new facility will provide day care for children, job and language training, a place for seniors to gather and new office space.

I wish to congratulate the South Vancouver Neighbourhood House; Chris Friesen, Chairman of the Board and board members; Executive Director Karen Larcombe; and the many volunteers for their hard work to bring positive change to our community.

* * *

TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since confederation of three provinces in 1867, Canada has grown to the ten provinces and three territories of today. Now, a bold new confederation opportunity is being proposed and should be explored.

The Turks and Caicos Islands, standing at the doorway to the entire Caribbean and South American marketplace, is beckoning a formalized relationship with Canada. Full provincial status for the Turks and Caicos Islands would give Canada a greater expanded economic, political and trade influence in the Caribbean.

The Turks and Caicos Islands, as Canada's 11th province, would also benefit greatly from the heightened Caribbean political influence as a major trader and transshipment port of Canadian goods and services.

The Turks and Caicos Islands, Canada's confederation partner of the new millennium, would become a Canadian model of regional

stability and prosperity. Those who share the boldness and vision of our fathers of Confederation think that the time for action is now.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

●(1115)

[English]

SPONSORSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my question for the acting Prime Minister is a very direct one. Can he tell us whether he, in his capacity as a minister, expects his staff to act independently or on his instruction?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I expect my staff to conduct themselves in a professional manner at all times, consistent with all of their duties and obligations including all the relevant laws of the land.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, CPC): Mr. Speaker, clearly, the minister sidestepped the issue.

The Prime Minister's two most trusted advisers, working under his direction in his office, were interfering with the awarding of advertising contracts, clearly outlined yesterday at committee. Their actions were the actions of their minister.

Why did the Prime Minister interfere in 1995 and in the year 2004 refuses to take responsibility for his actions?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the hon. gentleman is muddling a number of things together.

First of all, with respect to the memorandum from Ms. O'Leary, it is very clear that the memorandum calls for more competition, not less. It also refers to a relationship with the firm known as Everest which, in fact, was a relationship entered into by the previous Conservative government.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, CPC): More deception, Mr. Speaker.

I want to quote from the committee yesterday where Allan Cutler, coming before the public accounts committee—and this is a perfect description of the Liberal government—said:

Ethics and integrity seem to be minor considerations when it relates to advertising.

He went on to say:

—I was asked to prepare and award contracts in circumstances which I considered questionable or improper.

Why did the government hang it on bureaucrats when it was the Prime Minister himself, as finance minister, giving the instructions?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I admire the courage of Mr. Cutler and I wish him well in the testimony that he is giving. People coming forward in these circumstances to shed light on previously existing situations is exactly what was called for by the Prime Minister.

There is nothing in the testimony that has been given by Mr. Cutler that would in any way relate directly to the Prime Minister or the former minister of finance.

Oral Questions

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister claims to know nothing about the advertising scandal. However, the evidence we heard yesterday makes it very clear that he and his most trusted advisers were involved in the awarding of contracts that the Auditor General declared broke all the rules. In fact, Groupe Everest was singled out.

Is it not time the Prime Minister admitted that he is directing or was directing his staff in awarding these contracts?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me again make the point that the advertising relationship with the firm known as Groupe Everest was entered into prior to the fall of 1993 by the previous Conservative government.

It was an inherited circumstance and the finance minister and his office took steps at the earliest possible moment to complete the business and change the arrangement.

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that only begs the question, why was the staff of the finance minister, now Prime Minister, directing and singling out that particular advertising agency, Groupe Everest? Ministerial staff does not freelance. Ministerial staff follows orders.

How can the Prime Minister continue to deny that he knew nothing about the funnelling of tax dollars into Liberal pockets when his right hand and his left hand, his most trusted advisers, Littler and O'Leary, had their fingerprints all over this scandal?

• (1120)

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, the hon. gentleman has things all inverted. He has trouble knowing which end of the telescope he is looking through.

The memorandum referred to here is a memorandum from the department to Mr. Littler, not the other way around.

[Translation]

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Allan Cutler, who had the courage to denounce what he found unacceptable, says that in November 1994 the political blessing was given to let all rules for awarding contracts drop by the wayside, and that was when public funds started to be diverted to the friends of the Liberal regime.

Since the sponsorship scandal began in November 1994, that is two months after the Parti Québécois was elected and as referendum fever was rapidly building, are people not entitled to know exactly what the Canadian unity fund concealed within the Prime Minister's budget was used for?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the reserve to which the hon. member is referring, the reserve existed at that time in the fiscal framework of the government. The current Prime Minister has not initiated any activities from that envelope. He has invited the Clerk of the Privy Council to look into that funding envelope and to make recommendations on how best to deal with it.

[Translation]

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has acknowledged the existence of the national unity

fund in his own budget. *La Presse* today reported that there was an envelope of \$40 million concealed in this fund for 2002-03 alone. We do not know what the situation was prior to that.

In order to give us a better overview, can the Prime Minister tell us how much as finance minister he allocated to the national unity fund from 1993 on?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the current Prime Minister has not made any use of that particular reserve. He has asked the President of the Privy Council to examine the matter and to make recommendations on how best to deal with that reserve for the future.

[Translation]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what we want to know is how much has been spent since 1993. The secret national unity fund did indeed exist and benefited from a hidden budget of \$40 million. It is impossible that, as finance minister with responsibility for budgets, he could not have been aware of this.

So can the Prime Minister confirm to us that, from the time of his first budget, he authorized a secret fund, the existence of which was deliberately concealed from the public?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, the Prime Minister, upon becoming Prime Minister, has not made any use whatsoever of that particular reserve. He has asked for the appropriate professional advice from the public service in the person of the President of the Privy Council to determine how best to handle it from here on forward.

[Translation]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Minister of Finance, I would like to point out that the Prime Minister was finance minister for nine years.

In budget after budget for those nine years, that is in nine budgets, the Prime Minister transferred considerable amounts to slush funds, thus becoming an accomplice to his predecessor, Jean Chrétien.

How can the Minister of Finance claim that the arrival of his government and a new Prime Minister represents a change from the way things were during the Chrétien years, when his actions while in Finance prove he was in it up to his neck?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, the Prime Minister has not made any use of that fund and he is seeking advice from the public service in terms of how to dispose of it.

*Oral Questions***CANADA PENSION PLAN INVESTMENT BOARD**

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal gravy train has just made another stop, this time to pick up another old corporate pal of the Prime Minister, Purdy Crawford. Mr. Crawford served with the Prime Minister on the board of Imasco and contributed \$5,000 to his leadership campaign.

It makes us wonder what we have to donate in order to get an appointment to the other place.

Mr. Crawford has just been hired by the CPP investment board as, get this, an adviser on conflict of interest and ethics. Protect whistleblowers or protect a pal? It is a tough call. Why does the government not get it and break the mould for Liberal friendly ethics counsellors and the trough of Liberal patronage?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member really wishes to cast aspersions upon this particular individual, who was recommended not more than two years ago as Canada's chief executive officer of the year.

• (1125)

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one has to wonder, when will this path of appointing corporate conservative cronies to Liberal boards and commissions end?

Canadians are demanding more and more that their pension funds be used for ethical investments, investments with no place for the scourge of tobacco companies. Mr. Crawford has been involved with the tobacco company Imasco since the early 1970s, as a board member with the Prime Minister and even as its CEO and president.

How can we expect ethical, neutral advice from a staunch defender of tobacco investment and marketing? Is the CPP Investment—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are of course established guidelines for dealing with investment issues of this kind.

I would also point out that if the hon. member wants to be critical of appointments, she might want to be critical of one of our advisers on municipal matters, which of course is Mr. Harcourt, and of one of our previous advisers on health care, which of course was Mr. Romanow.

The government obviously tries to seek the best advice it can. That includes, from time to time, New Democrats.

* * *

SPONSORSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over the last 10 years public servants have come and gone and public works ministers have come and gone, but one person remained in control. That person is the present Prime Minister. He ran the finance department with an iron fist as it handed out these bogus contracts. He sat on Treasury Board even while his own department bent the rules. How can Canadians be expected to swallow the line that he did not know?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is relying on a hodgepodge of information to draw some inappropriate conclusions. The memorandum from Ms. O'Leary was clearly an argument for more competition, not less competition. The firm that the hon. gentleman and his party are complaining about, Groupe Everest, was in fact originally contracted by the Conservative Party, not the Liberal Party.

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 10 years and they kept the ad company that ran off the rails. Something had to change and the Liberals did not do it.

Throughout those last 10 years of Liberal mismanagement, there has been one common thread weaving in and around the scandals, the corruption and the waste, and that one thread is the present Prime Minister. That hodgepodge of evidence the finance minister talks about points to him, and it is mounting. What will the excuse of the day be now that the Prime Minister's line, he did not know, has been shown to be a serious nose-stretcher?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the Prime Minister's career in public life is a very well known career for Canadians. It is a career that is applauded by Canadians. It is supported by the vast majority of Canadians, even to the point when the pollsters asked members of the Conservative Party who was best able to lead the country, they said this Prime Minister.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's career is becoming better known every day. The Prime Minister said he knew nothing about ad scam until 2002. The truth is that in 1995 he was told by Treasury Board, of which he was vice-chair, by the way, to stop breaking the rules in awarding contracts.

Months later, his staff were still breaking the rules. Ministerial staff simply do not wing it on their own. They follow orders. Why did the Prime Minister continue to break the rules and dole out contracts to his political friends?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. gentleman is referring to some comments that have been attributed to Monsieur Guité. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the finance department disputed those allegations back in 1995 and continues to dispute them.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the common thread through all of this political mess and all this corruption is the current Prime Minister. He was told in 1995 by the Treasury Board, of which he was chair, to stop breaking the rules.

Why did the Prime Minister ignore these demands of Treasury Board, continue to break the rules and continue to hand out contracts to his political friends?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there was a set of rules put in place in the early 1990s with respect to contracting procedures, which had to do, if the hon. gentleman is familiar with the details, with the old appendix Q to the government procurement regulations and so forth.

Throughout my investigation of those matters, I determined that the procedures laid out deserved to be strengthened. In fact, that strengthening took place during the course of 2002 and 2003 to revise the rules. Prior to that, all of the evidence before me would suggest that the Minister of Finance complied with all of the obligations upon him.

• (1130)

[Translation]

Ms. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Jean Chrétien was prepared to do anything for the sake of national unity, even commit fraud and divert public funds. It seems the Chuck Guité approach was used in the flag campaign as well. We have learned that a flag maker, who is also the federal Liberal Party president in British Columbia, told the federal MPs of that province that rules were being violated.

Can anyone on the other side of the House deny that British Columbia MPs did nothing even though they knew what was going on?

[English]

Hon. Stephen Owen (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the flag challenge to which the hon. member refers was something that the government undertook at a time when many questions were being raised about our national unity.

Having said that, let me say that the government is examining the files and, like any other advertising contracts, investigations are underway to ensure that if any wrongdoing occurred, people will be held to account. If money was paid inappropriately, it will be returned to the taxpayers of Canada.

[Translation]

Ms. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Ms. Braverman personally phoned the Prime Minister, who was the finance minister at the time, to inform him of the situation. Once again, he chose to wash his hands of it, claiming that the flag campaign was the then heritage minister's responsibility.

Can the Prime Minister deny that he too did nothing?

[English]

Hon. Stephen Owen (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is an issue to deal with advertising. We have a number of processes underway that are looking at any aspect of the Auditor General's report dealing with sponsorship, advertising or public opinion research. The public accounts committee is looking into these issues.

The opposition cannot have it both ways. When a Commons committee does good work they just blame it on a government majority on the committee, but they try to take credit for it whenever it comes up other information. The government is being open with committees, it is being open with the Canadian public—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has made a solemn appeal

Oral Questions

to all those who knew something about the sponsorship scandal, asking them to come forward and speak about it publicly. Yet, when Liberal supporters write to him or phone him to denounce dubious practices, he does nothing.

How does the Prime Minister expect us to take him seriously when he invites those who knew something to talk, but when notified, did nothing and washed his hands of it?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, far from washing his hands, the Prime Minister has launched the most comprehensive process ever undertaken to make sure that this matter is thoroughly ventilated, all the facts are known, the trail is followed to wherever it leads, and the appropriate consequences ensue. The Prime Minister has been very open, transparent and definitive in dealing with this matter and Canadians recognize that.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister is not credible. Would the Prime Minister not have been better off following Mr. Cutler's lead and, instead of washing his hands of it as he did, showing courage and transparency and denouncing the sponsorship scandal, rather than condoning it through his silence?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, without commenting on the detail, of course the government applauds the courage of Mr. Cutler.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Financial Administration Act limits the signing authority for public servants at the Department of National Defence. Anything over \$250,000 must go to Public Works. How could one person have signing authority for \$160 million?

Hon. Stephen Owen (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the employee being referred to obviously had no authority to sign contracts that were not authorized by the lead contract with Hewlett-Packard. If something was done of a criminal nature, the RCMP are investigating it to find out. The particular employee has been fired. The investigations and audits continue.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, only the minister—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. I do not know how the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke is able to hear the answer. I can hardly hear it and I think the hon. members who are yelling could not possibly hear it.

If we are going to have multiple answers from all sides of the House we will change the rules, but the rules are that one person asks a question and one person answers. The minister had the floor and now we have the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke who has the floor. Perhaps we could have a little order.

Oral Questions

•(1135)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, only the minister could approve an expenditure of this size. Has the minister plugged the loophole that allowed a single individual to sign off on \$160 million of taxpayers' money?

Hon. David Pratt (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that what the hon. member does not understand is that this was not one single contract for \$160 million but a series of small contracts being dealt with. The thing to keep in mind as well is that there is a forensic audit going on and that the RCMP is also looking into this. As well, there may be further disciplinary action forthcoming.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday this government said the theft was, and I quote, “a very sophisticated criminal scheme”, and that is why it went undetected by the Liberals for years.

When it comes to keeping track of tax dollars, it seems that this Prime Minister is so incompetent he makes Inspector Clouseau look like Sherlock Holmes. Why did someone, anyone, not get suspicious when DND employee Paul Champagne was living in a mansion, with a gym, an indoor pool and a tennis court, on billionaires' row? Did anyone think to ask him how he could afford all that on a director's salary?

Hon. David Pratt (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated, a forensic audit is going on. The RCMP is looking into this matter. There are a lot of details that will be forthcoming, in terms of the actions that are taken subsequently. I fully expect that this matter will end up in the courts. At that point, a lot of information will come forward.

However, I go back to the point that we cannot jump to any sort of conclusions, with respect to the final outcome of this. Let us let the process work.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, CPC): Well, thank you, Inspector Clouseau. Paul Champagne was a director—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I think the hon. member meant to address the Chair. I do not see the inspector in the room. I am sure he would want to address his remarks to the Chair. I hope he was not suggesting that I am somehow Inspector Clouseau.

Mr. Jay Hill: Thank you, Inspector Speaker.

Paul Champagne was a director at the Department of National Defence, a middle-management position. It is incomprehensible, even I might add unbelievable for an incompetent Liberal government, that any bureaucrat could single-handedly sign off on \$160 million of taxpayer money.

Why did no one take the time to investigate whether Paul Champagne had won a lottery or made a killing on the stock market, as he claimed? Was it because there were so many Liberals at the trough that they did not notice Paul Champagne living high on the hog?

Hon. David Pratt (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may be prepared to jump to all sorts of conclusions here, but there is some fairly serious work being done with respect to this, his joking aside. I would urge the hon. member,

and the opposition as a whole, to wait for the results. This thing will be settled.

From the standpoint of the government's position, we feel very confident that the eventual outcome will support our version of the facts.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Mr. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the superannuation directorate of PWGSC is located in Shediac, New Brunswick. For over 20 years, these dedicated and hard-working public servants have managed public service pension benefits.

In recent weeks, concern about possible privatization, outsourcing or public-private partnerships has worried these great government employees.

What assurances can the minister give us about the future of the superannuation directorate and its future modernization?

Hon. Stephen Owen (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for the excellent question. I would also like to thank the employees of the superannuation directorate in Shediac for their continued hard work in ensuring that the pension system runs smoothly.

I can tell the hon. member that there are no plans for the privatization or outsourcing of those dedicated employees in Shediac. In fact it is quite the opposite. The superannuation directorate is being confronted with excellent training opportunities as part of the modernization of the public service.

* * *

CHILD BENEFITS

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Social Development. Nova Scotia has the lowest number of subsidized day care spaces in the country. Two non-profit day cares have closed in Halifax and Dartmouth in the last month, leaving 100 families scrambling for child care. The situation in B.C. and Ontario and Quebec is no better.

There is no accountability for the federal dollars that have been transferred to the provinces. In Halifax and Dartmouth, subsidized day cares will see an increase of only \$11 a month instead of the \$11 a day that they need.

Today's families want to know this. When will this government commit to a national day care program and enforce national standards to help families in need?

•(1140)

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Nova Scotia, like all provinces and territories, has jurisdiction over how it invests in child care. I understand that Nova Scotia officials are willing to meet with the child care operators to discuss their concerns.

Nova Scotia currently receives \$15 million annually for early childhood development and \$25 million for early learning in child care. I understand the minister will be speaking soon to her Nova Scotia counterparts on this matter.

* * *

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, under previous Conservative and now current Liberal governments, post-secondary tuition in this country has more than tripled and students and their families are suffering under an increasing debt load.

My question for the finance minister is quite clear. Will the next budget offer significant relief for our students and their families or will this government continue to pull a “Bertuzzi” on our students?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to travel across the country in January and I consulted with Canadians about their prebudget expectations. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in every one of those round table sessions, education was indicated as a major concern and priority for Canadians. They also emphasized that the critical issue was access. While I cannot scoop myself, I think I will leave the answer right there.

* * *

SPONSORSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister claims he did not know about ad scam. That is the old ignorance defence. Everybody else seemed to know. Treasury Board officials knew, Privy Council officers knew and certainly his Liberal friends on the gravy train knew. His most trusted senior staff, we have learned knew, and they do not act on their own. Perhaps he just did not want to know. The Prime Minister is on the wrong side of common sense here.

When will he realize that the Canadian public is just not buying this?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, everything the Prime Minister has said and done, both as Prime Minister and in his previous capacities, indicates complete honour and probity in public life. Any allegation to the contrary is totally malicious.

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the list of subjects that the Prime Minister claims not to know anything about grows longer by the day. The billion dollar HRDC boondoggle, “I did not know”. The billion dollar gun registry, “Who me?” Now we have the hundred million dollar ad scam scandal and \$160 million in DND contracts. It just keeps going.

Billions of dollars have been thrown away under his watch, which begs the question, how can the Prime Minister really expect Canadians to believe that anyone could know so little about so much?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman reminds me of the adage that one is taught in law school. When one is weak on both the law and the facts, all one can do is pound the table. There is a lot of table pounding going on here.

Oral Questions

Again, I refer to the documents to which the people across the floor are referring. The memo from Ms. O’Leary was about more competition, not less competition. The memo with respect to Mr. Littler was to him, not from him. They have inverted all of the evidence completely on its head and have come up with a mismatch.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today’s *Vancouver Province* newspaper states:

We say it’s time politicians passed Surrey North MP[s]...bill to make street racing an aggravating factor in sentencing.

The media and the public want Parliament to act on Bill C-338. The House has shown support by sending the bill to the justice committee, but we all know time is running out on this Parliament. It is time to deter this irresponsible criminal behaviour.

Will the minister show some leadership by supporting Bill C-338 so it can become law before an election is called?

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the matter has been referred to the committee, as my hon. colleague has mentioned, and that matter is now before the committee for examination.

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week in Surrey an 18 year old who has already had his licence suspended twice lost control of his car at 140 kilometres per hour. He smashed a bus shelter, injuring 71 year old Sarjeet Dhillon. Everything points to yet another tragic result of a street race. Spring will bring an increase in racing with nothing more than house arrest for those who injure or kill.

Bill C-338 sends a message to the courts to treat these crimes more seriously. The minister could pass it in a day. Why will he not support it?

• (1145)

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because this minister respects the approach to the democratic process and parliamentary review legislation, to which it has been referred.

* * *

[Translation]

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Air Canada is preparing to cancel the purchase of 15 Bombardier regional jets and go with Embraer instead.

Oral Questions

Can the government assure us that the Minister of Industry will intervene with Air Canada so that its choice will produce the maximum possible benefit for Quebec's aeronautics industry?

[*English*]

Hon. Gurbax Malhi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Air Canada has indicated that it may change its strategy regarding the purchase of Bombardier regional aircraft. The government recognizes how important the Air Canada purchase is to Bombardier and the Canadian aerospace industry.

We are continuing to review the request for the sales financing support. Any decisions will be made with consideration to the Government of Canada priorities and with the utmost respect for public funds.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, can the government assure us that it will act quickly and not give Air Canada any excuse to buy elsewhere? Is it going to let Embraer boast that it outsmarted Bombardier even with Air Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Gurbax Malhi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, we are continuing to review the request for the sales financing support. Any decision will be made with consideration to all Government of Canada priorities and with the utmost respect for public funds.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government continues to add to the democratic deficit. Due to objections from China, democratic Taiwan has been denied World Health Organization status.

Last spring Parliament passed an opposition motion that called for Canada to support the admission of Taiwan as an observer at the World Health Organization.

Why is the government refusing to support Taiwan at the World Health Organization?

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, because we have discussed this many times before, participation in the World Health Organization requires the support of all members of the World Health Organization.

We have told the Taiwanese government, and many others have done, and offered complete help for World Health Organization issues through other means. We inform and participate with the government of Taiwan. We recognize their legitimate interest in these issues. We wish to work with them, but we cannot control completely ourselves what happens in other international organizations.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is the same tired anti-Taiwan mantra that the minister used nine months ago in the House and failed to convince his own caucus members who supported the opposition motion to support Taiwan's application for observer status.

The democratic deficit continues. How can the government justify ignoring the expressly stated will of Parliament?

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, sometimes the expressed will of politicians runs up against some hard facts which they cannot change. This happens to be one of them.

In this case we cannot change the WHO by ourselves. To suggest that we are anti-Taiwan is completely erroneous. The fact of the matter is the House, the members of the House, all of us wish to work with the Taiwanese government and the Taiwanese people to ensure that they get the best health organization help they can.

We are doing that, and we are working through the international channels that we can. We support their ability and their wishes to have good health organization information. We will continue to do that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

Hon. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

It has now been one year since our country was struck by mad cow disease. One of my constituents recently told me that he had sent 13 cows to the abattoir and received \$882 for them, instead of the \$10,000 he would have got a year ago, and, in one very tragic instance, a cheque of \$2.01 for 2 animals.

What is the government prepared to do to help farmers in my riding and elsewhere?

● (1150)

[*English*]

Hon. Mark Eyking (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Agri-Food), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for asking that important question. Being a big promoter of the dairy industry in the House, he knows the effect BSE has had on farms and farm families.

We are taking many approaches. One is to get the border open. The other one is to roll out financial programs. One of those financial programs is the cull cow program, a \$120 million program. We also recently removed the slaughter requirement from that program to get more money to producers and in their hands more quickly.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is a growing consensus of unfairness in how the federal government deals with the provinces in relation to resource development.

The Minister of Natural Resources has alluded to the fact that government will bring the Atlantic accord in line with the accord's fundamental commitment to give prime benefits to the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Oral Questions

Is this the policy of government and, if so, will the Deputy Prime Minister stand and confirm this will be done before the election call?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in a conversation some months ago with the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Prime Minister indicated that these were matters that needed to be carefully examined and re-examined.

The Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador can rest assured that this is going to be done.

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this uncertainty is no way to grow an economy. If we were dealing with the old German currency, we would have a flat mark.

When will the Minister of Natural Resources live up to his commitments? When will he stop ducking the issues and when will he put his money where his mouth is?

Hon. R. John Efford (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my almost 20 years in politics, I have never ducked any issue and the hon. member opposite knows that very well.

As the Minister of Finance just answered, we have taken it under consideration. We have had discussions with the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador and we are not to be put on any timetable by the member opposite.

* * *

[Translation]

FISHERIES

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Neigette-et-la Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Quebec and New Brunswick governments have signed an agreement to develop a joint strategy and thereby avoid a repetition of last year's crisis in the crab fishery. That crisis affected 3,000 workers in Canada, including 1,000 in the Gaspé. These two governments are doing more than their share.

Given that it will be crab fishing season very soon, will the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans accept his responsibilities by tabling his plan for the snow crab fishery without further delay?

Hon. Geoff Regan (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the department is currently considering all fisheries management methods, including for snow crab. The plan will be announced in due course.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Hon. David Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

Yesterday I spoke to packers in the United States who told me that they are laying off 100 employees soon because they do not have access to live cattle from Canada.

Thousands and thousands of families on both sides of the border depend on that border being opened. Does he have any words of encouragement for Canadians on that?

Hon. Mark Eyking (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Agri-Food), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I

would like to thank the member for Edmonton Southeast for his question.

I had the pleasure meeting with some of his farmers last month and they told me their concerns. One of the things that they want to see is the border opened. The Prime Minister and the government is working to open that border.

I would like to commend members on this side of the House and across the floor who will be going to Washington next week to talk to the Americans about opening the border. It would be good for both countries if the border were open.

* * *

SPONSORSHIP PROGRAM

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the acting Prime Minister.

Michel Vennat and André Ouellet have been suspended as presidents of crown corporations. They were given to March 1 to explain themselves. I understand they met with the President of the Treasury Board. Mr. Ouellet, I understand, is coming to committee to testify.

I have two questions. First, is Michel Vennat coming to testify to Parliament? Second, on what fixed date will a decision be taken on whether these suspended officials will be fired?

Hon. Stephen Owen (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question under advisement and provide an answer next week.

There is an ongoing investigation and consideration of the facts. We will carry through with the investigations that are underway and provide that information, but also take action on these files as soon as it is appropriate.

* * *

●(1155)

HEALTH

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has come to light that in 1981 the Canadian Red Cross and Health Canada knew of a test that could have prevented the transmission of hepatitis C through blood transfusions.

They chose to do nothing. As a consequence thousands of innocent Canadians, including my constituent, Allan Blumenfeld, contracted hepatitis C.

Why has the Prime Minister not done the right thing and reopened the compensation package for those infected prior to 1986?

Hon. Geoff Regan (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is very sensitive to the people who are living with hepatitis C. The government has committed \$525 million for individuals infected with hepatitis C before 1986 and after 1990.

In collaboration with provincial and territorial governments this commitment will help ensure that individuals infected with hepatitis C do not incur out-of-pocket expenses.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

TAIWAN

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, almost one year ago, the House of Commons adopted a motion to support Taiwan's application for observer status in the World Health Organization. At the time, this motion was of an urgent nature, because the Asia-Pacific region had just been hit by SARS.

Given that almost an entire year has passed, and now bird flu is hitting that same part of the world, why is the Minister of Foreign Affairs still refusing to intervene with WHO member states so as to facilitate Taiwan's application for observer status in this organization, even if it means changing the organization's bylaws.

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my answer is the same as to the previous question. The member knows perfectly well that the organization's bylaws are what will pose a problem. The entire international community must approve in order to change an international organization's bylaws.

Instead, in Canada—because we intervened on behalf of Taiwan—we are working with the Government of Taiwan to ensure it has all the information it needs to respond to the health crisis affecting its citizens. That is what we are doing.

There is a practical solution to this problem, not the ideological solution the opposition member would have us adopt.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, another tax season is going by and still the government refuses to plug the outrageous tax loophole where businesses can write off fines as tax deductions. Does it not see how fundamentally wrong this is? Has the Liberal Party completely lost its ability to tell right from wrong? This situation is offensive to the sensibilities of any thinking Canadian.

My question is for the finance minister. By what warped reasoning does he continue to give tax breaks for breaking the law?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, hon. members will know that this is not the first time that the hon. gentleman has raised this matter. In response to him on previous occasions, I have indicated that I would take his question as a representation, as part of my consultations with Canadians.

Obviously, if there is something to be said on this matter, it would have to be said a week from Tuesday.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the government decided to compensate only the victims infected between 1986 and 1990, it claimed that earlier infections were not preventable and that nothing could have been done to protect transfusion recipients before 1986. Now we know that this travesty was preventable and there was a test, yet the government still refuses to administer justice.

Why has the Prime Minister not shown compassion for the suffering and the dying?

Hon. Geoff Regan (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Health, the government has shown great compassion and has great compassion for those suffering with Hepatitis C. In fact, as I indicated earlier, it has committed \$525 million for individuals infected with this grave disease.

In collaboration with provincial and territorial governments, the government will help to ensure that these victims do not incur out-of-pocket expenses. The government is very compassionate to those concerned.

* * *

● (1200)

[Translation]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, CN employees have been on strike for roughly 20 days now and, according to the union, the employer has hired scabs from the United States in order to maintain operations.

Will the Minister of Labour commit to ending this unacceptable situation immediately, and can she tell us what solutions she intends to put forward?

[English]

Hon. Judy Sgro (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for the question. Our policy is quite clear. We do not issue work permits to illegal strikebreakers.

* * *

ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the president of ACOA has been out on the lecture circuit promoting a Liberal Party document called "The Rising Tide". She has clearly stepped outside her bounds as president of ACOA. She should be neutral, supporting all members of Parliament and all parties.

Has the minister spoken to the president to cease that type of action and will he ask her for an apology to all parties in the House and all citizens. She is clearly outside her bounds.

Hon. Joe McGuire (Minister of Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the deputy minister of ACOA was merely doing her job as deputy minister. She is speaking out on government policy. The implementation of ACOA policies is her mandate, and is my mandate. She is simply doing what I have asked her to do.

The Speaker: I am afraid that terminates question period today. I would like to point out to all hon. members that we got in six extra questions today which is the first time this week. Is it because members were relatively quiet? But the questions and answers were all very short. Congratulations.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[English]***NATIONAL DEFENCE**

Hon. David Pratt (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons and on behalf of the Government of Canada, I have the pleasure to table, in both official languages, two copies of the government's response to the recommendations contained in the standing committee's 23rd report based on chapter 7 of the April 2003 report of the Auditor General of Canada: "National Defence—Environmental Stewardship of Military Training and Test Areas".

* * *

*[Translation]***PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT**

Hon. Jacques Saada (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister responsible for Democratic Reform, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-24, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act.

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

The Speaker: When shall the bill be read a second time?

[English]

Pursuant to order made Thursday, March 11, 2004, later this day.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have no intention to prevent the introduction of this bill in the House of Commons, but I wonder by what process was there deemed to have been consent given to adoption at first reading.

Was it on the basis of consultation with House leaders? If that was the case, why was there not consultation with members of the House who are not affiliated with parties recognized by the House?

● (1205)

The Speaker: First reading of a bill does not require consent from anyone. I am assuming the right hon. member means the motion in respect of second reading of the bill which is to take place later this day by special order adopted yesterday, which no doubt the right hon. member has seen in the Journals of yesterday.

However, perhaps someone else can answer the question as to who was consulted. Like the hon. member, I hear about these things when they are presented in the House.

[Translation]

Hon. Jacques Saada (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister responsible for Democratic Reform, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a process that is perfectly normal. Meetings are held every week with all the leaders of the recognized parties in this House. There was an agreement between the party leaders. This agreement requires consent of the House. I have sought consent for the motion to telescope the entire process for this bill.

I cannot comment on the presence or absence of members in this House, but all those present could object if they wanted.

[English]

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, I accept and thank you for your correction as to procedural matters. I should have raised the issue at another point.

However, the matter I think is germane. There was an action taken and at the very least, I would ask the House to consider its implications. There was an action taken that presumed to achieve the agreement of all of the members of the House, but it was taken as the result only of consultations with House leaders who are authorized to speak in the name of members who belong to parties recognized as official parties in the House and who have House leaders.

There was no consultation in that process, a matter requiring the unanimous consent of the House, as I understand it. There was no consultation with a number of members of the House, myself included, who are not affiliated with parties recognized in the House.

I anticipate that a point will be made that I am raising this point with respect to this bill a day too late in the process, and I accept that. Nonetheless, there is an issue of principle here that relates to the rights of members of Parliament, particularly those of us who are designated as independents. I would like some guarantee that attention will be given to resolving this issue.

I am a member of the House of Commons duly elected here. There are others in my situation for whom House leaders do not speak. There cannot be unanimous consent without our consent. Therefore, a procedure must be found to ensure that this reality is respected and reflected.

[Translation]

Hon. Jacques Saada: Mr. Speaker, the meetings held between the leaders of the parties in the House are not binding in nature. The only thing that makes agreements reached there binding is the power conferred upon us by the House, or in other words that which the motion confers in this House. Here in this House, all members have the right to speak.

The motion was tabled in the House yesterday, and all those present were able to speak.

I see this desire to debate retroactively as rather dubious. I do not see that there is anything that needs correcting.

[English]

The Speaker: I am afraid I do not either. I think we have gone as far as we can.

The motion got unanimous consent in the House yesterday. If the right hon. member or any other member of the House had concerns about the motion at that time, then obviously consent could have been refused. It was not. It was passed, so we are stuck with the rule now.

I urge the right hon. member to have a chat with the government House leader at his convenience to pursue the matter further, but I think from the point of view of the House we ought to get on with the order of business here today.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be tabling two reports. First, I have the honour to present the ninth report of the Standing Committee of Procedure and House Affairs regarding the associate membership of certain committees of the House.

With leave of the House, I intend to move concurrence in the ninth report later this day.

Second, I have the honour to present the tenth report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding its order of reference of Wednesday, February 18, regarding Bill C-3, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act.

The committee has considered Bill C-3 and has agreed to report it with amendments.

[English]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, Lib.): [Editor's Note: Member spoke in Cree]

(English)

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources regarding the order of reference of Thursday, February 12, Bill C-11, an act to give effect to the West Bank First Nations Self-government Agreement.

The committee has considered Bill C-11 and reports the bill with amendments.

● (1210)

[Translation]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move:

That the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

[English]

The Speaker: [Translation]

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)

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

LABELLING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table five petitions.

Canadians are very concerned about the lack of action by the government in response to the private member's bill passed almost unanimously in the House, that being legislation to require warning labels on all alcoholic beverage containers. They are appalled and concerned that at a time when we need such warning labels, the government has chosen not to act. They call upon Parliament to remind the government of its obligations and to do what is in the best interests of all Canadians.

MARRIAGE

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a whole stack of petitions here. The petitioners are calling upon Parliament to recognize in federal law the time honoured definition of marriage as the lifelong union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others.

The petitioners are from different parts of Canada and they add to the tens of thousands of signatures already tabled in the House about marriage, that most basic building block of society.

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of other petitions, and with your indulgence I will quickly present them now.

In this petition, residents of Canada want to draw attention to the fact that there is a loophole in the Income Tax Act in that businesses in Canada are able to deduct from business income, for tax purposes, fines and penalties imposed upon them in respect to environmental laws, consumer protection laws, workplace safety laws, and so on.

They are calling upon Parliament to immediately enact legislation amending the Income Tax Act to prohibit the deduction of all fines and penalties from business income for tax purposes. They do not want those fines to be simply a cost of doing business.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I also present a petition in regard to the matter of child pornography. The petitioners draw to the attention of the House the fact that the creation and the use of child pornography is condemned by the clear majority of Canadians and that the courts have not applied the current child pornography law in a way which makes it clear that such exploitation of children will always be met with swift punishment.

Therefore the petitioners call upon Parliament to protect children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that all materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children be forthwith outlawed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Scott Brison (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Canada-U.S.), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[Translation]***PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT**

Hon. Jacques Saada (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister responsible for Democratic Reform, Lib.) moved that Bill C-24, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, today, I have the honour of addressing Bill C-24, which seeks to amend the Parliament of Canada Act to allow retired parliamentarians who are between 50 and 55 years of age to benefit from the Public Service Health Care Plan, the Pensioners' Dental Services Plan and the Public Service Management Insurance Plan established by the Treasury Board. The terms and conditions would be the same as those that apply to retired public servants aged 50 to 55.

With this legislation, all parliamentarians who are entitled to a pension will be able to get coverage under these medical plans beginning at age 50, just like public servants.

To benefit from such coverage, eligible parliamentarians would have to pay the required contributions, as is the case for other retired parliamentarians and public servants who are collecting a pension.

This measure bridges an important gap for parliamentarians aged 50 to 55 who are not yet eligible for pension.

[English]

The second part of the bill deals with the disability allowance for parliamentarians over 65 years, which was established in 2001 to provide coverage on the same basis as that available for parliamentarians under 65. Since then, it has been brought to the government's attention that the authority for medical plan coverage for parliamentarians receiving a disability allowance is not clear. The bill clarifies this situation.

The bill would come into force on January 1, 2001, consistent with other changes applicable to parliamentarians at that time.

I would like to conclude by thanking wholeheartedly my colleagues on all sides of the House for their support for this bill which has, in my view, a very profound and important humanitarian value.

• (1215)

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on Bill C-24, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act. As the government House leader mentioned, this bill brings into line benefits for retired parliamentarians, the same as we would offer the public service.

Quite often people look upon elected politicians and think perhaps that our benefits are greater than anybody else's. We should not expect any more than anybody else but we should not expect any less. Sometimes it is only when we see a case where need has arisen that we see the discrepancies in our legislation. I am very pleased to support this legislation which will be there to protect people, retired parliamentarians, as it would be for public servants between the ages of 50 and 55, if the need arises.

That is the type of legislation we should always be conscious of making sure it is appropriate and up to date, so that whether we are a member of the public service or an elected representative, the benefits are there in time of need. That is really what this bill does and we are very pleased to support it.

[Translation]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a fairly rare event, but today you will see a harmony of spirit for humanitarian reasons, as the government House leader has indicated, on the subject of Bill C-24, amending the Parliament of Canada Act.

I am happy to see the broad consensus that exists in the House today, although I am somewhat sad to have to make such an amendment to the health insurance plan for retired parliamentarians.

The bill is simply intended to recognize a situation. Sometimes, when a bill or regulation is established, certain situations may fall through the cracks.

The bill we are agreeing to adopt is intended precisely to correct this kind of situation where a member of Parliament who is eligible for pension but is under 55, that is, between 50 and 55 years of age, would be denied entitlement to benefit from a health insurance and dental insurance, even if he paid his share of premiums. Therefore, we are not asking for the moon, but simply the recognition of a situation that can sometimes be a problem.

That is why, as my Conservative and Liberal colleagues have said, it appears completely normal to us in the Bloc Québécois to make the plan similar to that which applies to public servants between the ages of 50 and 55, who are retired and decide to pay their premiums for health insurance and, thus, receive its benefits.

I will not speak longer, except to express my approval, as previous speakers have, for Bill C-24. I believe this is a way to improve to some extent the situation and condition of some members of this House. On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I am pleased to give my support to the amendment and to Bill C-24.

[English]

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased on behalf of all of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party caucus to support Bill C-24, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act.

I also want to acknowledge the cooperative spirit in this place that has led to this bill coming before the House today. I appreciate the fact that all members from all parties in this House came together to address a serious flaw in our legislation.

Bill C-24 addresses a gap in the legislation. It addresses the issue if a member of Parliament today, who may have served for up to six years and has not yet reached the age of 55, but must leave this place or make a decision not to run for election because of health reasons, that MP is not able to buy into the health plan which he or she is eligible for at the age of 55.

Government Orders

We are addressing what is an oversight in our current legislation, a flaw that was unintended. It is fair to say that no one in this place believes that this is anything but an oversight. I cannot imagine that the drafters of the legislation intended to penalize members who find themselves unable to continue to work in the House of Commons because of illness yet find themselves, when they need it the most, unable to continue to pay into the health care plan.

This is a loophole that needs to be fixed. I am pleased to see that we are on the path of fixing it today.

• (1220)

The Speaker: The order provides that there would be one spokesman from each of the parties in the House. Is the right hon. member seeking unanimous consent of the House to speak on this matter?

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Does the House give consent to the right hon. member for Calgary Centre to speak on this matter?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, I completely support this legislation. I think that it would be an anomaly that members of this House not have access to the same privileges that exist for other public servants.

I rise to thank the deputy government House leader for giving me background on this legislation on which I had not had the opportunity to be consulted before it was presented to the House. That courtesy I hope will become a practice in the House with regard to members such as myself.

I would also note that when the original legislation was brought in, there was an absolute insistence that there would be no changes in any of its provisions. I see the former government House leader who introduced that legislation is in the House and could confirm that we have departed by this legislation from that undertaking. I do not object to that. I note it and I certainly support this piece of legislation.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, March 11, Bill C-24, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, is deemed read a second time, deemed referred to a committee, deemed reported without amendment, deemed concurred in at report stage, deemed read a third time and passed.

(Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed)

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-12, an act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of children and other vulnerable persons) and the Canada Evidence Act, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to speak to Bill C-12, a bill that has been recycled by the federal justice minister, a bill that would do nothing to help give children the legal protection they need.

We heard a lot of evidence in committee regarding the bill. We heard from frontline police officers and from child advocacy groups, including groups like Beyond Borders. The government has simply ignored the mounds of evidence from these child advocate groups and frontline police officers who have indicated time and again that the Bill C-12 would not be effective in protecting children.

By reviving what has been referred to as pedophile-friendly legislation without a thought to the real needs of children, the Prime Minister has simply carried out the previous prime minister's legacy of indifference.

The bill does not address the fundamental problems relating to the protection of children that our criminal justice system should address. It does not eliminate all defences for the criminal possession of child pornography. It does not raise the age of consent for adult-child sexual contact from 14 years of age, one of the lowest ages of consent in the western world.

One of the provisions in the Criminal Code allows an adult to have sex with a child as young as 12 years old if that adult thought the child was in fact 14 years of age. While that may seem preposterous, that is exactly what happened in a recent case in Saskatchewan where a judge acquitted two adult males in their twenties who had sexual relations with a young aboriginal girl who had run away from home. They were acquitted because they thought she was 14 years of age.

The bill fails to introduce mandatory sentences for child sexual assault, as has been done in other jurisdictions, specifically the United Kingdom and the United States.

The bill also fails to streamline the laws of evidence governing convictions for sex offenders.

Canada is becoming a global haven for child predators because of these glaring Liberal policy failures. In fact, the entire bill is filled with vague provisions that fail to create the certainty of protection that children require. No doubt prompting therefore the applause from a notorious child predator like John Robin Sharpe, who supports the bill, because he believes it would bring understanding to the adult-child sexual relationship. Praise from a child predator is evident, but all the frontline police officers and child care agencies, indeed, every witness who went before the justice committee, condemned the bill, other than the minister himself.

Let me deal specifically with some of the concerns that have been raised.

The first concern that needs to be raised, which I know some of my colleagues have addressed, centres around the controversy regarding the artistic merit defence. That controversy began in reaction to the court case of the previously mentioned child predator John Robin Sharpe.

The Supreme Court of Canada in *R. v Sharpe* said that artistic merit should be interpreted as broadly as possible. That really opened the door to mischief in terms of trying to enforce this particular law. It basically meant that one could bring forward any witness to say that there was at least some artistic merit to these degrading writings and that would be sufficient for a judge to consider an acquittal.

Government Orders

● (1225)

That interpretation of the law by the Supreme Court of Canada helped shape the decision that allowed Mr. Sharpe to be acquitted for two counts of possession of child pornography with the intent to distribute, as the material, containing violent writing targeting vulnerable children, was considered by the judge to have artistic merit.

It is truly remarkable that we would never accept the defence of artistic merit with respect to women in our society and with respect to the exploitation of racial minorities, and yet with respect to the most vulnerable minority of them all, our children, the courts are more than quick to protect artistic merit rights and destroy the protection that children deserve. It is very evident that that defence needs to be eliminated. It is simply not necessary.

We have called on the federal government, as the Conservative Party, to eliminate that defence. The government responded but the response has been a pitiful response in terms of protecting children.

The defence in the old bill has now been reduced into a single defence of public good. Despite the former justice minister's attempt to sell this bill on the basis that the artistic merit defence has been eliminated, he admitted in the justice committee hearings that the artistic merit defence is still included under the broader public good defence.

Again, that is typical of the kind of approach that the prior justice minister took and now apparently the new justice minister takes. If people are sufficiently outraged they make changes, not changes that substantively address the concerns raised, but rather changes that simply disguise their original intent and in fact carry out that original intent.

What did the former justice minister state in describing what this new public good defence includes? He admitted, and I want to quote from his comments. He stated:

Artistic merit still exists in the sense that a piece of art will have to essentially go through the new defence of public good and through the two stages. Of course, the first question is always this. Does it serve the public good?

Clearly, within there is still the defence of artistic merit.

In the Sharpe decision, when it was heard by the Supreme Court of Canada, the court also addressed that particular statement. It briefly considered the defence of public good. The court found that public good has been interpreted as "necessary or advantageous to... the pursuit of science, literature, or art, or other objects of general interest". That was the Supreme Court of Canada's interpretation of public good.

The court went on to say:

It might be argued that the public good is served by possession of materials that promote expressive or psychological well-being or enhance one's sexual identity in ways that do not involve harm to others. In some cases this might eliminate some of the more problematic applications of s. 163.1(4). For example, it might in certain cases foreclose the law's application to visual works created and privately held by one person alone....

● (1230)

That statement by the Supreme Court of Canada has been the subject of a lot of controversy. One of the things that the court apparently did not understand was that this type of written child

pornography is used to groom children into thinking that these types of sexual relationships with adults are all right. It is very difficult then to suppress this particular information or this type of child pornography. The excuse being offered by these pornographers is that they were only writing it for themselves.

I heard an interesting story with respect to some of Mr. John Robin Sharpe's material that it was in fact found with a notation on it, "This material may be illegal in Canada". That is a curious thing to put on one's own writings required for one's own personal use. If Mr. Sharpe thought it would be illegal, that is one thing, but why would he have to put that on the face of the material itself? The inference is clear. He distributes this material in order to assist other child predators in their activities.

In trying to create these kinds of exceptions, ostensibly to protect free speech, what the court does is it opens the door to the abuse of children.

The Conservative Party calls for the elimination of all defences that justify the criminal possession of child pornography. Members opposite say that then means we have to make it illegal in every context. That is not correct. That is being mischievous. Obviously, for the purposes of prosecution, for example, it would not be illegal for the police or prosecutors to possess that or for researchers who are studying the effects of exposure to child pornography.

However there needs to be some limitation and clear delineation of what is acceptable and what is not.

We were met with a problem similar to this some years ago when it appeared that police officers were conducting certain illegal activity to further another criminal investigation.

The Supreme Court of Canada said there was no justification for police officers to engage in that illegal activity, no protection in common law, statute or otherwise. The House addressed that issue by passing legislation that set out exactly when police officers could break the law to investigate another charge. It was clearly delineated and set out in statute.

When members opposite say that the exclusion of all child pornography and categorizing it as criminal possession would never work because it would exclude the legitimate handling of pornography by police or prosecutors for a prosecution, is simply a lot of nonsense.

● (1235)

This bill needs to go back to the drawing board to address what I consider a fundamental flaw in that legislation, but yet a flaw that can be remedied by good statutory language. I might note in this context as well that civil libertarians have also indicated that they have a concern with the defence of public good and that it is simply too vague and too broad. So those who are interested in protecting children are concerned about this and civil libertarians who are concerned about certain artistic endeavours are also concerned that this phrase establishes no standard at all.

Government Orders

I want to talk about the age of consent. This bill, frankly, does not deal with that issue in an effective manner. Instead of prohibiting all child exploitation by adults where that child is, for example as in other countries, under the age of 16, this legislation requires a court to examine on a case by case basis if a child has been harmed. This kind of tiptoeing around criminal behaviour is reprehensible. The Conservative Party will not support this kind of vague legislation.

Again, comments by the notorious child predator John Robin Sharpe praising this pedophile friendly piece of legislation further validate the opposition's concern about this bill. Instead of raising the age to simply and clearly state that there shall be no adult-child sexual contact, the Liberals import this vague standard.

At the same time, I recognize that it is not the role of Parliament to get involved in certain social policy issues, for example, sexual relationships between children. The concern of the Conservative Party is not to regulate the sexual conduct of children between each other, that is, children under the age of 16. What we are concerned about is the exploitation of children by adults. We recognize that there needs to be a close in age exemption that ensures we do not criminalize consenting activity, but we do want to stop the kind of activity that John Robin Sharpe was just recently convicted of.

On the age of consent, 80% of Canadians polled said they want to raise the age of consent to at least age 16. The response of this government has been that there are certain cultural considerations in Canada which prevent it from doing that. We have asked time and again what culture in this country agrees with the sexual exploitation of children by adults. The Liberals have been silent. The government has tried to rely on some kind of cultural camouflage, which has only insulted Canadians of every culture. If there is evidence that cultures in Canada accept the exploitation of children by adults, why does the government not bring it forward instead of casting aspersions on every culture in Canada?

• (1240)

The approach of the Liberals in this bill to create this category of exploitative relationships is simply cumbersome and is in fact very difficult to prove in terms of trying to bring forward a prosecution. We already have a provision that makes it against the law for someone in a position of trust to exploit a young person between the ages of 14 and 18. Here, they are simply trying to recast this. Those are my brief comments at this time. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member if he would reflect on the part of the country that he comes from, the area of Winnipeg, Manitoba. In particular, has there been a sense of an increase of child pornography and so on in that area? Have there been greater concerns in the last number of years since he has served in public office? Would the member reflect on some of the comments from the Toronto police he alluded to and the concerns they have with respect to raising the age of consent? Could he confirm that this would be their express wish as well?

Mr. Vic Toews: Mr. Speaker, from my conversations with them, I understand that the Toronto police, as well as other police forces across Canada, support an increase of that age of sexual consent to

age 16 when it comes to dealing with child-adult sexual relationships.

In terms of pornography itself and child pornography in particular, the police are very concerned. Indeed, they are overwhelmed. In this age of technology and computers there can be thousands, indeed hundreds of thousands, of pictures on a particular computer, making it very difficult to prosecute these cases, and very cumbersome and very expensive. We had a presentation here from the Toronto police about a year ago now, wherein they expressed concern that the legislation and the approaches by the government were not stemming this tide of child pornography.

Rather than simply proceeding along the same path as it has been, why will this government not bring in legislation that addresses the concerns of front line police officers, that addresses the concerns of child advocacy agencies, and that indeed addresses the concern that children are not being protected in the existing law or in this law itself?

• (1245)

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my esteemed colleague who just spoke. He has been attorney general in his province and has worked in the law field for some time, so he has had a lot of discussion and dialogue with the authorities, with justice officials under his purview and his watch in the province of Manitoba, and he serves our Conservative Party very well as our lead critic in these matters.

The bill we have before us, Bill C-12, is one about which different people have wanted to speak out. People are outraged that we do not have it right in respect of the piece of legislation that we have here today. This whole controversy about the artistic merit defence actually began some time ago in reaction to the court case of John Robin Sharpe, a notorious child pornographer.

The bill purports to make amendments to the Criminal Code to safeguard children from sexual exploitation, abuse and neglect. We think the bill has not done this in the appropriate way and to the extent that it should. Therefore, as Conservative Party members, we have objections with respect to the Liberal government bill before us today.

The Supreme Court of Canada said in the Sharpe case that artistic merit should be interpreted as broadly as possible. That very much concerns us. We do not have any other direction from Parliament, the highest court in the land, if we will, so therefore we have a broad latitude in the statement from the Supreme Court on the John Robin Sharpe case. That statement helped shape the decision that allowed John Robin Sharpe to be acquitted for two counts of possession of child pornography with the intent to distribute.

That material, containing some very violent writings targeting vulnerable children, was considered by judges to have artistic merit. Since that time, this side of the House, particularly the Conservatives, has called on the federal government to eliminate that particular artistic merit defence.

Government Orders

Under this now slightly changed bill, Bill C-12, the existing defences of child pornography, that is, artistic merit, educational, scientific or medical purposes, are reduced to a single defence of public good, but this still has not solved the problem because of how wide and a little bit vague this term is.

Despite the attempts of the former justice minister, the member for Outremont, to sell us the bill and convince us on that basis that the artistic merit defence was eliminated—and technically speaking that would be true—he admitted in the justice committee that it is still included under the broader public good defence. Therein lies the difficulty. As he said in the justice committee, artistic merit still exists in the sense that a piece of art essentially will have to go through this new defence of public good and go through the two stages, and of course there is always the first question: does it serve the public good? That is in the committee records of September 25, 2003.

In the Sharpe case, the Supreme Court of Canada also briefly—

The Deputy Speaker: I do not like to interrupt the member, but there is a matter that the House might or might not choose to deal with. Let me give the opportunity to the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the hon. member and I offer my apologies for interrupting him on debate.

I would ask for unanimous consent of the House to be permitted to table the second report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts respecting the protection of witnesses who appear before the committee in relation to its study of chapter 3, “The Sponsorship Program”, chapter 4, “Advertising Activities”, and chapter 5, “Management of Public Opinion Research”, of the November 2003 report of the Auditor General of Canada.

• (1250)

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-12, an act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of children and other vulnerable persons) and the Canada Evidence Act, be read the third time and passed, of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the Supreme Court of Canada in the Sharpe decision considered the defence of public good. It found that “public good” has been interpreted as necessary or advantageous to the pursuit of science, literature, art or other objects of interest. We know that can get fairly broad and in fact a little strange at points.

I refer to something which I think shocked the entire Canadian public when a Canada Council award was given to an individual named Istvan Kantor in recent days, an individual who has actually been fined for vandalism with his so-called art and so on. There was money out the door on that. He was recently awarded by the Governor General. The public was probably more of the view that the guy should be fined yet further for some of his atrocious acts of vandalism and so on, considering his criminal record. Instead, he was encouraged for that by getting the award.

Obviously we have some upside down values at points in society and we regard things that are not particularly good. There is a stream of thought out there that says these are great things and they are good for the pursuit of science, literature, art and objects of general interest. That is part of the problem.

It was said that it might be argued that the public good is served by possession of materials that promote expressive or psychological well-being or enhance one's sexual identity in ways that do not involve harm to others. Obviously in the case of Robin Sharpe it is at the point that these are not just imaginations or machinations in the brain, but they kind of work out in his life.

Within the last day Robin Sharpe has again been convicted. He carried out a sexual act on a young person many years ago and there was a conviction. It is obvious that it is not just an issue for this man in particular, that it only has to do with him, but in fact it does perpetrate harm upon other people.

The Conservative Party wants to make very plain that we do not think there should be any defences that justify the criminal possession of child pornography. Of course, the criminal possession of child pornography does not apply to those in the justice system or, for purposes of prosecution, researchers studying the effects of exposure to child pornography.

Believe me, it is pretty horrifying to speak to police officers. A number of them are having to research this stuff and bring it forward for prosecution. It messes up their minds in a very big way having to go over that material and having to present all of it, and not just a sampling of it. I gather at the end of the day the police officers who have to see this horrific stuff are almost traumatized from the violence and brutality that is inflicted upon children in these images that are used in prosecutions.

We do not bring charges against the good folk of the police forces across the country. In fact, they would prefer not to have to go through so much of that stuff in prosecuting the cases against those individuals. It is a horrific thing for the police officers to be put through, the good police, the men in blue who defend the interests and common good in this great domain of Canada.

Government Orders

On the issue of the age of consent, 80% of Canadians that have been polled have said that they want the age of consent raised to at least 16 years. Only two years ago provincial ministers unanimously passed a resolution calling on the federal government to raise the age of consent to at least 16. The will is there, one would think, at least on the part of the provinces. We question whether the will is there and obviously it is not on the part of the federal government. It just does not seem to understand the urgency of it. Even the pressure of the provinces bringing this forward and unanimously asking for it still has not moved the government.

In most western democracies 16 or 17 years old is the minimum age of consent. We think it is not asking too much at all in this modern world. Because of technology and so on, it is going to be passed around, distributed and disseminated so very readily. We think that in the promotion of good for the public and for the protection of youth, the age of consent should be raised.

● (1255)

We heard from another member in answer to my question to him that certainly the police officials across the country, the chiefs of police and the police officers on the beat want the age of sexual consent raised because it would make their jobs easier. It would put them in a position where they could get convictions much more readily instead of all the ropes and hurdles they have to go through in terms of prosecuting some of this very vile, offensive stuff.

Even the former justice minister Anne McLellan stated that raising the age of consent was something the government—

The Deputy Speaker: The member is very much aware of the practice of the House in terms of the identity of one another and how that process works. I would simply ask the member to keep that in mind.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: My regrets, Mr. Speaker. I will just make reference to the former justice minister from Edmonton, Alberta, and I think people would have in mind of whom I am speaking.

She stated that raising the age of consent was something that the government should be moving forward on. She said back in October 2001 with regard to changing the age of consent from 14 to 16:

Those consultations will be concluded and reported on by December 31, 2001 and I think we will see that a consensus is emerging that with certain safeguards we should probably be moving on the age of consent from 14 to 16.

That was the case. The provinces unanimously want that to proceed. Then she went on, and this is the kind of way that she evaded, dodged and escaped from it. She said, in a very interesting way to kind of step around it:

But as with some of these things, they look simple on the surface, but they're not quite so simple. It requires a fair number of changes to the code; we're going to have to review all those sections where age is found. But it's certainly an issue very much on our agenda.

Well let us get it on the agenda. Let us put it forward. Let us do it instead of sidestepping in the manner she did. Where there is a will, there is a way. Yes, there are some complications but if there is really a heart and a spirit and a desire to move forward on this very vital thing, then we can do it. We can move it ahead. Where there is a will, there is a way to get it done, and very quickly.

One of the major objections we have to Bill C-12 is that it does not raise the age of consent for sexual contact between children and adults, those kinds of exploitive relationships. In fact there is a category that is aimed at protecting people between the ages of 14 and 18. In determining whether a person is in a relationship with a young person that is exploitive of that young person, a judge must consider the age difference between the accused and the young person, the evolution of the relationship, as well as the degree of control or influence by the accused over the young person.

Really it is something that allows just too much to slip through on this. It fails to create the kind of certainty of protection that children require. It fails to give that assurance and that kind of tool, if you will, to the good police across our country who need something. They need some more teeth in the law so that they can move forward in rapid fashion with these prosecutions instead of dragging on and on, with people slipping through with these kinds of defences that are allowed.

As it stands, this bill would not serve as a real deterrent and would simply result in longer trials and more litigation dragged out over time.

Prior to this bill, it was already against the law for a person in a position of trust or authority, with whom a young person between ages 14 and 18 was in a relationship of dependency, to be sexually involved with that young person. That already was in effect so there is nothing new in that respect in this law. It is unclear how adding people who are in a relationship with a young person which is exploitive of the young person does anything to add legal protection for young people. We are not convinced that there is any improvement by way of what is suggested in that little term exploitive relationship in Bill C-12.

In the Sharpe case there were two exemptions carved out for child pornography: materials such as diaries or drawings created privately and kept by that person for personal use; and visual recordings of a person, by that person, engaged in lawful sexual activity, kept by the person for personal use.

That latter exemption has the potential to expose children 14 to 18 years of age to further exploitation by child pornographers since they would be engaging in legal activity, but the government's failure to prohibit all adult-child sex continues to be an unacceptable risk. Only by raising that age of consent will young people be truly protected under the Criminal Code.

We are not advocating for the criminalizing of teenagers, as with other jurisdictions with a more reasonable age of consent, but in those jurisdictions, such as the U.K., Australia and most states in the United States, a close in age exemption would apply to ensure that those individuals, those teenagers, are not criminalized.

● (1300)

Bill C-12 would also increase maximum sentences for child related offences. They include sexual offences, failing to provide the necessities of life and abandoning a child. That is good so far as the statement exists, but it does no good if the courts do not impose the sentences.

Government Orders

We know by experience that when maximum sentences are raised, there is no corresponding pattern in the actual sentencing practices. This has been demonstrated across the land. The maximum penalty can be raised but if there is no minimum sentence, then it really does not do anything in the way of successful prosecutions and there is no change in the actual sentencing patterns. What is needed are mandatory sentences, truth in sentencing, eliminating statutory release, and that there be no conditional sentences for child predators.

As has been said by others here today, we are all experiencing the effects of modern technology. We are all part of the wave of technology and its advances, but that is also part of what is creating the difficulty here. The problem is it surpassed the legislative provisions. There is some archaism that governs the use of evidence in these cases. We really need to have that addressed. The bill fails to address those shortcomings. Amendments are required to deal with child pornography cases effectively and efficiently such that we make some serious impact to drive it back or push it off to the very edges of society or to eliminate it altogether, if possible.

The bill creates a new offence of voyeurism and the distribution of voyeuristic material. That is a positive step, and we will give credit where it is due. It makes it an offence to observe or make a visual recording of a person who shall have a reasonable expectation of privacy if the person is in a place in which the person can be expected to be nude or engaged in sexual activity.

There was a recent case in the city of Saskatoon at the exhibition grounds. I think that disciplinary action is being brought against the person, who is a law enforcement official himself. His excuse is that he was on certain medications and so on. He was using a camera in a voyeuristic manner in the washrooms at the exhibition in Saskatoon. We need laws in place because of the advancement of technology. Certainly that is to be commended and is a good thing.

The Conservative Party of Canada believes that the bill falls far short in terms of protecting Canada's children. Members of Parliament across the country have discovered this plain and clear especially as they have talked to those who work with youth, child advocacy groups. Conversations with the police make it very apparent that this is a flawed bill. It is inadequate and will not do the job, which is a very unfortunate, regrettable thing for the children of our country.

The bill will not give children the greater legal protection that they need and which we owe to them as citizens of this country. Children are the future of our country and should not be allowed to be at risk. We need to get the laws in place and we need to get it right. This bill simply will not do the job.

With those regretful comments at the end, I conclude my remarks. Bill C-12 is in serious need of amendment. The Conservative Party of Canada hopes that maybe at some point we could have that done.

•(1305)

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in listening to my hon. colleague I could not help but note the irony that the government will not do anything about raising the age of consent for such an important life decision as that for a 14

year old, while at the same time it recognizes some inherent problems for young people. It tells them they cannot smoke a cigarette until they are 16, but it is okay to have sex when they are 14. They can drive a car when they are 16. They have to wait until then and even then, in some provinces there is a graduated system so that we still have some controls when they start to drive at age 16.

The government in its enlightenment says that someone is not capable, not mature enough to select the person who is going to represent them in government. Given that the people who are old enough and supposedly mature enough have elected a Liberal government, maybe it suggests we should be opening it up to younger people to make those kinds of decisions.

The government is saying that people have to be 18 years old before they can make an informed decision on who is going to represent them in government. When we pass laws in this country, we make decisions that probably have far more impact on the young people coming up into adulthood than they do on us who make those decisions.

I wonder if the hon. member could comment on the fact that the government recognizes or at least claims that a child is not mature enough to vote for the person who is going to enact the laws that affect him or her until he or she is 18, yet that child can make such life changing decisions dealing with sexuality at age 14.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Mr. Speaker, it is a strange irony that we allow individuals to have adult privileges at a much younger age in respect to the things that my colleague referenced. We definitely have a problem. Individuals across Canada have used this as an excuse to abuse young people, and to take advantage of them and exploit them sexually. They use the excuse that they thought the individual was 14 years old.

I recall a case in Tisdale, in my home province, involving a young aboriginal girl who was not 14. She was in fact a couple of years younger than that. The individuals who took advantage of her sexually said they thought she was 14 years of age. If we were to raise the age of consent to 16 years of age, there would be no possible excuse for somebody looking at a gal of 12 years old or thereabouts. That excuse would not hold water.

The age of consent needs to go up to help our police across the country, and to stop people from using this as an excuse and a defence. This would also stop the defence from having any clout in our courts. We need to remove that possibility entirely.

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his fine speech and his good efforts over the years for ethical and social causes. I want to carry on with the same train of questioning of my other hon. colleague.

Many times over the past few years, we on this side of the House have asked the Liberals to increase the age of consent from 14 to 16 years of age. During question period at one point in time, one of the members opposite explained it could not be increased to 16 for cultural reasons.

Government Orders

There is another inconsistency with regard to the way the Liberals have been approaching the question and it has to do with the long proclaimed United Nations rights of the child. The government agreed to article 1 in the United Nations rights of the child which defines a child as being a person under the age of 18.

With all of these inconsistencies and international standards, perhaps my colleague could explain to me, what is the definition of a child? Why does he think the Liberals are hesitating on raising the age from 14 to 16, which would apparently be appropriate and consistent with most other world bodies as well? Could my colleague please enlighten us?

• (1310)

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Mr. Speaker, I also find it a tremendous irony when international bodies like the United Kingdom, and most states in the U.S. as well as other modern democracies, have a higher age of 16 and in some cases 17.

It is a cruel irony that we do not raise that age of consent. It is hypocritical. We need to do better. I am not sure why Canada needs to lead the parade downhill by keeping that age lower when we see other nations leading the charge against this violent, offensive, and hateful stuff that hurts the most vulnerable among us.

I thank the member for Edmonton Centre-East for a good question which draws attention to the hypocrisy of the Liberal government. We should be doing something. Sadly and tragically, the Liberal government simply has no will to do it.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to debate this issue. Many others have spoken on some of the specific issues. I will do a little bit of that too, but I would like to talk about this issue in a general fashion first.

I would like to raise the question, why, after 10 years that I have been here, are we still just talking about this issue? I was first elected in 1993 and very soon after I came down here we raised many of the issues we are still talking about today. We have asked questions of the government, in committee and in the House of Commons, as to why it is not acting more quickly on something as urgent and so critical as protecting our children from sexual predators. What question could be more fundamental for government to deal with than that?

It has been 10 years that I have been here. I have been asking questions and my colleagues have been asking questions. We stated our position on protecting children from sexual predators and nothing has happened. The legislation that we are debating today, Bill C-12, in practical terms when applied, will not change things. My question to the government is, why has it taken 10 years and why after 10 years has nothing been done on such a critical issue?

I do not expect that I will get an answer to my question today, but Canadians certainly deserve an answer to this question. It is a question that Canadians are still asking. Next to some of the hot button issues, it is one of the issues most often brought to my attention, especially the issue of raising the age of sexual consent. However, there are other aspects as well that deal with protecting our children from sexual predators.

If this issue is so important to my constituents, I would have a hard time not believing that it is also important to the constituents of

all members opposite. In fact, they are hearing the same things that I am hearing because in various ways I have heard them say so. They are concerned about the age of consent. They are concerned about some of these other things like artistic merit that my colleagues and everyone in the House has been debating.

Therefore, if that concern is so widespread, including on the government side, why has appropriate action not been taken after 10 years? We will hear the government use the excuse that was used by the public works minister yesterday in question period when he said that it was not his government. He said that his government only started on December 12.

Really, that is what he said in response to a question. We were talking about how the government's reputation has been tarnished due to all the scandals, like the ad scam, the sponsorship program, and the military issue that my colleague from Prince George has brought up recently regarding how \$160 million was somehow misspent. It is probably the worst type of corruption, yet the government did not pick up on it for years. These things come up, and we have been bringing them up on a regular basis.

What did the public works minister say yesterday? He said that his government has only been in place since December 12, trying to distance himself and the responsibility of the Prime Minister, the cabinet and all the members of Parliament on the government side. The Liberal members are trying to distance themselves from their responsibility; however, they were a part of the government over the past 10 years. I would be trying to distance myself from that too, quite frankly, if I were there.

However, corruption is one thing and we are not talking about corruption in this debate today. We are not talking about the sponsorship scandal or any of the other areas of corruption.

We are talking about something every bit as important though, and that is the protection of our children from sexual predators. If so many of these members of Parliament feel, as I know they do, that this is something they want to do, that they want their government to do, why have they been so ineffective in doing it? After all, they are part of the government, or at least they are supposed to influence the government in caucus and in other ways.

• (1315)

I do not think it is because they are not good people. I know that most members of Parliament, no matter which party they are from, do the best job they can to represent their constituents. They do that; we all do that. We work very hard at that. I believe Liberal members of Parliament are no different. I have talked with them enough to know that they want to represent their constituents.

Why then, on critical issues such as this, can they not do that? Why are they not allowed to do so? Why have they been so unsuccessful in dealing with this most urgent of issues, such as protecting our children?

The answer comes down to a lack of democratic process in the House of Commons, in the government, and in our political system. That is something that I have talked about an awful lot in the last 16 years since the Reform Party of Canada was founded.

Government Orders

One of the main issues that the Reform Party was founded on back in 1987 was the issue of democratic reform. It would put in place various democratic reforms so that each and every member of Parliament from every political party would have a real impact in this place. Members would be able to actually represent their constituents in this place.

Why after 16 years and why after more than 10 years of the government being in power has so little been done on that issue? It is because of Bill C-12, that we are dealing with today, and what happens with every other piece of legislation we deal with in the House that will depend on whether we have a democratic system or not?

Have we had a democratic system in place, one that was really working? The government has had 10 years to do that and it has actually made things worse rather than better. I honestly believe that things are less democratic in the House now than they were 10 years ago when I came here.

Had democratic changes been made, I believe the Liberal members of Parliament, who understand the importance of this issue, along with my colleagues and colleagues from other political parties, would have forced the government to pass legislation which would deal with these issues that we are talking about in Bill C-12.

It comes down to having a process in place that allows people from right across this country to appear to be represented and to in fact be represented by their member of Parliament. After all, their member of Parliament should answer to them and not to this cabinet and not to the Prime Minister. That is not the way our system should work.

Unfortunately, it is the way that it does work. That is a sad commentary on 10 years of Liberal government. We can go back farther than that. I am only looking at the 10 years that I have been here because I am very much familiar with those 10 years.

I know the fight that my colleagues and I, and some in other political parties too, including the governing party, have put up to bring democratic change. It would ensure that issues like the protection of children would be dealt with in the way that the general public wants it to be dealt with.

Every one of us is elected by the people in our constituency to work on their behalf, to represent their views. We learn about issues from polling and surveys, and many of us do that in our households. We will take an issue such as the protection of children or the age of consent, and I have done that myself and many of my colleagues have done that. We have given information looking at both sides of the issue.

Sometimes we will invite someone who takes a contrary position to our own position to put information in our households to our constituents. We will put our position in because part of being a representative is to be a local leader. Part of leadership is to try to persuade people to our point of view. We put our persuasive position in there. Then we allow our constituents to decide. We allow our constituents to make it clear, by actually voting, how they feel on these important issues.

● (1320)

Any survey that has been done backs up widespread public support to raise the sexual age of consent for children from 14. They should not be making decisions on whether to have sex with an adult. That is not something they should not have to think of at that age. Let them be children for awhile.

Every one of the official polls done on the issue shows an 80% support rate or higher for raising the age of sexual consent to at least 16.

It comes down to unfortunately the fact that we have, as the Prime Minister calls it, this democratic deficit. What has he done to fix it? Nothing. What has he done to deal with this issue when he must know about it, because I am sure many of his members of Parliament have made the point to him that they want these issues dealt with by the government. What has he done? He has done nothing about it.

This legislation, should it pass, quite frankly will not help solve the problem. I will quickly go through some of the specific issues in the legislation that have not been dealt with by the government. I will talk about issues that are conspicuous by their absence.

The first is the issue of artistic merit, and some of my colleagues have talked about it. The controversy on artistic merit has been going on for some time. It certainly came from the John Robin Sharpe case from British Columbia. I think we are all very much aware of that. He is a notorious child pornographer.

In the Supreme Court case, *R. v Sharpe*, it was determined that artistic merit should be interpreted as widely as possible. In the legislation the government has said that it will deal with it by taking away the artistic merit defence and put in place the public good defence. This was after a former justice minister, who was attempting to sell the bill to committee, admitted that the broader public good defence in fact would allow the artistic merit defence to be there. I want to read the quote from the former justice minister. He said:

Artistic merit still exists in the sense that a piece of art will have to essentially go through the new defence of public good and through the two stages. Of course, the first question is always this. Does it serve the public good?

He went on to say that artistic merit was a part of what was considered under whether it served the public good.

That issue has not been dealt with in the legislation in any kind of effective way. In practice, when it goes before the courts, it probably will not change a thing. It will probably be dealt with in exactly the same way and the artistic merit of what I call child pornography will still be a consideration and probably the results will be no different. The government has failed entirely in that regard.

The Conservative Party calls for the elimination of all defences that justify the criminal possession of child pornography. We are clear on that. Why is the government so unclear on that? What it is clear on is that it is not willing to take this issue and deal with it head on to ensure that our children are protected.

Private Members' Business

The second issue which has not been dealt with at all in the legislation is age of consent. I have already referred to that because it is an issue that so obviously should have been dealt with years ago. We all know that having 14 year olds decide whether they want to have sex with an adult is simply not acceptable, yet that is not in the legislation. In the general polling 80% of Canadians have said that they want it to be in there.

Canadians are clear on this and, as I said, many MPs have done their own surveys on this through their householders they send out to constituents. We have received results that in many cases are much higher than the 80%. Why has it not been dealt with?

• (1325)

Another former justice minister, although I cannot name her, said this on raising the age of consent. She indicated very clearly that it was something the government looked forward to doing. This was years ago. She said:

With regard to age of consent—from 14 to 16—we have our child as victim consultation paper. We discussed that at our federal-provincial justice ministers' meeting in September in Nova Scotia. Those consultations will be concluded and reported on by December 31 of this year, and I think we will see that a consensus is emerging that with certain safeguards we should probably be moving on the age of consent from 14 to 16.

This was in October 2001. What that former justice minister is saying is that she believes all provinces, and that is what we found too, want to go ahead with raising the age of sexual consent from 14 to 16. She acknowledged that was what Canadians wanted and it was certainly what the premiers wanted. Therefore, the federal government would not be improperly interfering in the areas of provincial jurisdiction, something that is so important to our Bloc colleagues as well as to us. We are very conscious of the federal government respecting provincial jurisdiction. That has been done. The provinces want to go with this and the federal government is ignoring that wish.

Again, Bill C-12 fails to raise the age of consent of sexual contact between children and adults. That is clear. The government claims that it has somehow effectively dealt with this issue of the age of consent. It has not. Though, as I have said before, probably a majority of its members of Parliament support that. Why do a majority of its members of Parliament support that, even in the governing party? Because their constituents have told them that.

The third issue, which I will refer to very briefly, is the issue of minimum sentences. In the bill the government raises the maximum sentence allowed under these various offences, but it puts in place no mandatory minimum sentence. Raising the maximum sentence probably will do nothing to help judges take these issues more seriously under the law. Putting in place mandatory minimum sentences for these offences on the other hand will mean judges will have no choice. Parliament will have dictated and minimum sentences will be put in place. It will give offenders at least the minimum sentence as required by law, but the government has refused to do that.

I want to close by saying that it is hard for me to understand why after 10 years this has not been changed and why the bill will not change it. It is a sad commentary. Let us move ahead. I can assure the House the next government will change that.

• (1330)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: 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*]

DAIRY TERMS ACT

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC) moved that Bill C-340, an act respecting the use of dairy terms, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased in this final hour of the day to address my private member's bill, a bill that promotes accuracy and honesty in the use of dairy labels and marketing of food products.

Bill C-340, entitled the dairy terms act, would ensure the correct use of dairy terms to protect consumers from being misled and to ensure fair practices in the food trade. The act would establish rules for using dairy terms on food labels and, with some exceptions, would prohibit dairy terms from being used when a food contains no dairy ingredients at all.

That is the concern because we have more sophisticated kinds of processing, substitutes for this, that and the other, vitamins and minerals are added in and a whole plethora of possibilities, and the consuming public is being misled by some of the labelling. Sometimes we have products that have no dairy in them at all and yet they make the pretense of being good dairy products. We take objection to that. This is the very nature of the bill before us now.

I am glad the bill is votable because I know there is cross-party support for this initiative. I have had members from Liberal governing side approach me today, and in recent days, in respect of what they say is their support. We will see at the time of the vote. I assume that will materialize when they stand to vote for this. Then at least it will go to committee for some good discussion and adjusting and tweaking for the good of the consuming public and dairy farmers across the country.

I am optimistic that we have that sense of goodwill across party lines to have this at least move into committee and possibly through the House entirely, for which we would be appreciative.

Private Members' Business

The bill reflects an important trend today. It is a consumer oriented trend. We are talking about honesty and accuracy in the labelling of food products. We see concerns about accurate labelling of food everywhere today in the matter of genetically modified foods. We have had debate on that and on mandatory labelling of irradiated foods. Some people want labels to accurately distinguish organic foods from non-organic alternatives. Those are all legitimate debates that need to take place. However, this one is much more simple in that we want truth and accuracy in food labelling.

Just last month my colleague, the member for Scarborough Southwest, led off debate on the first hour of a food labelling bill that he introduced, Bill C-398. The bill would expand requirements for nutritional information on food labels.

The bill before us today really concerns the use of dairy terms in the labelling of food items. Specifically, it aims to ban the false or inaccurate labelling of non-dairy products with terms traditionally associated with dairy foods. We are talking about the use, and the alleged misuse, of words such as milk, butter, cream and yogurt, when there are none of the constituent ingredients in the product, and people are misled by that.

The Dairy Farmers of Canada, the national association that represents Canada's dairy industry, has been seeking such provisions for several years now. They have tried to prosecute companies that they believe have crossed the line in this area, using what is called Canada's guide to food labelling and advertising. Maybe that is the problem. It is a guide and does not have any real force of law by way of real teeth. They have also tried to use provisions in law to challenge trademark applications. Rarely do they meet with success, and current guidelines seem to be unenforceable.

That is why we need a new law. There is an absence, a vacuum, so we need this law, the dairy terms act, which would be enforceable and would protect consumers and producers alike.

One case that the Dairy Farmers of Canada challenged at the trademark application level was a brand of popcorn called "Gout de Beur". Not only was the term butter in the name, but the imaging on the package was of a piece of popcorn slamming down into a slab of what appeared to be butter. The name and the image gave a rather different impression than the reality and the actual facts of the case. Another case involved a product called "Molly McButter". They attempted to take those cases forward under the registration of trademarks, but they lost in these and other cases.

• (1335)

Interestingly, Canada has backed provisions, such as those found in the bill, on the international stage. The bill is actually intended to bring Canada's domestic policy in line with the commitments that we have made overseas. Canada participates in the process for developing and amending the Codex Alimentarius, the international food code produced by an international body set up through the World Health Organization and the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.

The codex was amended in 1999 to strengthen provisions on dairy labelling, and far from opposing that international move, Canada endorsed the codex general standard for the use of dairy terms. Unfortunately, the Liberal government has not been willing to

implement these pro-consumer measures in Canada. It is a question that we are engaged in today and we hope to have the support of the government in respect to this so it can follow through in terms of that particular international commitment and its agreement to these particular measures.

Dairy term regulations do exist at the provincial level, but in the year 2000 a government established working group did recommend deregulation at the provincial level. The working group was set up in September 1999 at the request of the federal/provincial/territorial agri-food inspection committee, which is responsible under the agreement on internal trade. It is supposed to deal with inter-provincial technical barriers to trade. The purpose of the working group was to examine the regulatory options available to balance producer protection in the development of new products and the need to protect consumers with accurate labelling and the prevention of practices that could mislead consumers.

This position was based on the idea that sufficient federal controls exist through the Food and Drugs Act, other relevant legislation and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency's Guide to Food Labelling and Advertising to prevent fraud and consumer misunderstanding. The Dairy Farmers of Canada's experience trying to combat some questionable labels, however, suggests that stronger federal measures need to be implemented. That is why I have introduced this dairy terms bill. This recommendation to deregulate at the provincial level adds impetus to the need to pass the dairy terms bill as soon as possible.

With that background I now want to discuss some of the specific concerns related to the misuse of dairy terms in the labelling of non-dairy food products.

In many cases consumers looking for a dairy product know it contains good, nutritional dairy calcium and many other minerals and vitamins. However they could unintentionally buy a non-dairy alternative due to the misuse of dairy terms on the label.

On the other hand, there are consumers out there who are lactose intolerant or maybe they cannot have a big amount of dairy products. They might be looking for a non-dairy alternative and they may mistakenly overlook some substitute products when those products are labelled in such a way that suggest at first glance that they contain dairy ingredients.

Private Members' Business

The greatest concern, of course, is consumers who purchase a non-dairy product thinking that it has dairy ingredients. Young moms going into a shopping centre, assuming that they are buying a healthful dairy product, could be buying a product that has little or no dairy ingredient. Since quality and nutritional value are believed to be leading reasons for the popularity of dairy products, accurate labelling is essential. Misleading labels can have negative health implications for consumers.

Canada's dairy producers spend over \$75 million each year on advertising dairy products and promoting the nutritional benefits of dairy foods.

It is kind of hard, Mr. Speaker, to be talking over the noise here. I wonder if my colleagues across the way could kind of shut it down temporarily. I know the member across the way on the Liberal side supports the bill so he will want to give me his rapt attention.

I do not think anybody in the House believes that it is right for the producers of non-dairy products to take advantage of the marketing of dairy foods with labels that misrepresent the presence of dairy ingredients in their alternative products. Not only does this impact the health of consumers, but it illegitimately takes market share from the dairy industry, taking money out of the pockets of Canada's hard-working dairy producers. It is not right, not honest and not accurate, and there is a moral underlying theme.

• (1340)

When manufacturers of dairy alternatives use dairy images, such as cows or slabs of butter, in the labelling of dairy products, it is quite obvious to me that there was clear intent in likening their products to the original dairy items. Such actions reinforce the claim of dairy products that dairy terms are an important selling feature for foods because of the quality and nutrition that consumers associate with these food products.

It is the evidence of intentional misrepresentation in the use of dairy terms that demonstrates the need for this dairy terms bill. It would protect consumers and it would protect dairy producers from false labelling and marketing. Consumers are entitled to that. I am convinced of that. We need truth in sentencing and we need truth in labelling. Consumers should have the right of a properly informed choice in the matter of dairy products and non-dairy alternatives.

In 2000, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, which does not have a vested interest, performed a consumer survey which demonstrated the importance that consumers place on product labels in terms of their expectation of what important ingredients are in the food item. Despite acknowledging these results and offering verbal support for concerns about the reliability of dairy terms in product labels, the government has failed to act, unfortunately.

This proposed dairy terms act, I need to make plain, would not ban all uses of dairy terms. Exceptions are recognized. The main category of exceptions is non-dairy foods that people are sufficiently familiar with due to their historic usage. Let us be clear that the bill would not require the renaming of apple butter. We all know what that is. It is not purporting to be a dairy product. Peanut butter, maple butter, cocoa butter, coconut milk or milk of magnesia are things that do not fool or mislead the public. That is not at all affected or changed by the bill or the effects of the bill.

When people walk into a pharmacy and grab a bottle of milk of magnesia, they are obviously not walking in there for the purpose of pouring it on their children's cereal the next day as they head off to school. There is not a need to make adjustments in respect of these terms where people are long familiar with them through their historic usage.

I hope the proposed dairy terms act, if passed, will be used in a very positive, useful way in the country. It is not intended to be a heavy-handed instrument indiscriminately and blindly used. The intent of the bill is to deter intentional deception in the use of dairy terms for non-dairy products.

The dairy terms bill also provides room for some flexibility with terms such as creamy that could refer to the dairy content of a product or it could be just a reference to the texture. That is well and fine. Also, with many of the names listed as acceptable due to their historical usage, we know that the use of butter in the name refers to the texture of the product and the way that it spreads like butter. These would not be things that are banned. We are not going after that. When it is describing texture, it would be very permissible.

The Dairy Farmers of Canada have noted how some producers seem to design their labels in a way that seems to highlight the dairy term, while making the reference to texture much more obscure. One is hard pressed to think up a reason, other than intentional misrepresentation, for why a label would be designed in such a fashion.

I can speak from personal experience on this. I drink a soy beverage. I enjoy dairy products such as cheese and milk, but I have to be careful not to consume too much of it. I know about this on a personal basis. People use soy products. We call it soy loaf if it is a cheese like product, but it is not cheese. Let us not deceive the public about that. If it is a drink, it is called a soy beverage. This does not have any effect on those as long as there is accuracy in the labelling that way.

As I see my time has run out I will cede the floor to others and perhaps respond to questions in order to shed a little more light on the subject.

• (1345)

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague on the other side of the House for bringing forward Bill C-340.

At the beginning of his speech, the member asked members on all sides of the House to support his bill. I will support the bill but my first support goes to the industry and the producers. Dairy producers in Canada give us the finest and the best product possible in the world, and it costs the government nothing. Supply management is the backbone of rural and small town Canada.

I had the opportunity to meet with the Dairy Farmers of Canada, dairy farmers in Ontario and people in my own riding of Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington. In the next couple of weeks the national Holstein convention for Canada will be held in Kingston.

Private Members' Business

I know the bill's intent is good and I personally will recommend that we adopt the bill and send it to committee. However I think some changes need to be made in terms of the language. I want the people at Agriculture Canada to look at the bill. We need to learn from this and move with it. The Canadian Food Inspection Agency has done a lot of studies. It has talked with people and partners in the industry. It is looking at applying this to all types of food, and that is fine.

My colleague has done a good job with the bill. He has met with the past president of the Dairy Farmers of Canada who I believe is from the Prince Albert area of his riding.

I would like to know if my colleague will work with us because I would like to work with the industry. I would like to see the legislation go to the all party Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food so it can be fine-tuned. We need to support our producers and we have seen that with the meat industry and BSE where the industries are still thriving but our producers deserve our attention.

Will my colleague work with us and the industry to see if we can improve on the legislation?

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for providing me with his assurance that he will work within his party to encourage others to support the bill. I appreciate that. I think there is some evidence of support from all parties on this legislation.

I definitely concede the fact that we need to have discussions and debate in committee in terms of adjusting and tweaking the bill because it would affect all Canadians. Yes, some areas of the country have more dairy industries than others. Leo Bertoia, from Langham in my riding of Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, and other good folks have related their concerns and frustrations with regard to why we need a bill of this nature.

With the expression of goodwill from the member across the way, I would ask for unanimous consent to send the bill directly to committee so we can have those very worthwhile discussions and get the bill adjusted and tweaked.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member have the consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. Mark Eyking (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Agri-Food), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is good to see many people in the House concerned about the dairy industry.

I am pleased to rise today to debate Bill C-340, the dairy terms act, as proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Saskatoon—Wanuskewin. The issue, a very important one today, is food labelling.

The hon. member has raised some very important points about labelling of dairy and dairy food products, valid points that are shared by dairy industry producers and by me. I would like to tell members that I have many dairy farms in my riding and I also have a very large dairy processing plant, so this is very important to me too.

A number of questions can be asked about dairy terms on labels of foods that may contain little or no dairy products. What about a product that claims to taste buttery but has no butter? What if it has a butter flavour?

I understand that dairy producers feel that the current federal labelling regulations are not adequate for protecting dairy products. Many dairy farmers in my riding have brought this up to me. They are concerned about the ability of existing federal legislation to protect their interests with respect to the use of dairy terminology on non-dairy foods. Their concerns are legitimate and our government is working toward a solution that will help address this issue.

I will explain more on that in a moment, but this issue is larger than just dairy products. Yes, the Government of Canada wants a solution for dairy, but we need a solution for all natural products.

There are three points that we must keep in mind during this debate.

First, there are many stakeholders who have an interest in how ingredients are represented on labels. Among these stakeholders are the food processors, importers, retailers and industry associates, to name just a few. There are other issues that stakeholders want to consider when it comes to product labelling. These issues include constraints of innovation, significant additional costs and administrative burden on our industry.

Second, the labelling of food products has repercussions on international trade. Any changes to the labelling of products must be consistent with our obligations under NAFTA and also the WTO, for example.

Third, there are other food producers that are also concerned that labels on food may refer to ingredients and flavours that have little or no connection to the actual product. What about maple flavoured products that have no maple, or honey flavoured without honey, or even chocolate flavoured without chocolate? We cannot regard the issues raised by the dairy terms act in isolation from similar concerns about other kinds of food products.

As members can see, this is a very complex issue and the government is taking it very seriously. In fact, the CFIA is seeking a solution to address labelling for all food products. It seeks to give consumers products that are labelled in such a way that consumers can make informed decisions. The CFIA has been consulting on proposals for highlighted ingredients and flavours, which would be applied to all types of ingredients and foods.

Consultations took place between January and April of last year and again between July and September. There were also two more workshops held on labelling issues, last November in Toronto and again in January in Saint-Hyacinthe, Quebec. In addition, CFIA has conducted bilateral meetings with stakeholders and has commissioned a consumer survey, because at the end of the day we have to sell our products to the consumer.

In other words, the government is already proceeding in a very thorough and methodical fashion to address the clarification of food labelling in the broader context of labelling of all food products, not just dairy products.

Private Members' Business

To launch this first consultation, the CFIA released a discussion paper addressing the broad spectrum of food labelling issues. The discussion paper contained three proposals that address the same types of issues raised by the proposed bill from the hon. member.

First, when ingredients or components are highlighted, whether a high or low amounts, a percentage of the ingredient as added into the food must be declared either on the front panel or ingredients list.

Second, when the highlighted ingredient is a flavour or an artificial flavour, the words "flavour" or "artificial flavour" must appear adjacent to the named flavour. Let me give an example: "butter flavour" or "artificial butter flavour".

• (1350)

Third, when an ingredient or a component name is used to describe the sensory characteristic of a food, that special characteristic must be stated adjacent to the description, for example, "creamy texture".

In an analysis of this discussion paper and subsequent consultations, the CFIA heard many different points of view. It received input and advice from food processors and from the producers, of course, and from importers, distributors, industry associations, provincial governments, health professional associations, and also consumer associations and the consumers themselves.

In other words, the solutions that will emerge from this process will be built upon a wide consensus among different stakeholders involved. These consultations may result in changes to labelling policies through regulatory amendment, but these changes have not yet been finalized. It is a work in progress.

The challenge is to clarify food labelling rules without creating a proliferation of acts and regulations each designed to address a different food. Today it is the dairy terms act. What will it be tomorrow? The maple terms act? Or the honey terms act or the meat terms act?

CFIA's approach is in keeping with the Government of Canada's policy on smart regulation. What we should create is a regulatory process that results in the greatest net benefit to farmers and Canadian society while weighing the benefits of alternatives to regulation.

The process is now in place to improve product labelling systematically. It is open to the public for input. It puts forward proposals that would be in keeping with the current standards of labelling of prepackaged foods. The hon. member mentioned the international tests. We always have to keep that in mind.

The hon. member has put forward this bill with the support of dairy producers. I think it is a very good gesture in itself. Despite their active involvement in the consultation process on this issue with CFIA, it would appear that the dairy producers want to push for a stronger mechanism for additional protection for dairy terms according to their own priorities.

We cannot have it both ways. We cannot push for a balanced, thorough approach of labelling food as represented by the consultation process and at the same time pass the bill before us today.

I thank the member very much for bringing this up and for speaking on behalf of dairy farmers and bringing this forward in the House. For my part, I stand by the process that we have in place and the solutions that are going to be passed through CFIA, a process that has dairy producer associations very much as participants.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the current CFIA approach to address food labelling, which means they should join with me in voting against the bill.

• (1355)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-340 after the speech the parliamentary secretary just delivered.

I can appreciate that the Canadian Food Inspection Agency wants to label all food across Canada, I have no problem with that, but this bill is seeking to legislate one of the oldest products around. We have all consumed milk in our lives; I think milk is one of the sources of life. We are not talking about just any product.

I would say to the parliamentary secretary that there are so many stakeholders in the entire food chain, so many producers and ways of doing things that these days, butter is no longer butter, milk is no longer milk and cheese is no longer cheese. That is the reality. The only thing the dairy industry wants is to say that milk is milk, cream is cream and cheese is cheese. It is easy to understand. Let us get this in writing and require all producers in Canada, all those who want to sell products, to comply with the regulations. The bill is straightforward.

I support the parliamentary secretary and the government in their desire to see all foods labelled in Canada. But there is one obvious instance. The dairy industry spends \$75 million annually in order to get milk back to being milk, butter back to butter, and cheese to cheese. These efforts are all being undone by the industries that make use of substitutes, often chemical in nature, to give the same taste. It is as simple as that.

The bill is straightforward. Its purpose is set out in clause 3:

3. The purpose of this Act is to ensure that food is described or presented in such a manner as to ensure the correct use of dairy terms intended for milk and milk products, to protect consumers from being confused or misled and to ensure fair practices in the food trade.

Quite simply, it is a matter of keeping milk as milk, cream as cream, butter as butter.

As for the application:

4. This Act applies to all food marketed for human consumption in Canada.

In other words, anyone wishing to use dairy terms must have dairy products. It is as simple as that.

Then there is the prohibition, because obviously the purpose of the act is to prohibit something:

Private Members' Business

5. No person shall manufacture, offer for sale, sell, market or advertise for sale any food to which this Act applies, if it is described in a manner contrary to this Act.

People may make statements here in the House, but if someone claims to have buttered popcorn and there is no butter on it, I have a problem with that, as most other people would.

A survey was carried out in Quebec by the Union des producteurs agricoles which showed that the majority of Quebecers expect to find dairy products in something using the words “milk”, “cream” or “butter”. That is something everyone expects.

Nevertheless, companies decide to save money by trying to achieve the same taste with derivatives and chemical products. That is a reality. Why does the government not want to get involved in this regulation today? To protect the segment of the food industry that is using improper terms to make money. It is as simple as that.

Clearly, the Bloc Québécois is completely opposed to this. There are farmers who are currently fighting for survival, given all the problems they face. All this bill is asking the government to do is set restrictions on these things. In other words, restrict industry from using dairy terms for products that are not dairy products.

There is no cost to anyone. It is solely a bill that we, as legislators, can vote on in the House.

Part of what members do is make laws. It is hard to understand that today the Liberal government, through the parliamentary secretary, has just stated that we would have to wait until the Canadian Food Inspection Agency passes legislation on labelling for all products in Canada. I have a problem with this. This means that this issue will never be resolved because it will take years.

A Liberal colleague made a suggestion earlier. This bill, which targets a specific type of product, dairy products, needs to go to committee for consideration and consultation with the industry stakeholders. They can come tell us why we should not do this.

● (1400)

I want to give an example, because we know that one of the major problems is that producers and often processors will use a term, such as “ice cream”, when no cream is used. Often, milk is used. So, it is ice milk, not ice cream.

Furthermore, chemicals are frequently used to make ice cream, so it really is not ice cream at all. Many people listening think that when they eat ice cream they are eating cream. But they are not.

All we want is to ensure that the product label and advertising reflect the ingredients used to produce that product. It is as simple as that. That is the aim of this bill.

To this end, there are even some exceptions allowed. For the benefit of everyone listening, I am referring to clause 6(8). Exceptions include all generally recognized products, such as peanut butter.

Why do we call it “butter”? It is because it has the texture of butter. No one in the House wants to prevent peanut butter manufacturers from using the term “peanut butter”.

However, what we do not want is for terms to be used for items that are not found in the composition of the products. I will give

some examples: chocolate cream pie without cream; butter cream glaze without butter; buttered popcorn without butter; ice cream without cream. These are things we want to avoid. It is as simple as that. It is easy to understand.

I have a problem with the government telling us that the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is looking at a global labelling method for all products. I would not mind, but in the meantime, our dairy farmers are spending \$75 million a year on advertising their products only to be outdone by manufacturers who do not hesitate to use dairy terms.

I would like to reiterate that milk is a raw commodity. We have all consumed milk in our lives. We are not about to start comparing this product with all other products. We are inundated with products. Hon. members know that all sorts of things come on the market.

That is why labelling is very important. There are GMOs and all sorts of other things. One day we will have to be able—and I agree with the government on this—to label all the products that turn up in our stores and on our shelves.

However, no one can tell me that milk is not a product that we know. We all have drunk milk at least once in our life. Think about it. Perhaps the hon. members do not remember, but it is clear that we have all drunk milk.

Obviously the bill before us today sets some things straight, because, in fact, too many middlemen and industrialists use these terms to make money. These terms do not reflect reality.

In this respect, if only for the sake of mothers and children, we must at least try to raise the next generation by telling them, “No one has the right anymore to tell you things that are unrealistic or untrue”. When the word “dairy” is used, it will be because there is truly a milk component present in the product.

I hope that I will be one of those who has a chance to vote in favour of this bill and will be able to say to his children and grandchildren, “For several generations, we were pushed around by industry, which tried to use by-products to make its incredible profits”.

Therefore, we can set this right again. It would be one good thing we could do for the dairy industry, children and mothers, so that everyone listening to us and everyone who comes after us, will understand that the members of this House decided that, in the dairy industry, when a product is sold as a milk product is must truly be a milk-based product.

Therefore I am pleased to state that the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of this bill.

● (1405)

Hon. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about this bill.

Private Members' Business

First, I want to dissociate myself from the remarks we just heard, which I do not find very kind—in fact I find them rather harsh—toward Canada's food processing industry.

This is a very important industry, in the dairy sector and in other sectors. We know the companies located in our region, be it the Saint-Albert Cheese Factory, in my riding, or others such as Ault Foods, elsewhere. These are important industries in our country, and I think they have a very good reputation as regards food safety, ethics and so on. I do not feel that they deserve to hear such criticism.

Second, it must be recognized that several shareholders in the agri-food industry are farmers themselves. There are a number of cooperatives. Take for example one of the largest ones in the country. We know it well, because it is located in Quebec. Earlier, I mentioned cooperatives in my riding, such as the Saint-Albert Cheese Factory, or others elsewhere in the country.

So, one should avoid making such gratuitous accusations about the food processing industry.

This whole food labelling issue is not a simple one. Like others here, I grew up in the days when we used Beehive syrup, with a beehive on the bottle. Yet, as far as I know, Beehive syrup does not have any honey in it. It is made with corn extract, not honey extract. If there is honey in it, there is not much. In fact, there is probably none at all.

This is just an example.

[*English*]

I was raised in a household where there always was a brown can of maple spread in front of us. I do not even know whether that spread contains any maple syrup at all. I suspect it probably does not or not very much. It is maple flavoured or something like that. Maybe it has a little bit of maple syrup but probably not much. It is a form of caramel with seasoning. I think I have eaten enough of it to remember the taste, although it has been a long time since I ate that stuff.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member is telling us that the industry got me to eat a product using misrepresentation. When I was 7, 8 or 10 years old and I ate a product called “maple spread”, I did not eat it because it contained maple syrup. I ate it, as one might guess, because I thought it was good. That was why we ate that product.

That said, the hon. member opposite has made some good points about a certain number of issues. For example, when one goes to the grocery store, I think it is abnormal, and the dairy producers in my riding are always asking me this question, that in all the big supermarkets there is a big refrigerator with a sign saying “Dairy products” and that the margarine is always in there. But we know that margarine is not a dairy product. And in the flyers and the newspaper ads, as well as in the supermarket counters, this product is found in the dairy section.

It is arranged so that those who might usually buy a dairy product will perhaps be tempted to take the other product right next to it. In such a case, there is at least an attempt to get consumers to buy a product that is not the one they wanted.

On the other hand, we often find eggs in the dairy counter. I do not know anyone who could confuse eggs with butter. In that case, it is obvious that there is no attempt to confuse the consumer. Sometimes there is such an intention and sometimes not.

• (1410)

[*English*]

A little earlier I was pondering with some colleagues as to whether or not butterball turkeys contained butter. There are a number of other such questions that create confusion with the consumer. If it does, well all the better, but it is not always obvious that it does. To that extent I give credit to the MP for raising the issue and bringing it to our attention.

[*Translation*]

I am told that some of the bill's clauses, as they are currently worded, can produce the opposite effect to that intended by the hon. member across the way.

The department's experts have advised me, for example, that the terms “artificial butter flavour” and “imitation cheese” will not be allowed. I agree. However, from what I am told, the use of terms such as “butter flavoured” would also be restricted. It may be going too far to restrict the use of “butter flavoured” to describe a product containing natural butter extract. Perhaps that was not the intention when the bill was drafted; nevertheless, experts conclude that this is the effect of the bill.

The parliamentary secretary has taken a positive approach in his suggestion today. This is not a dilatory approach, as the member opposite said.

The government is not promising to undertake a study on packaging and labelling at a later date. It will not happen at a later date; consultations are underway as we speak. During the consultations, 2,000 adults were surveyed. According to the experts in this field, the accuracy rate is 95%.

We hold these consultations on the content of various food products. It would be important, in all of our undertakings, not to do anything to harm the food processing industry, and even less so the dairy farmers of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, and Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh, soon to become Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, or anywhere else. Our primary interest must be to protect farmers, as well as consumers, and we also need the consumer's support for what we are doing.

The hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel has said that the dairy industry spends a great deal of money on promoting its products. He claimed that the main reason for doing so was to counteract the bad guys in the food processing industry.

I do not feel that is their main objective. As far as I know, their campaign is to make the consumer realize that what we were told in past years was incorrect, for instance that eating a lot of cheese or other dairy products was somehow bad for the health. Now we know that was far from correct. We know that some of the fats people have been eating in substitutes for butter or other dairy products are very bad for us, and that in fact dairy products have some very beneficial effects.

All this to say that the campaign run by dairy producers seeks to inform the public and increase the consumption of their products which, in my opinion, are excellent. To claim that if we eat cheese we will all end up weighing 150 kilograms is not necessarily true. If this were the case, I would be very heavy, because I probably eat more cheese than most hon. members do. My colleagues are always teasing me about my dairy product consumption, particularly cheese, which I eat in very large quantities.

The things that we were told in the past are not necessarily true and the dairy industry knows that. It has quite rightly decided to inform consumers about the very high quality of its products, and I support this initiative.

• (1415)

Also, the dairy industry just went through some very difficult times. I mentioned this this morning in the House. During oral question period, I raised the issue that prices for culled cows or even heifers are terrible. We must support the agricultural community in this regard.

If the bill is reviewed in committee, some major amendments will be necessary. We must protect our producers, but we must also preserve consumers' confidence, because we want them to buy the excellent food items made by dairy producers from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell and elsewhere.

[English]

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to participate in this debate today and to listen to the comments made by members.

It is a very interesting topic to think about such things as milk and dairy products. These are products that are the stuff of life that we have all grown up with, and to realize that there is a discrepancy and confusion sometimes about what terms are being used and what the foods really are that we are seeing in the grocery stores.

I just read a book called *Fast Food Nation*. It is an interesting look at fast foods, but also the whole flavouring industry, and the chemical creation of taste, flavours and scents that are overtaking our food industry. Therefore, it is not at all unreasonable for us to be asking, what is it that we are eating? I think that is the question that the member for Saskatoon—Wanuskewin is trying to get at and I support his efforts in that respect.

My colleagues and I in the NDP believe that fair labelling practices are important for today's Canadian families who have a bewildering array of products facing them during every trip to the supermarket. The average supermarket today has over 35,000 products, which is an incredible number.

Private Members' Business

Whether we actually benefit from that enormous choice and whether the quality of our lives has been improved by the kind of choice is another debate and we are not going to talk about it here. However, it does lead families and shoppers to want to have accurate labelling on products so that they can make decisions about what foods they are buying. With so many products, the average shopper cannot hope to scan each and every one of them before making their purchasing decisions.

This bill would provide consumers with accurate information on the ingredients of the products they choose. Consumers depend on the name of a product to decide if it is something they want since most lists of ingredients are small and written in common terms using words like hydrogenated and disodium phosphate. These are confusing technical terms that people do not understand. They want to have faith in the labelling and do not want to be misled.

New Democrats are also concerned about the impact that labelling can have on Canadians with low literacy skills. Misleading product names can prove especially confusing for people who are not able to get through the language as easily. They depend on words they know to make purchasing decisions. Also, seniors and other Canadians with low vision depend on the larger fonts of product names instead of the smaller fonts of ingredient listings to make their decisions.

Therefore, when they see the word dairy, milk or cheese, they get a comfort level from that and that helps them make a decision. In fact, we must ensure that they are not being bamboozled and that, in fact, it is a true representation of what they are buying.

My colleague from Winnipeg North Centre has a private member's bill before the House on food labelling. That bill's intent is to ensure that consumers will know whether a product has genetically modified ingredients before they make purchasing decisions. It is another fair practice that Canadians want so that they can trust in the product that they are buying.

As the member who brought forward the bill has mentioned, at the present time federal legislation does not have adequate protection for the use of dairy terms and that is just not acceptable. For example, the Food and Drugs Act and the Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act prohibit false and misleading labels, but what constitutes false and misleading labels in the dairy context is not fleshed out.

• (1420)

The dairy products regulations made under the Canada Agricultural Products Act do contain labelling requirements, but these only apply to standardized dairy products, for example what has to be on the label of cheddar cheese once it has met the standard. Federal legislation does not deal with the issue of the improper use of dairy terms and images on imitations or on substitutes.

Each year, Canada's dairy producers spend over \$75 million advertising dairy products and promoting the nutritional benefits of dairy products. The good reputation and nutritional value of dairy products is being usurped by products which claim to have the same qualities as dairy products but which do not.

Private Members' Business

As I understand from my colleague from Saskatoon—Wanuske-winnipeg, the dairy terms act embodies the principles that were adopted at the international level by the Codex Alimentarius Commission in 1999 in the general standard for the use of dairy terms. Canada supported this standard at the international level. Canada should provide that same level of protection for dairy terms at the domestic level. It seems very straightforward to me.

Most important, the bill prohibits a dairy term from being used when a food or an ingredient in a food is intended to replace a dairy product or a dairy ingredient. It prohibits using a dairy term in conjunction with the words “flavour” or “taste” when the food is not milk, a milk product or a composite milk product.

The dairy terms act deals with the correct use of dairy terms in the marketing of food. It does not prohibit food from being made.

I support this bill. I support efforts always to clarify language and clarify the meaning of language. I support any efforts to make it easier, not more difficult, for citizens to understand the nutritional value of the foods and beverages that they are buying in the supermarket. I will be supporting this bill when it comes to a vote.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, although I know it is against all the rules, I have to note the absence of the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who could not wait to leave the House because there is cheese in the lobby, and cheese does not last long when the member is around. I have the same fondness for milk and I have absolutely no interest in drinking something that pretends it is milk or is like milk.

I think all of us are much more aware of what we eat and how it affects our health, not only immediately but over the long term. A good part of that is wanting to know what is in the food we are eating, what really is behind what it may appear to be, what it may be coloured to look like or what it may be described as.

There is certainly a very strong interest in the public in knowing what is in the food we are buying, as there is for me. Labelling is a very important component of that. I recognize how extremely important the dairy industry is to the country. It is an industry that produces \$4.1 billion worth of farm cash receipts in a year. It accounts for nearly 14% of all processing sales in the food and beverage industry. It employs 38,000 people on farms and another 26,000 workers at the primary processing level, and it imposes strict quality standards at both the farm and processing levels so that we are assured of quality food when we buy dairy products.

However, the bill would affect more than the dairy industry. It would affect other areas of the agrifood industry. It relates to how the

industry develops new products. It may in fact limit some of the potential for innovation in the agrifood industry as a whole. Because it is not only the dairy industry that would be affected by the results of the bill, I would suggest that the approach taken by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, that is, to look at labelling more broadly and to consult with processors, consumers and other segments of the food and agrifood industry, is perhaps the more responsible one to take.

In fact, that approach would take into consideration a number of different points of view and different interests that would be affected by the content and the intent of the bill. It would indeed move toward responsible and honest labelling of food, but in a way that does not favour one segment of the industry over the other, that does not go so far in protecting one industry that it may harm others and may in fact go beyond what is needed for the kind of accurate and fair information that consumers are looking for in their packaging.

I do applaud the intent of the bill. However, I do think it is important that we look more broadly at the issue of labelling food and not have a number of bills coming forward to deal with this sector of the agrifood industry and another bill dealing with another so that we would have a mishmash of labelling requirements that may in fact run contrary to one another.

I do believe in the approach the agency is taking in trying to bring all these requirements together in order to bring forward something that is comprehensive and integrated and also respects the kind of information consumers want as to nutritional value, fatty content and all the other things we have started taking an interest in, both for our own personal health and for the health of the generations to come.

I believe that a broader approach is needed here. It may take a little more time but I think the end product will be much more to the benefit of the dairy industry, of consumers and of the agrifood industry in Canada as a whole.

• (1425)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

It being 2:30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday March 22 at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28 and 24.

(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 Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MRS. BETTY HINTON

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. LOYOLA HEARN

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

HON. MAURIL BÉLANGER

HON. JACQUES SAADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Third Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brison, Hon. Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Canada-U.S.)	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Bryden, John	Ancaster—Dundas— Flamborough—Aldershot	Ontario	CPC
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale—High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Burton, Andy	Skeena	British Columbia	CPC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	British Columbia	CPC
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington— Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Quebec	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec Est	Quebec	Ind.
Carroll, Hon. Aileen, Minister for International Cooperation	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	Nova Scotia	CPC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	CPC
Castonguay, Jeannot	Madawaska—Restigouche	New Brunswick	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Hon. Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada	Guelph—Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Charbonneau, Hon. Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (Emergency Preparedness)	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	Lib.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	CPC
Clark, Right Hon. Joe	Calgary Centre	Alberta	PC
Coderre, Hon. Denis, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Minister responsible for la Francophonie and Minister responsible for the Office of Indian Residential Schools Resolution	Bourassa	Quebec	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—St. Clair	Ontario	NDP
Comuzzi, Hon. Joe, Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Cotler, Hon. Irwin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	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	CPC
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	CPC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Hon. Paul	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dhaliwal, Hon. Herb	Vancouver South—Burnaby	British Columbia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland and Labrador	CPC
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CPC
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Efford, Hon. R. John, Minister of Natural Resources	Bonavista—Trinity— Conception	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Art	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	CPC
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	CPC
Eyking, Hon. Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Agri-Food)	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Farrah, Hon. Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Rural Development)	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de- la-Madeleine—Pabok	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CPC
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Hon. Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Science and Small Business)	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam —Burnaby	British Columbia	CPC
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Frulla, Hon. Liza, Minister of Social Development	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint- Paul—Pointe Saint-Charles	Quebec	Lib.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Sébastien	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	Quebec	BQ
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing— Pembroke	Ontario	CPC
Galloway, Hon. Roger, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Samia—Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gaudet, Roger	Berthier—Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, Hon. John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Cities)	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton Centre-East	Alberta	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Finance	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay—Boundary— Okanagan	British Columbia	CPC
Graham, Hon. Bill, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	CPC
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Hon. Albina, Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister of State (Civil Preparedness)	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency— Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CPC
Harper, Stephen	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CPC
Harris, Richard	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	CPC
Harvard, Hon. John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	Charleswood St. James— Assiniboia	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, Hon. André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Quebec	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	Newfoundland and Labrador	CPC
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Hon. Grant, Leader of the Opposition	Macleod	Alberta	CPC
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	CPC
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CPC
Hinton, Betty, Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	British Columbia	CPC
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	CPC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce— Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Jobin, Christian	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la- Chaudière	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CPC
Jordan, Hon. Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	CPC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CPC
Keyes, Hon. Stan, Minister of National Revenue and Minister of State (Sport)	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole	Stormont—Dundas— Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Hon. Gar, Minister of State (New and Emerging Markets)	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	Lib.
Lastewka, Hon. Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	Ind.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
LeBlanc, Dominic	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CPC
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish— Guysborough	Nova Scotia	CPC
Macklin, Paul Harold	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Mahoney, Hon. Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Hon. Gurbax, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Bramalea—Gore—Malton— Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	Quebec	BQ
Marcil, Hon. Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Quebec	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Manitoba	CPC
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ind.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Right Hon. Paul, Prime Minister	LaSalle—Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	Ontario	NDP
Matthews, Bill	Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	British Columbia	CPC
McCallum, Hon. John, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Markham	Ontario	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Hon. Joe, Minister of Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	British Columbia	CPC
McTeague, Hon. Dan, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock— Langley	British Columbia	CPC
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	Alberta	CPC
Milliken, Hon. Peter, Speaker	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	CPC
Mills, Dennis	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Beaches—East York	Beaches—East York	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.....	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Moore, James.....	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	CPC
Murphy, Hon. Shawn, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.....	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island....	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo—Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert.....	Kenora—Rainy River.....	Ontario	Lib.
Neville, Anita.....	Winnipeg South Centre.....	Manitoba	Lib.
Normand, Hon. Gilbert	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador.....	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London—Fanshawe.....	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton—Victoria—Brock ..	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak.....	Calgary East.....	Alberta	CPC
Owen, Hon. Stephen, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel ..	Quebec	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Hon. Rey, Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar.....	Manitoba	CPC
Pankiw, Jim.....	Saskatoon—Humboldt.....	Saskatchewan	Ind.
Paquette, Pierre.....	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Denis, Minister of State (Financial Institutions)	Brome—Missisquoi.....	Quebec	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie.....	Peace River.....	Alberta	CPC
Peric, Janko.....	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.....	Quebec	BQ
Peschisolido, Joe	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Minister of International Trade.....	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister of Health, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Official Languages...	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth.....	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Hon. Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (Border Transit).....	Chatham—Kent Essex.....	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	Quebec	BQ
Pratt, Hon. David, Minister of National Defence	Nepean—Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, Hon. David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Compton—Stanstead	Quebec	Lib.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proulx, Marcel.....	Hull—Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie.....	Ontario	Lib.
Rajotte, James	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	CPC
Redman, Karen.....	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Regan, Hon. Geoff, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Carleton	Ontario	CPC
Reynolds, John, West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	CPC
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CPC
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	Quebec	BQ
Saada, Hon. Jacques, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister responsible for Democratic Reform	Brossard—La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Savoy, Andy	Tobique—Mactaquac	New Brunswick	Lib.
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Middlesex	Ontario	CPC
Scherrer, Hon. Hélène, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	Lib.
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	CPC
Scott, Hon. Andy, Minister of State (Infrastructure)	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Sgro, Hon. Judy, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Simard, Raymond	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Skelton, Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CPC
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CPC
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	Alberta	CPC
Speller, Hon. Bob, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Spencer, Larry	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	Ind.
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	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	British Columbia	CPC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	CPC
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Hon. Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Aboriginal Affairs)	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibault, Hon. Robert	West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	CPC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	CPC
Tirabassi, Tony	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Toews, Vic	Provencher	Manitoba	CPC
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Ontario	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski-Neigette-et-la Mitis	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex...	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Hon. Tony, Minister of Transport.....	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle	Prince Edward—Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CPC
Venne, Pierrette.....	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert.....	Quebec	Ind. BQ
Volpe, Hon. Joseph, Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development.....	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest.....	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre.....	Manitoba	NDP
Wayne, Elsie.....	Saint John	New Brunswick.....	CPC
Whelan, Hon. Susan	Essex.....	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford.....	British Columbia	CPC
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CPC
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John.....	St. Albert	Alberta	CPC
Wood, Bob.....	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
Yelich, Lynne.....	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CPC
VACANCY	Ottawa-Centre	Ontario	
VACANCY	Etobicoke	Ontario	
VACANCY	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Third Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harris, Richard	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	CPC
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	CPC
Hinton, Betty, Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	CPC
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CPC
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Ind.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	CPC
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	CPC
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	CPC
Moore, James	Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Owen, Hon. Stephen, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Peschisolido, Joe	Richmond	Lib.
Reynolds, John, West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	CPC
Robinson, Svend	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	CPC
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	CPC
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	CPC
White, Ted	North Vancouver	CPC

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Hon. Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Blaikie, Hon. Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	CPC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Harvard, Hon. John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	CPC
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	CPC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Hon. Rey, Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	CPC
Simard, Raymond	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Toews, Vic	Provencher	CPC
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour and Minister responsible for Homelessness	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
Castonguay, Jeannot	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, Minister of State (Infrastructure)	Fredericton	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	CPC
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	CPC

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)

Barnes, Rex	Gander—Grand Falls	CPC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	CPC
Efford, Hon. R. John, Minister of Natural Resources	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	CPC
Matthews, Bill	Burin—St. George's	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Lib.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)

Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Minister of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
--	----------------	------

NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Brison, Hon. Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Canada-U.S.)	Kings—Hants	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	CPC
Cuzner, Rodger	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Agri-Food)	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	CPC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	CPC
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Hon. Geoff, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley— Eastern Shore	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert	West Nova	Lib.

NUNAVUT (1)

Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
------------------------	---------	------

ONTARIO (103)

Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Hon. Jean, Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Status of Women)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Hon. Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald, Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril, Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn, Minister of State (Public Health)	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Hon. Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development (Student Loans)	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
Bryden, John	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Aldershot	CPC
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Hon. Aileen, Minister for International Cooperation	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Hon. Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—St. Clair	NDP
Comuzzi, Hon. Joe, Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Hon. Paul	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Art	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Hon. Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Science and Small Business)	London North Centre	Lib.
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CPC
Galloway, Hon. Roger, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, Hon. John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Cities)	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Hon. Bill, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Hon. Albina, Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister of State (Civil Preparedness)	Mississauga East	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Lib.
Jordan, Hon. Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Hon. Stan, Minister of National Revenue and Minister of State (Sport)	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole	Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Hon. Gar, Minister of State (New and Emerging Markets)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Hon. Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Macklin, Paul Harold	Northumberland	Lib.
Mahoney, Hon. Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Hon. Gurbax, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
McCallum, Hon. John, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Markham	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Hon. Dan, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Hon. Peter, Speaker	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis	Toronto—Danforth	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Beaches—East York	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo—Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London—Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton—Victoria—Brock	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Peric, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Minister of International Trade	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Hon. Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (Border Transit)	Chatham—Kent Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, Hon. David, Minister of National Defence	Nepean—Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Carleton	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Middlesex	CPC
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Lib.
Sgro, Hon. Judy, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	York West	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Hon. Bob, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Hon. Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Aboriginal Affairs)	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, Hon. Tony, Minister of Transport	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle	Prince Edward—Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Hon. Joseph, Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Hon. Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.
VACANCY	Ottawa-CentreOntario	
VACANCY	EtobicokeOntario	

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence.....	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Hon. Joe, Minister of Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	Egmont	Lib.
Murphy, Hon. Shawn, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Hillsborough.....	Lib.
QUEBEC (75)		
Allard, Carole-Marie	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André.....	Richmond—Arthabaska	Ind.
Bachand, Claude.....	Saint-Jean.....	BQ
Bakopanos, Hon. Eleni.....	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Barrette, Gilbert.....	Témiscamingue.....	Lib.
Bergeron, Stéphane.....	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie.....	BQ
Binet, Gérard.....	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy.....	Québec Est	Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin.....	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Hon. Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (Emergency Preparedness)	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies.....	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Minister responsible for la Francophonie and Minister responsible for the Office of Indian Residential Schools Resolution	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Hon. Irwin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	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	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles.....	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude	Portneuf.....	Lib.
Farrah, Hon. Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Rural Development).....	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la- Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Frulla, Hon. Liza, Minister of Social Development	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul— Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec.....	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel.....	Champlain	BQ
Gagnon, Sébastien	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	BQ
Gaudet, Roger	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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, Hon. André, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Lib.
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Jobin, Christian	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	Lib.
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Lancôt, Robert	Châteauguay	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Ind.
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg—Jacques-Cartier	BQ
Marcil, Hon. Serge, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Lib.
Martin, Right Hon. Paul, Prime Minister	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, Minister of State (Financial Institutions)	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre, Minister of Health, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Official Languages	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Price, Hon. David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Compton—Stanstead	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Roy, Jean-Yves	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Saada, Hon. Jacques, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister responsible for Democratic Reform	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
Scherrer, Hon. Hélène, Minister of Canadian Heritage	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	Ind. BQ
VACANCY	Saint-MauriceQuebec	

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Anderson, David	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CPC
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CPC
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Minister of Finance	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	CPC
Skelton, Carol.....	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar.....	CPC
Spencer, Larry	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.....	Ind.
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin.....	CPC
Yelich, Lynne	Blackstrap	CPC
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Hon. Larry	Yukon.....	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of March 12, 2004 — 3rd Session, 37th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:	Guy St-Julien	Vice-Chairs:	Nancy Karetak-Lindell Maurice Vellacott	
Larry Bagnell	Stan Dromisky	Rick Laliberte	Lawrence O'Brien	(16)
Serge Cardin	John Duncan	Yvan Loubier	Chuck Strahl	
Brenda Chamberlain	André Harvey	Pat Martin	Andrew Telegdi	
David Chatters				

Associate Members

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

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Paul Steckle

Vice-Chairs:
Gerry Ritz
Rose-Marie UrGilbert Barrette
Rick Borotsik
Wayne Easter
Ken EppMark Eyking
Georges Farrah
Marcel GagnonHoward Hilstrom
David Kilgour
Larry McCormickJohn O'Reilly
Louis Plamondon
Dick Proctor

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
Joe Comartin
Paul Crête
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
John DuncanClaude Duplain
Reed Elley
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
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason KenneyMario Laframboise
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
John Maloney
Inky Mark
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
Pauline Picard
James RajotteScott Reid
John Reynolds
Jean-Yves Roy
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
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:	Sarmite Bulte	Vice-Chairs:	Jeannot Castonguay Gary Schellenberger	
Jim Abbott	Christiane Gagnon	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	James Lunney	(16)
Carole-Marie Allard	Gurmant Grewal	Wendy Lill	Dennis Mills	
Mark Assad	John Harvard	Clifford Lincoln	Caroline St-Hilaire	
Paul Bonwick				

Associate Members

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

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair:

Sarkis Assadourian

Vice-Chairs:
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Raymonde FolcoDiane Ablonczy
Colleen Beaumier
Sheila Copps
Hedy FryArt Hanger
Sophia Leung
Steve MahoneyInky Mark
Pat Martin
Grant McNallyYves Rocheleau
Andrew Telegdi
Byron Wilfert

(16)

Associate Members

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

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairs: Bob Mills
Paul Szabo

Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Bernard Bigras
David Chatters

Joe Comartin
Stéphane Dion
Sébastien Gagnon

John Godfrey
Charles Hubbard
Serge Marcil

Diane Marleau
Anita Neville
Julian Reed

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Paul Crête
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Bev Desjarlais
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley

Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy

Jason Kenney
Yvan Loubier
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
John Maloney
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds

Gerry Ritz
Svend Robinson
Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
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:**

Roy Cullen

Vice-Chairs:Nick Discepola
Monte SolbergRodger Cuzner
Odina Desrochers
Richard Harris
Rahim JafferSophia Leung
John McKay
Maria Minna
Massimo PacettiPierre Paquette
Gary Pillitteri
John Reynolds
Werner SchmidtAlex Shepherd
Robert Thibault
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(18)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Stéphane Bergeron
Bernard Bigras
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John DuncanReed Elley
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Roger Gaudet
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jim Gouk
Gurmant Grewal
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Loyola Hearn
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
Pat Martin
Philip Mayfield
Alexa McDonough
Grant McNally
Val Meredith
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Brian PallisterCharlie Penson
Gilles-A. Perron
Pauline Picard
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Carol Skelton
Kevin Sorenson
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Tom Wappel

Vice-Chairs: John Cummins
Bill Matthews

Andy Burton
Rodger Cuzner
Reed Elley
Georges Farrah

Ghislain Fournier
Shawn Murphy
Joe Peschisolido

Carmen Provenzano
Jean-Yves Roy
Gary Schellenberger

Paul Steckle
Peter Stoffer
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

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

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

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

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

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:	Bernard Patry	Vice-Chairs:	Stockwell Day Diane Marleau	
Stéphane Bergeron	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dan McTeague	Karen Redman	(18)
Scott Brison	Francine Lalonde	Deepak Obhrai	Raymond Simard	
Bill Casey	Paul Harold Macklin	Charlie Penson	Bryon Wilfert	
Art Eggleton	Alexa McDonough	Beth Phinney		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Cummins	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Yvan Loubier	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Gary Lunn	Svend Robinson
Sarkis Assadourian	Ken Epp	James Lunney	Yves Rocheleau
Claude Bachand	Mark Eyking	Peter MacKay	Benoît Sauvageau
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	John Maloney	Gary Schellenberger
Eleni Bakopanos	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Carol Skelton
Colleen Beaumier	Jim Gouk	Pat Martin	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Gurmant Grewal	Brian Masse	Kevin Sorenson
Bernard Bigras	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Darrel Stinson
Bill Blaikie	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Chuck Strahl
Rick Borotsik	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Greg Thompson
Garry Breitkreuz	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Sarmite Bulte	John Harvard	Bob Mills	Vic Toews
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Maurice Vellacott
Chuck Cadman	Grant Hill	Anita Neville	Elsie Wayne
John Cannis	Jay Hill	Lorne Nystrom	Susan Whelan
Rick Casson	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Randy White
Martin Cauchon	Betty Hinton	Pierre Paquette	Ted White
David Chatters	Rahim Jaffer	Pauline Picard	John Williams
Paul Crête	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Stéphane Bergeron	John Cannis	Mark Eyking	Charlie Penson	(9)
Bill Blaikie	Bill Casey	John Harvard	Susan Whelan	
Sarmite Bulte				

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Eleni Bakopanos	Stockwell Day	Keith Martin	Svend Robinson	(9)
Colleen Beaumier	David Kilgour	Charlie Penson	Yves Rocheleau	
Martin Cauchon				

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair: Paul Szabo

Vice-Chairs: Paul Forseth
Robert Lanctôt

Carole-Marie Allard
Leon Benoit
Brenda Chamberlain
Roger Gaudet

Joe Jordan
Walt Lastewka
Pat Martin

Anita Neville
Gilles-A. Perron
Alex Shepherd

Tony Tirabassi
Ted White
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

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

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

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

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

HEALTH**Chair:**

Bonnie Brown

Vice-Chairs:Gilbert Barrette
Rob MerrifieldDon Boudria
Diane Bourgeois
Gerry Byrne
Deborah GreyIvan Grose
David Kilgour
Réal MénardRobert Nault
Gilbert Normand
Svend RobinsonGreg Thompson
Susan Whelan
Randy White

(16)

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

HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:	Judi Longfield	Vice-Chairs:	Eugène Bellemare Brian Pallister	
Peter Adams	Libby Davies	Tony Ianno	Carol Skelton	(18)
Eleni Bakopanos	Reed Elley	Gary Lunn	Yolande Thibeault	
Paul Bonwick	John Finlay	Larry McCormick	Suzanne Tremblay	
Jeannot Castonguay	Monique Guay	Grant McNally		

Associate Members

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

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:	Brent St. Denis	Vice-Chairs:	Marlene Jennings James Rajotte	
Gérard Binet	Joe Fontana	Gurbax Malhi	Andy Savoy	(16)
David Collenette	Cheryl Gallant	Brian Masse	Carol Skelton	
Paul Crête	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Grant McNally	Lyle Vanclief	
Herb Dhaliwal				

Associate Members

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

JUSTICE, HUMAN RIGHTS, PUBLIC SAFETY AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Chair: Derek Lee

Vice-Chairs:

Chuck Cadman
Paddy Torsney

Sue Barnes	Paul DeVillers	John Maloney	Jerry Pickard	(18)
Garry Breitzkreuz	Robert Lanctôt	Richard Marceau	Kevin Sorenson	
Marlene Catterall	Lawrence MacAulay	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews	
Yvon Charbonneau	Peter MacKay	Pauline Picard		

Associate Members

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

LIAISON

Chair: Judi Longfield

Vice-Chair:

Tom Wappel

Peter Adams	Sarmite Bulte	Derek Lee	Brent St. Denis	(19)
Sarkis Assadourian	Charles Caccia	Pat O'Brien	Paul Steckle	
Raymond Bonin	Roy Cullen	Bernard Patry	Paul Szabo	
Don Boudria	Gurmant Grewal	Guy St-Julien	John Williams	
Bonnie Brown				

Associate Members

Gilbert Barrette	Raymonde Folco	Bill Matthews	Gerry Ritz
Eugène Bellemare	Paul Forseth	Rob Merrifield	Gary Schellenberger
Chuck Cadman	Yvon Godin	Bob Mills	Raymond Simard
John Cannis	Jay Hill	James Moore	Monte Solberg
Jeannot Castonguay	Marlene Jennings	Brian Pallister	Chuck Strahl
John Cummins	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Janko Peric	Paddy Torsney
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Robert Lanctôt	Beth Phinney	Rose-Marie Ur
Stockwell Day	Paul Harold Macklin	Marcel Proulx	Maurice Vellacott
Nick Discepolo	Diane Marleau	James Rajotte	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Bonnie Brown	Judi Longfield	Bernard Patry	John Williams	(7)
Roy Cullen	Pat O'Brien	Tom Wappel		

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:	Pat O'Brien	Vice-Chairs:	Jay Hill Janko Peric	
Rob Anders	Murray Calder	Lawrence O'Brien	David Price	(16)
Claude Bachand	Rick Casson	John O'Reilly	Jane Stewart	
Robert Bertrand	Cheryl Gallant	Louis Plamondon	Bob Wood	
Bill Blaikie				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Peter Goldring	James Lunney	John Reynolds
Diane Ablonczy	Jim Gouk	Peter MacKay	Gerry Ritz
David Anderson	Gurmant Grewal	John Maloney	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Deborah Grey	Inky Mark	Gary Schellenberger
Rex Barnes	Monique Guay	Keith Martin	Werner Schmidt
Leon Benoit	Art Hanger	Pat Martin	Carol Skelton
Stéphane Bergeron	Stephen Harper	Philip Mayfield	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Richard Harris	Alexa McDonough	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitkreuz	Loyola Hearn	Grant McNally	Darrel Stinson
Andy Burton	Grant Hill	Val Meredith	Peter Stoffer
Chuck Cadman	Howard Hilstrom	Rob Merrifield	Chuck Strahl
Bill Casey	Betty Hinton	Bob Mills	Greg Thompson
David Chatters	Rahim Jaffer	James Moore	Myron Thompson
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Anita Neville	Vic Toews
Stockwell Day	Gerald Keddy	Deepak Obhrai	Maurice Vellacott
Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Brian Pallister	Elsie Wayne
John Duncan	Francine Lalonde	Charlie Penson	Randy White
Reed Elley	Sophia Leung	Joe Peschisolido	Ted White
Ken Epp	Wendy Lill	Pauline Picard	Bryon Wilfert
Brian Fitzpatrick	Yvan Loubier	James Rajotte	John Williams
Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	Scott Reid	Lynne Yelich

SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Claude Bachand	Jay Hill	Carmen Provenzano	Rose-Marie Ur	(9)
Murray Calder	John O'Reilly	Peter Stoffer	Bob Wood	
Rick Casson				

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:	Don Boudria	Vice-Chairs:	Yvon Godin Raymond Simard	
Eugène Bellemare Roy Cullen Claude Drouin Christiane Gagnon	Rahim Jaffer Christian Jobin Jason Kenney	James Lunney Marcel Proulx Scott Reid	Benoît Sauvageau Benoît Serré Yolande Thibeault	(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson Roy Bailey Rex Barnes Leon Benoit Stéphane Bergeron Rick Borotsik Garry Breitzkreuz Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters 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 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 Pauline Picard Louis Plamondon James Rajotte	John Reynolds Gerry Ritz Gary Schellenberger Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson 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:	Marcel Proulx Chuck Strahl	
Garry Breitzkreuz Elinor Caplan Claude Duplain Roger Gallaway	Yvon Godin Michel Guimond Loyola Hearn	Dale Johnston Judi Longfield Lynn Myers	Carolyn Parrish Benoît Sauvageau Diane St-Jacques	(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson Roy Bailey Rex Barnes Leon Benoit Stéphane Bergeron Bill Blaikie Rick Borotsik Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters John Cummins Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral 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 Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton Rahim Jaffer Gerald Keddy	Jason Kenney Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Inky Mark Philip Mayfield Grant McNally Réal Ménard Val Meredith Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Lorne Nystrom Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Charlie Penson Dick Proctor James Rajotte Scott Reid	John Reynolds Gerry Ritz Gary Schellenberger Werner Schmidt Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Caroline St-Hilaire Darrel Stinson Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Vic Toews Paddy Torsney Maurice Vellacott Elsie Wayne Randy White Ted White John Williams Lynne Yelich
---	--	---	---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Marcel Proulx	Vice-Chair:		
Claude Duplain Yvon Godin	Lynn Myers	Benoît Sauvageau	Chuck Strahl	(6)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT

Chair:	Paddy Torsney	Vice-Chair:		
Yvon Godin	Michel Guimond	Marcel Proulx	Scott Reid	(5)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chair:	John Williams	Vice-Chairs:	Marlene Jennings Beth Phinney	
Maurizio Bevilacqua Odina Desrochers Paul Forseth Roger Gaudet	Peter Goldring Joe Jordan Walt Lastewka Dominic LeBlanc	Steve Mahoney Philip Mayfield Val Meredith	Shawn Murphy Alan Tonks Judy Wasylycia-Leis	(17)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders David Anderson Roy Bailey Rex Barnes Leon Benoit Rick Borotsik Garry Breitzkreuz John Bryden Andy Burton Chuck Cadman Serge Cardin Bill Casey Rick Casson David Chatters John Cummins Stockwell Day Bev Desjarlais	Norman Doyle John Duncan Reed Elley Ken Epp Brian Fitzpatrick Cheryl Gallant Jim Gouk Gurmant Grewal Deborah Grey Art Hanger Stephen Harper Richard Harris Loyola Hearn Grant Hill Jay Hill Howard Hilstrom Betty Hinton Rahim Jaffer Dale Johnston	Gerald Keddy Jason Kenney Gary Lunn James Lunney Peter MacKay Inky Mark Pat Martin Grant McNally Rob Merrifield Bob Mills James Moore Anita Neville Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Charlie Penson Gilles-A. Perron James Rajotte Scott Reid John Reynolds	Gerry Ritz Benoît Sauvageau Gary Schellenberger Werner Schmidt Alex Shepherd Carol Skelton Monte Solberg Kevin Sorenson Darrel Stinson Peter Stoffer Chuck Strahl Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Vic Toews Maurice Vellacott Elsie Wayne Randy White Ted White Lynne Yelich	
---	---	--	---	--

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE PROTECTION OF WITNESSES AND TESTIMONY

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Odina Desrochers	Marlene Jennings	Judy Wasylycia-Leis	John Williams	(4)

SREG

Chair:		Vice-Chair:	Paul Harold Macklin	
Gurmant Grewal	Céline Hervieux-Payette	Pat Martin	Caroline St-Hilaire	(5)

TRANSPORT

Chair:

Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairs:
John Cannis
James MooreRex Barnes
Bernard Bigras
Bev Desjarlais
Jim GoukCharles Hubbard
Ovid Jackson
Christian JobinJim Karygiannis
Mario Laframboise
John ManleyAlan Tonks
Susan Whelan
Lynne Yelich

(16)

Associate Members

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

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Stan Dromisky
Yves Morin

Joint Vice-Chair: Norman Doyle

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michael J. Forrestall
Noël Kinsella

Jean Lapointe
Vivienne Poy

Mark Assad
G rard Binet
Elinor Caplan
Claude Duplain
Marcel Gagnon
Roger Gallaway
Deborah Grey

Karen Kraft Sloan
Wendy Lill
Lawrence O'Brien
Louis Plamondon
Werner Schmidt
Diane St-Jacques
Darrel Stinson

(21)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Rex Barnes
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
John Cummins
Libby Davies
Stockwell Day
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
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston

Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
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
Beno t Sauvageau
Gary Schellenberger
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
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: Paul Harold Macklin

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron
Mac Harb
James Kelleher

Raymond Lavigne
Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin

Rex Barnes
Elinor Caplan
Paul DeVillers
Ken Epp
Raymonde Folco
Roger Gallaway
Peter Goldring
Michel Guimond

Derek Lee
John Manley
Pat Martin
Val Meredith
Lynn Myers
Caroline St-Hilaire
Tom Wappel

(24)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz
Andy Burton
Chuck Cadman
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Chatters
John Cummins
Stockwell Day
Norman Doyle
John Duncan
Reed Elley

Brian Fitzpatrick
Paul Forseth
Cheryl Gallant
Jim Gouk
Deborah Grey
Art Hanger
Stephen Harper
Richard Harris
Loyola Hearn
Grant Hill
Jay Hill
Howard Hilstrom
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Dale Johnston
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney

Gary Lunn
James Lunney
Peter MacKay
Inky Mark
Philip Mayfield
Grant McNally
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Charlie Penson
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
John Reynolds
Gerry Ritz
Benoît Sauvageau

Gary Schellenberger
Werner Schmidt
Carol Skelton
Monte Solberg
Kevin Sorenson
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson
Vic Toews
Maurice Vellacott
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Elsie Wayne
Randy White
Ted White
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Paul Martin	Prime Minister
Hon. Jacob Austin	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. David Anderson	
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Minister of Finance
Hon. Anne McLellan	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister of Health, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Official Languages
Hon. Jim Peterson	Minister of International Trade
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour and Minister responsible for Homelessness
Hon. Denis Coderre	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Minister responsible for la Francophonie and Minister responsible for the Office of Indian Residential Schools Resolution
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Minister of Western Economic Diversification
Hon. John McCallum	Minister of Veterans Affairs
Hon. Stephen Owen	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. Bill Graham	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Stan Keyes	Minister of National Revenue and Minister of State (Sport)
Hon. Bob Speller	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Joseph Volpe	Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development
Hon. Reg Alcock	
Hon. Geoff Regan	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Tony Valeri	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Pratt	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Jacques Saada	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister responsible for Democratic Reform
Hon. Irwin Cotler	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Judy Sgro	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Hélène Scherrer	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. R. John Efford	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Liza Frulla	Minister of Social Development
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Minister of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. Andy Scott	Minister of State (Infrastructure)
Hon. Gar Knutson	Minister of State (New and Emerging Markets)
Hon. Denis Paradis	Minister of State (Financial Institutions)
Hon. Jean Augustine	Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Status of Women)
Hon. Joe Comuzzi	Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Albina Guarnieri	Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister of State (Civil Preparedness)
Hon. Joe McGuire	Minister of Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Hon. Mauril Bélanger	Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Carolyn Bennett	Minister of State (Public Health)
Hon. Aileen Carroll	Minister for International Cooperation

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Hon. Scott Brison	to the Prime Minister (Canada-U.S.)
Hon. Joe Fontana	to the Prime Minister (Science and Small Business)
Hon. John Godfrey	to the Prime Minister (Cities)
Hon. Andrew Telegdi	to the Prime Minister (Aboriginal Affairs)
Hon. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of the Environment
Hon. John McKay	to the Minister of Finance
Hon. Yvon Charbonneau	to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (Emergency Preparedness)
Hon. Jerry Pickard	to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (Border Transit)
Hon. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Industry
Hon. Gerry Byrne	to the Minister of Health
Hon. John Harvard	to the Minister of International Trade
Hon. Larry Bagnell	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Brenda Chamberlain	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada
Hon. Walt Lastewka	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. Dan McTeague	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Mark Eyking	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Agri-Food)
Hon. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Rural Development)
Hon. Eleni Bakopanos	to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development (Social Economy)
Hon. Paul Bonwick	to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development (Student Loans)
Hon. Joe Jordan	to the President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Shawn Murphy	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Jim Karygiannis	to the Minister of Transport
Hon. David Price	to the Minister of National Defence
Hon. Roger Gallaway	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Sue Barnes	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Hedy Fry	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. André Harvey	to the Minister of Natural Resources

CONTENTS

Friday, March 12, 2004

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code	
Bill C-12. Third reading	1439
Mr. Grewal	1439
Amendment to amendment	1441
Mr. Casson	1441
Mr. Vellacott	1441
Mr. MacKay	1442

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Epilepsy Awareness Month	
Mr. Murphy	1445
Equalization	
Mrs. Yelich	1445
Angel Hair For Kids	
Mr. Reed	1445
Kidney Month	
Mr. Castonguay	1445
Women Parliamentarians	
Ms. Bakopanos	1445
Canadian Wheat Board	
Mr. Benoit	1446
Employment Insurance	
Mr. LeBlanc	1446
Women of Ciudad Juarez	
Ms. Guay	1446
Public Service	
Mr. Bellemare	1446
Federal Election	
Mr. Gouk	1446
Softwood Lumber	
Mr. Brison	1447
Violence Against Women	
Ms. Wasylcyia-Leis	1447
Social Housing	
Mr. Bergeron	1447
International Women's Week	
Mr. Proulx	1447
Justice	
Mr. Casson	1448
South Vancouver Neighbourhood House	
Ms. Leung	1448
Turks and Caicos Islands	
Mr. Goldring	1448

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Sponsorship Program	
Mr. MacKay	1448
Mr. Goodale	1448
Mr. MacKay	1448
Mr. Goodale	1448
Mr. MacKay	1448
Mr. Goodale	1448
Mr. Toews	1449
Mr. Goodale	1449
Mr. Toews	1449
Mr. Goodale	1449
Ms. St-Hilaire	1449
Mr. Goodale	1449
Ms. St-Hilaire	1449
Mr. Goodale	1449
Mr. Sauvageau	1449
Mr. Goodale	1449
Mr. Sauvageau	1449
Mr. Goodale	1449
Canada Pension Plan Investment Board	
Ms. Wasylcyia-Leis	1450
Mr. Goodale	1450
Ms. Wasylcyia-Leis	1450
Mr. Goodale	1450
Sponsorship Program	
Mr. Ritz	1450
Mr. Goodale	1450
Mr. Ritz	1450
Mr. Goodale	1450
Mr. Benoit	1450
Mr. Goodale	1450
Mr. Benoit	1450
Mr. Goodale	1450
Ms. Gagnon (Québec)	1451
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra)	1451
Ms. Gagnon (Québec)	1451
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra)	1451
Mr. Laframboise	1451
Mr. Goodale	1451
Mr. Laframboise	1451
Mr. Goodale	1451
National Defence	
Mrs. Gallant	1451
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra)	1451
Mrs. Gallant	1451
Mr. Pratt	1452
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	1452
Mr. Pratt	1452
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	1452
Mr. Pratt	1452

Public Works and Government Services

Mr. LeBlanc	1452
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra)	1452

Child Benefits

Ms. Lill	1452
Mr. McCallum (Markham)	1452

Post-Secondary Education

Mr. Stoffer	1453
Mr. Goodale	1453

Sponsorship Program

Mr. Pallister	1453
Mr. Goodale	1453
Mr. Pallister	1453
Mr. Goodale	1453

Justice

Mr. Cadman	1453
Mr. Cotler	1453
Mr. Cadman	1453
Mr. Cotler	1453

Airline Industry

Mr. Crête	1453
Mr. Malhi	1454
Mr. Crête	1454
Mr. Malhi	1454

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Duncan	1454
Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale)	1454
Mr. Duncan	1454
Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale)	1454

Agriculture

Mr. Boudria	1454
Mr. Eyking	1454

Natural Resources

Mr. Hearn	1454
Mr. Goodale	1455
Mr. Hearn	1455
Mr. Efford (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)	1455

Fisheries

Mrs. Tremblay	1455
Mr. Regan	1455

Agriculture

Mr. Kilgour	1455
Mr. Eyking	1455

Sponsorship Program

Mr. Clark	1455
Mr. Owen (Vancouver Quadra)	1455

Health

Mr. Grewal	1455
Mr. Regan	1455

Taiwan

Mr. Bergeron	1456
Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale)	1456

Taxation

Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	1456
Mr. Goodale	1456

Health

Mr. Grewal	1456
Mr. Regan	1456

Canadian National Railway

Ms. Guay	1456
Ms. Sgro	1456

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency

Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	1456
Mr. McGuire	1456

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**National Defence**

Mr. Pratt	1457
-----------------	------

Parliament of Canada Act

Mr. Saada	1457
Bill C-24. Introduction and first reading	1457
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1457
Mr. Clark	1457
Mr. Saada	1457

Committees of the House**Procedure and House Affairs**

Mr. Proulx	1458
------------------	------

Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources

Mr. Laliberte	1458
---------------------	------

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Proulx	1458
Motion for concurrence	1458
(Motion agreed to)	1458

Petitions**Labelling of Alcoholic Beverages**

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	1458
--------------------------	------

Marriage

Mr. Vellacott	1458
---------------------	------

Income Tax Act

Mr. Vellacott	1458
---------------------	------

Child Pornography

Mr. Vellacott	1458
---------------------	------

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Brison	1458
------------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Parliament of Canada Act**

Mr. Saada	1459
Bill C-24. Second reading	1459
Mr. Hearn	1459
Mr. Sauvageau	1459
Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	1459
Mr. Clark	1460
(Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed) ..	1460

Criminal Code	
Bill C-12. Third reading	1460
Mr. Toews	1460
Mr. Vellacott	1462

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Public Accounts	
Mrs. Jennings	1463

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code	
Bill C-12. Third reading	1463
Mr. Vellacott	1463
Mr. Gouk	1465

Mr. Goldring	1465
Mr. Benoit	1466

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Dairy Terms Act

Mr. Vellacott	1468
Bill C-340. Second reading	1468
Mr. McCormick	1470
Mr. Eyking	1471
Mr. Laframboise	1472
Mr. Boudria	1473
Ms. Lill	1475
Ms. Catterall	1476

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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