

**CANADA** 

# House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136

NUMBER 057

2nd SESSION

36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT (HANSARD)

Friday, February 25, 2000

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent** 

# **CONTENTS**

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

# **HOUSE OF COMMONS**

Friday, February 25, 2000

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

# **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**(1005)** 

[Translation]

#### CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved that Bill C-2, an act respecting the election of members to the House of Commons, repealing other acts relating to elections and making consequential amendments to other acts, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to acknowledge the efforts of all those who were involved to varying degrees in the drafting of this bill, and thus in improving the Canada Elections Act.

I particularly wish to thank the committee members—a number of whom are present in this House as I speak—and to offer particular congratulations to the leadership of my parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River, and his predecessor, the hon. member for Peterborough.

It had become obvious that our elections act needed reforming. It dates back 30 years, as has been pointed out by numerous members from all parties. It was also important to amend the legislation to reflect a number of court decisions relating to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Action was therefore required, and action there was. Collective action, moreover.

Last fall, my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, pointed out, and rightly so, that this bill is not solely the creation of the government, but is indeed the fruit of a concerted effort by all parties represented in this House, the outcome of which is reflected in the report by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs released in June 1998.

It is also appropriate to point out, I believe, that this reform of our electoral process has its roots in the Lortie commission of 1991. In other words, our future elections act has taken close to nine years in gestation, parliament after parliament, committee after committee, study after study, consultation after consultation. A nine year gestation period.

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron: A white elephant.

Hon. Don Boudria: Yes, in fact, it is like four elephants in a row.

I will not dwell at length on the many stages we went through before undertaking this reform, because these are well known. However, I will mention the reports, three of them, from the chief electoral officer, which have guided our efforts and, of course, as I said, the work done by the former and current members of the committee.

Last fall, I took advantage of the parliamentary break to travel across the country to meet academics and students, and to talk to them about the reform that was taking shape.

[English]

What changes will be made by the bill? First, there a number of changes of an administrative nature. For example, the problem of voting hours in time zones that do not switch to daylight savings time has been corrected. We have also given returning officers the right to vote, which is certainly something that was due.

We are ensuring that the right of candidates to campaign in multiple unit residential buildings is protected by law so that people who own these large buildings cannot stop a candidate from entering if they happen to favour another political party.

• (1010)

We have also harmonized certain measures of the act which the requirements of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms have called for in various judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada, mainly the Libman decision. This includes the reintroduction of third party spending limits. I will come back to that point in a few minutes.

Finally, with regard to financing, we have attempted to make certain provisions of the act consistent with the economic reality of today; that is to say, to take into account the need to change some of the measures which were designed some 30 years ago.

Since Bill C-2 was introduced there have been some important changes. The Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs continued its important work throughout the fall. I know something about this because I was called upon to testify before the committee on at least three different occasions. The latest conclusions of the committee are reflected in Bill C-2. The committee made a number of amendments to the bill which I would like to outline to the House today.

Hon. members will recall that originally the Canada Elections Act included a blackout of some 72 hours before polling day. The supreme court felt that 72 hours was too long, but that a blackout was justifiable. The court felt that 72 hours was not justifiable and that in order for this blackout period to work there would have to be other elements to justify it.

We initially wanted a blackout period of 48 hours. Many people, including members of the House, told us they would not want to support that measure. Therefore, we eliminated the provision entirely, except for a blackout on voting day. That came largely as a result of representations which we received from western Canadians who felt that it was inappropriate to have the results in central Canada known to people in western Canada before they had voted themselves, something which we recognized some time ago. It was equally important to protect the new so-called exit polls from the night of the election from becoming known until people had actually voted themselves. We concur with that and the change has been made to reflect it.

We also have a blackout that establishes a cutoff for polls and ads to ensure that voters across the country have access to the same information before they vote.

If we think it is important for voters in western Canada not to have access to the results of the votes cast in eastern Canada, surely it is equally important for voting held previously and as manifested in exit polls not to be revealed before the voting is complete.

We had also decided to abolish the process of vouching, which allows voters in rural regions to guarantee the identity of their neighbours at the polling place, even if those neighbours have not been registered. Here, as well, we heard some concerns and we have agreed to extend this vouching process to all electoral districts subject to certain conditions. I want to thank the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre who made excellent contributions to the committee in this regard, and who offered amendments.

Another amendment he offered, which we accepted at report stage, would allow us to know the identity of people who give contributions through companies they own when those companies are numbered companies and do not otherwise have easily identifiable names. Now the names of the principals will be known.

I believe the hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes also made a contribution to that effect and I thank him as well.

**(1015)** 

[Translation]

An hon. member: Les Patriotes too.

**Hon. Don Boudria:** Les Patriotes too. We must not forget Les Patriotes.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew: They were great Liberals.

**Hon. Don Boudria:** The Minister for International Trade is reminding me that Les Patriotes were great Liberals, and I would not want to forget them.

Getting back to my speech, I do not want to get into partisan rhetoric, because it is not in my nature.

[English]

Another point of concern is the personal safety of electors. If there is reason to believe that the disclosure of electors' personal information, such as their address, would put them in danger, they would be allowed to indicate a former place of residence. This is very important for women who live in shelters for battered women. Their aggressors would not be able to find them because the address would not be on the voter's list. That was a side effect in the past when we had to print a permanent voter's list. We have made accommodation in the bill to protect those in danger of violence. This clause will now protect women who are living in battered women's shelters.

We also recognize the difficulties that can be encountered by persons with disabilities who need help to mark their ballots and who cannot get to the poll. An election officer will come to their residence now and assist them to vote in the presence of a witness of their choosing.

On the practical side of things, we have considered the future impact of new technologies in the polling process and, more specifically, their utilization. We will authorize the Chief Electoral Officer to develop an electronic voting process and put the process to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs to seek approval to test it.

I must thank the hon. member for North Vancouver who has been quite insistent on involving electronics and modernizing the electronic voting process. At his strong insistence, we put that item in the bill.

With regard to finances, there are a number of changes to the reporting procedures. It should be clear that from now on candidates can include expenditures for child care and the care of any dependants in their reimbursable expenses. Although this clause has been designed for everybody, I hope it will have a particular attraction to women who might want to be candidates. It is not the

be all and end all, but if it at least encourages a larger number of women to be candidates then it will have contributed toward the democratic process.

Another new measure lowers the veil on trust funds.

# [Translation]

Again, it is the hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes who brought this issue to our attention.

# [English]

The bill stipulates that the name and address of the original donor for any contribution over \$200 made through a trust created to promote the election of a candidate will now have to be clearly identified. I thank the hon, member for bringing that issue to our attention as well.

To respond to the technical concerns expressed by experts, the spending limits for candidates and political parties will be adjusted using the revised list of electors. We now have a larger than usual number of revisions on the permanent voters list. This meant that a candidate running for public office would often not have the total number of names. Therefore, when they set out campaign spending limits and found out later that there was a revision, they were unable to take into account the multiplier effect of the new people added on the voters list in order to increase the amount they were allowed to spend. This will now be taken in account because we have made that adjustment.

This is where I am afraid that perhaps some members, in particular my distinguished colleague from Vancouver North, might not agree with me. The most important financial reform of this bill relates to the participation of third parties in an election campaign.

# • (1020)

The elections act formerly imposed limits on third parties and candidates. Those of course had been thrown out by a court in Alberta and had not been appealed. The result of this was that in the last election campaign those who wanted to vote for a member of this House had spending limits in terms of what they could do to promote the candidate. However, anyone organizing to defeat a member of this House, effectively had no limit if they organized through a third party.

Call that third party the National Citizens' Coalition, call it the rifle group, call it anything else, it does not matter. Those who were outside of the candidate process could do virtually anything, could obtain funds entirely, if they wished, from outside of Canada, something that is illegal for the purpose of electing someone and they could participate indirectly in the electoral process that way.

Luckily the Libman decision in 1997 by the Supreme Court of Canada declared that control on third party spending would help to preserve the fairness of the democratic electoral process. Bill C-2 rectifies this and now puts in measures to control third party spending.

## [Translation]

The measures concerning third parties are based on three major principles. First, third parties have a right to participate in the electoral process. This is in compliance with the supreme court ruling in the Libman case.

Second, their spending should be restricted just like that of registered parties and candidates. That is perfectly normal.

Third, even if the third parties have important things to say, their spending should be subject to limits that are stricter than those of the candidates or the political parties, since, after all, still according to the Libman decision, according to the supreme court, the candidates and the political parties are the ones trying to get elected.

Second, naturally, the limits that apply to the third parties apply only to spending on advertising, whereas in the case of the candidates, the limits apply to almost all spending, including the cost of running an office, election headquarters, and so on.

We therefore are proposing to limit the advertising expenditures of third parties to \$150,000 nationally and to \$3,000 within each riding.

We are also proposing that third parties be required to register once their spending on advertising exceeds \$500. We want to avoid in this is having a group with a very small base, such as a school program wanting to write to a candidate, subject to such a limit. We do want to be reasonable. Therefore, only spending of \$500 or more would be subject to the elections act.

Members will agree that all these measures reinforce the three broad principles governing our electoral process, namely accessibility—it is expanded by this process—fairness—I think that, once again, with the measures on the third parties, and so on, the bill talks a lot about fairness—and transparency, which will be increased by the new ways of disclosing amounts and electoral spending.

Bill C-2 provides us with yet another opportunity to assert Canada's leadership in the electoral process and thus enlighten democracies the world over.

I am sure that all members will recognize the wisdom of the measures proposed and that they will take this opportunity to support them. Our electoral system is the envy of the world.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

**Hon. Don Boudria:** As is our country, and even the Bloc Quebecois members opposite who can hear me know it. No doubt that is what is behind the hubbub this morning.

#### **(1025)**

In conclusion, I know that other members wish to speak early on today so as to be able to make it home for the weekend. I thank them for their contribution throughout the process and congratulate them on a job well done. I would like to be able to jump the gun and congratulate them on their unanimous support for the bill, although I realize it is not impossible that one or two of them may decide to vote against it. After all, we are living in a democracy.

Mr. Louis Plamondon: May we ask questions?

**The Deputy Speaker:** No, there are no questions and comments for the first three speeches at third reading.

**Mr. Louis Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I seek the unanimous consent of the House to be allowed to ask a question of the member who just spoke.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[English]

**Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I will preface my comments today by pointing out that the government has moved time allocation on this bill. It is the 23rd time in this parliament that it has moved time allocation on a bill before the House. It has preliminarily closed debate on bills 23 times since the start of this parliament.

Bill C-2 is an example of a flawed bill that the Liberals want to ram through the House. They do not particularly want it to be examined in this public place so they have limited the time for debate. I can see the minister burying his head in shame. I want to remind him that since we began debating the bill in the House, the Reform Party has had only two hours and forty minutes out of a total of seven hours and twenty-three minutes to debate a bill which the minister himself has said, has not been dealt with for 30 years.

Before making my own comments, I will deal with a few things that were said by the minister. He said that we had improved the Canada Elections Act by combining the results of all the parties working together in the House. However, a few days ago we voted on the report stage amendments to Bill C-2 and there were close to 80 amendments proposed by the opposition. I think this shows the minister that the opposition was far from satisfied with the process to that point. If close to 80 amendments were being proposed at report stage, then the minister must be wrong when he says that the elections act has been improved.

He also mentioned that he had travelled during the break last fall to talk with academics and students across the country. The funny thing is, the minister would not allow the committee to travel across the country to talk with academics, students and interested parties even though we had made requests to do so. I actually heard him on the radio talk show CKNW in Vancouver. I remind the minister that the callers absolutely trashed the gag law component in Bill C-2 and he had a fairly rough ride from the callers on CKNW in Vancouver.

He also mentioned the Libman decision. I will come back to that in a little more detail because it does deserve some detailed comment, in particular because of a court ruling that came out of British Columbia on February 9. The minister knows that he is clutching at straws when he quotes Libman. He also knows that it will cost taxpayers a lot of money to defend this flawed bill. What he should have done was had discussions with third party interests and tried to reach some accommodation.

The minister also talked about the release of results and how things had been done in the bill to make sure that westerners did not see the results of the election before their polls had closed. Even the Chief Electoral Officer told the minister that with the Internet in place now it was almost impossible to prevent the transmission of results. If people want to see them they can dial up the website for Scarborough—Rouge River, for example, where they may have already posted their own local results after the polls close in Ontario. There is really no effective way of preventing the distribution of results.

The publication of polls is another area that has just come under court challenge in British Columbia. A very important result came out of the province on February 9 which put into question the entire section of the bill to do with publication of polls. I will deal with that a little later as well. I will come back to third party spending limits too because they are an important part of the bill.

# • (1030)

As the minister wrapped up his speech he mentioned our electoral system being admired around the world. That is just plain wrong. The Chief Electoral Officer was questioned at length in committee by members of all parties about the patronage system which is riddled throughout the elections act. The Chief Electoral Officer has no power over who is appointed as a returning officer or a deputy poll clerk. All those positions are patronage appointments put in place by the parties.

When the Chief Electoral Officer was asked whether he would recommend our Elections Act to any third world country or an emerging democracy, and I asked him that question, he said he would not. There is no way that he would recommend Canada's Elections Act to a third world country or an emerging democracy. He did not say what the minister just said, that our act is admired around the world. He said the act was not fit for a third world country. I remind the minister that the act is far from perfect.

Notwithstanding the fact that the minister took great pains to point out the various amendments that were finally accepted by the

# minister during the committee process, as I mentioned almost 80 amendments were proposed by the opposition parties in the House.

We went through a lengthy voting session two nights ago. We were up until 12.40 in the morning voting on almost 80 amendments. That proves absolutely that the opposition parties were not satisfied with what happened at committee.

It is now crystal clear that the government sent the bill to committee before second reading with the intention of keeping it out of the public spotlight, despite the claims of the minister that the process was designed to accommodate meaningful amendments.

Not very many significant amendments were made in committee, even though the official opposition, third party witnesses, the print media, broadcast witnesses, small parties and many other expert witnesses made suggestions, good ones, on ways in which the bill could have been made more democratic.

The elections act is so biased toward the parties with seats in the House that it is normal for any changes to the elections act to be slipped through on a Friday afternoon when there is hardly anybody here. I know the people who are watching this debate on television do not have a vista of the House right now, so they cannot see or have any idea who is here and who is not.

I know I am not allowed to mention the presence or not of members in the House, but it is a well known fact that when the government wants things to slip through quietly without too much attention it does it on a Friday afternoon when it can be done with a lot of ease because hardly any members are present.

In this case I know the minister started off thinking he would be able to push the elections act through in that manner. He was quite surprised to find that initially the official opposition was vigorously opposed to some parts of the bill. That was joined then by the other opposition parties and we turned it into a bit of a nightmare for the minister. He has moved closure on debate now to try to ram it through on a Friday before we all go home for a break.

Elections acts should be politically neutral and should be supported by all parties in the House. They should be supported by the Chief Electoral Officer. They should be supported by the voters. That is not the case with the elections act. It is opposed by all those groups.

The government has wasted an opportunity to modernize and democratize the act. The new act does little more than renumber the paragraphs in the old act. At the same time it tries to reintroduce sections that have already been struck down by the court. The bill maintains the most objectionable provisions of the old act, especially those that benefit the ruling party, which in this case is the Liberal Party.

The bill does nothing to address serious public concerns involving campaign financing, party registration requirements, the timing

#### Government Orders

of byelections, third party spending issues and patronage appointments within elections Canada.

The rights of electors and third party participants in the democratic process continue to be trampled by provisions which adopt a paternalistic role in terms of dictating how much money can be spent and presuming to decide for electors who is a frivolous candidate and who is not.

In drafting the bill the government virtually ignored the work of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, even though the minister made reference to that report. The government also ignored several decisions of various courts and the Supreme Court of Canada.

# • (1035)

The government is very inconsistent in the way it looks at court rulings. Given its past reluctance to go against any court ruling by introducing the bill and pushing it through the House, the government is saying that it is okay for the courts to make child pornography legal and to allocate fisheries according to race, but it is not okay to touch the elections act or anything that affects our ability to get elected, especially if it is the ruling party.

Returning to some specifics of the bill, I will deal first with third party spending. Let us look at the effect of third party spending. I think everybody would agree, if one candidate only has \$1,000 to spend—and that is certainly the case with some of the smaller parties—and another candidate like myself has an allowance of \$60,000, that there is an imbalance. I think everybody would agree that my \$60,000 would allow me to put up billboards and to run advertisements on radio and television. The smaller party candidate who only has \$1,000 would be lucky if he or she could put up one or two billboards and would truly be at a disadvantage.

If we are looking at the difference between \$100,000 and \$1 million in a riding there will not be much difference. If I could spend \$100,000 on billboards and advertisements and somebody else came along with \$1 million, he or she would have so many billboards and so many advertisements that it would actually be an irritation that would work against the interest of that third party. Even if there is an influence from third party spending, relatively speaking it is not great when we consider that candidates get to spend \$60,000 or more and the parties get to spend a lot more.

The minister spent a lot of time talking about Libman at which point I mentioned that he was clutching at straws. In Libman v Quebec the supreme court struck down the third party spending limit in the Quebec referendum act as too restrictive. It said that reasonable spending limits were both constitutional and desirable and left it up to the legislatures and parliament to determine a reasonable limit. However the supreme court decision is in conflict

with two separate decisions in the court of Alberta and the February 9 decision in the B.C. supreme court which struck down all third party spending limits as unconstitutional.

The supreme court decision dealt with spending during a referendum campaign whilst the other three courts dealt with spending during election campaigns. It therefore appears that the minister is clutching at straws when he uses the Libman decision based on referendums to try to defend a gag law in an elections act. Furthermore, the main evidence in the Libman case was based on the Lortie report which as the minister stated is some nine or ten years old. The Lortie report was based on a preliminary report by a UBC political science professor named Richard Johnston.

His report indicated that third party spending—and this was a preliminary report—might influence election outcomes. However, Mr. Johnston filed his final conclusions a few years later in which he said that third party endorsements had no discernible effect on election outcomes. That is the flaw in the Libman case.

In his ruling in the B.C. case Justice Brenner stated that there was no evidence which would allow him to conclude that third party spending or advertising had any impact on voter intentions and that to override charter rights it was necessary that there be more than a general hypothetical concern about a problem when there was no evidence the problem existed in the past or is likely to exist in the future.

The Libman case was based on the Lortie report, which was based on flawed evidence. The B.C. court pointed out that flawed evidence. If the minister forces the issue back into court—and certainly the Canadian Taxpayers Federation and the National Citizens' Coalition have said they would take it there—he will lose. There is no doubt that referendum spending is different because it only relates to a yes and no answer to a question, whereas elections involve an enormous number of issues and candidates. The same rules cannot be applied, and in any case not a single study in the world indicates that third party spending can be linked conclusively to an election result.

• (1040)

Mr. Gerald Chipeur, a constitutional lawyer with the firm of Fraser Milner, has successfully challenged unfair sections in both the provincial and federal elections acts. He told the procedure and House affairs committee that the Libman decision would likely not survive a challenge because of its applicability to referendums rather than to elections.

In addition, one group that appeared before the procedure and House affairs committee was Environment Voters. In support of its arguments against third party spending limits, it provided an opinion letter from barrister Clayton C. Ruby of Ruby and Edwardh, a law firm in Toronto. In his letter Mr. Ruby stated that in his view third party spending limits could not be justified under the constitution. He also made reference to the Libman decision by stating:

—these limitations were postulated by the Court in the context of a simple yes/no proposition being put to the electorate of one province. Limitations that are appropriate to this kind of narrow and focused question are simply inappropriate to the broad complexities and shaded nuances of a many sided campaign for a general election. . It believe these new proposals for a campaign spending limitation are flatly unconstitutional.

The supreme court passed an opinion on the Alberta court's striking down as unconstitutional spending limits in the elections act. The supreme court put out its opinion that it did not think the Alberta court's ruling was valid in terms of elections even though the supreme court had not studied the evidence. It was not a ruling based on evidence. Yet the minister continues to cite the supreme court's comments as justification for imposing spending limits on third parties.

Far from levelling the playing field, if the supreme court decision were to be upheld it would give advantage to the Liberals because it restricts the ability of any other person or group to counter government propaganda during an election.

The new bill limits third party spending to \$150,000 for a general election, of which no more than \$3,000 may be spent in any particular riding. This is in stark contrast to the total election spending limit for the Liberal Party of Canada which is close to \$30 million. Of this amount, approximately \$18 million is allocated to its 301 candidates in the form of their individual campaign expenses, while the remaining \$11 million can be spent directly by the party.

By way of comparison, for the 1997 general election the election expenses limit for the Bloc Quebecois was \$3.02 million. For the PC Party it was \$8.5 million. For the NDP it was \$11.4 million and for Reform it was \$8.5 million. Let us remember that these were the maximum amounts allowed and not necessarily the actual amounts spent. They are based partly on the number of candidates running.

I already mentioned that the National Citizens' Coalition and the Canadian Taxpayers Federation intend to challenge third party spending limits as unconstitutional. They are confident of winning their case based on what has been learned from the Alberta, the B.C. and the Quebec court decisions.

It is not the place of the government to limit the right of individual Canadians or groups of Canadians to spend their own money in support of a cause or candidate. The right to spend one's own money on election advertising is a right which is just a valid for the poor as it is for the wealthy. It would have been a much better approach to consult with third party interests across the country in an effort to reach a compromise on reasonable spending

limits. That way the expensive cost of court challenges, which will eventually strike down all the limits, could have been avoided.

In completing this section I would mention as evidence that third party spending cannot be tied directly to any outcome. During the referendum on the Charlottetown accord the yes side lost even though it spent 10 times as much as the no side. During the 1993 election the PC Party spent many millions of dollars more than any other party in the race and yet had only two members elected to the House. Reform, which spent one of the smallest amounts per member, had 54 members elected to the House. In addition, referenda conducted in Switzerland and California over several decades show no correlation between the amount spent by each side and the final voting result.

#### **•** (1045)

Even if third party spending did make a difference in elections, why would we be opposing that? Elections are supposed to be for the voters. If the voters are upset or pleased with any candidate, why should they not be permitted to spend their own hard-earned money on opposing or endorsing that candidate as they see fit? What right does the government have to interfere in their freedom to express their opinion about a candidate?

I am prepared as a member of this House to have any third party spend anything it wants in my riding. I believe that as long as members of the House are following the will of their constituents, they will not be removed from office. It is when they choose to represent their party view or their own personal view over the will of their constituents that they get kicked out of office. That is why many members are afraid of third party spending limits. They are afraid that if they do not obey their constituents' will and instead obey their party will or personal will, they will be thrown out of office.

I have one more quote from the ruling of the B.C. Supreme Court on February 9 regarding third party spending. The court said: "There are certain circumstances in which the goal of fairness in elections would support an argument for third party advertising. If in a future election campaign all of the parties were to agree on a significant policy point then the lack of third party advertising would mean that the people would be limited to the views of the major political parties and media commentators. The third party spending limits would effectively silence citizens who wished to express a contrary view".

That is an argument right from a judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia. It supports the idea of third party spending limits. I find that an interesting and supportable argument.

Turning to the publication of poll results during the blackout period, in the case of Thomson Newspapers v the Crown, previous legislation preventing the publication of poll results in the final 48

#### Government Orders

hours of an election campaign was struck down. The government is now imposing a 24 hour blackout even though the print media have declined to give any assurances that they will not again challenge this provision in court.

I would say that the print media probably have been encouraged to take this back to court by the ruling which just came down from the British Columbia court. The British Columbia court has struck down yet again any blackout provisions on the release of poll results and it went every further. It said there should not even be a requirement to print methodology for the polls. What the court in B.C. has said is that there is no right of government to interfere in the publication of polls or even the methodology for those polls.

The government rejected a suggestion that I made in committee and which was accepted as a compromise by the media, that they could print poll results right up until the time of the election but they would have to print the methodology so that voters would know how those poll results were obtained. The minister rejected that compromise. Now the court is striking down the entire provision that was in the act. We have ended up with something worse than if we had accepted the compromise which I negotiated with the parties during committee.

Clause 326 of the new elections act requires that the first person to transmit poll results and anyone who transmits them in the 24 hours thereafter, must provide the details of the poll methodology. However, in the recent Pacific press case in British Columbia, Justice Brenner struck down the provisions requiring publication of such information on the grounds that it offends the principle of freedom of the press which is guaranteed under section 2(b) of the charter of rights.

As in his ruling on the matter of third party spending, Justice Brenner applied the rule that in order for a law to justifiably override a guarantee under the charter, it must be demonstrated that there is a pressing and substantial need for such legislation. He concluded that there is no history of false or misleading elections opinion surveys being published, that there is no evidence that any individual has encountered any difficulty in obtaining methodological information from the sponsoring media outlet, and very few individuals are interested in obtaining such information beyond the customary information routinely provided by the media.

# **●** (1050)

Justice Brenner therefore concluded there is no pressing and substantial need for these requirements and he struck down the law. We now have the British Columbia case of February 9 pushing another section of the minister's elections act right out the window.

Public opinion begins to form long before the election writs are issued. It continues to be shaped throughout the election period and after based on the many types of information and issues that are being discussed. To suggest that voters will change their allegiance

on the basis of poll results a few minutes before they go to the polls is absolutely ridiculous.

In committee the Chief Electoral Officer of Ontario had this to say about blackout provisions: "I have concluded that the blackout has no truly useful purpose and therefore ought not to be imposed on the electorate for electoral process. It is unnecessary and it limits the constitutional right otherwise given to Canadians. I suggest that Bill C-2 not impose blackouts at all". He also stated that enforcement of blackout provisions is virtually impossible.

Constitutional lawyer Gerry Chipeur, whom I mentioned earlier, in his presentation to the committee said that of all of the provisions in this bill that fly in the face of court decisions, the blackout provision is the most certain to be struck down.

Turning to another court case on the requirements for registered party status, in March 1999 an Ontario court struck down the sections of the elections act which would require a party to run 50 candidates in an election to remain on the register and to have its candidates listed with party affiliation on the ballot. The court indicated that two candidates should be sufficient to constitute a party. However all of the small parties who appeared before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, including the Communist Party of Canada which had challenged the law and had it struck down, said that the number 12 as contained in a private member's bill which I had put forward to the House was an acceptable compromise.

All members will know that the number 12 relates to the recognition of party status in this House. The position I put forward in committee was that 12 was a sensible number as opposed to two, which most people would think was a bit low.

If the government had bothered to consult with the affected parties an acceptable compromise could have been reached because all of the parties agreed to 12. Then we could have finished this whole legal court challenge, put it to bed and we would have had a workable number in the bill. However, the minister refused to accept it and now that case is going to appeal on March 2 and 3, in a couple of weeks. Right about the time that this bill goes to the Senate we are going to have a court case probably striking down provisions in the bill. It is totally ridiculous the way the minister has handled this matter.

The court said that we could have a party of two people and that is clearly what the court will ultimately decide again. Instead of 12 we are going to end up with two. The minister foolishly has plunged ahead with his number when there is every piece of evidence to support a higher number.

In fact in committee when he was asked about it, the minister said, "Obviously given that I am the minister who suggested to have the appeal, I am of the opinion that it works just swell the way

it is". I think that shows the intransigence of the minister on this. He is quite happy to ignore the ruling of the Ontario Court of Appeal because he does not like the number 12 or the number two.

The position the official opposition takes is that elections are for the voters. The government takes the position that elections are for the parties. The reason it wants the 50 candidate rule is because it does not want competition from small parties. The government thought back in 1993 that the Reform Party would not be able to get 50 candidates so we would not be able to have our party name on the ballot. It thought that was a great way to prevent us from ever coming to the House of Commons. It was wrong because here we are.

The government is still trying to prevent any other party from getting a foothold in this place and it is wrong. Voters have a right to know that if there is a candidate on their ballot, that that candidate has a relationship to some other candidate in another riding by means of party affiliation. It makes sense for openness and the conveyance of information to voters that there be a party name on the ballot beside every candidate who is a member of a party, regardless of whether that party runs 12 candidates or 50 candidates in the election.

#### • (1055)

Turning to patronage appointments, one of the worst parts of the whole elections act and the piece that the Chief Electoral Officer criticized three times in three separate appearances at committee was the patronage appointments in Elections Canada.

The Chief Electoral Officer cannot even appoint his own returning officers. All 301 returning officers are appointed by the Prime Minister of Canada. They are Liberal patronage appointments to what should be non-partisan positions throughout Elections Canada. It is a disgrace. No wonder the Chief Electoral Officer will not even recommend our elections legislation to a third world country because of the patronage that is riddled throughout it. He told the committee how difficult it is to get rid of an incompetent returning officer because he cannot go to the Prime Minister and say "Your political appointee is incompetent and an idiot who should be removed from office".

Every one of the opposition parties tried to get the government to change that rule and to allow the Chief Electoral Officer to advertise based on competence and ability to do the job.

That whole system of patronage runs right through Elections Canada with all the political parties being able to appoint people at the lower echelons within the structure. Certainly many of my Reform colleagues and I refused to do that in the last election. We insisted that the returning officers advertise in the newspaper for qualified people. That is the way it should be done.

We are coming very close to question period. At this stage I would like to put forward an amendment.

#### I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following therefor:

Bill C-2, an act respecting the election of members to the House of Commons, repealing other acts relating to elections and making consequential amendments to other acts, be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs for the purposes of:

Reconsidering clause 350 in light of the B.C. Supreme Court ruling of February 9, 2000 that struck down gag law provisions in the B.C. Elections Act and prior similar rulings of the Alberta Court of Appeal with due regard for the constitutional right of Canadian citizens to free expression;

Reconsidering clause 370 in light of an Ontario court ruling that struck down provisions requiring political parties to endorse a minimum number of candidates in a general election in order for the party to be registered, with due regard for the right of small, regional and nascent political parties not to be disadvantaged such as by having their names excluded from the ballot;

Reconsidering clauses 324 to 328 in light of the B.C. Supreme Court ruling of February 9, 2000 that struck down provisions in the B.C. Elections Act imposing a blackout on the publication of poll results and requirements for the publication of methodological information, with due regard for the constitutional right of Canadians to free expression;

Reconsidering clause 13 with due regard for the democratic principle that the Chief Electoral Officer should be selected in a non-partisan and democratic fashion rather than being unilaterally and arbitrarily appointed by the government of the day;

Reconsidering clause 24 with due regard for the entreaties of the Chief Electoral Officer that he be allowed to hire returning officers according to merit as determined through competitions open to all qualified Canadians, to insulate the appointment process from partisanship;

Reconsidering clause 26 with due regard for the principle that the electoral system and all of its agents constitute the very foundation of the democratic process in Canada, and as such the appointment of assistant returning officers should be free of real or perceived political bias;

Reconsidering clause 34 with due regard for the importance of insulating the process for appointing deputy returning officers from patronage, nepotism and partisanship;

Reconsidering clause 35 with due regard for the principle that poll clerks should be hired impartially on the basis of merit rather than being appointed by the government of the day according to political affiliation;

Reconsidering clause 57 with due regard for the danger that the timing of general elections could be manipulated for reasons of political opportunism by the government of the day;

Reconsidering clause 59 with due regard for the right of Canadian citizens who are inflicted by natural or man-made disaster to have full and fair opportunity to participate in the electoral process;

Reconsidering clause 67 with due regard for the constitutional right of all Canadians, regardless of wealth, to be qualified for membership in this House; and

S. O. 31

Reconsidering clause 143 with due regard for the potential for abuse of the electoral process such as the casting of multiple ballots by a single voter on behalf of imaginary friends or the registration of household pets as voters.

**●** (1100)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Debate is on the amendment, and we will resume debate after Oral Question Period.

# STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

**(1105)** 

[English]

# GREAT LAKES BASIN ECOSYSTEM

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn your attention to one of the world's most important natural resources, our Great Lakes.

The area surrounding the Great Lakes is home to 8.5 million Canadians and is of great economic importance to Canada. Recognizing this, Canada and Ontario signed an agreement respecting the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem, crafted to restore and protect the ecosystem, to prevent and control pollution and to conserve species, population and habitats. A strong ecosystem is also integral to a healthy and vigorous economy.

Since signing the Canada-Ontario agreement water quality has improved substantially. Among the accomplishments is a significant decrease in the levels of contaminants in the lakes and an increase in the number of sentinel species, such as lake trout and osprey. Yet there is much more to be done. I make the plea for new funding to improve our waterways and enhance the quality of life for our citizens.

I call for the renewal of the Canada-Ontario agreement to ensure continued co-operation and co-ordination in this important endeavour. Above all else, let us leave an environmental legacy to our children.

. . .

# **HEALTH CARE**

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, 54% of Canadians say that health care is their number one concern.

The Minister of Health proposes more rounds of talks with the provinces, but not until May. We already know the system is not working. We know the status quo is not an option. We already know that health care is not sustainable.

Here is what the government does not tell us. Canada ranks 23rd out of 29 OECD countries for total health expenditures. The

# S. O. 31

provinces are having to devise their own strategies because the government shows no leadership. Above all, the disasters in health care continue.

We have a government which has misplaced \$1 billion. Ours is a country whose government has placed us in the bottom third of the OECD countries, below Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Will it take the total collapse of health care before this government gets off the fence and does something?

# \* \* \*

# **CANADIAN SOCCER**

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Canadian soccer team for making the finals in the Gold Cup.

After a stunning goal in the 68th minute of play, Canada beat Trinidad and Tobago 1 to 0 last night and will play Colombia on Sunday for the Championship of the Americas.

As a former soccer coach and the proud father of a soccer enthusiast, Matthew, I am particularly proud of Canada's soccer achievements.

A lot of expensive equipment, like hockey sticks, is not needed to play soccer. Players need a pair of shorts, good running shoes, energy, a quick mind and the desire to make some good plays. That is why soccer is the most universal sport in the world.

It encourages a common bond between players from Canada and other countries from all parts of every continent in the world.

Canada was ranked 85th in the world but beat 10th ranked Mexico. Our team is now in the finals for the Confederation Cup against Colombia on Sunday. This is truly an accomplishment.

Our congratulations to the coaches, players and all the volunteers who made this victory possible. They have made us all proud.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

# PARENTAL LEAVE POLICY

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, all those attending the Sommet de la Jeunesse in Quebec City, including the Quebec Liberals, reached consensus on the necessity for the Government of Quebec to repatriate the entire policy of parental leave.

In order to avoid distortions and waste, the Government of Quebec therefore asked the federal government to comply with the Emploment Insurance Act, which calls for the right to opt out with full compensation.

As is his usual habit, the Prime Minister said no. In so doing, he is saying no to the Government of Quebec, to the Liberal Party of Quebec, to the social and community organizations of Quebec, and the families of Quebec in particular.

Of course, keeping that program in Ottawa lends political visibility to the Liberal Party. They ought to have learned their lesson from the Human Resources Development Canada scandal: when visibility overrides public interest, it is a two-edged sword.

We are asking this government to put the interests of Quebec families before its partisan interests.

\* \* \*

• (1110)

[English]

#### THE BUDGET

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in last fall's throne speech the government made very significant commitments to increase the well-being of our nation's children and to undertake measures that improve the health of our natural environment.

Monday's budget will be the true measure of the government's commitment to both the children's agenda and to the ecological agenda.

\* \* \*

# **FUEL TAXES**

**Ms.** Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Beauséjour—Petitcodiac who are irate at the high gas and fuel prices.

It would seem that the federal government is once again turning its back on hard-working Canadians.

Not only has the high fuel tax hurt the trucking industry, it has also hit low income families especially hard, many of whom cannot handle any extra heating costs.

In 1995 the Liberal government raised gas taxes by 1.5 cents per litre as a means to lower the federal deficit. The deficit is gone. Can the government explain why the fuel tax still remains? Because of such extra taxes the Department of Transport enjoys a surplus in excess of \$6 billion per year, mostly due to fuel tax revenue increases.

Today I urge the Liberal government to take action immediately and lower fuel taxes to help all Canadians through this very difficult period.

# CHINESE CANADIAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week I was pleased to attend the Chinese Canadian Heritage Foundation inaugural gala in Vancouver. The gala raised money for the Chinese Canadian Heritage Foundation, which will be dedicated to preserving, recording and promoting Chinese Canadian heritage for all Canadians. This is the true spirit of Canada's multicultural society.

I would like to thank the co-chairs, Dr. Jan Walls and David Choi, the donors and the many volunteers who made this event a success.

The efforts of the foundation will let all Canadians know of the invaluable contributions which Chinese Canadians have made to our great country so we will have a better understanding and appreciation for each other.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Kitchener—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in May 1998 Industry Canada made a \$5.7 million investment under Technology Partnerships Canada in Research in Motion, RIM, Advanced Wireless Technology to develop the next generation of RIM's two-way messaging products.

TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS

The result is the small hand-held device called the Black Berry. This device was selected as the ultimate mobile computing tool of 1999 by *Info World* magazine for providing easy and timely wireless access to e-mail.

RIM, founded in 1984 in Waterloo, is the world leader in wireless technology. RIM is a great example of Canadian companies that compete and win on a global scale. Not only do we get back the \$5.7 million investment, we also get royalties. Technology Partnerships Canada also helped in the creation of hundreds of new jobs.

I congratulate Research in Motion and Industry Canada.

# THE BUDGET

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Monday is budget day. Canadians will see some tax relief from one hand, while the other hand takes it back with new taxes.

Reform's solution 17 proposal would reduce taxes to a single flat rate of 17%; real tax relief which would remove two million low income Canadians from the tax rolls.

# Oral Questions

Opponents claim that our plan would slash needed social programs. This is nothing more than fearmongering by those who want to keep our taxes higher than they need to be.

By reducing wasteful government spending Canadians could have these tax breaks and rebuild underfunded social programs at the same time.

A case in point is VIA Rail. VIA Rail exists only through the provision of huge government subsidies, subsidies which the government is now proposing to increase to \$500,000 a day.

The private sector has already taken over former VIA Rail money losing operations, which now operate without subsidies. They pay taxes, they bring in tourist dollars and provide unsubsidized jobs for Canadians.

It is time for the government to stop its wasteful spending habits and provide real tax relief to Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

# CANADIAN FORCES SUPPLY DEPOT

Mr. Bill Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to draw attention to the fact that the 25th Canadian Forces Supply Depot, located in Montreal, has been successful in obtaining international certification for the quality of its environmental management system.

It had already earned international certification for its processes, and now it is one of a select group of Canadian organizations meeting both of these important international standards.

• (1115)

The 25th Depot is the largest military logistics centre in Canada and warehouses more than 2,000 hazardous products. Thanks to the efforts of staff and management, the Depot has developed an appropriate environmental management system, based on hazardous goods monitoring, staff training and adherence to legal requirements.

We congratulate the staff of the 25th Supply Depot on obtaining this certification.

# **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

# **HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have obtained documents that show that the Prime Minister's office and the human resources minister's office were both intimately involved in the renewal of an HRDC grant to Les Confections Saint-Élie.

# Oral Questions

These documents outline a meeting between Denise Tremblay of the PMO and Robert Theriault of the HRD minister's office. That meeting discussed whether or not an HRDC grant should be renewed for that textile company in spite of the fact that the company did not reach its agreed upon job targets.

Why were both the Prime Minister's Office and the human resources minister's office so personally involved in this particular case?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the information on this specific project. I would be happy to try to get it for the hon. member. I am confident that any of the allegations made by the hon. member suggesting some improprieties are not well-founded. If he wants to place similar questions again, I will ask the parliamentary secretary if she has information that she can provide to the House at this time.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we will be happy to provide the information for the deputy prime minister.

Yesterday the human resources minister argued that a textile manufacturer moved from a city with a textile industry to a city with a fountain industry because it could not find a location in Montreal. An hour later the president of the numbered company contradicted her. He said that it was not because they could not find a location in Montreal, but rather, that the move was made for business reasons.

Did the Prime Minister's special support of Les Confections Saint-Élie have anything to do with the moving of jobs from Rosemont to Shawinigan?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the House that HRDC officials are looking into this matter. If any irregularity has taken place, HRDC will take the appropriate action.

The company's decision to relocate was a business decision and it had every right to make that decision as 75% of the total investment was its private money.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, 25% was not.

A no name textile company applies for a grant in Montreal. It ends up in the Prime Minister's riding, a place not exactly famous for its textile industry. Now there are questions about whether or not 3393062 ever actually set up a textile plant.

Why were high level staff from the PMO and the HRD minister's office so personally involved in decisions of this nature?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a very strange comment for a member from a party which has an ongoing love affair with the private sector.

We in the government believe we have a role in participating in the creation of economic opportunity for people, particularly in areas of high unemployment. We are building the workforce for the 21st century and we will continue to participate with private sector partners who are willing to leverage our money.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is the taxpayers who are concerned about where their money is being spent.

We know there was a meeting on September 2 involving a top local HRD official, the minister's own assistant and the Prime Minister's assistant. We know they met to give funding to Les Confections Saint-Élie, which had fallen 25% short of its job creation commitments as required under the TJF.

Why did the minister and the Prime Minister pressure the local HRD official to make a payment contrary to the signed TJF agreement?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making a totally unwarranted allegation when she uses the word pressure. I challenge her to get up and show proof of pressure. If she does not have it, and I do not think she has, she should withdraw those unwarranted allegations.

• (1120)

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are also interested in what else the Prime Minister's assistant, who is known for interfering in TJF projects, talked about at that meeting. We know a new request for funding came for Les Confections Saint-Élie a month after HRDC had broken the rules and had approved the final payment for that initial grant.

Did Les Confections Saint-Élie receive any further funding from HRDC as a result of that meeting?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will have to get back to the member on that particular question. I do not know if the contract was amended.

However, I do know that TJF had 30,000 projects across the country and they have a 95% success rate, which is better than the private sector working in the open market. Statistics Canada reports that of the start-ups of new businesses, only 77% are still alive after their first birth date.

Our success rate with our partnerships of government and the private sector are actually more successful than those in the private sector alone. [Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I received additional information on this unbelievable matter concerning the ridings of Saint-Maurice and Rosemont.

For one thing, the file was not transferred to Shawinigan, but remained in Montreal. On March 5, 1998, the owner of the company met with officials from Human Resources Development Canada, in Montreal, and told them that the premises located at 5800 Saint-Denis Street were no longer available and that he was looking in other regions of Quebec, including Beauce, to get closer to the American border. As we know, that person's company ended up in the riding of Saint-Maurice, in Shawinigan.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister confirm these facts?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm what the hon. member claims to be facts. Are these facts or his own suppositions?

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister will soon be in a position to differentiate between facts and suppositions, and I can hardly wait.

He will admit that the businessman who decided to get closer to the U.S. border by going to Shawinigan is definitely not good in geography.

On March 15, 1998, 3393062 Canada Inc. signed a lease with Confections Saint-Élie Inc. By the way, the name of that company sounds familiar. Oh yes, it is located in the Prime Minister's riding.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister confirm these facts?

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the questions being posed by the Bloc Quebecois members suggest that they do not understand the history of the area of Shawinigan nor the history of the textile industry in the country. Shawinigan has long been a textile centre and it is perfectly logical.

The other thing is that it is not always wise to second guess the business decisions of our private sector partners, whether they be private sector or non-profit organizations. The genius of this country is that we accept and promote the ideas of local entrepreneurs to create economic activity because we are building—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Rosemont.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us continue this little horror story.

# Oral Questions

The company started its business by creating five jobs. On March 19, 1998, it invoiced HRDC for the five jobs. On April 14, 1998, the firm was paid the amount of \$165,984 for the 42 jobs it was to create.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister confirm these facts?

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to inform members that we have 30,000 projects under grants and contributions. We know not everything will be perfect, but when we hear of any irregularities we will research them. If we find any kind of bad behaviour it will be referred to the police.

Members will always find a way to pick a scab. Even though 95% of the projects are in good hands and Canadian taxpayer money is well invested, they will continue to pick the scab of the few they can find that may have some problems or do have problems. However, we will refer the problem ones to the police.

• (1125)

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the parliamentary secretary refuse to confirm these facts, when I talked yesterday with assistant deputy minister Danielle Vincent, who confirmed them.

My question is unchanged: where is the money?

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to comment on a private telephone conversation from yesterday. I am not privy to the ideas of that conversation and therefore I cannot comment. However, I assure the House that the officials are reviewing this file and if anything is untoward it will be referred to the police.

\* \* \*

# **HEALTH CARE**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

The other day in the House the minister said that more than money would be required to fix health care. We certainly all agree with him on that. There is a need for reform.

However, the reality of the situation is that more money is required as well. More money must be delivered on Monday when the budget comes down in order to restore the 50:50 federal-provincial partnership if the minister wants to have the moral high ground again and if he wants to be able to work with his provincial counterparts, as he says he wants to do.

# Oral Questions

Will there be significantly more money put back into health care on Monday in the budget?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the budget will be tabled on Monday, but let us look at what the government has done over the last two to three years. When all other programs were being reduced, we restored and increased the transfers to the provinces for health. The Prime Minister, in his letter to the premiers following their February 3 meeting, said that careful consideration would be given to the priorities expressed by premiers.

I urge the member to wait until Monday. I also urge the member to urge his provincial counterparts in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and B.C. to work with us toward medicare renewal in the months ahead.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was here when the Canada Health Act was passed. When the government laid down the rules for medicare in the Canada Health Act, it was contributing a heck of a lot more money to medicare than it is today on a percentage basis.

Does the minister not acknowledge the need to get back to a 50:50 relationship between the federal government and the provinces if he wants to show the kind of leadership in reforming and saving medicare that he claims he wants to do? He is going to have to do that. When will that be done? Is he committed to doing it?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that the Government of Canada has to do its part. Not only is this the right thing to do, and the money is needed, but over time the Government of Canada will not be in a position to enforce the principles of the Canada Health Act unless it has a presence in the system. That is why, under the Prime Minister's leadership, we committed significant additional money last year to health transfers to the provinces. As we said at the time, more will be done as our balance sheet improves.

I agree with the hon. member. I urge him and his counterparts to work with us to renew medicare into the future.

# **AGRICULTURE**

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, with yesterday's welcomed but belated announcement of Manitoba and Saskatchewan agricultural support, the minister acknowledged the huge impact that the cancellation of the Crow benefit had on farm net incomes.

Is the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food now admitting to western Canadian farmers that he and his government totally mishandled the cancellation of the Crow rate and that it should have been phased out over a much longer period of time, as was proposed by the previous Conservative government?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when this government took over from the hon. member's party, I do not have to remind Canadians of the financial situation of the country. We had to make some changes at that time. We made changes that affected the grain transportation policy in western Canada, which we put considerable resources and funds into it at that time. We added more to that yesterday. The result of that is further diversification and, in the long run, a stronger agricultural economy both on the farm and in rural western Canada.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, the minister obviously did not admit to his mishandling of it but he should have.

We know we have a grain handling problem right now in transportation. Will he commit to fixing the transportation problem and throwing his full and immediate support behind the implementation of the Kroeger report recommendations?

**(1130)** 

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that there has been an ongoing consultation and discussion process with Justice Estey, with Mr. Kroeger, with the industry and with everyone involved in grain transportation across the country.

The government's intention is to make some positive changes to strengthen again in another way western agriculture on farms and in rural communities.

# KENORA—RAINY RIVER

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the riding of the minister of Indian affairs there is a different definition of the winning conditions. If people donate to the minister's campaign they win big. If they are members of the Liberal executive and donate to his campaign, the rules will be bent to ensure that they win big.

Businesses in his riding donated just over \$16,000 to the 1997 election campaign. That is a fair amount of money, but the return on the investment was a staggering \$2.5 million. Why does the Indian affairs minister think that it is okay to repay the generosity of private donors with public funds?

**The Speaker:** Order, please. We are going a bit far in the allegations today. If the hon. Deputy Prime Minister wishes to address this question I will permit it.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making an outrageous allegation. He is saying that there is a direct connection between donations and government funds.

I challenge the hon. member to say that outside the House and take responsibility for alleging what is conduct contrary to the criminal code. I suggest he back that up with facts here and outside the House. If he cannot do that, as I know he cannot, then let him withdraw those remarks and take the blame for misusing the privileges of the House as he is doing.

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the president of the Liberal Party in the Indian affairs minister's riding got a taxpayer funded loan of \$150,000. Lucky him. The trouble is that the agency that gave him the loan limits its loans to a maximum of \$125,000. He got \$25,000 more than is allowed.

Why do prominent Liberals in the Indian affairs minister's riding get more money than anyone else is entitled to?

**The Speaker:** Order, please. I think the thrust of the questions is such that these are pretty strong allegations. If the hon. minister or anyone else wants to respond to that I will permit it, but I prefer we stay away from the party stuff and stick with the policies for which these ministers are responsible.

Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again that member and that party are absolutely wrong.

First, treasury board guidelines and the agreement signed between the federal government and the particular local agency allow for loans over \$125,000. If the hon, member did his job and actually did his research instead of just reading the paper, he would have known that.

By the way, that is a loan given on a commercial basis with repayment and with an interest rate much higher than what someone would pay in the private sector.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

# **HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the riding of Rosemont affair, the minister claimed that no premises were available in Montreal. The owner, Mr. Goldberger, was furious and denied this, saying that his decision was strictly a business one.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister tell us what reasons were given for this business decision, for leaving Montreal to go to Saint-Maurice? What other business is involved?

# Oral Questions

The Speaker: I do not know that the government can know what went on in that person's head.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** Order, please. If the hon. Deputy Prime Minister wants to answer the question, I give him permission.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member's question is a matter for the government. It is impossible for me to know what went on in Mr. Goldberger's head. The hon. member must ask Mr. Goldberger and ask him what he meant by "business decision".

**•** (1135)

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Goldberger says Confections Saint-Élie signed a lease in March 1998. Confections Saint-Élie also got grants in the summer of 1997, which the Prime Minister boasted about in his election flyer.

Is this the business in question with Mr. Goldberger?

[English]

**The Speaker:** Once again I do not know how we can get inside the head of someone else. If the parliamentary secretary wants to answer the question, go ahead.

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with you. Opposition members continue to ask questions about this file when I have already assured them that departmental officials are looking into it to see if there are any irregularities.

I would like to say, though, that with 30,000 projects across the country with a variety of partners we should be looking at these things as the best efforts of groups of Canadians, whether they be business persons or non-profit organization members, to create economic activity. We have leveraged \$2.7 million in private sector partnership—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, what a surprise. The human resources minister got it wrong again. The minister's famous list has Aquilium Software Corporation listed as bankrupt. That came as quite a shock to the company. It is alive and well, and frankly must be very glad the human resources minister is not its accountant.

Is it the policy of the minister to deem companies bankrupt so they can qualify for even more HRDC money?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform

# Oral Questions

Party does not know how to accept good news when it finds it, it is so busy thinking of the bad news.

The list we released on February 21 includes the status of bankrupt and closed companies as we knew them when the funding was stopped. It is quite possible and to be hoped that some of these companies were able to get back on their feet and are now successful. The department would not have tracked their status after the project had been stopped.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, good news does not constitute driving a company under with kindness. The HRD minister took a billion dollars of taxpayer money and bungled it.

Now they are spending money, giving it to companies and telling the world that they are bankrupt. What kind of mismanagement is that? Is it a policy of the minister to kill and drive viable businesses under with kindness?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that is the most ridiculous nonsense I have ever heard in the House. We are in the business of creating economic activity—

The Speaker: Let us tone down the rhetoric on both sides a bit.

**Ms. Bonnie Brown:** The government is certainly not in the business of driving companies under. The government is in the business of creating opportunities for Canadians by leveraging private sector money with government money in order to create opportunities.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the member for Rosemont was told by the assistant deputy minister of Human Resources Development Canada that the entire grant of \$165,984 was paid to Mr. Goldberger's company on April 14, 1998. Yet this same deputy minister admits that only five jobs had been created by that date.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister tell us whether it is routine practice for this government to distribute the full amount of grants even before jobs have been created?

[English]

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the questions that are coming forth from the Bloc Quebecois today contain levels of detail for which I would have a fulsome answer, provided they had the courtesy of giving me these details ahead of question period.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will put a more general question to the Deputy Prime Minister, or

other delegated ministers, or perhaps the Minister for International Trade could answer.

Is what we have here not proof of the practices fit for the dark ages that the Minister of Human Resources Development condemned when she first took up her post?

**(1140)** 

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is well known that one of the longstanding conventions, based on longstanding precedents of this House, is that only the present minister comments on matters having to do with a department.

[English]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister who arranges our tax levels is the final banker. He is the trustee of the money that taxpayers are obligated to pay. Canadians are looking to him to oversee the money management of the government.

Yesterday the Deputy Prime Minister said:

—the Minister of Finance has stated his support for the programs administered by the HRD department—

Since the finance minister supports the human resources minister even after the billion dollar boondoggle, how much would she have to lose before he withdrew that support and showed Canadians they could trust him?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the stewardship of the Minister of Finance on behalf of the entire government of the finances of the government is proven by the fact that he eliminated, together with all of us, the \$42 billion deficit left to us by the Conservatives.

He has back to back balanced budgets, back to back surpluses, low interest rates and low inflation. That is fine stewardship and it goes much further than the empty rhetoric of the hon. member.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, listen to this for stewardship. The minister of HRDC said that she took action when she became aware that her department was in the dark ages in the management of grants and contributions.

Last spring the auditor general reported on a \$1.9 billion TAGS program: 34% did not contain any proposal, 26% had no clear objectives and one-third did not meet the criteria under which they had been approved. I could go on.

Why did the minister wait until this January, almost a whole year, before she took action on this mismanagement and incompetence?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister is the first one to admit that there are problems within the department in grants and contributions administration.

She has come forward with the action plan to address these issues. That action plan has been suggested and reviewed by outside specialists. Currently it is being reviewed or will be started to be reviewed by the human resources development standing

We are trying to fix the problems. Picking at the scabs that can be produced by looking through these files is not helping anyone.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### **CINAR**

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the CINAR affair, which now admits to fraud, after public denunciation and a new investigation, yesterday in this House the Minister of National Revenue indicated that his voluntary disclosure program might apply.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Are we to understand that the government is preparing to grant CINAR the right to make use of that program, thus providing this affair with a first class funeral?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, no, quite the contrary. The honourable member is well aware of the existence of a voluntary disclosure program.

Besides, we are not of course allowed to comment on individual returns. The Bloc Quebecois ought to be able to understand very clearly why the contents of individual returns ought not to be disclosed.

. . .

# INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

With the increase in our small and medium businesses' activity abroad, could the minister tell us whether Canada is really benefiting from the opening up of international markets?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of this House today to the fact that the opening up of markets benefits all, and certainly Canada.

For example, last year, our exports increased by nearly 12%, and our imports by 7.7%. The Government of Canada is working tirelessly to have the international system based on clear rules so our SMBs may enjoy greater access to the markets, as they create longstanding and quality jobs.

This also means a better quality of life for Canadians. Hats off to Canada's small and medium business—

Oral Questions

The Speaker: The hon. member for Prince Albert.

\* \* \*

• (1145)

[English]

#### **HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government is sending its top bureaucrats, including those from HRDC, to the all-inclusive P.A. Douglas seminar in Banff. On the agenda in between the wining and dining are such riveting topics as "How to Say Goodbye", our wish for the minister.

How can the minister justify this expense? What will HRDC bureaucrats be learning, how to say goodbye to more taxpayers' dollars?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not give us any notice of this question on a detailed specific matter. However, I will take note of the question, consult with the minister and get back to him on the real facts as soon as possible.

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, based on the billion dollar waste scandal, it is apparent that HRDC officials did not gain any managerial wisdom at last year's luxurious retreat in Banff. This year an agenda item is "Getting People to Like You".

If the minister and her officials want people to like them, they do not need a seminar. They need to stop their irresponsible and wasteful spending at HRDC. Why does the minister make it so difficult for people to like her?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if there is a seminar on getting people to like you, that explains where the Leader of the Opposition must be today.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** Order, please. We should not say whether one member is here or not on any given day.

\* \* \*

# **HEALTH CARE**

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, all week and today included the government has suggested that it has restored the cuts it took out in 1995. That statement is a distortion of the facts and it does a great disservice—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** Order, please. Let us go easy. It is not out of order, but you are getting close.

# Oral Questions

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis:** My apologies, Mr. Speaker. Let me just say that it obscures the facts and does a disservice to Canadians.

The facts are the government cut the cash to health care. Cash transfer payments are the glue that holds the national health care system together. When cash drops so low, the government loses the moral authority to enforce the Canada Health Act. We are still short \$4.3 billion in cash.

My question is simple and straightforward. On Monday will the government put back the cash it took out of health care?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to be informative and tell the whole story, why does she not give the facts on the value of the tax points in billions of dollars for health care and the value of equalization? Without that, her answer is incomplete. Because of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I cannot say misleading, but at the very least it is incomplete.

The Speaker: More than that, you cannot even say that you are not going to say misleading.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let me mention to the Deputy Prime Minister the government's own words in the federal budget of 1997 which stated "only the cash transfer affects program spending". The government knows that it is the cash that makes the difference and gives the government the power to enforce the principles of medicare.

If the cash has been restored, why do we have a crisis today? Why is the Ottawa Hospital today making choices about urgent surgery, not elective surgery, and choosing who shall have that surgery?

The problem is that the cash has been cut and all we know is that the government is preparing to put in a one time only payment. On Monday will the cash be put back and will it stop—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the budget will be tabled on Monday.

The numbers speak for themselves as the Deputy Prime Minister has said. The total value of the transfers to the provinces, all of which can be used for health care, is higher now than it was when we took office.

The opposition can quibble about numbers in the past but the real question in front of Canadians is, how do we hang on to our health care system for the future? How do we make sure it is sustainable for our families and children in the years to come? That is what we are focusing on. I am now working with people in the provincial departments to make sure we reshape medicare for the future.

• (1150)

#### TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transport has become a profit centre at the expense of the trucking industry and the people employed in it. The government eliminated the Atlantic regional freight transportation assistance program and the maritime freight rate both of which allowed Atlantic truckers to equalize costs and compete with other parts of the country.

Will the government meet with representatives of the trucking industry and put together a plan with them to reduce costs for the industry?

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to members of the House that there have been ongoing consultations with all members of the industry. In the very near future we will have before the House and before the members of the transportation committee our recommendations to solve many of the problems which the industry is facing right now.

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has done everything it can to drive up operating costs for the trucking industry. The Liberals increased the excise tax on diesel fuel. They eliminated federal competitive assistance programs and have now allowed the condition of our national highways to deteriorate.

The deputy premier of New Brunswick took the initiative to meet with truckers and offer them help. Will the transport minister give them the same courtesy and meet with them to work out a plan to reduce their costs?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary has already indicated that work is under way and ongoing.

Let me just correct the record with respect to the excise tax. The government has not increased the excise tax on diesel fuel. In fact, that tax was imposed in the first place and then increased by the previous Conservative government. It was four cents when we came into office and it is four cents today.

\* \* \*

# FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Foreign Affairs assure the House that Canada will decline the invitation to join the North American missile defence system, one of the most insane ideas emanating from Washington since Ronald Reagan's star wars proposal?

# Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify for the hon. member that at this point in time the United States government has not made a final decision on this particular weapons system nor have we been

I would like to underline that we do have a concern about the proposal and the impact upon the ABM treaty which is a very essential link in the broad arms control regime that we have. We

would therefore have to take that particular factor into very serious

\* \* \*

#### **HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a \$600,000 transitional jobs fund grant was awarded to MacNeils Cove in Nova Scotia to build a boardwalk. However, the boardwalk was built without any of the required permits and as a result remains unfinished. A local resident calls it a monument to human stupidity. I call it a monument to Liberal stupidity.

Why did the HRD minister spend \$600,000 of taxpayers' money on a boardwalk boondoggle that did not have the required permits?

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the community to which the member refers, there were 405 displaced workers from the fishery. HRDC sat down with the community to identify appropriate intervention that might get these people back to work. The project identified was twofold: building the boardwalk and clearing up the waterfront area, which has now turned it into a tourist attraction. There is evidence in the file on this project that the landowners gave permission and a building permit was issued. As a result, 164 fishers moved on to long term employment.

[Translation]

account.

# **GASOLINE PRICES**

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the sky-rocketing prices of gasoline, fuel and diesel are a concern to consumers and businesses, as they are increasingly affected by this situation.

My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Now that several provinces have announced their plans, what is the government waiting for to announce its own action plan, within its jurisdiction, to meet the public's concerns?

**•** (1155)

[English]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr.

# Oral Questions

Speaker, the federal government's jurisdiction in this matter relates to two areas. First, the competition policy, as the Minister of Industry has already explained, has been investigated and in appropriate circumstances the proper action has been taken. Second, there are cases of national emergency, threatened national security, but we are obviously not at that point. Matters relating to the regulation of consumer prices are entirely within provincial jurisdiction.

\* \* \*

#### SCOTIA RAINBOW

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there was a revelation in the House yesterday. We found out that the minister for ACOA can read a Liberal press release turned into an editorial.

I have an article from the Nova Scotia provincial election stating that a worker at Scotia Rainbow said he could not believe he had to put together Liberal election signs. Workers were asked to nail signs together on company time and put them on their front lawns. A lot of workers are feeling threatened.

Is it because of this connection to the Liberal government and Scotia Rainbow that the minister continues to dance around this issue?

Hon. George S. Baker (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, ACOA did put in a million dollar loan into this enterprise. HRDC put in \$2 million. The provincial government put in double that amount of money. The investors put in double that amount of money. And by far, the largest amount of money was put in by the chartered banks.

To slam the federal government for this huge expenditure by the chartered banks and private individuals would be like blaming the boy scouts for the gulf war.

\* \* \*

# **GASOLINE PRICES**

Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, PC): Mr. Speaker, high fuel prices are causing a crisis not only for trucking companies but for all Canadians. When will the government show leadership and reduce fuel taxes or will it continue to keep looking for excuses to justify doing absolutely nothing about this crisis?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have explained in response to a previous question from a member of the same party, the excise tax on diesel was a tax invented by the Conservative Party. It was increased by the Conservative Party.

# Oral Questions

It was four cents a litre when we came into office. It remains at four cents a litre today. If the hon, member would like to know the source of this problem, she might look in the mirror.

\* \* \*

#### **KOSOVO**

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Monday tens of thousands of Albanians faced a crowd of Serbs across the bridge that spans the Ibar River in the divided city of Mitrovica. We know that Canadians bore the brunt of the violent demonstrations.

My question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence. What role did the Canadian forces play in preventing the violence from escalating even further?

[Translation]

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question.

In Mitrovica, inter-ethnic violence between Albanian Kosovars and Serbs is an explosive situation. This is why 200 Canadian troops were redeployed from Pristina to Mitrovica.

[English]

On Monday tens of thousands of Albanians faced a crowd of Serbs across the bridge which spans the Ibar River in the divided city of Mitrovica. The Canadian presence helped prevent the clash between the Albanian and Serb residents from completely deteriorating. The Canadians bore the brunt of this violent demonstration—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Surrey Central.

\* \* \*

# **HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian Aerospace Group International received a \$1.3 million TJF grant to allegedly create 500 jobs in North Bay, Ontario. The project failed. The company was then given a \$1.7 million interest free loan to set up in Saint-Hubert, Quebec.

Since the project in North Bay never got off the ground, will the boondoggle government be recovering the \$1.3 million tax dollars lost on that grant?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the biggest oxymoron around here is Reform Party research. No money was given for the project in Saint-Hubert.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, is there anyone in the government who can explain to us

today how it is that they are unable to confirm the facts that we have brought to light?

**(1200)** 

The Deputy Prime Minister spoke of suppositions, when it was a deputy minister of Human Resources Development Canada who herself called the member for Rosemont yesterday to pass on these facts

Why is no one in this government able to answer questions, when we have the information from a deputy minister? Why is it that a deputy minister is calling us, that the minister does not know, that the Deputy Prime Minister does not know, and that the parliamentary secretary does not know?

Something is wrong with this picture.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are very open to the hon. member when we are in a position to confirm the facts.

He alluded to a conversation. I think it wise that we contact the deputy minister and ask whether she is able to verify the hon. member's allegations. We will check this out and get back to the hon. member in due course.

\* \* \*

[English]

# POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, despite the platitudes from the Prime Minister for a good future for young people, the only vision of the future for tens of thousands of students is a massive debt wall.

It is undeniable that high student debt and skyrocketing tuition fees are directly caused by the massive retreat in federal funds for post-secondary education.

If the government is truly committed to education and accessibility, will the government commit to the single most important action needed, to restore funds to post-secondary education?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think we all appreciate the confidence of the hon. member in the Liberal government. She is looking to the government to do the right thing. The government will do the right thing. I cannot say what the details will be or whether they will cover this exact subject, but her vote of confidence is appreciated.

\* \* \*

# **HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, we know that the government is caught in the past, but can the Minister of HRDC please explain why four companies, owned or partly owned by three members of the

executive of the Ministry of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, received \$385,000 in HRDC grants for job creations in 1997?

Many of the companies which received over \$2.5 million in Kenora—Rainy River, courtesy of the overtaxed Canadian, funnelled \$16,000 back to the government member in political donations.

If this is not blatant patronage, what is it?

**The Speaker:** I understand the question. It deals more with party matters. I see the hon. Deputy Prime Minister on his feet. If he wishes to respond, I will permit him to do so.

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we cannot let anything stay on the record of the House of Commons which is linked to the allegations of the hon. member when he talks about money from the government being funnelled back. Those are assertions for which he has provided no foundation, as far as I am aware. We are all aware that there is no foundation. If he took his job seriously he would get on his feet and withdraw those unwarranted allegations.

# **ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

• (1205)

[English]

## GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 25 petitions.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

# CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages and on behalf of the Minister for International Cooperation, the list of companies supported by CIDA between April 1, 1996 and March 31, 1999, grouped by company, as requested in the House yesterday.

[English]

**Mr. Jim Pankiw:** Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have submitted an application for an emergency debate regarding an international event which falls within the scope of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Because of the urgent nature of this matter, I seek the

# Routine Proceedings

unanimous consent of the House to move immediately past the daily routine of business directly to applications for emergency debates.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member can revisit this matter at the end of Routine Proceedings. We have received the application.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik:** Mr. Speaker, I request through your good graces that you use your office to facilitate the settlement of a difficulty which is disrupting the work of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food.

I know that you cannot intervene, Mr. Speaker-

**The Speaker:** You are correct. I cannot intervene unless there is a report before the House. As far as I know, there is no report before the House, so your point of order is out of order.

\* \* \*

# CANADA FOUNDATION FOR INNOVATION

Mr. John Cannis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour today to table, in both official languages, the Canada Foundation for Innovation annual report for 1998-99. Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), this report will be referred to the Standing Committee on Industry.

\* \* \*

# **COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

BILL C-20

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had an opportunity to speak from my place in the House in this parliament and I am tempted to make a speech. However, I will resist that urge because it would be out of order.

[Translation]

Pursuant to order of reference of Thursday, February 10, 2000 your committee has considered Bill C-20, an act to give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec Secession Reference, and has agreed, on Thursday, February 24, 2000, to report it without amendments.

Some hon. members: Democracy, democracy.

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on chapter 1 of the

April 1999 report by the Auditor General of Canada on "Correctional Services of Canada: Reintegration of Offenders".

[English]

I also present the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts relating to the public accounts of Canada, 1998-99. Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons the committee requests the government to table a comprehensive response to these two reports.

\* \* \*

• (1210)

# AN ACT FOR THE RECOGNITION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-437, an act to amend an act for the recognition and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms and to amend the Constitution Act, 1867.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time I have introduced my property rights bill in the House.

The government has such disdain for any legislative protection for property rights that thus far it has refused to make my previous attempts votable, and it has refused all attempts to even have my proposals reviewed by the standing committee.

Individual property rights need strengthening because they were intentionally left out of the charter of rights and freedoms. Recent court cases have proven that Canadians have no protection whatsoever from the arbitrary taking of property by the federal government.

My bill would make up for this mind-boggling omission from the charter by strengthening the property rights provisions in the Canadian bill of rights. My bill would also require a two-thirds majority vote of the House whenever the government passes laws that override fundamental property rights, like it did when it passed the Firearms Act and the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

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

**Mr. Joe Jordan:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I sit on the subcommittee on Private Members' Business. That member knows that it is a non-partisan committee. To accuse the government of making that decision is just—

**The Speaker:** That is not a point of order.

\* \* \*

# **COMPETITION ACT**

**Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-438, an act to amend the Competition Act (game of chance).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to introduce a private member's bill at first reading. This bill deals with printed material which conveys the general impression that the recipient has won a prize, but in order to collect that prize a fee must be paid.

The private member's bill would make it an offence under the Competition Act to deliberately circulate material which conveys the general impression that the recipient has won a prize; however, for them to be able to collect that prize they must pay money. Any individual or company which contravenes this legislation will be guilty of a summary conviction and can be fined up to \$200,000 or sentenced to one year of imprisonment.

This is an important consumer issue. As members of parliament we have an obligation to address this matter. Therefore, I am pleased to bring this forward in legislation.

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

\* \*

# MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT

**Mr. Jim Pankiw** (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-439, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act (rights ceasing to accrue after the end of 2000).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this enactment is simply to provide that the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act shall cease to apply to service as a member after the end of 2000. Members will not be entitled to contribute or accrue any benefits for service after December 31, 2000.

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

\* \* \*

# MEDICALLY UNNECESSARY ABORTION REFERENDUM ACT

**Mr. Jim Pankiw** (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-440, an act to provide for a referendum to determine whether Canadians wish medically unnecessary abortions to be insured services under the Canada Health Act and to amend the Referendum Act.

**●** (1215)

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this enactment is to provide for a referendum to be held on the question of whether public funds should be used for medically unnecessary abortions.

If the electors agree that this should not be the case, an amendment to the Canada Health Act would be brought into force which would allow a reduction in fiscal transfers to provinces that allow such funding.

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

**\* \* \*** 

#### CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-441, an act to amend the Criminal Code (consecutive sentence for use of firearm in commission of offence).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this enactment is to require that a sentence for the commission of certain serious offences be supplemented if a firearm is used.

The additional sentence is to be served concurrently to the other sentence and is to be a further minimum punishment of 10 years imprisonment if the firearm is not discharged, 20 years if it is discharged and 25 years if it is discharged and as a result a person, other than an accomplice, is wounded, maimed or disfigured.

The offences affected are those specified in the sections of murder, manslaughter, attempted murder, assault causing bodily harm with intent, sexual assault with a weapon, aggravated sexual assault, kidnapping, hostage taking, robbery and extortion.

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

\* \* \*

# COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I move that the first report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, presented on Tuesday, February 22, be concurred in.

I appreciate my hon. colleague from Peace River seconding the motion to concur in this report today. I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak today about this very important issue, especially in light of the announcement that was made as recently as yesterday by the government. I am speaking about the agricultural crisis, especially as it relates to western Canada and producers in all four western provinces. As members will notice, I have included my own province of British Columbia.

Not many people understand that in the northeast corner of British Columbia, an area that I represent, there is an agricultural sector that is very similar to the three prairie provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. It is a very important issue in my particular riding of Prince George—Peace River and all across Canada, but especially on the prairies.

# Routine Proceedings

In the brief time that I have I must say that I feel the government has failed miserably in properly and adequately addressing the agricultural income crisis in Canada today. I say today because the most recent opportunity to address this problem in a very real way was as recent as yesterday and the government failed. The Liberals have failed once again. They have come forward with some ad hoc funding but no plan to get that assistance to the producers, especially the farmers who are beginning to prepare for spring seeding. The uncertainty producers are facing is whether they should even put a crop in the ground this spring. This is something the government needs to address in a comprehensive and very real way. It should not be done in some photo-op by the minister saying "Well, we have listened, we have heard the concerns emanating from western Canada and we intend to address this by throwing in another \$240 million".

(1220)

This was another announcement just like the others we have seen over the last year and a half.

Mr. Charlie Penson: It is the same money.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague from Peace River said, it is the same money. They just keep announcing it over and over again.

Farmers are not fooled. One of the reasons that the official opposition, the Reform Party of Canada, launched its own series of grassroots agricultural meetings across western Canada was to get input from farmers themselves at small townhall meetings, not by blowing into Regina, Saskatoon or Calgary and talking to a select group of witnesses who appear before the standing committee. We wanted to go out and talk directly to the producers who were most affected by the government's lack of agricultural policy.

My colleagues, who are agricultural critics for the official opposition, instituted a plan to travel across western Canada and set up meetings called assistance for struggling agricultural producers, ASAP. The acronym could also be "as soon as possible". As soon as possible we need to help farmers in Canada. It is important for Canadians to ask themselves a very serious question at this juncture of our history: Do we want to have a viable agricultural industry in Canada? If the answer to that is yes, and I suspect it is, we want a healthy and secure supply of food in our nation, then we must give farmers the support that is necessary and the certainty to conduct their business.

We have been holding these meetings all across western Canada. By the time they are done, around mid-March, my colleagues will have conducted over 60 small townhall meetings scattered across western Canada. In my riding we held one about half way through the north and south Peace River agricultural regions in a small little community called Farmington. I suspect this is one of the few times members will hear that name in this place. It is not a big

community but it is a very important agricultural community in my riding of Prince George—Peace River.

The meeting was held on January 11, a cold winter night with blowing snow and blizzard conditions in the Peace River country in northern British Columbia. We expected maybe a few dozen farmers to show up. When my colleague and I went to the meeting we were not sure just how many people would brave the cold, the wind and the snow that night but over 100 farmers came out to that meeting, these were men and women who realized their livelihoods and the very security and future of their family farms were at stake. Some of them travelled dozens of kilometres and, in some cases well over 100 kilometres, to attend the meeting that night.

My colleague from Peace River held similar meetings in his riding of Peace River, Alberta, the adjoining riding just immediately to the east of my riding. He held meetings in Grande Prairie and Peace River and the response was the same. If we lump the two meetings together, we had well over 150 individuals show up to air their concerns.

#### • (1225)

Following the meeting we had in Farmington, one of my constituents undertook a unique journey. Nick Parsons, from Farmington, a small community just north of the city of Dawson Creek, at mile zero of the Alaska highway, took it upon himself to undertake a combine odyssey to Ottawa. He decided to drive his combine right here to Parliament Hill.

An hon. member: To send a message.

Mr. Jay Hill: Exactly. He wanted to send a message and he is sending a message. He is a little over halfway in his journey, a journey of some 3,000 kilometres. I know this because I have driven it, but I was not driving a combine. It took me about four days by car as compared to his four to six weeks to drive his combine down here.

Members would be amazed at the support this farmer has received during his travels. When I was talking to him via his cell phone the other day he told me that his journey is one of tears and fears. The fears of Canadian farm families are being expressed to him as he travels across western Canada; the fears that the industry is dying and the fears that there is no hope.

Can anyone imagine being a farmer in western Canada today? The reality is that the government has given them no hope for a future. This is being expressed to Nick Parsons every day as he continues his journey across western Canada. Every day individuals stop Nick's combine and hand him \$20, \$10 or whatever they can afford to assist him in his journey across western Canada while he tries to draw attention to the plight of the farm family and farms in Canada. He wants everyone to know that no matter how hard the

farmers have struggled, they cannot make ends meet. No matter how efficient they have become over the last number of decades, the reality is that they cannot make ends meet because international subsidies have driven down the price of their product to the point where they cannot pay their bills. They are now on the verge of losing their farms and their homes.

I have to try to convey the tragedy that is occurring on farms across western Canada to the urban public who perhaps might be watching the proceedings today. What is happening is a national tragedy.

Farmers are looking to the government for something more than having money thrown at them, money that never reaches them. In the last year or so I have often made the comment that no matter how many announcements, how many photo opportunities the government has to announce the same money over and over again, all the money in the world sitting on the cabinet table does the farmer and his family absolutely no good until it is on their kitchen table.

Of the money that was announced, even before the most recent announcement yesterday, around 25% has actually reached farmers to help them. This is a tragedy.

It is unfortunate that my time is up because I could, on behalf of farmers all across Canada, go on speaking about this all day.

Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to the agriculture committee report, which was just tabled as a result of hearings held in December 1999. I note there was an earlier report in December 1998. These two reports indicate that there is a problem. Members of the agriculture committee understand there is a problem and they want to do something about it.

After reading the report, I agree with much of the analysis and much of the analysis has been provided by the member who just spoke.

The New Democratic Party caucus disagrees strenuously with at least one conclusion in the report. Our agriculture critic, the member for Palliser, tabled a minority report, an addendum to the report, in which he stated that the committee suggests that Canada is so impoverished that it cannot afford to invest in our grain farmers to the same extent as other countries.

# • (1230)

The report indicates that Canada cannot compete with the treasuries of these countries. My hon. colleague, the member for Palliser, says that Canada certainly has the financial resources to compete on a comparative basis with the United States and Europe. The problem is that the Canadian government has decided it does not want to compete. We know that it has cut support to farmers

since 1993 by roughly 60%, so my colleague in this minority report is saying that we in fact can compete.

We have been on to this issues, as has the Reform Party. The NDP caucus has and will continue to support farmers in rural communities in the ways that they are attempting to put bread on their own tables in addition to putting it on ours.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the New Democratic Party for his comments and his intervention. He certainly raises a very valid point. What I was trying to drive home during my brief remarks is that I think it is incumbent upon all Canadians to look inside themselves at this juncture in our history to decide what priority they place on our agriculture industry.

The hon. member was referring to the level of support that other countries give to their agricultural sector, whereas in Canada, especially in the grain sector, we have seen a diminishing level of support from the federal government over a number of years. We could debate all day how much our national treasury can afford to support an individual sector of the economy.

The member referred to his party's minority report on the report of the standing committee. Our agricultural critics also put forward a minority report in which we listed eight positive things, other than just an ad hoc propping up of the sector, the government could undertake to assist farmers.

The farm safety net programs must be reformed to ensure long term stable protection. That was one of the things that we put forward, something that a lot of farmers have advocated for a long time. A lot of farmers have been involved through their local producer organizations in promoting an expanded NISA program, the Net Income Stabilization Act.

The federal government could lower the costs it imposes on producers by giving general tax reductions, lowering user fees charged by the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food and reducing federal taxes charged on the manufacture, transportation and sale of agricultural input such as fertilizer and especially fuel.

We hear members raising the issue of the high cost of fuel in the House every day. That is something the government could move on. It could do something about that. It could bring down the taxes on fuel. It would have a direct impact on the input costs of farmers as they do their planning for this spring's seeding.

As well the government could further lower the costs of farmers by enabling a competitive, commercially accountable grain handling and transportation system. Many parliamentarians from all parties have talked about changes to our transportation and grain handling system, yet very little is being done.

The official opposition, the Reform Party of Canada, has identified a whole raft of things in our minority report, as have other

# Routine Proceedings

parties, that the government could be doing to assist farmers. Yet we see nothing but a photo op and government members saying they will throw another couple of hundred million dollars at it. Maybe it will eventually get to the farmers and maybe it will not, but they will throw it at them in the hope that it solves the problem. Farmers especially know darn well it will not solve the problem.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I travelled with the committee as it made its tour of the three prairie provinces, so essentially I will be reporting on that.

I would like to acknowledge the fact that we cannot pin a label on all the people on the other side. Some of them are willing to step out of the mould. I would like to acknowledge especially the fact that the member for Broadview—Greenwood in Toronto has done his share in trying to profile the plight of prairie farmers when he organized that rally. Back in November the Reform had a supply day.

• (1235)

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: Bob was also there.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Yes, there were more members, but I acknowledged the member for Broadview—Greenwood because he helped organize it. The point I am trying to make is that the more we can get people from the other side joining together with us to show this is a non-partisan issue and to communicate to the people in the cities the plight of farmers, the better off we will all be.

There are some real issues we have to deal with in this place and it is very difficult sometimes not to be partisan. It is great to see members on the other side helping us because they do not have elected people on the prairies and in rural ridings to help communicate that message to the cities. There is one cabinet minister from Regina who is strangely silent on the issue, but I am glad to see other members trying to do their best.

As I mentioned, I have been travelling with the committee. Yesterday the Prime Minister made quite a big deal of the fact that \$1 billion were being made available to farmers in Saskatchewan. I need to clarify the fact that it was not \$1 billion in new money. I hope he does not think farmers are not smart enough to know what has been going on.

We have used the words billion dollar boondoggle in referring to the mismanagement of the jobs fund under HRD. I used the words billion dollar boondoggle to describe the gun registry because in a few years a billion dollars will have been wasted going after the good guys rather than dealing with the real problem in Canada in that regard. We could talk about the billion dollar boondoggle in aboriginal affairs, and I suppose there are other areas. Here we have a billion dollar boondoggle. When we look at all the things that are going on, we are going to be talking real money soon. Why do I call it a boondoggle? It is because the money is not getting to farmers.

The programs are announced. When we listen to the media it sounds like some grand thing has been done. I suppose the impression created in Toronto is that farmers are getting this money. If we listen carefully and we read the fine print, it says that we will know by the end of March how the funds will be disbursed. The farmers need the money. As my colleague from Prince George—Peace River said, it has to be on the kitchen table.

Two years ago Reform said something needed to be done about the crisis developing in agriculture. The Prime Minister said "These things take time to develop". What have the bureaucracy and the government being doing for the last two years? The Prime Minister went on to say "You know me. I have to do my homework first". What was announced yesterday clearly shows that he has not done his homework.

This is only a small fraction of what farmers pay in tax. Farmers are taxed to the max. Some of their input costs may be as much as 50% tax. People in the cities do not realize that farmers only get back a small fraction of the money they send to Ottawa back.

Yesterday I had with me a box of shirts from the backs of a few farmers. They want me to make the point with the people here and across Canada that the government has literally taken the shirts off their backs. I wanted to present those shirts to the Prime Minister and the finance minister on behalf of farmers in Saskatchewan, and they would not accept them. Then I went to the agricultural minister who said he would not take them to the Prime Minister. I still have the shirts that the government has taken right off the backs of farmers.

Many points need to be made in this regard. Reform has suggested a lot of good things. I want to let people who are watching know that they can access a minority report on the Reform's position on the Internet. We are limited in time in the House so I cannot go into all the details, but I will briefly summarize what Reform is saying. Canada must aggressively attack international subsidies and trade barriers so that farmers do not have to compete with all the grain being dumped on the international marketplace that forces farmers to sell their product below the cost of production.

• (1240)

Mr. Charlie Penson: It sounds like the Boy Scouts to me.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz:** Exactly. My colleague from Peace River has just made the point that we have tended to be the Boy Scouts at the bargaining table. It is about time we got tough. Our competitors are tough.

What does that do for prices within Canada? Because farmers are caught in the international marketplace they are actually subsidizing the food being eaten in Toronto. People do not know that farmers are being forced to sell below the cost of production and

people within Canada are benefiting from that fact. Whatever happens in the international marketplace happens here. That is why our government has to come to the rescue in the short term and reduce taxes.

The government must immediately reduce the burden it places on farmers. Farmers pay an inordinate amount of tax, everything from an excise tax on fuel to user fees. What are user fees? For people watching in the cities, user fees such as grain inspection fees amount to \$138 million annually for prairie farmers. Farmers are compelled to pay the cost of agencies that benefit all sectors of society. A good quality safe food supply helps everybody but the farmer has to pay the whole shot. That is not fair. Those fees should be reduced, and Reform is asking for that to take place.

The government should give grain farmers the freedom to market their own grain independent of the wheat board. One may often hear or be given the impression, especially by the minister responsible for the wheat board, that because the wheat board has a monopoly and farmers are not allowed to sell outside it is somehow great for farmers.

The point is that farmers are not even allowed to process their durum wheat into pasta and put it on the store shelf for sale. The wheat board makes them sell their own grain to the wheat board and buy it back before they can process it. Of course there is a big handling fee and they have to buy it back at a higher price and the profit is diminished.

I hope at some future point I will be able to address this problem even more. We need to debate agriculture a lot more in the House. At this point I would like to move:

That this House now adjourn and consider these things.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The request for the House to adjourn is not receivable by the Chair because the House is now under special order on time allocation and the vote on Bill C-2 must be and will be put today at 2.15 p.m. We are still on questions and comments.

**●** (1245)

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties with discussing agriculture in Ottawa is that there is a pervasive feeling with the Liberals and I believe sometimes with the Reform Party that if it is not grown in the west, it is not agriculture.

The fact is the agricultural crisis and issues which face all Canadian farmers are not western centred. There are significant issues and indeed a crisis in western agriculture, but there are also agricultural crises in other parts of the country.

My riding which represents 50% of the agricultural product from Atlantic Canada, a greater level of agricultural output than all of Prince Edward Island, is in an agricultural crisis. We have had four

years of unprecedented levels of drought and destruction. For instance the fruit growers have been virtually pummelled by this.

I am concerned with—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): If the hon. member for Kings—Hants will forgive me, I must correct a statement I made just a moment ago. I want to put people at ease. I said that the vote would be taken at 2.15 p.m. I was in error. The vote will be at 1.15 p.m. We will go into Private Members' Business at 1.30 p.m. Therefore, to be clear, we are under time allocation and time allocation means that the vote will be taken today at 1.15 p.m.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I ask for further clarification on that.

It is my understanding that the motion to adjourn the House put forward by my hon. colleague from Yorkton—Melville is in order. The reason it is in order is that the House was considering Bill C-2 this morning during the hour of debate from 10 o'clock to 11 o'clock. The House went to Routine Proceedings following question period and we are now on motions.

We are not considering Bill C-2 any longer. We have no way of knowing when we return to orders of the day following Routine Proceedings whether the government will call Bill C-13 or another bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you seek further clarification and a further ruling on this because my understanding is that we are not currently under time allocation that has been imposed on Bill C-2.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I will be happy to consult with the table and we will make sure that we are doing exactly the right thing.

As members can see the Chair benefits by having a lot of good professional advice at his beck and call. At page 9, chapter III, sittings of the House, Standing Order 25 states:

When it is provided in any Standing or Special Order of this House that any business specified by such Order shall be continued, forthwith disposed of, or concluded in any sitting, the House shall not be adjourned before such proceedings have been completed except pursuant to a motion to adjourn proposed by a Minister of the Crown.

Unless a minister of the crown makes the proposal that the House adjourn, the House will not adjourn and we are still under the provisions of the standing order.

The ruling was correct. We are in debate. We are in questions and comments and we will start the questions and comments period from the beginning. The hon, member for Kings—Hants.

**Mr. Scott Brison:** Mr. Speaker, the agriculture industry is in a crisis across Canada and for very different reasons. Frankly a solution that may work in one region will certainly not address

issues in other regions. Geographically Atlantic Canadian agriculture faces very different issues from those of western Canadian agriculture. That is common sense.

(1250)

The Liberal government changed the EI rules in 1995. It had an extremely deleterious impact on agriculture in Atlantic Canada to the extent that Atlantic Canada farmers in my riding last year lost about 30% of their crops because of the difficulty in attracting seasonal workers.

With the short growing season in Atlantic Canada, seasonal work issues are more important than they are in other regions. It is a growing season issue. The government may have thought that if the rules were changed those people would go from seasonal work to full time work. It did not work that way. Many of those seasonal workers are now on provincial welfare rolls because of this misdirected policy.

The Reform Party is positing some solutions for agriculture in western Canada. As a party that purports to be a national party, I would be interested in its recommendations for the seasonal work issue facing farmers in Atlantic Canada.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reply to this question because I spent quite a bit of time visiting farms in that member's riding. I heard firsthand the concerns of those farmers. Perhaps a point that could be made here is that some of the members of parliament from that area should be representing those people so I would not have to be going there.

In order to develop our policy we spent time on the farms in that area. It is interesting to note that the farmers there have concerns that are very similar to the concerns in the west. One is that the federal government does not have an agricultural policy which deals with concerns right across Canada. It is time we developed a comprehensive agricultural policy.

The member says that some of the problems faced by people in his riding are not the same as those in the west. Of course there are individual characteristics but there are common characteristics. One of the things I am finding that farmers and also small businesses face right across the country is that people bear a huge tax burden which they can do nothing about it.

Built right into the farmers' input cost, be they on the prairies or in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, is a high level of tax that farmers cannot avoid when the federal government uses employment insurance premiums as a cash cow that is built right into the product. They are pyramided. Whenever the farmer has to buy something he is caught paying that tax and he cannot pass it on. That is just one example.

[Translation]

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to say that we in the Bloc Quebecois also oppose this report, because, once again, the policies included in this—

An hon. member: Question, question.

**Mr. Odina Desrochers:** Mr. Speaker, I have the floor. Could my colleague opposite respect that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Lotbinière, on questions and comments.

**Mr. Odina Desrochers:** Mr. Speaker, it is such a complicated business, asking a question of those people over there, that one has to start with a brief preamble so that they will be able to grasp what it is all about, and get back on track with reality. They need something concrete.

What I wanted to say, first of all, is that I was against this report that has been made public. In committee, I stated that I had a great deal of difficulty understanding the title's reference to urgency, when all the decisions reached by the government do not reflect urgency or crisis.

I would like to know whether my Reform colleague shares my opinion. Does he agree also that the inertia of this government needs to be condemned?

• (1255)

[English]

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz:** Mr. Speaker, I can put my response in just a few words. Yes it is a crisis. I agree with my hon. colleague from Quebec. It is a genuine crisis. It has developed very quickly because of the drop in commodity prices. However, the farmers would be able to survive if their input costs were reduced. The government could do much to reduce those input costs but it has done nothing, such as tax reduction. Yes there is a huge crisis out there and something needs to be done in the next month.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood. Just before we get to the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood, the hon. member for St. Albert on a point of order.

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I move:

That the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca be now heard.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): This is a rather unusual proceeding. The clerk has just filled me in on the proceedings of the proceeding, so I will fill the House in on the proceedings of the proceeding as well.

What happened was that I recognized the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood on debate. At the same time the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca was on his feet. It is the purview of the Chair to recognize whomever the Chair chooses to recognize. The only way a member has to challenge the Chair's decision on who has been recognized is to move that another member be recognized.

That is where we are now because the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood had not begun to speak. Had the member for Broadview—Greenwood begun to speak, it would have been game over and the point of order would not have been receivable. But because the member had not begun to speak, another member rose on a point of order. That is where we are.

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In the spirit of co-operating with the member from the Reform Party, I have no problem in deferring and allowing the member to proceed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): That is really generous but I still have to put the motion. Interestingly, a while ago we discussed whether a point of order is in fact a point of order and can be raised if there is another point of order on the floor. If the hon. member cares to go back to *Hansard*, I will not get into that again.

Right now we will put the question. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Call in the members.

• (1315)

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It being 1.15 p.m., pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, February 21, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of Bill C-2. Accordingly, the motion moved by the member for St. Albert is null and void and the demanded division is no longer necessary.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would point out to you that what should be null and void is the government's heavy handed use of time allocation.

order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): That is not a point of

# **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

# CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-2, an act respecting the election of members to the House of Commons, repealing other acts relating to elections and making consequential amendments to other acts, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The question is on the amendment.

• (1320)

[Translation]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the recorded division stands deferred until Monday, February 28, 2000 at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

**Mr. Jim Pankiw:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Again, with respect to my application for an emergency debate, I would beg the brief indulgence of the House to explain the application so I can seek unanimous consent to move to that now.

The situation is that three Canadian children are being held hostage by the child protection services agency in California. They have been there for six months, separated from their parents. It is a violation of their rights and the rights of—

# Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Excuse me. We need to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to hear your justification for an application for an emergency debate.

Does the hon. member for Saskatoon—Humboldt have the consent of the House to put forth his reasons for the application for an emergency debate?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have a question on procedure. I do not believe that when an hon. member is requesting an emergency debate he or she needs unanimous consent to outline it, according to my understanding.

• (1325)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The hon. member for Yorkton—Melville is quite correct. That would be the case if we were in Routine Proceedings; however, the House is not in Routine Proceedings, under which the Speaker would normally consider applications for emergency debates. Therefore, an application for an emergency debate would require unanimous consent.

**Mr. Ken Epp:** Mr. Speaker, you will recall that when we were interrupted for the vote we were in fact dealing with a motion which was under Routine Proceedings, so we are still in Routine Proceedings.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): When we were interrupted for the vote we were governed by an earlier order, which was the procedure having to do with time allocation.

[Translation]

**Mr. Réal Ménard:** Mr. Speaker, concerning the request for an emergency debate by our Reform colleague, I take it that some children are involved.

Before we reach a decision in this House, I would like our colleague to explain to us how this affects Canadian children, and how we could help him.

I believe that, because children are involved, we need to—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Perhaps the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve could ask for the unanimous consent of the House to allow the member to conclude his explanation.

**Mr. Réal Ménard:** Mr. Speaker, what we want is the unanimous consent of the House to get additional information, so that our colleague can tell us about the urgency of this matter, about how we can help him and about how Canadian children are involved.

We should at least listen to the member to get additional information. Government members are nodding, which means they are prepared to entertain his request.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Does the House give its consent to proceed as suggested by the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, as you just pointed out, the recorded division on the amendment to Bill C-2 at third reading stands deferred until next week.

I simply wish to draw the attention of the Chair, of all the members of this House and of those who are watching us on television that, because of the gag order at third reading, Bill C-2, the Canada Elections Act, which is a fundamental law in any democracy, has only been debated by two parties in this House, namely the Reform Party and the government party, while the other three opposition parties were gagged.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** That is not a point of order. The Chair will accept a motion to see the clock at 1.30 p.m.

**Mr. Jim Pankiw:** Mr. Speaker, since it appears that we will not be able to hear the application for an emergency debate, I wonder if the members who declined that request would be willing to discuss it with the parents involved.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The Chair sees the clock at 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]

# FIRST NATIONS OMBUDSMAN ACT

The House resumed from November 4, 1999 consideration of the motion that Bill C-222, an act to establish the office of First Nations Ombudsman to investigate complaints relating to administrative and communication problems between members of First Nations communities and their First Nation and between First Nations, allegations of improper financial administration and allegations of electoral irregularities, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this private member's bill deals with accountability for native people. Accountability is something that everybody

claims we should have. There are many people on the government side who do their very best to ensure that many do not. Nowhere is the lack of accountability any more blatant than in the case of Canada's aboriginal people.

The two biggest problems that governments generally have foisted upon native people are the reserve system and the Indian Act.

I had occasion to be present at a service club where a native woman was the speaker for the evening. She was university educated and married to a Vancouver city police officer who was non-native. She was a very articulate woman. She pointed out that under the Indian Act, should she die, she is not even allowed to leave her estate to her husband or her children because the Indian Act makes her a ward of the government, a ward of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

• (1330)

Another problem is the reserve system. It is nothing more than the ghettoizing of Canada's native population. In my riding I have the largest concentration of Russian Doukhobor people in the world, bar none. Not even Russia. It was the Doukhobor people's custom to live in a communal lifestyle when they came to Canada. That is the way they established themselves. Over time they have chosen to integrate into society, to have regular jobs, to have homes and to participate in all the benefits and responsibilities of being Canadian. A few have chosen not to do that and have stayed in a communal lifestyle. The operative word is chosen.

That is something that is being taken away from Canada's native people. There are things being done that virtually force them or at least put a tremendous amount of pressure on them to stay on reserves. The money that goes to the various reserves is done on the basis of the population of the reserve. It is incumbent upon native leaders to find ways to encourage native people to remain on reserve. For people who are not already on reserve they try to force them, in one manner or another, to become residents of the reserve. It is nothing more than a feudal system.

One of the big problems is elections and how people are democratically elected. When I was talking about the Nisga'a treaty and some of the problems of potential autocratic leadership, some people asked if the leaders were not elected in most cases. The answer is that they are. As I pointed out to them, I am elected. I am the member of parliament for my riding. I am elected by the people of my riding to represent them. If I do not do a good job, they are entitled to write to a newspaper, go on radio, stand on the street corner and rail against me, and run against me in the next election. If they beat me, fine. If they do not, life goes on.

What if I owned all their houses, owned their bank accounts and controlled where they worked? What kind of accountability would

people have if they became leaders with that incredible kind of power or if someone ran against them and was not successful? When the same people was back into power, what kind or retribution would they force upon the people who had the temerity to run against them and to speak out against them? What is holding those leaders accountable to native people when such things happen?

We have documented case after case of situations where that has happened. That is not to say that some native bands cannot act benevolently on behalf of their people. We have some excellent cases of that. The Sechelt band operates very effectively with a municipal style native government.

We have other examples. I mentioned the Nisga'a so I will start with them. Many Nisga'a people live in poverty on reserves, in very oppressive conditions, but there are only 1,700 native people on Nisga'a lands at this point in time. Yet \$29 million a year go into their treasury from the provincial and federal governments for 1,700 people. Of course there are individual incomes. How come so many of them are living in such poverty if they have \$29 million a year?

If that is not bad enough, we have the Stoney just across the B.C. border in Alberta. They total 3,300 people and have \$50 million a year in income. Yet again many of them live in poverty, some to the point of living in basements of condemned homes. What happens to that money and where is the accountability?

• (1335)

Who speaks on behalf of native people who are looking for help and looking for better living conditions on reserves with the money coming in that is supposed to be theirs in part and supposed to be handled by the leaders on their behalf? Somehow magically it disappears and they are not getting help.

We have many other examples. The 5,500 Samson Cree have an income of \$92 million a year and yet many people on those reserves are living in very trying conditions.

The government reluctantly agreed under pressure from us to the Nisga'a committee travelling. It made a procedural mistake in the House and had no choice but to agree to it in spite of the fact that it publicly stated it did not want to be there. The government rigged, and I use that word without any hesitation, the witness list to ensure that people who had something to say were not allowed to do so.

We held an additional day of hearings for people who were frozen out by the Liberal list. We heard from members of the Squamish band who own a great deal of very valuable, very expensive commercial real estate in West Vancouver. They get tremendous royalties and revenues from that as well as the usual provincial and federal government payments. They told us that they received an income of \$900 a year from the band in terms of

help. We heard cases of people living in rat infested, rusted out trailers. That was the housing provided by the band. There is no accountability, none at all.

Welfare or social assistance is not paid directly to natives who live on reservations. It is paid to the band council. When that money is paid, the government looks upon the council to fairly distribute it to people in need.

One of the four tribal councils of the Nisga'a is under investigation for welfare fraud. The money that has been going to aid people in need on reservations has in fact not been reaching them. The preliminary investigation indicates that tribal council members' wives and children have been placed on the rolls to receive the money themselves.

What are the solutions? One of the first problems we always encounter is getting the government to admit there is a problem. It seems it has at least done that. A letter was written to a constituent by the then parliamentary secretary. I believe he still is the parliamentary secretary. There is much that can be said on the issue, but my time is coming to an end. We think the government should be held accountable. It was acknowledged in the letter which I do not have time to read now that there was a need for accountability. An article in the paper indicated that funding was going to leaders of various special boards to assist people but that it was not getting to them at all.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is indicating that I should be cut off. I can well understand why he would want me to be cut off. The Liberals do not want the truth to get out, but it will get out through newspapers, through us and through native people speaking out.

When will the government start listening and start helping people instead of shovelling money at the people who support them? When will it be accountable and start dealing with the real problems of native people instead of trying to buy them off through their leaders?

Mr. David Iftody (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again the hon. member in his predictable rather silly, non-factual, inaccurate, exaggerated speech that I have heard 20 to 30 times in the House refers to facts in newspaper articles.

I found it quite intriguing when I read in the *National Post* that it may have been his riding which received millions of dollars in grants from HRDC. At the same time this fellow is standing in his place very puffed up and self-righteous about how awful it is that we are doing this in Canada. It is quite interesting.

**●** (1340)

On a brighter note and more focused on the debate I will address Bill C-222 put forward by the member for Wild Rose for whom I

have great respect. He is a decent and good man. He believes very deeply in these issues although he is always wrong. However, we have to be compelled somewhat by his own deep feelings and belief in this regard. That is charming in itself. It is important to the member and we are equally passionate and committed to accountability and the other issues as well.

The plan we have put forward is about giving aboriginal peoples the tools they need to become self-sufficient, self-supporting, and contributing members of the Canadian family. I think all of us in the House and indeed all Canadians believe our ultimate goal is to have first nations people participate fully in Canadian society.

The bill would require the federal government to appoint an ombudsman empowered with certain quasi-judicial authority to oversee and investigate operations and elections of first nations, as the member alluded to. The proposed legislation would make it possible for this person, he or she, to propose changes to first nation policies and practices. If a first nation does not make the changes suggested, the ombudsman would make a report to the House of Commons.

It is not surprising coming from the Reform Party that it hearkens back to the turn of the century when the Government of Canada dispatched officers of the department who were in a sense officers of the court. They had those certain powers to dispatch moneys and work with the native people. They were in fact less bureaucratic and more quasi-police people who policed the reserves. We find it quite unacceptable. Indeed it does not help the situation at all. Not least of which, it does not help first nations people in their communities.

The bill deals with two main areas relating to accountability: band elections and financial management. I point out some specific problems with the bill. It is incongruent with the Indian Act, I say to the member and his research staff, those great folk in the Reform Party research staff from whom I hear from time to time. These two pieces of legislation could not operate together. The member in constructing the bill missed half the equation.

Members of the House should note that an election appeals process already exists in the Indian Act under the Indian band election regulations. These election processes, or for that matter any irregularities and complaints, fall within the mandate of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The bill is in direct conflict not only with the act as a whole but with the appeal process generally and more specifically. It is very incongruent. No attempt is made by the member to reconcile the conflict in existing laws.

The bill also fails to make a distinction between the various ways first nations elect their leaders. There are 610 bands in Canada. Of them 273 conduct their elections pursuant to the electoral provisions of the Indian Act. As already pointed out, the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs investigates alleged violations of the

Indian Act. These might include ineligible voters, ineligible candidates or secrecy violations. The bill fails to recognize that another 320 of Canada's first nations elect their leadership through traditional practices based on traditional electoral systems.

I do not find that at all surprising. Again, again and again in the House it has been well established and now will be come social fact and a part of Canadian history that the Reform Party does not care about first nations people and has no interest in recognizing their culture, their history and their development as a people in this country, to say nothing of the fact that they were the first people here.

It does not as well research this project sufficiently to take into account that 17 other first nations have negotiated modern self-government legislation. The legislation governs the manner in which these communities elect their leadership.

• (1345)

Once this legislation were in place the federal government would have no role to play in the leadership selection process. Given that Bill C-222 would likely infringe on the aboriginal treaty rights or other rights, consultation is required. What would happen if this bill were brought in?

The auditor general and others have compelled the Government of Canada or the minister not to litigate but to negotiate, in other words to stay out of the courts. It ties up these matters for years and years. It makes for rich lawyers but bad policy, bad outcomes and even more bad situations for first nations people. That has not been thought about at all. The bill does not contemplate that at all. Rather, it takes a confrontational approach once again to a complex problem.

In short, adopting this bill is not a simple process. I stress that it would require the House to repeal or amend several other pieces of legislation in order to consider passage of this bill. Given that it would likely infringe treaty rights, more consultation and work would obviously have to occur.

More important, this bill was not developed in consultation with any first nations people, notwithstanding the member's visits. I say quite honestly that on many occasions the member has visited first nations in his communities. He has tried to do something constructive.

On financial accountability, we need to work closely with first nations communities. The idea of having a policeman of sorts scowling through the books and backyards of first nations communities is not one that is particularly palatable for most reasonable Canadians. Canadians are very fair minded about these issues and would frown quite quickly on the notion of these kinds of practices

which are endemic and systemic to the Reform Party. It seems to delight in these kinds of things.

On the whole question of accountability, two weeks ago in Winnipeg I had the privilege to meet with the Auditor General of Canada, the chief of the Assembly of First Nations, Phil Fontaine, and some 300 first nations people from across the country. We discussed the question of accountability within the first nations communities. I can tell the Reform Party and other members that I was absolutely delighted with that meeting and with discussions with the auditor general. The grand chief and the first nations people were there, many of them women.

They have a genuine interest in resolving the administrative problems and practices that may be occurring on their reserves. They are not running away from those problems. Many first nations are bringing them forward in their own communities and challenging their leaders to come forward with suggestions to make them more accountable to the members themselves. This is what we cheer on and support. It facilitates government to government relations. It builds a better Canadian society and a better future for first nations people. This is what the government is trying to do.

I ask the Reform Party in bringing forward these kinds of measures not to fan the flames of discontent and irritability which sometimes exist between first nations and other Canadians but look very deeply into these matters. Look at them clearly and soberly. Bring forward to the House of Commons some good suggestions that we might debate and include in our legislation in order to make the country an even better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence and the opportunity to speak in the House and to inform the hon. members. I still am the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, at least, I understand, until July 15.

[Translation]

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today, on behalf of the Bloc Quebecois, to the bill put forward by the hon. member for Wild Rose.

• (1350)

I should say from the outset, if we are to lay our cards on the table right away, that the Bloc Quebecois is going to oppose the hon. member's bill, for various reasons.

We feel that the bill is extremely paternalistic. I looked up the definition of ombudsman for my personal interest and I would like to share it with everyone. An ombudsman is someone responsible for defending the rights of citizens in their dealings with public authorities. The Reform Party sees an ombudsman as someone who will defend the rights of citizens in their dealings with their own elected representatives. I find this extremely paternalistic, and

aboriginal peoples need no more of the paternalism that has always plagued them.

The Indian Act, which has been in force since 1876, is an extremely paternalistic statute that leaves people completely powerless. Every time they try to escape from the dependence in which they are trapped, they must seek the minister's permission. Whether it is a question of selling grain, buying livestock or trying to expand their band council office, they are always forced to ask for additional funds or seek the minister's permission. This bill is more of the same and, in my view, is very paternalistic. I think that we must trust aboriginals to resolve these issues.

The government may support them when they have specific needs, but that is a far cry from having the House of Commons establish the office of ombudsman to sort out all these issues. For one thing, I do not believe in it, and for another, I believe it is extremely paternalistic.

The Bloc Quebecois has always been proud to consult aboriginal people before taking a position. I am sure aboriginal people are not interested in having an ombudsman who will interfere in their lives and settle disputes. There are always disputes in society and we cannot always have someone like King Solomon to settle them. Discussion, consultation and mediation are the key to settling any dispute. We do not think that creating the office of ombudsman is the solution to all problems.

The proposal made by my colleague refers to two problems in particular that he would like to see solved by the ombudsman, namely improper financial administration and electoral irregularities. It is easy to say "we will appoint someone who will settle all this", but I do not think this is a constructive solution.

As I was saying earlier, problems are solved through discussion, consultation, mediation and work in the field. It is not up to people in Ottawa to settle these issues once and for all. This is not a way out for first nations, nor is it the way of the future.

The Reform Party also has a strong tendency to generalize. No one denies that there are problems within aboriginal communities. The auditor general has documented that fact. However, the Reform Party has a tendency to generalize when it discovers short term or very specific problems. Fortunately, the situation is not the same everywhere.

I regularly visit aboriginal communities. They usually are under very good administration. Certainly there are some that are poorly administered, but it is not fair to the aboriginal people to say that this is generalized, that aboriginal people are not good administrators, that they commit election fraud. It is a dangerous trend, one that contributes to narrow-mindedness, to imply that the aboriginal people have always been catered to, hand and foot, and that everything has always been paid for.

I wish to point out that the social contract of the time, and yet they were here first, informed them "We are going to put you into some small areas. There are 600 such small areas throughout Canada, 600 small communities".

#### (1355)

We told them "We are going to settle you there, and we will pay your bills. Meanwhile, we will take over all the natural resources and everything that you had, because you were the first inhabitants, but now it is all ours".

Generalizing in this way, saying that administration is bad on all reserves, is a disservice to aboriginal people, and to the white population as well.

What is needed is perspicacity and discernment. That is why we are going to vote against the bill.

As far as inappropriate financial administration is concerned, I have just said it was not generalized. Things are new. With the agreements on land claims and self-government, more and more money is returning to the native peoples, who are now being invited to administer it.

We have to put ourselves in the shoes of people who, for 325 years, have administered nothing. The Minister of Indian Affairs has administered everything for them. It is understandable that there are certain problems at times. These people must be given the benefit of the doubt. We must not condemn them out of hand, saying they are worthless, will never manage and will always have to be supervised. Earlier, it was said that the first criticism of this bill was its paternalism. Things have to be seen differently.

The auditor general has indicated a number of problems, and they have to be resolved other than through an ombudsman. One of the ways proposed, which we wholeheartedly support, involves some support from Canada's chartered accountants. They said they are prepared to lend a hand, to help those communities needing their expertise or to make it available to them at a reasonable price in order to set things up and try to reconcile rigid and responsible administration with the fact that nothing like this has happened for 125 years. This is another way out.

We also support everything that involves round tables. The native people discuss and settle their problems in a circle. This approach is totally in keeping with native tradition and culture. One way around things would be for the native peoples to meet with specialists in the matter and discuss things until solutions are reached. This should not be left up to someone in Ottawa, who will decide what is right. This is the wrong approach.

As for electoral irregularities, everyone knows that the Indian Act provides a mechanism. This statute has not always been very sensitive to native traditions. In addition, there have been amend-

ments, with the result that aboriginals may now have their own electoral system, subject to the minister's approval of course. At least now aboriginals can benefit from electoral legislation more in tune with their traditions and culture.

We would like to see more trust placed in aboriginals. We trust them to sort out their own affairs. When we have bills that affect them, we should consult them. They too have a great desire to end their longstanding dependence on the federal government. When I say end, I do not mean to go their own way completely and do whatever they wish. They must be allowed to manage their future in a manner respecting their traditions and their culture, which are very different from ours.

For all these reasons, and particularly because we trust aboriginals to resolve their own problems, the Bloc Quebecois will oppose Bill C-222 put forward by the member for Wild Rose.

[English]

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House to speak to Bill C-222 introduced by the member for Wild Rose. This bill, the first nations ombudsman act, would establish the office of an ombudsman to investigate complaints of an administrative, financial or electoral nature concerning first nations people.

We have all read in the papers about mismanagement on first nations in Canada and how more than \$4 billion provided to first nations in transfer payments did not always reach the intended recipients.

## • (1400)

The problem with this is that it has given some people the false sense that all first nations are poorly managed, when in fact many first nations manage themselves extremely well. It is the examples of mismanagement and misconduct that make the news and malign the efforts of other first nations.

This does not mean however that an ombudsman's office is not a good idea. On the contrary, this suggestion has a great deal of merit.

The member for Provencher was stating that he did not think this was a good idea and that he did not believe the government would go along with this because somehow it would mysteriously change the way we do business. Yet our own government has an ombudsman's office and should have an ombudsman's office.

Many organizations, including governments, make use of similar offices to provide people with an avenue by which they can lodge a complaint and feel that their concerns are being addressed.

As members of parliament, all of us have had occasions where we have either advised constituents of the presence of an ombudsman's office or, as a last resort, when a constituent feels that an ombudsman still has not responded satisfactorily to the problem, we have sent him or her to a higher office. Every member of parliament in the House, I am sure at one time or another, has used an ombudsman's office or has suggested that a constituent use an ombudsman's office.

The establishment of a similar office for first nations would be an effective and useful means of addressing concerns of aboriginal people, whether it be matters resulting from alleged unfair election practices or financial or administrative problems.

As the PC Party's critic for Indian Affairs and Northern Development, I had heard from aboriginal people on numerous occasions who have expressed their frustration with the lack of options available to them when they question the procedures or processes of the band chief and council. An independent ombudsman's office would provide a possible solution and would be in a position to assess information and respond to complaints.

Furthermore, it would allow aboriginal people to air their grievances when they feel they have been ignored by the chief and council or are unwilling to discuss it in a more public format. In some cases ombudsman's offices will only investigate an issue if all other avenues have been explored. In the case of first nations, however, it would be more effective if the ombudsman's office could be contacted at any stage or whenever a problem arises. It is my understanding that this bill would not limit access to the ombudsman's office.

In addition, the bill would allow any member of a first nation community to avail himself or herself of this service whether they live on or off reserve.

Under the provisions of the bill, the ombudsman would be appointed for a term of five years with the governor in council making the appointment on the recommendation of the minister. First nations would be involved in this process by making representations to the committee that would then report to the minister. It is important to ensure the impartiality of the ombudsman and this process would distance the first nations from the appointment of that ombudsman, otherwise the effectiveness and objectiveness of this office would be jeopardized.

In places where there have been questions about the legality of election processes or allegations of inappropriate use of band funds, there is currently little opportunity for aboriginal people to lodge a complaint except with the people who are often implicated in that same complaint.

Obviously this is not an ideal situation and does little to alleviate the problem. The only other course of action available is to complain to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development or to members of parliament, particularly those in the critic area or with in whose constituency the first nation falls.

#### Private Members' Business

The federal government has a fiduciary responsibility to aboriginal people and has the obligation to work on behalf of aboriginal people to protect their rights. This is an onerous responsibility that is sometimes misunderstood. The bill would acknowledge that first nations people also have to rely upon themselves and their organizations and elected bodies to protect their rights and access to services. Instead of having to outline their complaints to the minister of Indian affairs, they would have an independent ombudsman's office that would address their concerns. With the input of first nations, this process has the potential to help first nations people assume greater responsibility and accountability for their actions.

In some cases band members are not able to access the information that would help them prove their allegations. The bill would provide an ombudsman with the power and authority to access such records. At the same time, it would be at the discretion of the ombudsman as to what constitutes reasonable grounds for an investigation.

#### **●** (1405)

As I said earlier, I feel the bill has a lot of merit. There are always misunderstandings or misdemeanours that can easily be addressed if the proper process is put in place. The establishment of an ombudsman's office is one solution that could help first nations better serve their communities and, in the long term, provide better service, more transparency and accountability.

These are objectives that all governments and institutions strive to achieve with varying degrees of success. It is always a good idea to explore new options and possibilities for improvement.

The bill is a worthy proposal. It is not without some problems but the idea of an ombudsman's office should be embraced by the government and by all members of parliament. It would seem only natural that there be someone to whom ordinary citizens of Canada could turn to when they have questions or when they feel they have not been treated fairly by the authorities. All other segments of Canadian society have an ombudsman's office somewhere that they can turn to. Why should we exclude the ombudsman's office from first nations communities?

**Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-222, the first nations ombudsman bill, was proposed by my seatmate and friend, the hon. member for Wild Rose. I would like to thank and congratulate him for this initiative.

I was listening as the parliamentary secretary passed judgment on the bill and I have a couple of comments to make before I start into the main part of my speech.

He said that the Indian Act is incongruent with this proposal. That may well be, but the minister, I understand, wants the standing

#### Private Members' Business

committee to look at amendments to the Indian Act and, of course, we can always make amendments to accommodate this proposal.

When I travelled with the Indian affairs committee, I spoke to a chief who told me how their traditional electoral practices worked. I will explain this process so that people can hear about the kinds of things that can happen when we go traditional.

When all the candidates for a particular office, let us say the chief, get into a large room they are all sent into different corners. While they are waiting there, all the voters gather in the middle of the large room and begin moving toward their various candidates. One can well imagine the intimidation one would feel. This is not to say that anyone is being intimidated, but members can just imagine how lonely we would feel all alone in a corner and then finding out that our jobs had been on the line. There is no secrecy in a situation like that. If someone had found that his or her job or some benefits he or she had accrued as a member of the band were lost as a result of this process, he or she may want to bring that to the attention of an ombudsman.

The parliamentary secretary said "stay out of the courts". In response to that, I must say that his government is so frequently in the courts with different bands and first nations that it is almost impossible to write it all down. We know there are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of claims pending against the government.

If there are flaws, we accept that. There is probably no piece of legislation the Liberals have ever introduced that has been perfect. What do we do when we get a bill? We pass it and send it to a committee for review. We could invite the band leadership to the committee to pass judgment, give their advice on how to improve it or just tell us what they think. Why would we kill it here? The initiative did not come from the House. It came from the grassroots people.

Reports of mismanagement are downplayed but they come from across Canada. I was reading newspaper reports last year about east coast chiefs and councillors holding and doling out high paying jobs. Judge Reilly in Alberta caused an uproar when he slammed the Indian leadership for problems that contributed to a number of suicides on the Samson Cree Nation Reserve at Hobbema. Nothing was happening until he issued his report.

• (1410)

The Squamish band members in B.C. have asked the RCMP to investigate band finances. They have appealed to Indian affairs for help and were told that the department was only a funding agency, that it was not an investigative body, which is true. It is only a funding agency but it is also supposed to be a legislative agency.

Last year the National Post ran an entire series of articles detailing the squalor and corruption on some reserves and the

helplessness of band members to effect change. The need for such an officer became apparent to participants at grassroots meetings of aboriginals sponsored by the Reform MPs in the summer of 1998 and 1999. I was there and I would not have believed it if I had not seen it.

These meetings were held across Canada with a significant cross section of people attending. The idea of an aboriginal ombudsman came out of those meetings. One of its strongest supporters was Leona Freed who has emerged as the leader of a new group called First Nations Accountability Coalition. These people are calling for this, not us because we think we have all the solutions. We think that the people who are affected by legislation might also have some solutions.

Participants at these meetings charged band leadership with questionable allocation of band funds: refusals to conduct forensic audits when requested; jobs changing hands after band elections; nepotism, favouritism, cronyism; housing allocations to families and friends of chiefs and councillors; band leaders flying high on expense accounts, going all over the world to meetings and whatever; third world living conditions on wealthy reserves; misuse of dedicated funds meant for training, health, housing and land purchases; and any number of things. The government denies all of this, but from time to time it has to admit the facts in individual cases. However, it refuses to see a cause and effect relationship or to believe that anything can be done to improve the situation.

The Department of Indian and Northern Affairs has been of little or no use. Letters written in confidence to the minister have fallen into the wrong hands. What has been done? Allegation co-ordinators have been established to help with the work of co-ordinating allegations made, but they have no teeth, no authority to act and no investigative powers. What use they are is up in the air.

In 1997 several elders, led by Greg Twoyoungmen from Alberta, came to Ottawa to meet with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to talk about the problems on their reserves. What did they get from the minister? They got a closed door. The minister would not meet with them. The only people who would meet with them were the Reform Party critic and deputy critic for Indian affairs. Much of what we hear came from there as well.

Who do these people turn to when all the doors are closed? The department of Indian affairs sends people back to their reserve leaders. The RCMP need significant proof before they can move. They cannot go to the courts for lengthy and expensive court battles on a civil basis because they simply do not have the funds available to them.

It was the grassroots Indians themselves who proposed the office of aboriginal ombudsman as an independent watchdog. They are convinced that an ombudsman will enable band members to exercise oversight into the affairs of bands in a way that is out of their grasp right now.

One of the better parts of this proposal is that the ombudsman would not serve at the pleasure of bands but would serve a fixed term of five years and not more than two terms. The ombudsman's pay cheque would not come from a band so his or her independence would be assured and he or she could not be called into question. The ombudsman would get assistance from the Chief Electoral Officer when needed to help settle disputes and would report to parliament annually.

The need for such legislation is clear. The bill is worthy of support by members of the House. I encourage every member to vote in favour of it, send it to committee and let the first nations leadership meet with the committee and give their views on it.

It would be a mistake to let some of the assertions from the other parties that have opposed this legislation, that what the Reform Party is saying is that all band membership is illegal and that is why this is needed, to go unanswered. That is not so. For the times it does, it hurts individuals. Many bands conduct their affairs in an open and businesslike way. They have nothing to fear from any legislation that is designed to protect individuals. Individuals are often hurt by that type of thing.

#### • (1415)

The critic for the Bloc characterized Indians as different from other people, that they sit around in circles and talk. When three or four people come to my office, we sit in a circle around my coffee table and we have a ceremonial drink. We call it coffee. We are pretty much alike when it comes to that type of thing. We gather in a circle, face one another and hash out the problems.

That is not the issue at all. The issue is protection of individual people who run afoul of a large bureaucratic organization that has economic, political and judicial power on its side. The people need an aboriginal ombudsman to protect them.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague for introducing this critically important bill.

One profound tragedy in our country today is the existing situation for aboriginal people on and off reserve. The present government, previous governments and all Canadians have created an institutionalized welfare system in aboriginal communities. Through legislation we have put our heels on the necks of those people and have prevented them from having the same rights, responsibilities and obligations as other Canadians.

#### Private Members' Business

It is an insult to them that the government and previous governments have pursued these policies for such a long time. It will lead to the balkanization of our country. It will do nothing to address the fundamental problem of grassroots aboriginal people being dislocated from the wealth, the hope, the possibilities and prosperity that this country has to offer.

The government is empowering, albeit with honest intentions, the leadership of aboriginal people to rule. It is doing nothing to ensure that grassroots aboriginal people generate the control, responsibility and power to stand on their own two feet. That is why this bill is so important. It is important to have an ombudsman to ensure that grassroots aboriginal people are heard.

I have some true stories to tell. I have worked with aboriginals for a long time on and off reserve and in emergency rooms. I have seen firsthand the devastation brought on by fetal alcohol syndrome, child abuse, sexual abuse and gross poverty. I have not seen this type of situation since I worked in Africa. There have been medical problems that I have not seen since I worked in the third world. It is going on in our country today.

I implore the media to investigate what is happening in Nunavut, in northern Ontario, in northern Quebec, in Vancouver East and in northern British Columbia. This is not to say that all reserves or all aboriginal people are suffering from the same maladies. The incidence of poverty, medical problems and disempowered aboriginals is epidemic. We are ensuring that continues by virtue of the policies that are implemented in the House.

We want to empower grassroots people, but through the Nisga'a treaty and others we have done the exact opposite. We have empowered the people at the top. Time and time again grassroots aboriginal people have come to me saying they would like to send their children to school. But a lot of the money that is to go to the school to pay for books and teachers and to ensure that the kids get an education does not get there.

The elders in the aboriginal communities are saying that they would like to teach their people their traditional ways. Money has been allocated for that but it does not get to them. It disappears. Yet the chief and band council members drive expensive cars, live in expensive homes and go on expensive vacations while their people live in abject poverty.

#### • (1420)

If we were successful and if proposals made by the government and previous governments and the Conservative Party had worked, why is it that aboriginal communities have some of the highest rates of violence and sexual abuse? Their mortality figures are the highest. Maternal deaths are the highest. Infant mortality figures are well beyond anything in the non-aboriginal community. Why is

#### Private Members' Business

it that their diabetes rates are four times higher than non-aboriginal communities? I could go on.

Individual grassroots aboriginal people are not empowered to stand on their own two feet. We are not giving them the same resources and legal tools which enable us to produce for ourselves, our families and our communities. By doing so we get self-respect. It is a myth to say that we can give people self-respect. People only get self-respect by taking it. We only get it by being able to support ourselves, our families and our communities.

It is up to the aboriginal leaders to take a different tack and control themselves. How can they ensure that their people are going to have the power to represent themselves as opposed to the present situation where a small cabal of people at the top controls the situation.

Some aboriginal reserves work well under these conditions, the ones on the west coast in the Charlottes for example. There is responsible governance on the part of the people. They have invested the money the government has given them in ways which the people earn revenue. They have invested in the tools which give aboriginal people the education and the power to generate funds and work. They have healthy communities and live in congruence with their environment. This is what is taking place in some communities but unfortunately in many communities across the country that is not the case.

I can only plead with the government for an ombudsman to ensure that aboriginal people are heard.

When the current HRD minister was minister of Indian affairs, I went to her about situations in my riding. Children were falling into open sewers. Health Canada determined it to be a health hazard to the people living in the area. Yet it took years to get the money to the people so they could fix the problem. In part the leadership was not prepared to deal with these people in an honest way. This is what is happening.

The regional director could not intervene on behalf of the grassroots aboriginal people because the leadership in the community said no. The leadership in the community was compromising—and I am saying that nicely—the ability of the grassroots people to fix the problems on the reserve. If their own leadership will not speak for them, who will? The leadership, the director and the minister will not speak for them. If the minister just turns her face away and says that is the way it is, who will speak for these people? No one.

If non-aboriginal people suffered from the same type of nonsense that aboriginal people suffer from, they would not tolerate it because it would violate their basic rights. The basic rights of aboriginal people are being violated across Canada. As a result they are suffering from health problems and poverty. To merely give them money will not work. It will not work to engage in a process of land claims that will balkanize the provinces. It is going to compromise the tax base of a province and its ability to work with people to provide resources for everybody. We are going to compromise the economy of those provinces for everybody.

The only people who will benefit from this are the people at the top in aboriginal communities. That is what is happening. The fact that the government is prepared to turn a blind eye and stick its head in the sand is one of the greatest tragedies of this country today. It is truly profound.

#### (1425)

When members of parliament visit an aboriginal reserve they will not see what is going on behind the scenes. They will fete us around to look at the nice things that are happening on the reserve. We will not go into people's homes to see them lying drunk at 10 o'clock in the morning on soiled mattresses, 10 to a room. We will not see the children with gross infections on their faces, sitting among adults, looking for basic parenting, looking for the basic care which all children deserve. They do not receive that care.

Understandably, their societies are ill. If any of us were put in that environment, whether we were aboriginal or non-aboriginal, we would do the same thing. If we give people things all the time we create an institutionalized welfare state which takes the souls from human beings. It cuts away at the souls of the people. It destroys them from inside. That is why these people simply cannot get on their own feet, given the current situation and given the current legal tools which this government and previous governments have followed.

If this way of doing things were successful, then we would have seen a dramatic improvement in the health and welfare of aboriginal people. Have we? The answer is an obvious no. The longer we continue doing what we are doing, the longer this will continue.

Members from all political parties find the situation to be appalling. I know that all members of parliament want to do something about it. I know that all members want to work with aboriginal people to ensure that there is change. For God's sake, give those people the same rights and responsibilities that we have. They will flourish. They will teach us a great deal.

In 1967 former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau created a superb white paper. He recognized at that time that the way to aboriginal emancipation was through integration, not assimilation. Those were wise words then and they are wise words today. I can only implore the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Prime Minister to hearken back to that document which was created by Mr. Trudeau, read it again and listen to what he said.

Within the context of that document is, in my view, in our view and I think in the heart of the Prime Minister, the way to ensure that aboriginal and non-aboriginal people will come together, respecting their differences, ensuring that the respective cultures and languages will flourish and ensuring that all people in this beautiful country will be empowered to be the best they can become.

The failure to acknowledge that, the failure to change the present course, which is a course of separation, a course of balkanization, will hurt not only aboriginal people but non-aboriginal people. That is something that all of us will have to live with for the rest of our lives. We can strive for something better.

We must work with grassroots aboriginal people, not necessarily the leadership. Normally these questions are dealt with by the leadership of aboriginal groups and parliamentarians. The discussion does not get to the people on the ground, who want the same things which we have. They want safety, they want hope, they want prosperity and they want a future. They want to live. They want their culture and language to survive in perpetuity. We want that and they want that. We would all benefit.

#### Private Members' Business

We cannot tolerate the present situation. It will ensure the ultimate cultural and social genocide of these people. That is something for which we as Canadians should never be proud.

I hope that 20 years from now we will see that the Nisga'a treaty was a success. I truly hope for that. However, it is our view that it will not be the case.

I hope that the government will see fit to work with us and to implement the solutions found in the document of former Prime Minister Trudeau for the sake of all Canadians.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): 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 next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.30 p.m.)

# **APPENDIX**

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

#### CHAIR OCCUPANTS

# The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

# The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

# The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

# The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

## **BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron

Mr. Bill Blaikie

Ms. Marlene Catterall

Mr. Jay Hill

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

Mr. Peter Milliken

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

# ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session — Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member			itical iliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy			
Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of			
State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Ontario	
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	
Bélanger, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian			
Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	
Bellemare, Eugène, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for	Detailer Promount :	Queece	24
International Cooperation	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères — Les-Patriotes	Quebec	
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-		10
Definer, I van	de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National			
Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora.	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	
Blondin–Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories .	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Ontario	
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	PC
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of	Glengarry — Prescott —		-
Commons	Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview —		
	Dieppe	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
	<u> </u>	-	`

Name of Member (			litical filiation
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	. Nova Scotia	. PC
Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human			
Resources Development	Oakville	. Ontario	. Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	. Ontario	. Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	. Ontario	. Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie		
	Verte		
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport		
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	. British Columbia	. Ref
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel —	0.4.	7 '1
	Wellington — Grey		
Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	Scarborough Centre		
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane		
Caplan, Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill		
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	•	•
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford		
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester		
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge		
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	. Ontario	. Lib
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions			
of Quebec)	Outremont	. Quebec	. Lib
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	. Ontario	. Lib
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific)	Richmond	. British Columbia	. Lib
Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairie	es Quebec	. Lib
Chatters, David	Athabasca	. Alberta	. Ref
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice		
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac — Mégantic	~	
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke		
Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa		. Lib
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	•	
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North		
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	•	
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal		
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière–du– Loup — Témiscouata —	-	
	Les Basques		
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Etobicoke North		
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond		
Dalphond–Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	•	
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East		
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf		•
Debien, Maud	Laval East		-
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill		. ND
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	. Quebec	_
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North		
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South — Burnaby	British Columbia	. Lib
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint–Laurent — Cartierville	. Quebec	. Lib
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	•	
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or — Cape Breton		
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East		
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan		

Name of Member			litical filiation
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-	0.1	D.O.
DIZ	Chaudière	•	•
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche		
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte–Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic	G : AD :C	3.4 4.1	T '1
Diversification)(Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	-	•
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West		
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque		
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre		
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan		
Epp, Ken	Elk Island		
Finlay, John	Oxford		
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West		
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre		
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster —		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Coquitlam — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of			
Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government	Saint-Léonard — Saint-		
Services	Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gallaway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Girard–Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister			
responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay — Boundary —	D. C. I. C.	D.C
a	Okanagan		
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale		
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West		
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central		
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North		
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Gruending, Dennis	Saskatoon — Rosetown —	Saskatchewan	NDP
Guarnieri, Albina	Biggar		
·	MississaugaEast Laurentides		
Guay, Monique	Beauport — Montmorency – Côte–de–Beaupré — Île–	•	BQ
	d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre		
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
Harris, Richard M	Prince George — Bulkley		
	Valley	British Columbia	Ref.

Name of Member (		ovince of onstituency	Political Affiliation
Hart, Jim Harvard, John	Okanagan — Coquihalla Charleswood St. James —		
**	Assiniboia		
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	`	
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal		
Hill, Grant	Macleod Prince George — Peace Rive		
Hill, Jay Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake		
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar		
Trooppiler, suice E.	Tortuge Bisgui	·	Ref.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi		
Board	Trinity — Spadina	. Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and			
Northern Development	Provencher		
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey		
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	. Alberta	Ref.
Jennings, Marlene	Notre–Dame–de–Grâce — Lachine	. Ouebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	•	
Jones, Jim	Markham		
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	. Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	. Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	. Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	. Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast		
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap		Ref.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	. Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh		
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast		
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — Lond		
Konrad, Derrek Kraft Sloan, Karen	Prince Albert		
Laliberte, Rick	York North		
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier		
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	•	
Laurin, René	Joliette		
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint–Henri	`	_
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	-	
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the			
House of Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	. Quebec	Ind.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway		
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth		
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair		
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis		
Loubier Vyon	Whitby — Ajax		
Loubier, Yvan  Lowther, Eric	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot		
Lunn, Gary	Calgary Centre		
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan		
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish —	. 11o Lawara islai	
	Guysborough	. Nova Scotia	PC

Name of Member			litical filiation
Mahoney, Steve	MississaugaWest	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and	Malton — Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Attorney General of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	Nova Scotia	NDP
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	Quebec	BQ
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac —		
	Lennox and Addington	Ontario	
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and			
Agri–Food	Egmont	Prince Edward Island .	
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	British Columbia	Ref.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the			
Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches — East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal	D G 1 16 1 1		T
Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Saskatchewan	
Muise, Mark	West Nova	Nova Scotia	
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern	W B' E'	0	
Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and	Bellechasse — Etchemins —		
Development)	Montmagny — L'Islet	Quebec	
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries			
and Oceans	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.

Name of Member		Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Brien, Pat	Haliburton — Victoria —		
Obhrai, Deepak Pagtakhan, Rey D. Pankiw, Jim	Brock	Alberta	Ref.
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works	Brome — Missisquoi Niagara Centre	Quebec	Lib.
and Government Services	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie Perić, Janko Perron, Gilles–A.	,	Ontario	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)			
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue Picard, Pauline	Hamilton Mountain		
Pickard, Jerry Pillitteri, Gary	Chatham — Kent Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Bécancour	Quebec	-
Pratt, David Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	PC
Proctor, Dick Proud, George Proulx, Marcel	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Is	land . Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen Ramsay, Jack Redman, Karen	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Reed, Julian Reynolds, John	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	r . Saskatchewan	Ref.
responsible for Infrastructure  Robinson, Svend J.  Rocheleau, Yves	Burnaby — Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Kelowna	British Columbia New Brunswick	Ref.
Scott, Mike Sekora, Lou		_	
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	

Name of Member		Province of Constituency	Polit Affil	ical iation
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario		Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta		Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lak Centre			NDP
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International	Haldimand — Norfolk —			
Trade	Brant	Ontario		Lib.
Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	Ontario		Lib.
St–Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil			BQ
St–Jacques, Diane	Shefford			РC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie–James — Nunavik	•		Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	-		Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland			Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development				Lib.
•	Brant Shuayan			
Stinson, Darrel Stoffer, Peter	Okanagan — Shuswap Sackville — Musquodoboit			Ref.
Caralla Clauste	Valley — Eastern Shore			NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley			Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario		Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario		Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the				
Whole	Saint–Lambert			Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest			PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta		Ref.
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the				
Environment	Burlington			Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean			BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	•		BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry.	Quebec		BQ
Ur, Rose–Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Ontario		Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek			Lib.
$Vanclief, Hon.\ Lyle, Minister\ of\ Agriculture\ and\ Agri-Food\dots\dots\dots$	Prince Edward — Hastings			Lib.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac			PC
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan		Ref.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hube	ert Quebec		BQ
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario		Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario		Lib.
Wasylycia–Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba		NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick .		PC
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario		Lib.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	British Columbia		Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia		Ref.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario		Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert			Ref.
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	Ontario		Lib.

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.–Liberal; Ref.–Reform Party of Canada; BQ–Bloc Québécois; NDP–New Democratic Party; PC–Progressive Conservative; Ind.–Independent.

Anyone wishing to communicate with House of Commons members is invited to communicate with either the Member's constituency or Parliament Hill offices.

# ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

# Second Session — Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member		olitical Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Ref.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Ref.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	
Hill, Grant	Macleod	
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	
·		
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific)	Richmond	
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond	
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South — Burnaby	
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan .	Ref.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	
Harris, Richard M.	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	

Name of Member		tical iliation
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	Ref.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	Ref.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	Ref.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	NDP
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	Ref.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.
Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs  Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs  Blaikie, Bill  Borotsik, Rick  Desjarlais, Bev  Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie)  Harvard, John  Hilstrom, Howard  Hoeppner, Jake E.  Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern	Winnipeg South Winnipeg South Centre Winnipeg — Transcona Brandon — Souris Churchill  Saint Boniface Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia Selkirk — Interlake Portage — Lisgar  Provencher	Lib. Lib. NDF PC NDF Lib. Lib. Ref. Ind.
Development  Mark, Inky  Martin, Pat  Pagtakhan, Rey D.  Wasylycia–Leis, Judy	Dauphin — Swan River Winnipeg Centre Winnipeg North — St. Paul Winnipeg North Centre	Ref. Lib. Ref. NDF Lib. NDF

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliati	
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac		
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)			
Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)  Byrne, Gerry  Doyle, Norman  Matthews, Bill  Mifflin, Hon. Fred  O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans  Power, Charlie	Gander — Grand Falls	L	ib. ib. ib. ib. ib. ib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		-	.,
Blondin–Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	L	.ib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)			
Brison, Scott Casey, Bill Dockrill, Michelle Earle, Gordon Keddy, Gerald Lill, Wendy MacKay, Peter Mancini, Peter McDonough, Alexa Muise, Mark Stoffer, Peter	Kings — Hants Cumberland — Colchester Bras d'Or — Cape Breton Halifax West South Shore Dartmouth Pictou — Antigonish — Guysboroug Sydney — Victoria Halifax West Nova Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore	Pi N Pi N gh Pi N N N	NDP NDP PC NDP
NUNAVUT (1)			
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	L	.ib.
ONTARIO (103) Adams, Peter	Peterborough	1	.ib.
Assadourian, Sarkis Augustine, Jean Barnes, Sue Beaumier, Colleen Bélair, Réginald Bélanger, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage Bellemare, Eugène, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation Bennett, Carolyn Bevilacqua, Maurizio Bonin, Raymond Bonwick, Paul Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Brampton Centre Etobicoke — Lakeshore London West Brampton West — Mississauga Timmins — James Bay Ottawa — Vanier Carleton — Gloucester St. Paul's Vaughan — King — Aurora Nickel Belt Simcoe — Grey Glengarry — Prescott — Russell Oakville	Li	ib. ib. ib. ib. iib. iib. iib. iib. iib

Name of Member		olitical ffiliation
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	
Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	Scarborough Centre	
Caplan, Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North	
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Etobicoke North	
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	
Finlay, John	Oxford	
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	
Gallaway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	
Guarnieri, Albina	MississaugaEast	
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Trinity — Spadina	
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	
Jones, Jim	Markham	
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	
• •		
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of	a 1 1 2 2:	T '1
Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	
Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Whitby — Ajax	
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale	Lib. 
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General		
of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	
McKay, John	Scarborough East	
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.

Name of Member		olitical ffiliatio
Mills, Dennis J. Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Broadview — Greenwood	
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic		
Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora — Rainy River	
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	. Ind
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	. Lib
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	. Lib
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	. Lib
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	MississaugaCentre	. Lib
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	Hamilton Mountain	
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham — Kent Essex	
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	
·	Sault Ste. Marie	
Provenzano, Carmen		
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	
Reed, Julian	Halton	
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	
Sgro, Judy	York West	
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	
St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland	. Lib
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	. Lib
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	. Lib
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration .	Kitchener — Waterloo	. Lib
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	. Lib
Ur, Rose–Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	. Lib
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	. Lib
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	. Lib
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	. Lib
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	
Whelan, Susan	Essex	
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	. Lib
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food	Egmont	
Proud, George	Hillsborough	

Political Constituency Name of Member Affiliation QUEBEC (75) Louis-Hébert ..... Assad. Mark Gatineau ..... Charlevoix ..... BQ Bachand, André ..... Bachand, Claude ..... Bakopanos, Eleni ..... Ahuntsic ..... Verchères — Les-Patriotes ..... Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles–de–la– Bernier, Yvan ..... BQ Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle . . . . . . . . Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence . . . . . . . Lib. Bigras, Bernard ..... BO Rosemont ..... Brien, Pierre Témiscamingue ..... BQ Canuel, René ..... BQ Matapédia — Matane ..... Sherbrooke ..... Cardin, Serge ..... BQ Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec) . . . . . . . Lib. Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies . . . . . . . . . Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister ..... Saint-Maurice ..... Bourassa ..... Mount Royal ..... Cotler, Irwin Lib. Crête, Paul ..... Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup — BQ Témiscouata — Les Basques ..... BO de Savoye, Pierre ..... BO Debien, Maud BO Laval East Lotbinière ..... BQ Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister Saint-Laurent — Cartierville . . . . . . . . . of Intergovernmental Affairs ..... Lib. Lib. Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière..... Dubé, Antoine Duceppe, Gilles ..... Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel ..... Folco, Raymonde ..... Laval West ..... Lib. Fournier, Ghislain ..... Manicouagan ..... BO Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services ...... Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel . . . . . . . . Lib. Québec ..... BQ Gauthier, Michel ..... Roberval ..... BQ Godin, Maurice ..... BO Guay, Monique Guimond, Michel ..... Beauport — Montmorency — Côte-de-Harvey, André ..... Chicoutimi ..... Jennings, Marlene ..... Notre-Dame-de-Grâce -- Lachine . . . . . Lib. Lalonde, Francine ...... Mercier ..... Laurin, René Lib. Lebel, Ghislain ..... BO Champlain ..... Lefebvre, Réjean ...... Ind.

Name of Member		tical liatio
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Li
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	В
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	
Marchand, Jean–Paul	Québec East	
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	В
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	В
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse — Etchemins —  Montmagny — L'Islet	Li
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Brome — Missisquoi	Li
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	
Perron, Gilles–A.	Rivière–des–Mille–Îles	
		Li
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade	Papineau — Saint–Denis	
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BO
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancour .	B
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	
Proulx, Marcel	Hull — Aylmer	Li
for Infrastructure	Westmount — Ville–Marie	Li
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	В
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Li
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	
St–Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	
St–Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PO
-		
St–Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie–James — Nunavik	
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	
Bailey, Roy		
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	
the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Li
Gruending, Dennis	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	N.
	Blackstrap	Re
Kerpan, Allan	Prince Albert	Re
	Churchill River	N
Konrad, Derrek	Churchin River	
Konrad, Derrek Laliberte, Rick		R
Konrad, Derrek Laliberte, Rick Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	
Konrad, Derrek Laliberte, Rick Morrison, Lee Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	N
Konrad, Derrek Laliberte, Rick Morrison, Lee Nystrom, Hon. Lorne Pankiw, Jim	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	N. Re
Kerpan, Allan Konrad, Derrek Laliberte, Rick Morrison, Lee Nystrom, Hon. Lorne Pankiw, Jim Proctor, Dick	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Re NI Re NI
Konrad, Derrek Laliberte, Rick Morrison, Lee Nystrom, Hon. Lorne Pankiw, Jim Proctor, Dick Ritz, Gerry	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	N Re N Re
Konrad, Derrek Laliberte, Rick Morrison, Lee Nystrom, Hon. Lorne Pankiw, Jim Proctor, Dick	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	N R N R
Konrad, Derrek Laliberte, Rick Morrison, Lee Nystrom, Hon. Lorne Pankiw, Jim Proctor, Dick Ritz, Gerry Solomon, John	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	N Re N

(16)

(16)

(16)

# LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of February 25th, 2000 — 2nd Session, 36th Parliament)

# ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Sue Barnes John Finlay Derrek Konrad Chair: Vice-Chairs:

Claude Bachand Jim Gouk David Iftody John O'Reilly Ray Bonin Ivan Grose Nancy Karetak-Lindell Mike Scott Paul DeVillers Louise Hardy Gerald Keddy

Guy St-Julien

**Associate Members** 

Bill Casey Pierre de Savoye Carolyn Bennett Cliff Breitkreuz René Canuel Gordon Earle Serge Cardin Reed Elley

Ghislain Fournier

Maurice Godin Richard Harris Rick Laliberte

Gilles-A. Perron Daniel Turp Maurice Vellacott

#### AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair: John Harvard Vice-Chairs: Murray Calder

Howard Hilstrom

Odina Desrochers Gerry Ritz Hélène Alarie Joe McGuire Mark Assad Paul Steckle Gar Knutson Ian Murray Rick Borotsik Larry McCormick Dick Proctor Rose-Marie Ur Garry Breitkreuz

**Associate Members** 

Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Peter Adams Michelle Dockrill Lynn Myers Roy Bailey Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Lorne Nystrom Leon Benoit John Maloney John Solomon Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Rick Casson Lee Morrison Guy St-Julien

### CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Clifford Lincoln Vice-Chairs: Inky Mark

Dennis Mills

Irwin Cotler Alex Shepherd Caroline St–Hilaire Mauril Bélanger Rick Limoges Paul Bonwick Pierre de Savoye Eric Lowther Bryon Wilfert Cliff Breitkreuz Wendy Lill Mark Muise Sarmite Bulte

# **Associate Members**

Pierre Brien Benoît Sauvageau Jim Abbott Paul Forseth André Bachand Guy St-Julien Christiane Gagnon Serge Cardin Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Elsie Wayne Antoine Dubé Claude Bachand Rick Laliberte Carolyn Bennett Maurice Dumas Peter MacKay Rick Borotsik Gordon Earle Louis Plamondon

#### CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana Vice-Chairs: Leon Benoit

Steve Mahoney

(16)

(16)

Rob Anders John Bryden Pat Martin Pauline Picard Jean Augustine Sophia Leung John McKay David Price Bernard Bigras Rick Limoges Grant McNally Andrew Telegdi

Paul Bonwick

**Associate Members** 

Claude Bachand Gordon Earle Réal Ménard Suzanne Tremblay Deepak Obhrai Daniel Turp Louise Hardy

Serge Cardin Libby Davies Diane St-Jacques Francine Lalonde

## ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Vice-Chairs: Chair: Charles Caccia Rahim Jaffer Karen Kraft Sloan

Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Marlene Catterall David Pratt John Herron David Chatters Gurmant Grewal Joe Jordan Julian Reed

Jean-Guy Chrétien Nick Discepola

Pierre Brien

Dennis Gruending Walt Lastewka

Paddy Torsney

**Associate Members** 

Judy Sgro Guy St–Julien Jim Abbott Chuck Cadman Rick Laliberte Peter Adams Clifford Lincoln Serge Cardin Peter Mancini Hélène Alarie Aileen Carroll Peter Stoffer Stéphan Tremblay David Price Leon Benoit John Duncan Bernard Bigras Louise Hardy Nelson Riis Daniel Turp

**FINANCE** 

Vice-Chairs: Nick Discepola Chair: Maurizio Bevilacqua

Richard Harris

Scott Brison Roy Cullen Albina Guarnieri Richard Marceau Karen Redman (16)Lorne Nystrom Monte Solberg Sophia Leung Gary Pillitteri Paul Szabo

Ken Epp Roger Gallaway Yvan Loubier

**Associate Members** 

Diane Ablonczy Joe Fontana Rick Limoges Nelson Riis Rob Anders Paul Forseth Gary Lunn Benoît Sauvageau Carolyn Bennett Christiane Gagnon Peter MacKay Werner Schmidt Rick Borotsik Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Alexa McDonough Alex Shepherd Pierre Brien Monique Guay Bob Mills John Solomon Serge Cardin John Herron Lynn Myers Guy St-Julien Joe Comuzzi Dale Johnston Gilles-A. Perron Stéphan Tremblay Odina Desrochers Jim Jones Pauline Picard Daniel Turp Tony Valeri

Norman Doyle Jason Kenney Charlie Power Antoine Dubé

(18)

#### FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Wayne Easter Vice-Chairs: John Duncan Carmen Provenzano

Sarkis Assadourian Bill Gilmour Bill Matthews Lou Sekora (16)Nancy Karetak-Lindell Gérard Asselin Lawrence O'Brien Paul Steckle

Yvan Bernier Gerald Keddy Marcel Proulx Peter Stoffer John Cummins

**Associate Members** 

Gilles Bernier Ghislain Fournier Svend Robinson Mike Scott

René Canuel Yvon Godin Yves Rocheleau Suzanne Tremblay Paul Forseth Philip Mayfield

SUB-COMMITTEE ON AQUACULTURE AND OCEANS ACT

Chair: Carmen Provenzano Vice-Chair:

Yvan Bernier Bill Gilmour Charlie Power Peter Stoffer (5)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair: Bill Graham Vice-Chairs: Colleen Beaumier

Deepak Obhrai

Sarkis Assadourian Francine Lalonde Fred Mifflin Yves Rocheleau Jean Augustine Diane Marleau Denis Paradis Bob Speller André Bachand Keith Martin Bernard Patry Darrel Stinson

Maud Debien Ted McWhinney Svend Robinson

Rick Casson

**Associate Members** 

Claude Bachand Irwin Cotler Marcel Proulx Sophia Leung Eleni Bakopanos Paul Crête Gurbax Malhi Nelson Riis Eugène Bellemare Maurice Dumas Richard Marceau Alex Shepherd Carolyn Bennett Bill Blaikie Raymonde Folco John Solomon Pat Martin Gurmant Grewal Paul Mercier Diane St-Jacques Sarmite Bulte Dennis Gruending Lee Morrison Chuck Strahl Murray Calder Jim Hart Lorne Nystrom Stéphan Tremblay Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Serge Cardin Jason Kenney Pauline Picard Aileen Carroll René Laurin Charlie Power

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Colleen Beaumier Vice-Chair:

Jean Augustine Eugène Bellemare Maud Debien Svend Robinson (9)Eleni Bakopanos Aileen Carroll Diane St-Jacques Keith Martin

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair: Vice-Chair: Sarmite Bulte

Alex Shepherd Sarkis Assadourian Bill Blaikie Richard Marceau (9) André Bachand Murray Calder Deepak Obhrai Bob Speller

Libby Davies

**HEALTH** 

(16)

(18)

Reed Elley Ovid Jackson Chair: Lynn Myers Vice-Chairs:

Yvon Charbonneau Réal Ménard Karen Redman Rose-Marie Ur

Christiane Gagnon Bob Mills Paul Szabo Maurice Vellacott Judy Wasylycia-Leis

Marcel Proulx Greg Thompson Bill Matthews Ted McWhinney

**Associate Members** 

Carolyn Bennett Bernard Bigras Libby Davies John Herron Pauline Picard Pierre de Savoye Michelle Dockrill Jocelyne Girard–Bujold Guy St–Julien
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp Grant Hill Serge Cardin Jean–Guy Chrétien Sophia Leung John Maloney

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Rey Pagtakhan

Chair: Peter Adams Vice-Chairs: Maurice Vellacott Bryon Wilfert

Diane Ablonczy Jean Dubé Dale Johnston Andy Scott

Raymonde Folco Bonnie Brown Judi Longfield Judy Sgro Paul Crête Christiane Gagnon Larry McCormick Stéphan Tremblay

**Associate Members** 

John Godfrey

Carolyn Bennett Antoine Dubé Joe Jordan Mark Muise Yvan Bernier Maurice Dumas Nancy Karetak-Lindell Lorne Nystrom Bernard Bigras Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Wendy Lill Diane St-Jacques Serge Cardin Yvon Godin Eric Lowther Guy St-Julien

Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Peter Goldring Diane Marleau Bev Desjarlais Deborah Grey Pat Martin Michelle Dockrill Monique Guay Ovid Jackson Réal Ménard Angela Vautour Norman Doyle

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

Vice-Chair: Chair: John Godfrey

Carolyn Bennett Libby Davies Raymonde Folco Ovid Jackson Diane Marleau (9) Christiane Gagnon Eric Lowther Diane St-Jacques

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair: Carolyn Bennett Vice-Chair:

Wendy Lill Mark Muise Karen Redman Joe Jordan Suzanne Tremblay (9) Nancy Karetak-Lindell Maurice Vellacott Andy Scott

(16)

(16)

**INDUSTRY** 

Susan Whelan Chair: Vice-Chairs: Walt Lastewka Charlie Penson

Jerry Pickard Nelson Riis Jim Hart Pierre Brien Gurbax Malhi Gerry Byrne Dan McTeague Marlene Jennings

Ian Murray John Cannis Werner Schmidt Jim Jones Antoine Dubé

**Associate Members** 

Peter Adams Serge Cardin Christiane Gagnon Alex Shepherd Hélène Alarie Pierre de Savoye Jocelyne Girard-Bujold John Solomon Gérard Asselin Odina Desrochers Rahim Jaffer Guy St-Julien Bernard Bigras Jean Dubé Richard Marceau Peter Stoffer Chuck Cadman Joe Fontana Philip Mayfield Daniel Turp

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Andy Scott Vice-Chairs: Chuck Cadman

Ivan Grose

Jim Abbott Aileen Carroll John Maloney John Reynolds Reg Alcock Paul DeVillers Peter Mancini Jacques Saada Michel Bellehumeur Peter MacKay John McKay Pierrette Venne

Carolyn Bennett

**Associate Members** 

Bernard Bigras Louise Hardy Mark Muise Darrel Stinson Darrel Stinson Myron Thompson Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Tom Wappel Randy White Irwin Cotler
Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral Lynn Myers Jack Ramsay Svend Robinson Richard Harris Jay Hill Richard Marceau Keith Martin Pierre de Savoye Judy Sgro Jim Gouk

Dennis Gruending Michel Guimond Caroline St-Hilaire Réal Ménard Lee Morrison Diane St-Jacques

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

Vice-Chair: Chair: Paul DeVillers

Jim Gouk Rick Laliberte Pierrette Venne (9) Lynn Myers Tom Wappel Ivan Grose Peter MacKay Jacques Saada

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair: Pat O'Brien Vice-Chairs: Jim Hart

David Pratt

George Proud Elsie Wayne Bob Wood Robert Bertrand Art Hanger Paul Mercier (16)Hec Clouthier René Laurin John O'Reilly Gordon Earle Janko Peric Judi Longfield Peter Goldring

**Associate Members** 

Rob Anders Serge Cardin Francine Lalonde Pat Martin Leon Benoit John Duncan Ghislain Lebel Daniel Turp

Pierre Brien Monique Guay Peter Mancini

#### NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

David Chatters Chair: Joseph Volpe Vice-Chairs: Julian Reed

Réginald Bélair Gilles Bernier Carolyn Parrish Yvon Godin Guy St-Julien Tony Ianno Brent St. Denis Carmen Provenzano Serge Cardin John Duncan Tony Valeri Ghislain Lebel Werner Schmidt

**Associate Members** 

Jim Jones Gerald Keddy Jim Abbott Jean-Guy Chrétien Benoît Sauvageau Caroline St-Hilaire Michelle Dockrill Hélène Alarie Rob Anders Ghislain Fournier Derrek Konrad Darrel Stinson Gilles-A. Perron Nelson Riis Pierre Brien Christiane Gagnon Daniel Turp René Canuel Jocelyne Girard-Bujold

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair: Vice-Chairs: Marlene Catterall Derek Lee

Chuck Strahl

Ted White

(16)

(16)

(17)

Yvon Godin Carolyn Parrish Eleni Bakopanos Bob Kilger Jerry Pickard André Harvey Stéphane Bergeron Gar Knutson

Jay Hill Ray Bonin Grant McNally John Richardson Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

**Associate Members** 

René Laurin

Eric Lowther Peter Adams Norman Doyle John Solomon Suzanne Tremblay Randy White Michel Bellehumeur Deborah Grey Larry McCormick Bill Blaikie Joe Jordan Réal Ménard Michelle Dockrill

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair: Larry McCormick Vice-Chair:

Bill Blaikie Deborah Grey (6) André Harvey Joe Jordan

Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE TELEVISING OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

Lorne Nystrom

Chair: Marlene Catterall Vice-Chair:

Peter Adams Michelle Dockrill Grant McNally Angela Vautour (6) Stéphane Bergeron

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

John Williams Chair: Vice-Chairs: Steve Mahoney

John Richardson

Hec Clouthier Michelle Dockrill Judy Sgro Alex Shepherd Elsie Wayne Gilles-A. Perron Mac Harb Beth Phinney Marlene Jennings John Finlay Jason Kenney Benoît Sauvageau Philip Mayfield Paul Forseth

**Associate Members** 

Roy Bailey Bev Desjarlais Gurmant Grewal Lorne Nystrom Garry Breitkreuz Peter Stoffer Odina Desrochers Jim Jones Scott Brison Christiane Gagnon Derrek Konrad Suzanne Tremblay Jocelyne Girard-Bujold Rick Casson Ghislain Lebel

(16)

(23)

(23)

#### SUB-COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL REPORTING

Vice-Chair: Chair:

Michelle Dockrill Steve Mahoney John Richardson Elsie Wayne (8) Mac Harb Beth Phinney Benoît Sauvageau John Williams

**TRANSPORT** 

Vice-Chairs: Chair: Stan Keyes Joe Comuzzi

Val Meredith

Gérard Asselin Bev Desjarlais Ovid Jackson Joe Fontana Roy Bailey Murray Calder Dale Johnston Stan Dromisky Claude Drouin Michel Guimond Charles Hubbard Lou Sekora

Bill Casey

**Associate Members** 

Paul Crête Rick Laliberte Yvan Bernier Guy St-Julien Maurice Dumas Suzanne Tremblay Rick Borotsik Lee Morrison Daniel Turp Serge Cardin John Duncan Gerry Ritz Elsie Wayne David Chatters Ghislain Fournier John Solomon

# STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

#### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

**Joint Chairs:** Raymond Lavigne Joint Vice-Chair: Deborah Grey

Louis Robichaud

Representing the Senate: Representing the House of Commons:

The Honourable Senators

Normand Grimard Wendy Lill Norman Atkins Mark Assad Rick Limoges Isobel Finnerty Vivienne Poy Roy Bailey

Jerahmiel Grafstein Calvin Ruck Marlene Catterall Philip Mayfield Paul Mercier Hec Clouthier John Finlay Louis Plamondon Mac Harb David Price

Jim Karygiannis Karen Redman

**Associate Members** 

Libby Davies Suzanne Tremblay

Maurice Dumas

# **OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

Joint Chairs: Joint Vice-Chairs: Grant Hill Raymonde Folco Rose-Marie Losier-Cool

Benoît Serré

Representing the Senate: Representing the House of Commons:

The Honourable Senators

Gérald Beaudoin Lucie Pépin Mauril Bélanger Raymond Lavigne Jean-Claude Rivest Eugène Bellemare Inky Mark Joan Fraser Jean-Robert Gauthier Dan McTeague Louis Robichaud Brenda Chamberlain Michael Meighen Pierre de Savoye

Ted McWhinney Yvon Godin Val Meredith Bob Kilger Louis Plamondon

**Associate Members** 

Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Maurice Dumas Paul Mercier

Lorne Nystrom

# **SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS**

Gurmant Grewal Céline Hervieux–Payette Joint Chairs: Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the House of Commons:

Representing the Senate: The Honourable Senators

Ethel Cochrane Sheila Finestone George Furey Normand Grimard

Wilfred Moore Melvin Perry Jean–Claude Rivest Mark Assad Paul Bonwick John Bryden Bill Casey Joe Comuzzi Paul DeVillers Ken Epp Ghislain Lebel Ian Murray Lorne Nystrom Jim Pankiw Gary Pillitteri Jacques Saada Pierrette Venne Tom Wappel Ted White

(25)

# **Associate Members**

Michel Bellehumeur Michelle Dockrill Michel Guimond Suzanne Tremblay

# The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

# **Panel of Chairmen of Legislative Committees**

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

Mr. Peter Milliken

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Commitees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

# LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

(As of February 25th, 2000 — 2nd Session, 36th Parliament)

# BILL C-20,

# AN ACT TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLARITY AS SET OUT IN THE OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA IN THE QUEBEC SECESSION REFERENCE

Chair: Peter Milliken Vice-Chair:

Reg Alcock André Bachand Bill Blaikie Ray Bonin Irwin Cotler Claude Drouin Michel Guimond Grant Hill Rahim Jaffer Val Meredith Dennis Mills Bernard Patry

Karen Redman Andy Scott Daniel Turp

(16)

#### THE MINISTRY

#### According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien Prime Minister

The Hon. Herb Gray
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy
The Hon. David M. Collenette

The Hon. David M. Collenette

Deputy Prime Minister
Minister of Foreign Affairs
Minister of Transport

The Hon. David Anderson Minister of the Environment

The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian

Wheat Board

The Hon. Sheila Copps Minister of Canadian Heritage

The Hon. John Manley Minister of Industry
The Hon. Paul Martin Minister of Finance

The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton Minister of National Defence

The Hon. Anne McLellan Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada

The Hon. Allan Rock Minister of Health

The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay Solicitor General of Canada

The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano Minister of Public Works and Government Services

The Hon. Lucienne Robillard President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure

The Hon. Martin Cauchon

Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)

The Hon. Jane Stewart Minister of Human Resources Development

The Hon. Stéphane Dion President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of

Intergovernmental Affairs

The Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew Minister for International Trade

The Hon. Don Boudria Leader of the Government in the House of Commons

The Hon. Lyle Vanclief Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food

The Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans

The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw Minister of Labour
The Hon. George S. Baker Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada

Opportunities Agency)

The Hon. Robert D. Nault Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

The Hon. Maria Minna
The Hon. Elinor Caplan
The Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau
The Hon. Ethel Blondin–Andrew

Minister for International Cooperation
Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Leader of the Government in the Senate
Secretary of State (Children and Youth)

The Hon. Raymond Chan Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific)

The Hon. Hedy Fry Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

The Hon. David Kilgour Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)

The Hon. Jim Peterson Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)

The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel

The Hon. Andy Mitchell

Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)

Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development)

Initiative for Northern Ontario)

The Hon. Gilbert Normand Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)

The Hon. Denis Coderre Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)

#### PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Gar Knutson to Prime Minister

Denis Paradis to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Dromisky to Minister of Transport
Paddy Torsney to Minister of the Environment
Brent St. Denis to Minister of Natural Resources
Mauril Bélanger to Minister of Canadian Heritage

John Cannis to Minister of Industry Roy Cullen to Minister of Finance

Robert Bertrand to Minister of National Defence

John Maloney to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada

Yvon Charbonneau to Minister of Health

Jacques Saada to Solicitor General of Canada

Carolyn Parrish to Minister of Public Works and Government Services

Tony Ianno to President of the Treasury Board Beth Phinney to Minister of National Revenue

Bonnie Brown to Minister of Human Resources Development

Reg Alcock to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of

Intergovernmental Affairs

Bob Speller to Minister for International Trade

Derek Lee to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons

Joe McGuire to Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food Lawrence O'Brien to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans

Judi Longfield to Minister of Labour

Bob Wood to Minister of Veterans Affairs

David Iftody to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Eugène Bellemare to Minister for International Cooperation
Andrew Telegdi to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration

# **CONTENTS**

# Friday, February 25, 2000

GOVERNMENT ORDERS		Ms. Brown	4033
Consider Floridania And		Mr. Bigras	4033
Canada Elections Act	4021	Ms. Brown	4033
Bill C–2. Third Reading	4021	Mr. Bigras	4033
Mr. Boudria	4021	Ms. Brown	4033
Mr. Perron	4021	Health Care	
Mr. Boudria	4021		4033
Mr. Boudria	4022	Mr. Blaikie	
Mr. Pettigrew	4022	Mr. Rock	4034
Mr. Boudria	4022	Mr. Blaikie	4034
Mr. Boudria	4023	Mr. Rock	4034
Mr. Plamondon	4024	Agriculture	
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	4024	Mr. Borotsik	4034
Amendment	4029	Mr. Vanclief	4034
STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS		Mr. Borotsik Mr. Vanclief	4034 4034
			4034
Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem		Kenora—Rainy River	
Mr. Maloney	4029	Mr. Jaffer	4034
Health Care		Mr. Gray	4035
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	4029	Mr. Lowther	4035
Wil. Willis (Red Deel)	4023	Mr. Mitchell	4035
Canadian Soccer		Human Resources Development	
Mr. Solomon	4030		1025
D 4 17 D.P.		Mrs. Tremblay	4035
Parental Leave Policy	1020	Mr. Gray	4035
Mrs. Guay	4030	Mrs. Tremblay	4035
The Budget		Ms. Brown	4035
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	4030	Mr. Penson	4035
		Ms. Brown	4035
Fuel Taxes		Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	4036
Ms. Vautour	4030	Ms. Brown	4036
<b>Chinese Canadian Heritage Foundation</b>		Mr. Tremblay	4036
Ms. Leung	4031	Ms. Brown	4036
Wis. Leaning	4031	Mr. Tremblay	4036
Technology Partnerships		Mr. Gray	4036
Mr. Telegdi	4031	Mr. Epp	4036
		Mr. Gray	4036
The Budget	1021	Mr. Williams	4036
Mr. Gouk	4031	Ms. Brown	4036
Canadian Forces Supply Depot		CINAR	
Mr. Graham	4031		4037
		Mr. Bergeron	4037
ORAL QUESTION PERIOD		Mr. Boudria	4037
ORAL QUESTION LERIOD		International Trade	
<b>Human Resources Development</b>		Mr. Proulx	4037
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4031	Mr. Pettigrew	4037
Mr. Gray	4032	H D D	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4032	Human Resources Development	4007
Ms. Brown	4032	Mr. Konrad	4037
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4032	Mr. Gray	4037
Ms. Brown	4032	Mr. Pankiw	4037
Ms. Meredith	4032	Mr. Gray	4037
Mr. Gray	4032	Health Care	
Ms. Meredith	4032	Ms. Wasylycia–Leis	4037
Ms. Brown	4032	Ms. Wasylycia–Leis	4038
Mr. Duceppe	4033	Mr. Gray	4038
Mr. Gray	4033	Ms. Wasylycia–Leis	4038
Mr. Duceppe	4033	Mr. Rock	4038
1.11. Duceppe	TUJJ	1711. 1COCK	4030

Trucking Industry		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time	
Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	4038	and printed)	4042
Mr. Dromisky	4038	Mr. Jordan	4042
Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	4038	Competition Act	
Mr. Goodale	4038	Bill C–438. Introduction and first reading	4042
F		Mrs. Redman	4042
Foreign Affairs	1000	(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time	4042
Mr. Caccia	4038	and printed)	4042
Mr. Axworthy	4039	und printed)	1012
<b>Human Resources Development</b>		Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act	
Mr. Obhrai	4039	Bill C–439. Introduction and first reading	4042
Ms. Brown	4039	Mr. Pankiw	4042
NIS. DIOWII	4037	(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time	
Gasoline Prices		and printed)	4042
Mr. Cardin	4039	Medically Unnecessary Abortion Referendum Act	
Mr. Goodale	4039	Bill C–440. Introduction and first reading	4042
		Mr. Pankiw	4042
Scotia Rainbow	1020	(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time	7072
Mrs. Dockrill	4039	and printed)	4043
Mr. Baker	4039		
Gasoline Prices		Criminal Code	
Ms. Vautour	4039	Bill C-441. Introduction and first reading	4043
Mr. Goodale	4039	Mr. Pankiw	4043
Till Goodale	1037	(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time	
Kosovo		and printed)	4043
Mrs. Redman	4040	Committees of the House	
Mr. Bertrand	4040	Agriculture and Agri-Food	
		Motion for concurrence	4043
Human Resources Development		Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4043
Mr. Grewal	4040	Mr. Penson	4043
Mr. Boudria	4040	Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4043
Mr. Duceppe	4040	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4043
Mr. Gray	4040	Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	
Post–Secondary Education		Mr. Gruending	4044 4045
Ms. Davies	4040	Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	
	4040	Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	4045
Mr. Gray	4040	Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	4045
Human Resources Development		Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	4045
Mr. MacKay	4040	Mr. Penson	4046
Mr. Gray	4041	Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	4046
·		Mr. Brison	4046
DOLUMNE DDOCEEDINGS		Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4047
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Mr. Brison	4047
Government Response to Petitions		Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	4047
Mr. Lee	4041	Mr. Desrochers	4048
THE DOC	1011	Mr. Desrochers	4048
Canadian International Development Agency		Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	4048
Mr. Bellemare	4041	Mr. Williams	4048
Mr. Pankiw	4041	Motion	4048
Mr. Borotsik	4041	Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	4048
~		Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	4048
Canada Foundation for Innovation			
Mr. Cannis	4041	GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
Committees of the House			
Bill C-20		Canada Elections Act	
Mr. Milliken	4041	Bill C–2. Third reading	4049
Public Accounts	4041	Division deferred	4049
	4041	Mr. Pankiw	4049
Mr. Williams	4041	Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	4049
An Act for the Recognition and Protection of Human		Mr. Epp	4049
Rights and Fundamental Freedoms		Mr. Ménard	4049
Bill C–437. Introduction and first reading	4042	Mr. Bergeron	4050
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	4042	Mr. Pankiw	4050

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean)	4053
First Nations Ombudsman Act Bill C–222. Second reading Mr. Gouk	4050	Mr. Keddy Mr. Konrad Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	4055
Mr. Iftody	4051	Appendix	



Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442 Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to: Canadian Government Publishing, 45 Sacré—Coeur Boulevard, Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non—livraison, retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à: Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, 45 boulevard Sacré—Coeur, Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 089

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 Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 089

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

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9