CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 094 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, May 2, 2003

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 2, 2003

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

● (1010)

[*Translation*]

On the Order: Government Orders

April 30, 2003—The hon. Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons—Second Reading and Reference to Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs of Bill C-34, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act (Ethics Commissioner and Senate Ethics Officer) and other Acts in consequence.

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

That Bill C-34, An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act (Ethics Commissioner and Senate Ethics Officer) and other Acts in consequence, be immediately referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The Deputy Speaker: Wait a minute, I believe there is a problem.

I am sorry, but in the translation of the documents, two bills were mixed up.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: Mr. Speaker, is the French version exactly the same as the English version?

The Deputy Speaker: No, but all depends if we are talking about the bill or the sheet of paper I have in front of me because on this sheet of paper, the two bills were mixed up.

So, the English version is the right one, if that is what the right Hon. member for Calgary Centre is asking.

Right Hon. Joe Clark: My question concerns our Standing Orders, which provide that bills presented in both official languages should be identical.

If that is the case, we can go ahead, otherwise we have violated the fundamental rules of the House.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: It is the Speaker's form that is in error and not the bill. The bill is actually in the same form in both official languages.

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to Bill C-34, the proposed changes to the Parliament of Canada Act, an act of Parliament for which I have ministerial responsibility. The bill would establish an ethics commissioner and a Senate ethics officer.

On October 23, 2002, the government tabled a draft bill to establish the independent ethics commissioner reporting to Parliament, as well as a draft code of conduct of parliamentarians. The documents were tabled in draft form to give members the maximum flexibility in considering these documents.

The two draft documents have been the subject of extensive parliamentary consultation and study since last fall. The procedure and House affairs committee heard from numerous witnesses between November and April 2003.

On November 19, 2002, the committee circulated to all members a working document, outlining its findings up until that time. On March 21, 2003, the committee again released a draft report to all members seeking their input before finalizing its recommendations to the House. The committee held three round tables with MPs to seek their views.

[*Translation*]

The committee tabled its report in the House on April 10. It approves the appointment of an independent ethics commissioner, as provided in the bill, and it recommends several changes.

I want to thank the chair and all other members of the committee for their excellent work. I also want to thank members on both sides of the House, since the committee has tabled a unanimous report.

I am pleased to inform the House today that the government has accepted all the recommendations in the unanimous report. It remains to be seen whether the hon. members, who gave unanimous support to the report, will still be unanimous when it is time to vote on a bill they unanimously supported a short time ago.

It also remains to be seen how serious the hon. members opposite were in wanting a bill or saying they wanted a bill. It is not always the same thing.

[*English*]

There are key changes to the bill from the draft of last October. As recommended by the committee, the appointment of an ethics commissioner would be subject to consultation with leaders of recognized parties in the House. That was unanimously recommended and adopted by the committee. And of course, there was a subsequent resolution of the House.

The committee recommended that Standing Order 111.1 be amended. That is the Standing Order that we adopted after the equally unanimous modernization committee phase I where we set in that procedure for all other House officers. The committee unanimously recommended that the ethics commissioner be appointed pursuant to that rule. We agreed and are putting it in the bill.

The committee considered the length of the term of the ethics commissioner, which in the draft bill was set at a single five-year term. The committee recommended a term of five years or more and that it be renewable. I am pleased to advise the House that we have provided for a five year term and that it be renewable, but if it is renewable there would be another vote in the House of Commons pursuant to Standing Order 111.

The committee requested that the wording of the tenure provisions in the bill be clarified so that its meaning is clear when discussing the process for removing an ethics commissioner. Accordingly, proposed subsection 72.02(1) of Bill C-34 has been redrafted to do just that. We have agreed again with every recommendation of the unanimous committee report.

The committee recommended that the mechanism for parliamentarians to request that the ethics commissioner examine the actions of a minister or secretary of state under the Prime Minister's code be extended to parliamentary secretaries to ensure that they would have as much coverage or accountability under the bill. We agreed.

There are proposed changes to the Senate. The Senate committee studying the draft bill concluded that the other place should have its own separate ethics officer because its traditions are different. It has a separate Clerk. We have a Sergeant-at-Arms who we call the Usher of the Black Rod in the other place and so on. The other place has its own separate independent officers in many cases. It has provided us with a unanimous report. Having agreed with the unanimous report of the House, we gave the same courtesy to the other place and we will agree with the recommendation that it made to us in that regard.

Bill C-34 proposes that the ethics commissioner be responsible for administering a code of conduct for members of the House and the Prime Minister's code for public office holders, and that there be a separate Senate ethics officer to administer the code of conduct for the Senate. The name is different to differentiate the two people, but the responsibilities are identical in both houses.

Bill C-34 includes additional provisions to reinforce the fact that the ethics commissioner and the Senate ethics officer are covered by parliamentary privilege which is also provided for in the bill.

There are a few other changes that were made to clarify Bill C-34 and I hope colleagues agree that they would improve it. In any case, we are sending the bill to committee before second reading so that we could have even more amendments from colleagues.

The new wording clarifies that ministers, secretaries of state, and parliamentary secretaries would be subject to the House or Senate codes when carrying out their MP functions. This is so that someone does not think that ministers would be exempt from one code when dealt with by the other. They would be covered by both. We further clarified that.

When carrying out duties and functions of their office as ministers, parliamentary secretaries or secretaries of state, they too would be subject to the Prime Minister's conflict of interest and post-employment code for public office holders. There is further clarification in that regard.

Bill C-34 would require that requests to examine the actions of ministers, secretaries of state, and parliamentary secretaries under the Prime Minister's code be made in writing, and only if there would be reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a breach of the code. That is the same thing that is being asked for members and would be extended to ministers to make it more uniform. It is similar to the complaint mechanism I described before.

● (1015)

We have made amendments to the first draft of the bill pursuant to the unanimous committee report and we have agreed with every recommendation that was proposed in the unanimous report.

[*Translation*]

The first draft of the bill on the ethics commissioner has been the subject of broad consultations in both houses. I thank my colleagues in the House of Commons for their unanimous report, and the members of the other place, who also worked very hard.

The government has listened to the advice of parliamentarians. We have accepted all of their recommendations for improvements to the bill. Today, the bill will be referred to committee before second reading in order to make it even better, if need be.

[*English*]

I will conclude by saying that the first attempt to have such legislation started as early as 1976. I see two colleagues in the House today who, I think, were in the House of Commons at the time. There have been many tries at this. None of them have ever gotten as far as what we have in front of us today, but that is not far enough. Let us work together to ensure that this time this actually becomes the law, as opposed to just things that we say we are going to do in the future. We can all contribute toward that.

I invite colleagues to make this positive step by sending the bill to committee, possibly as early as today. If not, I will schedule it again on Monday. I want to send it to committee as quickly as possible, have another study of it, and hopefully pass it before June so that it will be the law of the land, not only for ourselves but for parliamentarians to come as well.

● (1020)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to stand in this wonderful place, the House of Commons of Canada, where all of us call each other hon. member, which is the requirement, and where the Standing Orders say that we because we are honourable obviously we will never say or do anything that is dishonourable. We cannot, according to our Standing Orders, even imply that it could be done, because that is a violation of the Standing Orders.

Here we have in this particular environment the need for a code of ethics, which is a strange outcome if we consider the fact that we are all here to be hon. members. Really what we are doing is introducing a bill that says there will be a watchdog to make sure that everybody is honourable. Indeed, it has become a necessity because of the foibles of this and previous governments.

I would like to make some points for anyone who happens to be listening. Back in my riding right now it is twenty minutes after eight and I am sure that probably 3,000 or 4,000 people there are watching CPAC. They are very interested in this. Really, our debate right now is whether or not the bill should be sent to committee before second reading.

When we first came here way back in 1993, that had not been done at that time. It was a new innovation that bills could be put to a committee before second reading. My first evaluation of that process was a positive one. I thought it was great that before the government entrenches its position and then at every stage in the bill marches its MPs through votes on command on the bill, it should be sent to committee so that there is more input into the bill.

I originally favoured that process, but it has turned out to be not so good for us because in a way it becomes a way of limiting debate. By sending the bill to committee before second reading, we have today an opportunity at this stage for only ten minute speeches and for a maximum of three hours. That is not really enough time to debate an issue of this magnitude and to see whether or not in principle we really should support the bill.

Second, when that process is done, then the government and the Secretary of State and Leader of the Government in the House of—

An hon. member: Minister of State.

Mr. Ken Epp: Minister of State. Sorry, I tend to get his titles wrong.

The minister takes great pleasure in saying that the committee has studied this and agreed unanimously; therefore, we need not debate it any further, let us just do it. Let us jam it through.

We have been informed that unfortunately in the Liberal caucus the other day there was actually almost a veiled threat, well, not a veiled threat, it was given as a carrot, I guess, with the Prime Minister saying that if they would pass this quickly he would allow us to leave earlier. Oh no, that was the other one, I think, the one on financing of political parties—

An hon. member: Yes, but the problem is the same

Mr. Ken Epp: —but the problem is exactly the same in that the power is all exercised by the Prime Minister.

The hon. member opposite who just spoke indicated that government members would like this passed really quickly. He is hoping that he can send it back to committee.

Having been one of the members on that committee, I would like to report here that it has been a really great experience. I have really come to respect the people from all parties who have worked on the procedure and House affairs subcommittee where we studied this bill and put together this report and the recommendations.

However, when the government House leader indicates that it was all unanimous, it was not without a lot of convulsions. It was not without a whole bunch of really deep concerns and the largest concern is undoubtedly the method of appointment of the ethics commissioner for the House of Commons.

● (1025)

It is true that the report was unanimous in the sense that we chose not to file a dissenting report. However, the reason for doing so was that we were told our requirement to have a super majority or a double majority to approve that ethics commissioner for the House of Commons would have required a change in the Constitution since the Constitution says that all votes in the House of Commons are decided by a simple majority.

We would really like to see the ethics commissioner have a higher level of approval because of the fact that this officer of Parliament would be unique in the sense that he or she is going to have jurisdiction over individual members of Parliament from all political parties. It is absolutely mandatory that the ethics commissioner have the support of all members in the House, not just the Liberal government.

Let us review what Bill C-34 does in terms of the appointment process and the ratification process on reappointment. It has a serious flaw. If everybody were wonderful and getting along with each other, there would not be a problem. People are congenial and they are kind and nice, and we would like to think that where it requires that the Prime Minister consult with leaders of other parties in the House prior to putting forward a name, that is in essence all very well. But all the bill says is that there shall be consultation with the leaders of the other parties in the House. There is absolutely no requirement in the bill that those leaders agree or that the majority agrees on the appointee being put forward. All it states is that there shall be consultation.

With a lack of definition of what consultation means, and without actually specifying that there be some degree of agreement on it, this really could turn out to be quite a sham. The Prime Minister could pick someone he wants and then talk to each of the House leaders and ask them what they think. It would not matter what they think or say about that person in response, the Prime Minister could say he has consulted, that he met the requirements of the act.

Further, Bill C-34 states that there is to be a ratifying vote in the House of Commons. Here again, we have observed that in a majority government, like the Liberals we have had here for the last nine and a half years, these Liberals tend to vote pretty well the way the Prime Minister wants them to, as directed by the party whip. So there is the possible scenario of the Prime Minister choosing someone objectionable, then talking about that individual with the other House leaders, and that would be as far as that goes; then he could then come in here and tell his members, "Hey, if you want to get out early, vote in favour of the appointee I am putting forward". So either by persuasion, by hanging out a carrot, or by some whipping by the whip, the Liberals would get their majority vote and the commissioner would be in place.

Yesterday I talked to somebody about what would happen if I were offered this position, although I do not think it will happen because of other disqualifications, namely in the area of language, so I am disqualified from most of these positions in our country. But if I were offered this position and in a vote in the House of Commons the majority government voted in favour of my appointment but all other parties voted against it, I would feel obliged to thank the Prime Minister for his offer but decline the position. I hope the person offered the position will have that same degree of honour in accepting it. It is absolutely mandatory when this person is going to delve into our personal lives as members of Parliament on both sides of the House that the person have integrity and the trust of all members of Parliament.

● (1030)

Even though the actual double vote is probably impossible because it would require a change in the Constitution, I would hopefully expect that there would be a very high degree of support for this person upon appointment.

Now here is the dilemma, Mr. Speaker: My time is up and of course I would like to speak for another hour or so on this topic because I have covered only one of about eighteen objections. However, it will go to committee and hopefully we will have some good work there.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on Bill C-34, concerning the appointment of ethics commissioners, and on the possibility of referring the bill to committee before second reading. Bill C-34 seeks to amend the Parliament of Canada Act and to create two distinct positions.

I am going to describe this bill briefly, for the people listening now and those who, we hope, will be reading these debates in the future.

These are the two positions. There is an ethics commissioner, responsible for administering a House of Commons code of conflict of interest—which does not yet exist, but which is being discussed and studied in committee—and for assisting the Prime Minister in administering the code of conduct for public office holders with respect to post-term conflicts of interest. There will also be a separate Senate ethics officer to administer the code of ethical conduct for the Senate.

As I was saying, the Senate code of ethical conduct and the House of Commons code of conduct governing conflicts of interest are now being developed within the two appropriate committees.

The Senate ethics officer will be appointed for a seven-year renewable term. The House ethics commissioner will be appointed for a five-year renewable term. This follows the pattern for the appointment of other officials, such as the Commissioner of Official Languages, or the Auditor General, or those who act as independent representatives before Parliament.

However, the unanimous report of a House of Commons committee, presented early in April, recommended that both these terms be renewable in order to reduce the loss of institutional memory. If it appears necessary to renew the term of someone in such a position, it is important to be able to do so, in order to preserve institutional memory.

The ethics commissioner will be appointed by the governor in council, after consultation with the leaders of recognized parties in the House. My colleague from the Canadian Alliance was wondering whether the appointment would be subject to consultation or to approval. That remains to be defined, but in this we recognize the wording of a promise from the 1993 red book. Ten years later, an old Liberal promise has almost been fulfilled. In fact, during second reading or in the committee stage, the top priority should be to make this point clear.

The draft bill tabled in the fall did not contain any provisions guaranteeing that the party leaders would be consulted. This is already a step forward. The government has committed to doing this, and we recognize this today.

Nor did the draft bill provide for a resolution by the House of Commons. Today, there is a possibility for a resolution in the House of Commons before these two commissioners are appointed.

We are also pleased that the bill will be sent to committee before second reading. This bill must undergo very serious analysis, which can only be done by concurrently considering the House of Common's conflict of interest code being drafted as we speak by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

It is impossible to discuss the appointment of an ethics commissioner, either separately or concurrently, without knowing all the ramifications of this code for members, ministers and parliamentary secretaries. Only by comparing the two documents will we be able to evaluate the overall process, in terms of whether there are possible ethics loopholes for elected representatives in the House of Commons. A serious analysis must be undertaken to understand what rules apply to public office holders, ministers and parliamentary secretaries. We intend to consider these issues very carefully, and we will continue this consideration in committee.

However, it is clear already that several aspects of the bill are very intriguing. We now have the assurance that the leaders of recognized parties in the House of Commons will be consulted about the appointment of the ethics commissioner since this will be a legislative requirement from now on. This obligation, which the Prime Minister committed to, was not included in the draft legislation introduced in the House of Commons on October 23.

Furthermore, the House will also be asked to approve the appointment of the ethics commissioner through a resolution. This is also a new provision in this bill. In its most recent report, the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs had recommended that these provisions be included.

● (1035)

We also are pleased that a complaints process for parliamentarians concerning ministers, ministers of state and parliamentary secretaries will be formally in place from now on.

As well, the commissioner will be required to provide an activity report to the House of Commons, and not just the Prime Minister. These provisions were included in the draft bill and are being maintained, and we are pleased with this.

As the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell has pointed out, this is not a new bill, or not the first time this important matter has been raised in the House of Commons.

Pleased as we are to have this opportunity to discuss this bill and this matter in the House today, we are somewhat disappointed that it has taken 10 years to be able to do so. We might say it is high time the Liberal government decided to keep its 1993 red book promise to appoint an independent ethics commissioner.

The red book made the following commitment:

> A Liberal Government will appoint an independent Ethics Counsellor—

This was expressed in the future tense. There are various kinds of futures, and this is a very distant future.

> The Ethics Counsellor will be appointed after consultation with the leaders of all the parties in the House of Commons and will report directly to Parliament.

That was, I might again point out, back in 1993.

Strangely enough, today we are accepting the appointment of an ethics commissioner after consultation, whereas the Canadian Alliance had, on an official opposition day, tabled a motion with exactly the same wording, if I recall correctly. It had had the finesse to copy the red book promise word for word, which was, I repeat:

> A Liberal Government will appoint an independent Ethics Counsellor ...appointed after consultation with the leaders of all the parties ...and will report directly to Parliament.

At that time, the Liberals voted against it. Today, however, they are presenting a bill to keep that promise, for which we are grateful, particularly having seen the ineffectuality of the present ethics commissioner, who answers only to the Prime Minister, reports only to the Prime Minister, is appointed only by the Prime Minister, and whose only friend, I believe, is the Prime Minister. That alone is a clear indication that there is a problem.

What happened during those 10 years to convince the Liberals to change their mind and honour their promises? I will tell you what. There were scandals at the Auberge Grand-Mère. There were scandals at HRDC. There was a scandal in the sponsorship program. There was a scandal in the firearms program. There were scandals in many departments, National Defence being one I happen to be thinking about. During all that time, we had an ethics counsellor reporting to the prime minister, accountable to the prime minister and dealing only with the prime minister.

We think it important that this ethics commissioner will have a code to enforce and to abide by for members, ministers, parliamentary secretaries and everybody else, and that he will report to the House of Commons and not to the Prime Minister.

Although we agree entirely with the bill or with the principles of a code of ethics, we think that we should not be sending out the message that we are regulating ourselves in this way because we are dishonest.

If improper actions have been taken, we have to correct the perception. Unfortunately, in our society, politicians are not perceived as being very good at respecting rules. I fear that if things are not made properly in the design process of this study - and not in the application - and if we play politics, then all the politicians in the House will suffer from an even worse perception in the eyes of our fellow citizens.

I urge us all to proceed with the utmost caution in our study at second reading stage of this bill dealing with the position of ethics counsellor and the ethical guidelines in general.

● (1040)

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-34, An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act.

First, I would like to state that the New Democratic Party supports the adoption of a code of ethics for all parliamentarians. It is interesting to note that all of the provinces of Canada have codes of conduct that require disclosure to an independent commissioner or to a legislative clerk. The House of Commons must therefore update its practices in this regard.

It is also interesting to realize that most of the conflict of interest scandals which we have witnessed in recent years, and which have culminated in a bill, involved ministers, and not backbenchers. Clearly the ministers are not following the guidelines already in place.

Ethics legislation must at the very least create an independent ethics commissioner, who would be an officer of Parliament and who would have the following duties: ensuring that the rules for disclosure of private interests of senators and members of Parliament, including their immediate family members, are respected; providing advice to members of Parliament regarding ethics and conflicts of interest; hearing complaints from the public regarding inappropriate behaviour under the terms of the code of conduct; and carrying out investigations into these complaints.

This last point is very important. In fact, Canadians should be able to file complaints directly with the ethics commissioner, and not solely through a federal member of Parliament. This would show the public that it is able to contribute to the process. It goes without saying that frivolous accusations must not be grounds for complaints. This process must be handled with the respect it deserves.

I believe that ethics standards should be the same for all parliamentarians, be they members of Parliament or senators. My colleague, the member for Halifax, introduced a private members' bill on the issue, in which she proposed creating a code of conduct for all parliamentarians. I think that her draft legislation would have been a better model than the bill before us today.

Bill C-34 sets out the duties and functions of an ethics commissioner and a Senate ethics officer. It is interesting to see that this bill proposes the appointment of two ethics officers, one for federal members of Parliament and one for senators. This leads me to believe that senators follow different ethics rules than members of the House of Commons.

I have a solution to this problem, and perhaps many Canadians will agree. All we have to do is get rid of the Senate and we will no longer have to deal with this problem. Why should we have senators, who are not accountable to the people? On reading this bill, it is obvious that if a senator has a conflict of interest, his peers will protect him.

At least, with members of the House of Commons, if voters do not like their ethical standards, they can show their dissatisfaction by not re-electing them. You need only ask Doug Young. I think he could tell you how the electoral process works.

Unfortunately, we cannot get rid of the senators. This is ridiculous. The purpose of this ethics bill is to reinforce the public's confidence in public office holders. Yet, Bill C-34 proposes two separate standards for parliamentarians. The NDP cannot support this double standard approach.

I am disappointed that this bill does not clearly explain how the ethics commissioner will be chosen. I believe that a vote in the House of Commons on the approval of the person appointed to the position of ethics commissioner should require a two-thirds majority. This seems essential to me. A simply majority would not be enough. The ethics commissioner must have the confidence and the support of all members of the House to have the confidence of the House of Commons.

● (1045)

I sit on the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. I can say that this committee has debated at length the issue of appointing an ethics commissioner and the rules contained in the code of conduct federal members of Parliament would be required to comply with. I would like to pursue these discussions when this bill is considered by the relevant legislative committee.

The House committee has already discussed what should be included in the code of conduct in terms of the definition of assets held by federal MPs.

Members generally agreed that spouses should be included in this definition, recognizing that many federal MPs share the ownership of assets with their spouse. To not include spouses would be to overlook a significant portion of the information regarding members' assets.

It was also suggested that it might be appropriate to include children who are not adults in the definition of family. I think the code should go even further and include adult children. This is one of the proposals in Bill C-417 put forward by my colleague, the hon. member for Halifax.

I am disappointed that this bill is not more comprehensive. Most of the rules of ethics that federal MPs are expected to comply with are set out in the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, and not in a piece of legislation.

I think that this weakens the bill. I also think that we should have rules that could be used in court, in addition to those which apply only in the House of Commons.

As my colleague from the Bloc Quebecois said earlier, polls on how Canadians perceive their members of Parliament show that their popularity level is the lowest. It is sad to say that this lack of popularity of Parliament was the doing of ministers. It is due to the way they managed their portfolios, their departments. It is due to scandals, widespread scandals, like the one involving Groupaction. Think of—

Think of Auberge Grand-Mère, government advertising contracts, the gun registry for which Groupaction was paid $22 million. One might wonder how they got these contracts.

It is important to have a code of ethics for all the members of the House of Commons. If we are to have a code of ethics for the House of Commons as a whole, it must show respect for the House of Commons. The only way to do that is not to shift the burden onto the Prime Minister of Canada, who would pick the ethics commissioner. The ethics commissioner should be selected by Parliament through a two-thirds majority vote, through a majority of parliamentarians. That person would be accountable to parliamentarians. He or she would have to be accountable to Parliament and not to the Prime Minister of Canada who, with all due respect, might choose someone he knows, someone who is a good supporter of his party as we saw in the case of the Electoral Boundaries Commission and any other commission put in place. It is always questionable.

If we want Canadians to have respect for Parliament, let us give the job to parliamentarians. Let us do it through a two-thirds majority of votes here in the House of Commons, and then maybe Canadians will give us a better rating, bringing it from 17% to 60% or 75%. We are the people's servants. We are here to serve the people, and our fellow citizens should have faith in us.

All I am asking for now—and one might hope it will happen—is that at second reading we look into the process, a process the Canadian people could respect. The best way to proceed is through democracy and by holding a vote in the House of Commons where two thirds of parliamentarians would choose the ethics commissioner because they are the ones the people elected.

● (1050)

[*English*]

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, a main feature of the 1993 election campaign was a promise by the Liberal Party to establish new standards of ethics. Well, it has certainly done that.

The Prime Minister intervened with a crown corporation to benefit a business of which he had once been a part owner. At least three ministers have been forced from office for conflicts of interest. A fourth has been given safe refuge as ambassador to Denmark.

[*Translation*]

As recently as this week, the Minister of Canadian Heritage broke the guidelines in such a way that according to the rules she should resign, but the Prime Minister, going against his own rules, chose to protect his friend.

[*English*]

Now the government proposes new legislation, establishing new ethics commissioners whose appointments can be controlled by the government majority.

The government has lived on loopholes. When the loopholes were not large enough, it enlarged them.

Remember the observation on Shawinigate by Gordon Robertson, the distinguished former clerk of the Privy Council, who wrote the first conflict of interest guidelines for Prime Minister Pearson. Mr. Robertson noted that there had been no specific provisions governing the prime minister because it never occurred to anybody that a prime minister's actions would require guidelines, not until this government made a show of appointing an ethics counsellor and then made a sham of that office by having it report not to Parliament, as promised, but to the Prime Minister.

The most notorious loosening of the rules involved the so-called blind management trust. For decades, cabinet ministers in the House were required to put their assets in an absolutely blind trust. One made a choice. If one pursued one's private interests, one stayed out of cabinet. If one served the public interest, one cut off all contact with one's private assets.

This government changed that rule deliberately. It deliberately broke the separation between private interests and the public interest. It created a system where a minister could look after his or her private interests at the very same time he or she purported to act in the public interest.

As a footnote, but to make matters worse, the Prime Minister told the House that system had been used by ministers of former governments. He knows that is not true, but he has not had the rectitude to correct the record of Parliament.

I do not know why the government let ministers abandon blind trusts. I do not know if that was done specifically to meet the requirements of the member for LaSalle—Émard, but he was certainly quick to take advantage of the looser system.

A few weeks ago, and under pressure, the member for LaSalle—Émard announced that he was divesting himself from his giant shipping company, Canada Steamship Lines. He admitted that during the time he was minister of finance he held 12 separate private meetings with his company officials regarding business activities of the multinational private company that he personally owned.

For the record, I do not believe he acted to enrich himself. He came here as a millionaire and he did not need more money. F. Scott Fitzgerald noted that the rich are not like the rest of us. He probably did it because he thought the rules that applied to others should not apply to him.

Whatever the motive, the government broke the wall between private and public interests. Even the member for LaSalle—Émard now admits that system fails the test of appearing to be fair.

What is clear is that this tailor-made system was not recommended by outside experts. On the contrary. Mr. Justice Parker, who conducted the public formal inquiry in the Sinclair Stevens affair, warned specifically against this type of arrangement.

It is worth noting how Justice Parker, in his report, defined conflict of interest. It is, he said:

> —[a] situation in which a minister of the Crown has knowledge of a private economic interest that is sufficient to influence the exercise of his or her public duties and responsibilities.

A minister need not act on that knowledge. Justice Parker did not find that Mr. Stevens acted on his knowledge.

Mr. Stevens was required to resign because it was alleged that he had done nothing more than what the member for LaSalle—Émard has admitted to doing 12 separate times.

That was the standard in Canada before this Liberal government deliberately lowered the bar. Simple knowledge of a private economic interest was enough to constitute a conflict of interest.

For eight years, the member for LaSalle—Émard regularly acquired such knowledge. That is not in dispute. He has admitted it himself.

According to the Prime Minister, Justice Parker's definition of conflict of interest is at the heart of the government's code of conduct for ministers. He has repeatedly said that in the House.

Former Liberal Prime Minister John Turner said in Parliament, on May 12, 1986:

> In public administration a Minister has the burden of proof, the duty to show that what he is doing is beyond reproach. The burden of proof is not on Parliament. It is not on the opposition, nor the media. The burden of proof is on the Minister.

The new looser system of a managed blind trust does have its own clear rules. Canadians have a right to know whether even those rules were respected.

Article 7 of the agreement stipulates that:

> If at any time whilst this agreement remains in effect, it appears that an extraordinary corporate event is proposed or threatened which might have a material effect on the shares or assets, the supervisors may consult with and obtain the advice, direction or instruction of the public officer holder....

● (1055)

The then minister of finance was allowed to be briefed only if: first, Canada Steamship Lines had an extraordinary corporate event; second, it had a material effect on the assets; and third, the supervisor was unable to handle it on his own. We are asked to believe that happened 12 times in eight years.

The Prime Minister says that while he has no knowledge of the subject of those 12 meetings, he is satisfied that each of them met the criteria of article 7. Why? Because Howard Wilson said so, the member for LaSalle—Émard agreed, and the Prime Minister declined to do his duty and find out if his new loose rules were respected or were broken.

The member for LaSalle—Émard says that he recused himself, he stepped aside from his ministry or the cabinet whenever there was a possibility of conflict. However more than the vast majority of companies, Canada Steamship Lines is critically dependent on a wide range of federal laws and regulations, including the tax system. Was the then minister of finance outside the room whenever taxes were discussed, or environmental laws, or shipping regulations, or safety standards, or changes in international laws or treaties?

The then minister's first budget in February 1994 announced the closure of tax havens. However between February and June 1994, the legislation that gave effect to the budget was changed. The Barbados tax haven was left open. Later changes were introduced that allowed the subsidiaries of Canadian corporations in Barbados to enjoy the same tax status as the parent company.

To follow the rules, the former finance minister would have had to recuse himself from all those decisions, some of which were at the heart of his own first budget. Perhaps that is what he did. However a vice-president of Canada Steamship Lines said on the CBC program *Disclosure* that the then minister's company shifted operations to Barbados in that period because of, and I quote directly,"changes in Canadian tax rules" .

We will not know for sure whether the rules were followed until the member for LaSalle—Émard makes public the full list of meetings he held with Canada Steamship Lines while he was minister of finance, who he met with, when he met with them and what they discussed.

Most members of the House accept the need for a conflict of interest code for individual members of Parliament. We will debate the details of the bill in days to come. However many of us also believe that this focus upon ordinary members of Parliament is designed to divert attention away from the flagrant conflicts of interest which have characterized so many ministers of the government, starting at the very top.

If that dark shadow is to be dispelled, the member for LaSalle—Émard must stop hiding the facts. He must be honest about what went on in those 12 secret meetings, what were the "extraordinary corporate events", what were the "material effects" on his business, and whether and how, having been briefed 12 times, he stood aside from ministerial or cabinet decision which affected the interest of the multi-million dollar company he owns. Leading the country requires moral authority, not just delegates' votes.

I have outlined today fundamental questions of integrity which must be answered by the member for LaSalle—Émard and any government that expects to be taken seriously on questions of conflict of interest.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

2010 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks an important milestone in Canada's bid for the 2010 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games. The International Olympic Committee will release reports on three candidate cities: Vancouver, Salzburg and PyeongChang. Its conclusions will have an influence on the key vote on July 2 when the IOC members gather in Prague to elect the host city for 2010.

During the IOC evaluation commission's visits in early March, the Government of Canada offered firm commitments of support and detailed information about essential federal services. These presentations clearly had an impact, as the chairman of the IOC commission went out of his way to praise the federal commitments.

The report will bring Canada's bid to host the world in Vancouver and Whistler seven years from now another step closer.

* * *

● (1100)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, private members' bills often bring forward issues which either the government has overlooked or are too small for formal legislation. Unfortunately, the government tends to look upon them as an intrusion into its powerful domain as drafters of legislation.

I recently introduced Bill C-347 seeking to eliminate conditional sentencing for violent offenders. After conditional sentencing legislation was first introduced, the then justice minister said that he never intended for it to apply to dangerous offenders, yet never did anything to fix it. My bill will.

I will soon be introducing a bill to eliminate automatic parole for offenders who have done nothing to earn parole. I am also working on a bill to broaden pension accrual legislation to apply to all public safety occupations and another to create a national compensation fund for public safety personnel. I will only be able to bring one of these important bills forward during the session.

I urge the government to examine these and other private members' bills and seriously consider introducing a collection of the as one or more government bills to place these overdue changes into legislation.

* * *

CHINESE CULTURAL CENTRE

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year the Chinese Cultural Centre of Vancouver is celebrating its 30th anniversary Founded in 1973, this centre has worked hard to promote Chinese cultural understanding.

I have joined with thousands of volunteers to build this cultural centre. It gives me great personal pride to stand in the House of Commons today to congratulate the Chinese Cultural Centre on its tremendous achievement over the past three decades. Its contributions have made our community stronger and has provided many needed resources to our Vancouver community at large.

Congratulations to Monty Jang, chairman of the CCC, Kitty Mar, chair of the fundraising event, the board of directors past and present and the thousands of volunteers who have made the Chinese Cultural Centre a true anchor of our community.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FÉDÉRATION DES CAISSES POPULAIRES DE L'ONTARIO

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on April 26, the general assembly of the Fédération des caisses populaires de l'Ontario voted in favour of closer ties with the Mouvement des caisses Desjardins.

By so doing, the Fédération des caisses populaires de l'Ontario made a decision that will greatly benefit its members and our community.

I want to congratulate, in particular, the president of the federation's board, Thomas Blais, who said,

> The Caisses de l'Ontario will be able to build on the economic strength of the Mouvement des caisses Desjardins. This is the most important decision in the history of the Caisses de l'Ontario.

Since the start of the cooperative movement in Canada, which was closely associated with Alphonse Desjardins and his wife Dorimène —by the way, Mr. Desjardins was a Clerk in this House at the turn of the last century—francophone rural communities have benefited from greater economic development, which still serves their interests today.

I want to congratulate the Fédération des caisses populaires de l'Ontario—

* * *

[*English*]

HMCS *WINNIPEG*

Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in a few short hours from now the men and women of the HMCS *Winnipeg* will be home in Esquimalt after seven and a half months at sea.

Throughout their lengthy development, Winnipeg played an important part in the campaign against terrorism and in the process appears to have set a new high for the number of boardings by a Canadian war ship.

Their success follows not only from their training and determination to accomplish the difficult task at hand, but stems from the continued support from family and friends and of course the gratitude of her namesake city, Winnipeg.

I know that all members of the House will join me in thanking Commander Kelly Williams and the men and women of the HMCS *Winnipeg* for their outstanding work in the name of Canada.

* * *

RIDE FOR SIGHT

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton Centre-East, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, this year is the 25th anniversary of a great organization formed to help the visually impaired; 25 years of caring

for the sightless, 25 years of community volunteering, 25 years of motorcyclists all across Canada riding to fight blindness.

The longest running motorcycle charity ride in the world this year celebrates raising over $11 million for vision research.

Congratulations to the executive, the coordinators, committee persons, and of course the legions of riders and volunteers.

I encourage people to join with rider Gilles Cronier from Scarborough, volunteer Sue Ross from Whitby and thousands of others as they meet at the Great Northern Exhibition Fairgrounds in Collingwood. Do not miss the 2003 Ride For Sight in its 25th anniversary celebration ride June 20 to 22 in Collingwood, Ontario.

I encourage everyone to support the Ride for Sight all across Canada. We can help too.

* * *

● (1105)

UNITED NATIONS

Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I hosted a town hall at Beth Tzedec Synagogue on the United Nations, Canada's legacy and responsibility for the future. I was pleased to welcome my colleague, the MP for Mount Royal, and Professor Andrew Cooper from the University of Waterloo. The presence of the Right Hon. John Turner, Rabbi Gunther Plaut and Rabbi Frydman-Kohl was a special testimony to the importance of the debate and the ongoing commitment of all the impressive engaged citizens of St. Paul's.

Canada's strong support for the United Nations cannot be unconditional. We must speak out strongly for reform. We cannot accept an organization that allows Libya as the chair of its human rights commission, the disgrace of the Durban conference and agendas that single out nation states such as Israel and give exculpatory immunity to offenders such as China and the Congo.

Professor Cotler said that if the UN did not exist, we would have to invent it. He urged that we immediately address the suggestion for an organization of democracies within the UN to work toward a more effective and just institution.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MSGR. LÉONCE BOUCHARD

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to tell the House today about the exceptional work of Monsignor Léonce Bouchard, who has just received from the Quebec government the Hommage bénévolat-Québec award for the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean.

At 72 years of age, Msgr. Bouchard is the epitome of people helping people in my riding. For over a dozen years, he has helped provide services for our society's most vulnerable.

In 1990, Msgr. Bouchard opened the first soup kitchen in Chicoutimi. This initiative quickly spread to Jonquière, La Baie and Lac-Saint-Jean. He also opened, in 1991, a shelter that cares for some 20 homeless individuals each day, people with addictions, mental problems or no place to live.

He has worked tirelessly for the community and its most vulnerable 365 days a year, seven days a week. Msgr. Bouchard clearly deserves this award. He is the symbol of people helping people among the various levels of society, and each day he makes our part of the world a better and fairer place to live.

* * *

[*English*]

SEA LAMPREY CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Ontario's quarter million lakes and rivers hold about one-third of the world's fresh water supply. The Great Lakes in particular, which define most of Ontario's border with the United States, account for a large portion of Canada's fresh water supply. The Great Lakes are also the source of a $4 billion a year fishery that supports thousands of jobs.

I would therefore like to congratulate the hon. member for Huron —Bruce for his efforts to prevent a $1 million funding cut to the sea lamprey control program. The sea lamprey is a non-native aquatic species that invaded the Great Lakes in the early 20th century and is known to devastate numerous species of fish.

It is critical to maintain funding for a highly successful program that is key to ensuring the future health and economic well-being of the Great Lakes and those who are living around it.

* * *

DAVID ECKMIRE

Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Blackstrap, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my condolences to the family of David Eckmire of Saskatoon. David passed away in April at the young age of 59. David was an accomplished and multi-talented professional in many ways, but perhaps he was best known in my riding and in much of Saskatchewan for his passion for and contribution to the local aviation sector.

As one of the greatest aviation champions in the province, David was an enthusiastic pilot who loved to fly, but also worked tirelessly on the ground to promote aviation in Saskatoon and Saskatchewan. He was a founding member of the Saskatoon Airport Authority, past president of the Saskatchewan Aviation Council, past chairman of the Nav Canada advisory committee and a member of the Civil Aviation Tribunal.

David's contribution to the community lives on, as we now enjoy better air links to the city and a state of the art facility in Saskatoon.

His spirit and dedication was an inspiration to all who had the opportunity to know and work with him. It is with great sadness that we mark his passing.

[*Translation*]

ALINE CHRÉTIEN

Ms. Carole-Marie Allard (Laval East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to congratulate Aline Chrétien, who was presented last night with the DAREarts inaugural cultural award in recognition of her contribution to the advancement of arts education for young people.

DAREarts is a remarkable program that has changed the lives of young people in Toronto in recent years. It is an innovative program that makes it possible for children in downtown Toronto to become familiar with the world of the arts by introducing them to works of art and culture.

Mrs. Chrétien, herself a dedicated pianist, holds an honorary diploma from the Royal Conservatory of Music, and presides over the annual National Arts Centre gala. Her generosity and her commitment to the education of these young people are exemplary.

* * *

● (1110)

[*English*]

HEALTH

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the mayor, councillors and citizens of Thompson. May 1, 2003 was proclaimed National Public Medicare Day in Thompson.

The citizens of Thompson, like those throughout Canada, call on the government to follow through on the Romanow report. The resolution supports Canada's publicly funded and delivered health care system and the principles of the Canada Health Act. It calls on the government to protect, restore and improve our public medicare system with the funding to do it.

The government needs to show leadership. It needs to take immediate action to implement the Romanow health report recommendations including a national public health strategy. The present concerns around SARS and the West Nile virus emphasize the urgent need for the government to act now.

The health minister's decision to minimize SARS screening and now to cut funding to West Nile crow testing shows her lack of commitment and disregard for the health of Canadians.

The government needs to act now, not tomorrow or the next day or the year after.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PAUL MASSICOTTE

Mr. Marcel Gagnon (Champlain, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to a man who is one of our own, Mr. Paul Massicotte, from Champlain in Mauricie.

As a successful businessman, he has served the world of agriculture through the cooperative movement, whose local activities he led for many years. The parish and the region quickly became too small for this man capable of bigger things, and he became a member of the executive of the Coopérative fédérée de Québec, where he served for 30 years, 11 of them as president.

He has travelled around the world and, in his own way, has been a great ambassador for Quebec. Quebec, the agricultural sector, the riding and the municipality of Champlain are proud of you, Mr. Massicotte.

I would like to congratulate his wife, Lise, and their six children for supporting and encouraging him so well. Bravo, Mr. Massicotte, and enjoy your well deserved retirement. Thank you for being a beacon to all who work in agriculture.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today the official opposition is talking about national defence.

I would like to talk a little about the official opposition and national defence. There are things the Alliance leader will not tell us on his party's position on the Canadian military.

For example, in 1994-95 the reform party was calling for a reduction of $1 billion from the defence budget. Yes, the Alliance leader's 1995 taxpayers' budget called for cuts to defence. In case there is any doubt, I want to quote what the current Leader of the Opposition said at the time: “I do not intend to dispute in any way the need for defence cuts”. So, I am somewhat puzzled today when the Alliance members suddenly pretend to be the champions of the Canadian military.

Canadians know that it is this government that increased defence spending this year by $1 billion and that will increase defence spending by over $5 billion by 2007. That is a real commitment to national defence.

* * *

CANADIAN ALLIANCE

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, I wish to read excerpts from a letter published in the Calgary *Sun* on September 5, 2002 signed by the Canadian Alliance candidate in Perth—Middlesex.

Referring to the Kyoto accord, Marian Meinen wrote that the Prime Minister “just wants to do what's politically expedient, as usual, and as usual the unthinking masses in Ontario are in agreement”. She also went on to say “But what do I know, I'm so out of the loop that I actually joined the Canadian Alliance and became president of our riding association. I think I live in the wrong part of Canada”.

What was she thinking? She deliberately insults the voters of Ontario and then asks for their support. What is worse is that her party has so far done nothing to distance itself from her offensive comments. She has insulted the good, well-meaning people of Perth—Middlesex.

I suspect Mrs. Meinen will regret her slight to Ontario on election day. I hope her leader will have the courage to denounce her comments.

Now more than ever, it is crystal clear that change comes with the Progressive Conservative Party.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the government has finally admitted that Ernst Zundel is a national security threat. Will Zundel be leaving the country tomorrow morning?

● (1115)

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because we are respectful of the rule of law and because we are respectful of the process, I would like to pay tribute to my department and the Solicitor General's department. They did a tremendous job.

What will happen now is this is in the Federal Court's hands. It will follow the process. I think it is pretty clear what the government wants to do.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is not quite that exciting because Zundel was identified as a security threat 10 years ago. The government still welcomed him back into Canada and allowed him to file a claim for refugee status.

The minister says a security warning is only valid for two years. Why does the minister give known security threats a clean bill of health after only two years?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am always disappointed when the official opposition's immigration critic has not done her homework. She knows perfectly well that under the new law, issuing certificates of renunciation is the method at our disposal to fully deal with these concerns. In order to do so, we must establish a process and follow the rules. This is exactly what we have done.

Some people might wish that the process were quicker, but I think that what is most important is that we ensure that we can act, in the end. That is exactly what we have done.

[*English*]

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the minister is all process and no action. Zundel is just the tip of the iceberg.

The Auditor General says that the thousands of people already illegally in Canada shot up by over 36,000 in the last six years. The government cannot manage to remove foreign criminals and illegals.

Given this sorry track record of incompetence, why should Canadians believe that Zundel will be out of our country any time soon?

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member has run out of arguments. Probably she is frustrated because she will not have anything else to ask because we are doing what we have to do.

I would say one thing. First of all not only do we apply the law and the new act but second, we are in front of cabinet right now because we feel that we should also redo the refugee claim process because of the length of time. I understand that people can be frustrated about the process.

The government's policy is not about building walls. Our policy is about controlling the doors, having a balanced approach with openness and vigilance. That is exactly what the government is doing.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, today we hear that the United States is imposing a 20% duty on all Canadian wheat exports to the U.S.

Western Canadian grain farmers are shaking their heads in disgust while the U.S. slams our grain industry with multiple trade actions and the government stands idly by.

The catalyst for these trade challenges has been the Canadian Wheat Board, but now all Canadian grain producers will be penalized.

Will the minister make the Canadian Wheat Board voluntary as so many producers want, or is he prepared to punish all Canadian producers for an outdated compulsory monopoly marketing system?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the allegations involved in the pending American action are not new allegations. They have been in the public arena for 10 to 15 years.

The Americans have pursued these actions on at least 10 previous occasions. Every time they have been pursued, those same kinds of fruitless statements have been made by the opposition. At the end of the day Canadian farmers have won 10 out of 10. The Government of Canada has stood with them every inch of the way. We will continue to do so.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, that is rubbish. The minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board has assured farmers for the past year that this U.S. trade challenge has no substance. The Canadian Wheat Board has assured producers for the last year that the U.S. trade challenge has no substance to it.

Now we find that the United States department of commerce will levy duties of up to 20% on all Canadian wheat sales into the United States.

Is the minister so incompetent that he failed to take the United States seriously, or has he been deliberately misleading Canadian producers?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has consistently stood by farmers in arguments of these kinds.

It is significant that the government defends the rights of farmers to make their own marketing decisions in Canada by Canadians.

The opposition by contrast sent a delegation some years ago to Washington, stood on the steps of the U.S. Capitol, joined arms with Newt Gingrich and sided with the United States.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in December 2002, the National Assembly passed a unanimous resolution asking the Government of Canada to use the surplus from the EI fund to support the unemployed, rather than to pay off the national debt. This consensus in Quebec remains strong, and the proof is in the fact that Quebec's new employment minister, Clause Béchard, just reiterated Quebec's concerns about the shameful use of the fund's surplus.

Given that a new spirit of cooperation is supposed to exist with Quebec and that the needs of the unemployed are pressing, is Ottawa now prepared to agree to the emergency meeting requested by Minister Béchard?

● (1120)

[*English*]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, I reject the comments of the hon. member. The Minister of Finance has said that he will sit down and work co-operatively with the new Government of Quebec and with his counterpart, Mr. Séguin.

Second, the member knows that the minister has already started a review of the EI program.

Therefore I suggest that the member be patient while that review continues and while the minister sits down and has good conversations with the new Government of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Claude Béchard feels the Government of Quebec could recover a significant share of the EI fund's surplus in order to better meet the needs of workers who are unemployed.

Is the federal government ready to go this route, as the Employment Insurance Act permits?

[*English*]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): First, Mr. Speaker, as we know there is no separate EI fund.

Second, the Bloc members should know that their kissing cousins in Quebec, the Parti québécois, are clearly not very good at mathematics to begin with. I do not think we need to take any lessons from our friends across the way.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the reason the government obstinately refuses to recognize the existence of surpluses in the EI fund is that it is using the money collected from employers and employees like a tax it can spend as it pleases, and has indeed used it to pay down the debt.

Will the government deny that using the EI surpluses as it is doing shows that it views these surpluses not as money belonging to the contributors but as a tax on employment?

[*English*]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Again, Mr. Speaker, we know that the EI fund is there for workers in times of need and it is being used as such.

The hon. member should know that the minister has started a review of the EI program.

I again remind the hon. member that since this government has come to power, EI rates have continued to go down. They have continued to go down this year, the 10th year in a row.

The math of my friends across the way is not very good and that is clearly reflected in the type of questions they have been asking. I suggest that they be part of the solution instead of part of the problem.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the government realize that viewing the surplus in the fund as a tax results in money being diverted from its intended purpose, thereby making it impossible to find a sustainable solution to the problems faced by the victims of the softwood lumber crisis, the fishers affected by the moratorium on fishing and seasonal workers, to name but a few?

[*English*]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has responded in all of those cases and has assisted where needed.

The member should know that in her own province workers in all those industries have benefited because we have a very effective EI program.

The minister, I repeat for the third time, is working with all stakeholders to review EI for future rates. However the rates have continued to come down, something that never happened under the previous government.

* * *

MARRIAGE

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the historic B.C. appeal court decision yesterday on same sex marriage is a victory for equality in Canada. It also is further evidence that the waffling and denial of equality for gays and lesbians by the government is unconscionable and unacceptable.

After three appeal court decisions, will the minister make it clear today that there will be no more delays, no more studies and no more government appeals?

Will the government do the right thing and stand on the side of equality and change the law to allow same sex marriage? How long will the minister take on this issue?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the member is raising a very important social issue for all Canadians.

We said last summer that we wanted to have parliamentarians involved in the debate. We have asked the justice committee to proceed with the consultation process. I have been told that the consultation is finished now. We expect to have the report soon.

There is no doubt in my mind that we are facing three decisions, one in Quebec, one in Ontario and the decision yesterday by the B.C. Court of Appeal, which was a very interesting and important decision.

We will wait for the recommendations from the committee and then the government will come forward with a position.

* * *

● (1125)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the foreign affairs minister cannot bring himself to say no to Bush a second time, no matter how bad the idea, and, on its merits, star wars is a very bad idea.

Until recently, the minister was Mr. Multilateralism. Now he is embracing star wars, even though it violates one of the most important arms control treaties on the planet.

Maybe I made a mistake yesterday. Maybe the star wars flip-flop is not a case of the Prime Minister kissing up to Bush, but rather the foreign affairs minister kissing up to the Prime Minister in waiting; or is it both?

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this may be about ballistic missile defence but it is not rocket science to know that we in this government will look at what is in the interests of Canada and Canadians in all circumstances.

We have a long and proud tradition of co-operating with the United States. No decision has been made yet by the cabinet on this. We will be looking at it. We will only make a determination if it is in the interest of Canada and in the interest of preserving peace.

That has always been the basic position we have taken and we will not deviate from that when we discuss anything like this with our American colleagues.

Oral Questions

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, referring to the maritime helicopter project, the Deputy Prime Minister said "There are lots of ways procurements get jiggled around".

An e-mail was sent on April 3, 2001, to Jean Pelletier, Eddie Goldenberg, Herb Gray and Alphonso Gagliano by Canada's ambassador to France, Raymond Chrétien. Mr. Chrétien outlined changes to the procurement process that would benefit the French bidder, Eurocopter.

Could the acting Prime Minister tell the House why Mr. Chrétien sent his e-mail to his uncle's office and not to the Department of National Defence? Is that what the Deputy Prime Minister meant by jiggling procurements?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence and I have answered questions about the MHP on several occasions in the House. We have indicated that the project is now on a rebundled basis. We have indicated that we are now into the second or third step of the outlined procedure for this particular calendar year.

We are determined to follow those steps meticulously to determine that the process is absolutely appropriate in the circumstances and, at the end of the day, that the military gets the equipment it requires, and at the very best possible price.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, as a Saskatchewan boy, the minister would know that we can rebundle this stuff as much as we want but we would not want to step in it.

Ambassador Chrétien's representation on behalf of France was made on April 3. Exactly three weeks later, the Department of National Defence announced a change to the requirement specifications in the way that Eurocopter wanted.

Did the Prime Minister's Office or the Privy Council Office instruct National Defence to give Eurocopter what it wanted?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no knowledge whatsoever of the allegation that the hon. gentleman is making but I would assure him that this Saskatchewan boy will do his very best job to deliver for the people of Canada.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, as a medical doctor I am proud of the health professionals and the way they acted in Toronto and beyond Queen's Park.

As a politician I am disappointed with the actions of the health minister. We now have a new development in the SARS case. We have patients who are relapsing. That means they may be infectious after they have gone home from hospital.

What is the health minister doing about this new development?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is right to raise that issue. It was discussed yesterday at an international conference of SARS experts in Toronto.

As Dr. David Heymann, from the WHO said, it is a concern and it is one that the global community is going to take very seriously.

What we need to do is the epidemiological work. We need to look at these patients, case by case, who have allegedly relapsed, and try to figure out why they have relapsed and whether there are certain populations that may be sensitive to relapse.

I can assure the hon. member and all Canadians that we are watching this very carefully, along with the global community.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, a dozen patients in Hong Kong have been reported now as having possibly relapsed. We have one in Canada who may be in the same position.

Surveillance of every single patient after they leave the hospital is necessary. My question is straightforward. Is that surveillance in Canada taking place?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, we are working, not only here at home but with the global community, to understand whether relapse is taking place, and if in fact it is taking place, what is causing it.

We will do everything in partnership with local public health officials to follow up with these patients. We will do everything that is needed to ensure surveillance of those patients is done so we will understand more about the possibility of relapse in certain patients who have suffered from SARS.

* * *

● (1130)

[*Translation*]

IRAQ

Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the problems in Iraq are increasing. Restoration of water and power supplies is happening at a snail's pace, the hospitals are paralyzed, security is still not a certainty, and what is most important, the public is becoming increasingly hostile as a result of events like the incident in Falluyah, and sees the foreign forces more and more as forces of occupation.

In offering his cooperation to the forces occupying Iraq without insisting that the UN play a central role, is the minister not at risk of having the local people associate the Canadians in Iraq—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the situation in Iraq. I think the conditions the hon. member refers to demonstrate exactly why this government and the international community should continue their humanitarian aid. The Minister for International Cooperation must continue his efforts for the people of Iraq.

This is a difficult and complex situation, but we are there for the people of Iraq. We must help put an end to the situation rather than making it worse.

Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the situation is indeed a difficult one over there. Why will the minister not side with the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post* in calling for the United Nations to be the main overseer of what he wants to see done?

Is the minister not concerned that offering his services without setting any conditions will diminish his ability to press for a UN presence during this great challenge to rebuild Iraq?

[*English*]

Hon. Susan Whelan (Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious, and it has been stated several times by the Prime Minister and by members on this side of the House, that we do indeed want the UN to have a vital role. We have heard the President of United States and the prime minister from the UK say very clearly that the UN would have a vital role.

We are working with the UN. We are working with a number of our international partners on the ground to ensure that humanitarian aid and assistance gets to the people in need and meets the needs of the Iraqi people.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, four Canadians are being held hostage on Nigerian oil wells. One of the hostages wrote an e-mail saying "Make no mistake of the danger we are in. If they have lost everything, they will make sure we lose everything and that means our lives".

All the government has done is simply confirmed that the hostages were taken. My question is simple. Will the government ask President Obasanjo to personally intervene in the release of these hostages?

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have already taken steps to do that. I sent a note to the Nigerian government.

The hon. member knows these are very delicate situations and we do not wish to encourage any act that would precipitate an act of violence in connection with a hostage taking.

We are not doing nothing. We have entered into contact with the Nigerian authorities. We are encouraging the president to speak to the company in question. We absolutely wish that the Nigerian authorities, who have in the past been able to resolve these issues without conflict, continue that path and not resort to acts that would endanger the lives of the hostages.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, notes do not save lives. Here is another example of the government's continued inability to deal with a crisis.

Morgan Tsvangirai is on trial in Zimbabwe for treason. The government has an RCMP report that needs to be released. It said in the House that this report would be released and was released months ago. In an e-mail from Tsvangirai's defence team it states "The Canadian government is not prepared to release the findings of the police report".

Why did the government tell the House that this police report was released when it was not, and when will it release this police report that will save three people—

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to provide a response to the member at this time.

I do wish, however, to state that the RCMP is an independent organization. It has to operate under its rules and procedures.

We will look into the issue of this report that he is talking about and an answer will be given in the House.

* * *

● (1135)

[*Translation*]

EXCISE TAX ACT

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, like the Bloc Quebecois in February, the Barreau du Québec and the Canadian Bar Association have criticized the Minister of Finance for wanting to retroactively amend the provisions of the Excise Tax Act, thus rendering invalid a number of judgments in favour of school boards, with respect to the GST.

How can the government be so lacking in decency as to seek to retroactively invalidate the agreements it once negotiated with the school boards, agreements that had been approved by the courts, thus giving them the value of a res judicata, a matter already judged?

[*English*]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, there were 29 cases in Quebec which the government did not challenge. On December 21, 2001 the Minister of Finance announced that we would in fact be bringing an amendment before the House. That in fact has now come forward. Afterward, because they were put on notice, the boards, both in Quebec and Ontario, were aware that an amendment would be made to the legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the difference is that the Government of Quebec has never tried to reverse the res judicata, contrary to the federal government's intentions.

Is the Minister of Justice aware that, if the government goes ahead with this, taxpayers will no longer have confidence in judicial decisions on tax law, since, if the government loses, it can always make retroactive changes in matters that have already been settled?

[*English*]

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the actions of the government are not contrary to the rule of law. As the member knows, the government of Quebec also retroactively acted in this case.

In this case, the Government of Canada is not challenging the decision of October 17, 2001. The retroactivity applies only because of the notice of December 21, 2001. The member knows that, and he also knows that all of those who went forward at that time were well aware that the legislation would be brought to the House, which it has.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, in the request for proposal to bidders on the Sea King replacement project, the Liberals specified, and I quote:

> a. the first certified MH shall be delivered no sooner than forty-eight (48) MACA and no later than sixty (60) MACA; [if the bidder is uncomfortable with its schedule]

Given the political interference on this file, can any Liberal minister over there claim this continued foot dragging is nothing more than a cheap trick to guarantee the politically pre-determined outcome?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can absolutely assure the hon. member that the Minister of National Defence and I are very determined to follow every proper step through this procurement process. We will determine at the end of the day that the military gets what it needs in terms of this helicopter and that the taxpayer gets the very best possible value.

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it was politics that cancelled the original order. It was politics that debundled the original order and again it was politics that rebundled it a couple of years ago. That is the reality. The minister is standing up to his knees in that political slop.

If the preferred manufacturer is not ready, the government will wait, and so will our chopper pilots. Liberal political games like this will again saddle taxpayers with cost overruns and lawsuits for years to come.

Who does the Prime Minister intend to take the fall for this, the defence minister, the public works minister, or the member for LaSalle—Émard? Who will take the hit?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister gave certain responsibilities to the Minister of National Defence and to me on exactly the same day last year. We have been pursuing our responsibilities in this regard with a great deal of care.

We are determined to avoid the litigation mess that the hon. gentleman has referred to, and to ensure that this contract is fulfilled at the fastest possible moment to the satisfaction of both the military and the taxpayer.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific to tell the House whether or not he is aware of any progress that has been made in establishing democracy in Burma. As members know, on May 6 last year the chair of the national league for democracy was released from her house arrest.

Can the minister brief us as to whether or not there has been any progress since that time?

Hon. David Kilgour (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there has been little progress, if any, over the past year on these issues. Over 1,000 political prisoners still remain in prison. Political freedoms are non-existent. There have been no reported meetings in the last six months between Aung San Suu Kyi and Burma's ruling generals.

We have no choice as the Government of Canada but to continue our economic and political measures. We continue to call on Canadian companies not to trade with or invest with the regime until the situation changes.

* * *

● (1140)

CANADIAN TELEVISION FUND

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance's last budget cut $25 million from Canadian TV programs while boosting tax credits to American productions. The Canadian TV industry is in gridlock, and facing layoffs and bankruptcies because of a fight between two leadership candidates.

Will the minister stop ducking responsibility for culture and put $25 million more new money into the Canadian TV fund?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Carole-Marie Allard (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is nice all of a sudden to see just how much recognition there is for the role of the Canadian Television Fund in improving television production in Canada.

I must say, however, that the fund has its own rules. We feel certain that another way to help artists will be found, and that these decisions will be announced in the very near future.

* * *

[*English*]

SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Foster is a 60 year old man from Regina who has been unable to work since having two strokes in the late nineties. Advocates working with him say he has been maliciously harassed by her department. After four years of denied applications and appeals, poverty and illness, Foster was finally advised that the review tribunal had accepted his appeal. Yet incredibly, he has been told by her department that it will overturn the appeal.

Why is the minister taking aim at the most vulnerable and impoverished people in society? Will the minister ask her officials to back off?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that I am not familiar with this, but I will make a note and get back to her as soon as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH

Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC): Mr. Speaker, the government responded this way in answer to a SARS question in the House six weeks ago. I am quoting from the *Hansard* of March 21:

> We know that it is not a real threat because the virus has been traced back to Hong Kong. There have only been a few cases in Canada that have come from there.

Given that response, would that not be pretty clear evidence that the government was not handling this issue seriously or taking any responsibility at all? How can the minister explain that statement?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would certainly be very interested in knowing from the hon. member who said that and the context in which it was said because certainly I did not say that and I resent the implication that I did.

I can do no better than quote Dr. David Heymann who was attending an international conference on SARS yesterday. He is the WHO's chief officer in relation to communicable diseases. In relation to the travel advisory, he said:

> We did not make our decision based on something that Canada was doing wrong. Canada was doing everything right, including screening passengers as they left.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Mr. Speaker, that is a pathetic response.

Alarm bells are ringing. Mandatory U.S. country of origin labelling regulations will take place September 2004. Not unlike the Minister of Health who sat on the SARS file long enough to destroy the Toronto economy, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food is content to sit back and see the pork and beef industry in this country destroyed.

Why is the minister waiting for someone else to do his job? Does he believe American stakeholders will ride to his rescue? Or does he even care? Maybe he should ask the Minister of Canadian Heritage for help.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude Duplain (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, discussions are currently being held; I do not understand the question by the hon. member opposite. The Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food is not waiting for someone else to do his job. Discussions on labelling with regard to this situation are currently being held with the United States.

[*English*]

TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS CANADA

Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton Southwest, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, two recent technology partnerships Canada grants were given to companies in order to create, and I quote the Industry Canada press release, "high quality jobs". Since they have received these grants both companies, Westport and March Networks, have cut jobs, not increased them.

Can the minister explain how technology partnerships Canada is promoting quality and value added when, despite millions of dollars in grants, it is not even creating jobs but cutting jobs?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since we created technology partnerships Canada in 1996, it has created up to 35,000 high quality jobs in Canada, most in the emerging sectors of the economy.

We have invested $1.6 billion through TPC. In return, we have leveraged $8 billion in private investment, creating possibilities in this economy to take on the world in emerging areas like information technology, aerospace, and the life sciences.

The cases to which the member is referring are cases in which money will not be advanced unless it is to reimburse expenses incurred.

● (1145)

Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton Southwest, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is not true that this program has created 35,000 jobs. I challenge the minister to table any document that supports that figure.

Not only does this program have a dismal record of job creation, it has completely failed to recoup any of the grants it has given. It has recouped less than 2% of the grants that it has given to this date and, according to the minister's own internal documents, will never recoup more than one-third of what it gives out.

Even beyond this, we cannot even know how much of the grants have been repaid because it is under a cloak of secrecy imposed by the minister himself. When will the government finally be accountable to taxpayers and put an end to this—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Industry.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, despite the member's many strengths, one of his difficulties is an abject inability to understand the value of technology partnerships Canada as a program.

We have created up to 35,000 jobs. I urge the member to read our annual reports that are tabled in the House every year. I urge the member to look at the evidence on the ground, some of it in Alberta, in his own riding. We are making investments that will be repaid. The rate of repayment is accelerating constantly. This is the way to ensure we will have an innovative economy for the future.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food said that the Canadian agricultural negotiator at the WTO was mandated to protect all three pillars of supply management, one of which is administered prices.

How can the minister explain that the government's chief negotiator has clearly told farmers that the administered prices issue was not part of her mandate?

Mr. Claude Duplain (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reassure the hon. member. For some time now on a number of occasions ministers have stated here that supply management was included in the rules we wish to see complied with and wish to promote. The three pillars of supply management are an integral part of this.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in order to do away with all ambiguity, would the minister not wish to confirm in writing that protecting administered prices is part of his negotiator's mandate, as are the other two pillars, thereby rejecting the Harbinson report?

Mr. Claude Duplain (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food has often expressed a desire to protect supply management. If supply management is to be protected, the three pillars of supply management also need to be protected. This is clear.

* * *

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was reported that the EI surplus has ballooned by $6.5 billion. The government is collecting a whopping 33% more in premiums than what is necessary. Payroll taxes hurt hard-working Canadians and businesses, yet the Liberals only moved to cut premiums by a measly 2¢ in the last budget.

Why are the Liberals continuously and intentionally ripping off Canadians?

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member does not get it. First of all, it is not 2¢. The member knows that the rates have gone down to $1.98 from $2.10. Second, the member also knows that for 10 years the rates have been coming down. Previous to this government they were going up. It is simple mathematics. If it is going down, that means people are paying less.

What is the problem? The problem obviously is that the member does not appreciate the fact that rates are going down and that we are looking at dealing with this system through the meetings with the minister for the reports that will come out after June of this year.

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the member needs to go to a math upgrade class because the increases to the CPP have offset any reductions in EI, and he knows that full well.

The former finance minister has said that he is running to become Prime Minister because he wants to bring integrity back to government. Well, his idea of integrity has been to balance the books on the backs of hard-working Canadians who pay inflated EI premiums.

Since the current finance minister is running against his old rival, will he undo the damage of the past 10 years to hard-working Canadians and immediately slash EI premiums?

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the economy is moving along very strongly. More people are working and the fact that more people are contributing is obviously good. That is very positive.

The fact that we are paying off the national debt, reducing corporate taxes, and reducing personal income taxes is obviously very good news. It is news that these people do not want to hear. We do not hear these negative comments except from the Alliance because only the Alliance cannot take it. The fact is that we are moving along, with 560,000 new jobs created last year. Any other questions?

* * *

● (1150)

HOUSING

Hon. Art Eggleton (York Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the appointment of the hon. member for Mississauga West to the cabinet. Knowing his support for affordable housing, his job with respect to Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation will be most beneficial to Canadians.

I want to ask him a question in connection with the SARS disease. There are many people who are having trouble with their mortgage payments because of their loss of income because of this terrible disease. I wonder what Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation could do to assist those people?

Hon. Steve Mahoney (Secretary of State (Selected Crown Corporations), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to congratulate the member for the tremendous leadership that he has shown on behalf of the people of the city of Toronto as chair of the GTA caucus.

CMHC has said to its lenders that anyone who has difficulty making their mortgage payments can sit down with their lender and see about working out arrangements that are suitable to help them if there is a crisis. We can defer payments, blend payments, and make changes that will make it possible for people to keep their homes and not run into financial difficulty. CMHC along with the government and the member are showing leadership in this area to say that Toronto is open for business again.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents in Nanaimo—Cowichan rely on water transportation. Under the government, Gabriola Island's green wharf, which allows the only public access between Gabriola and Mudge Islands was set for demolition. Last year, the then public works minister announced there would be an indefinite moratorium on the disposal of the green wharf until the access issue has been resolved. Public works officials have now arbitrarily imposed a September 13 deadline.

Will the present minister please confirm that he will stand by his government's previous commitment to an indefinite moratorium—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Government Services.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will most certainly consult with my predecessor and determine the best way to live up to the spirit of his commitment.

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, another related concern on this issue is that the government has been relying on local government to negotiate compensation issues with the landowner on Gabriola Island when this is really a federal responsibility. This will not be resolved until the federal government accepts its responsibility for this issue.

Will the Minister of Public Works and Government Services commit to having his department handle these negotiations, and respect provincial and municipal jurisdictions?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the moment I am not aware of all the legal nuances that might be involved here, but I can certainly assure the hon. member that I will inquire into it and obviously try to get the very best results that we possible can for his constituents.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government says it is putting in place measures to foster francophone immigration to minority communities. But if we look at the amounts provided for language training, we notice that only $300,000, or 0.4% of the program's $94 million budget, is allocated to French language training, with a mere $9,000 for the Maritimes, and nothing for Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories.

Is this deplorable situation not likely to turn prospective immigrants into prospects for assimilation?

● (1155)

Hon. Denis Coderre (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker. I think that we must commend the plan of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. I also think that our government is indeed ensuring that things are put into perspective.

That having been said, I think that the first principle is to ensure francophone immigration. We must make sure this development tool is available across Canada for minority communities as well. There is a steering committee in charge of conducting all assessments, and we will make the appropriate adjustments based on these assessments.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL AID

Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, preventable disease kills millions of children every year in developing countries. We know that immunization and vitamin A programs can prevent these tragedies.

Could the Minister for International Cooperation inform the House of what Canada is doing to ensure that the children in developing countries are protected?

Hon. Susan Whelan (Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a recognized leader in immunization and vitamin A programs and we are deeply committed to protecting children's health.

Yesterday I announced an additional $110 million to be devoted to immunizing children against tuberculosis, measles, diphtheria, tetanus, hepatitis B and yellow fever over the next five years. In the past this program has averted 40 million cases of measles and 500,000 deaths. To ensure that the vitamin A program can reach an additional 200 million children, $33.6 million will go to UNICEF. With yesterday's announcement we will be able to continue to see some of the results that we have seen in the past.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, only the Liberal government would want to tax amateur junior hockey players. Revenue Canada still intends to tax players and teams of the Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League.

Could anyone in the government, perhaps the self-proclaimed Saskatchewan boy, please explain why Saskatchewan junior hockey players are being treated differently from junior hockey players in the rest of the country?

Points of Order

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister has answered that question several times in the past and she has made it clear that protecting the rights of Canadians to benefit from Canada's social programs was essential for her and the CCRA. In that respect, CCRA has initiated an outreach program via the hockey association regarding the employment status of hockey players and their eligibility for Canada's social safety net to ensure they receive the benefits they are entitled to. In order for the government to continue providing these social programs everyone must continue paying their fair share, as in this case in the past.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANNES FESTIVAL

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while money is in such terribly short supply, the federal government has decided to leave the cast and crew of the film *Les invasions barbares* at home and to send four Canadian diplomatic service staff and their spouses to the Cannes Festival.

Will the government admit that, funds being as short as they are, instead of giving preferential treatment to four public servants and their spouses, more consideration ought to have been shown by first of all inviting our film actors, crew and creators to Cannes?

Ms. Carole-Marie Allard (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member across the way raises an interesting point, and I will be pleased to make inquiries of the department and get back to him with an answer.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thought everyone in Canada knew that West Nile Virus was a serious public health problem. Last year Health Canada paid to test dead crows for the virus. Today we hear from CBC radio that in fact the government has cut the funding for this year. Is the report accurate? Why would the minister cut off funding to test for the virus?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not cutting off funding to test for the virus. In fact, our lab last year worked 24/7 to test as many samples of blood and tissue as absolutely humanly possible. Learning from that experience with our provincial and territorial colleagues, and at their request, they wanted to expand the testing capacity to provincial laboratories. We agreed that it was appropriate. We have been working with some of the provinces to train their technicians so this testing can be done in provincial laboratories where they so wish.

In fact, funding is not being cut. We are constantly working with the provinces and territories to figure out how best to protect the health of Canadians.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, earlier in question period the Minister of Health asked who said about SARS six weeks ago in Parliament that "we know that it is not a real threat". If she will check *Hansard* for March 21, she will see that it was her parliamentary secretary who said that, responding to a question directed to her.

Does her parliamentary secretary speak for the minister, and if he was wrong in the information he gave the House, why did the minister not take the earliest opportunity to set the record straight?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt that the government has always taken the threat of SARS very seriously. That is why as soon as the WHO issued information in relation to this new and emerging disease we activated federal-provincial-territorial mechanisms. We activated our operations centre in Health Canada. We activated our level 4 lab in Winnipeg, working 24 hours a day 7 days a week to try to understand the science of this disease. In fact, we have always taken this disease seriously, which is why the WHO says we are the world leader.

* * *

● (1200)

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. Bill Graham (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during question period the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca asked me about the condition of Canadians who were held in a hostage taking off the coast of Nigeria.

I want to inform the member and the House that I have received information that the hostage taking and standoff is now over. The people are being removed by helicopters by the company in question. Our representative in Port Harcourt will meet them when they get there and we will be in contact with the family members.

[*Translation*]

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

The Deputy Speaker: I have also received notice of a point of order from the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier regarding a question that was raised yesterday.

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the point of order raised by the House leader of the official opposition, the hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, relating to the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Official Languages, which was tabled in the House on April 30 by the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst, vice-chair of the committee.

First, I would like to say how much I regret that the House leader of the official opposition did not trouble to tell me that he would be raising this matter. I believe that it would have been common courtesy to do so.

He quotes Standing Order 21, and I repeat it now:

> No Member is entitled to vote upon any question in which he or she has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any Member so interested will be disallowed.

Then, and this is where the problem lies, the hon. member draws the conclusion that I have placed myself in a conflict of interest situation because I signed the sixth report.

I signed the committee report to comply with the well-established practice whereby committee reports are signed by the committee president or chair. Moreover, I was duly authorized by the members of the committee to report the motion that had been passed, as is shown by the minutes of meeting no. 21.

The reporting of the motion does not indicate whether I am in favour of the motion or not, or whether I voted for it or against it. The report reflects the will of the majority of committee members, as expressed when they passed the motion.

Beauchesne, on page 241, indicates clearly, and I quote:

> The Chairman signs only by way of authentication on behalf of the committee. Therefore, the Chairman must sign the report even if dissenting from the majority of the committee.

The decision having been made during a meeting that was held in camera to discuss the committee's future business as well as a draft report, I must be careful in the information that I can disclose here.

I will repeat that I am very aware of the rules and that I followed them rigorously in the Quigley case. I offer as evidence the minutes and the record of proceedings of the public meeting of the Standing Committee on Official Languages held on February 4, 2003. At that meeting, the committee was voting on the issue of making a similar request to the Standing Committee on Liaison. The record of that meeting clearly shows that, at the time, I left the chair and abstained from voting on this issue.

For you, Mr. Speaker, and for the House leader of the official opposition, the question is: why would I have changed my behaviour at the April 29 meeting, even though it was held in camera?

I can say without any hesitation that I have followed the rules to the letter. At no time did I place myself in a conflict of interest. The only conflict that exists has to do with the legal interpretation of the Official Languages Act, a conflict that the courts will settle eventually and that I hope we will have the opportunity to examine in this House someday.

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak on this, since I am a member of the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

With regard to this matter, I want to support the member for Ottawa—Vanier. We attended the meeting, and the member for Ottawa-Vanier stepped down as chair so that the committee could make its decision; the member was not in conflict of interest.

I can guarantee the Speaker that, at no time, was the member for Ottawa—Vanier in a conflict of interest concerning the decision made. This matter related to Canada's official languages. The government has agreed that Canada has two official languages.

The current situation is unacceptable—

The Deputy Speaker: I do not want to hold a debate. I think that the Chair has enough information to rule on the matter.

First, the matter was raised by the hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, and then the minister of state and the government House leader spoke. Now, the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst has spoken briefly, and so, necessarily, has the individual at the heart of the matter, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

The matter has already been taken under advisement by the Chair, which now has sufficient information. I am certain that the Speaker will rule on this matter at the appropriate time.

This matter is concluded for today.

● (1210)

[*English*]

I also have notice of a point of order from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada on a matter arising out of question period.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was asked earlier about a report of an RCMP investigation: that the RCMP had been requested by a foreign government's court and ordered to table this report. I was not able at that time to speak to this question from the hon. member of the Canadian Alliance. I have been given some information. I wish to make it available to the member and to the House.

While this government and the Solicitor General cannot comment on court proceedings taking place in a foreign country, we are aware of the issuance of a court order in relation to the RCMP in the matter that was raised by the hon. member of the Alliance. The matter is presently being examined by officials with the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade in concert with officials from our Department of Justice.

I can assure the House and the member that the RCMP will take appropriate action based on the recommendations of officials within these Canadian government departments. That will as well conform to Canadian legal standards and practice.

The Deputy Speaker: There is another matter outstanding from the previous day, a matter of a question of privilege. I will now hear a submission from the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, the hon. member for Halifax West.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

FIREARMS ACT

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was a question of privilege from the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville. I responded at the time indicating that I would like to have the opportunity to respond further after doing some more research, which I have now done.

The member asked how it was possible to transfer ministerial responsibility for the firearms centre from the Minister of Justice to the Solicitor General when the firearms legislation passed by Parliament specified that the Minister of Justice was the responsible minister.

The member quoted from research prepared by the Library of Parliament that the authority to make this transfer was provided under the Public Service Rearrangement and Transfer of Duties Act. The government had the authority to make this transfer because Parliament, as I said yesterday, has provided the authority in that act.

The act provides a mechanism for the efficient reorganization of government and it has been used in the following recent cases. It has been used in the creation of new departments and related changes in ministerial responsibility in 1993, which included the Departments of Human Resources Development, Canadian Heritage, Industry, and Public Works and Government Services. All those departments were included. Another example is the transfer of responsibility for the Pest Control Products Act from the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food to the Minister of Health in 2000. Transfer of responsibilities to the Minister of Transport from the Minister of Public Works for the Royal Canadian Mint in 2002 is the third case.

In each of these cases, the minister actually responsible for the organization is not the same minister found in the statutes. As the Library of parliament's research indicates, and as a reading of statutes confirms, this is not a matter of privilege. It is a request for a legal opinion by the Speaker, which of course is quite another issue.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for his intervention. Of course, the matter of the question is already under advisement and the Speaker will be ruling on the matter very shortly.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 24 petitions.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

MARRIAGE

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions today.

In the first one, the petitioners draw to the attention of the House that the definition of marriage as being between a man and a woman is being challenged and that this hon. House passed a motion in June 1999 that called for marriage to continue to be defined as a union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others. Therefore, the petitioners call on Parliament to pass legislation to recognize the institution of marriage in federal law as being the union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, the second petition deals with child pornography. The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that the creation and use of child pornography is condemned by a clear majority of Canadians and that the courts have not applied the current child pornography laws in a way which makes it clear that the exploitation of children will always be met with swift punishment. Therefore, the petitioners call on Parliament to protect our children by taking all necessary steps to ensure that materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I ask that all the questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise and be able to speak on behalf of my constituents to Bill C-34, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, specifically regarding the ethics commissioner and the Senate ethics officer.

As well all know, the current Prime Minister has been searching for his legacy, something that Canadians will remember him by after his years of public service. While I greatly respect his years of service, I do not have to endorse what he has done during those years. The bill is a prime example of the Liberal legacy, saying that it will do something but only doing it in half measures.

If the purpose of the bill is to fulfill a 1993 Liberal red book election promise and provide for the appointment of a truly independent ethics officer that would report directly to the House Commons regarding the conduct of its members, then we would be able to proceed quickly with the bill. Unfortunately, as my colleagues before me have stated and as I will mention in the next few moments, this is really is not the case.

The bill is part of the Prime Minister's ethics initiative that he first announced in May 2002. As is often the case with the Prime Minister, his cabinet and his government, they use the right words but the meaning and implementation are shifted in such a way that the results are confusing. In other words, they simply do not walk the talk.

I believe if any one of us asked our constituents what they thought the term "independent ethics commissioner for the House of Commons" actually meant, there would be a fairly consistent response. Canadians who I have spoken with over the past number of years on this issue take the view that an independent ethics commissioner means exactly that, independent, free of influence and restrictions from anyone else.

While that would be the Canadian norm, the Liberal version of the world is always just a little bit different. Under the bill the term "independent ethics commissioner" is misleading. Under Bill C-34 the Prime Minister will make the choice of ethics commissioner. There will be a consultation process with the leaders of the parties in the House and then there will be a confirming vote in the House.

This may sound like it meets the needs of an independent ethics commission. However, we must consider that the consultation process with the leaders does not mandate that the Prime Minister change his mind if they all disagree.

Consider that the confirming vote in the House will undoubtedly be a vote in which all Liberals will mysteriously vote in favour of the Prime Minister's choice. This will not be a secret ballot where every member of the House can vote according to his or her independent view of the proposed ethics commissioner. Is it not ironic that an independent ethics commissioner will not be voted on by independent minded members of Parliament?

As we all very well know, there is a very strong precedent for secret ballots in the House. The Speaker of the House of Commons has been voted on in this fashion for the past several times and it has worked extremely well. The wishes of the members are clearly heard and they in turn are well served by that democratic choice.

I note that the House of Commons ethics commissioner is appointed for an initial five year term and is eligible for reappointment for one or more terms of up to five years each. Furthermore, Bill C-34 states that the House of Commons ethics commissioner will work under the general direction of a committee of the House of Commons, presumably the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. While this seems all quite logical, I believe we need to look at the working details of the bill more closely. Unfortunately again, Liberal logic and Canadian logic often do not match with each other.

When speaking out in opposition to Bill C-34, let me quote directly from Canadian Alliance policy and what I firmly believe should be involved in the bill. It states:

> We will facilitate the appointment of an independent Ethics Counsellor by the House of Commons. The Ethics Counsellor will report directly to the House of Commons and be given the mandate to investigate, and where applicable, recommend prosecution for conflict-of-interest infractions by a Member of Parliament, and/or his/her staff.

● (1215)

I am fully in favour of setting and maintaining a high standard of ethical conduct by government and parliamentarians. As public servants, we must ensure that a high standard is maintained. In this case it is this Liberal version of ethics to which I am opposed. By its very nature ethics are not something that can or should be subject to internal definitions.

I have no doubt that the Liberals will try to characterize my fellow opposition members as being against a code of ethics but let me emphatically state again that I fully support the premise and the need for an independent ethics commissioner. Unfortunately, after reading the details of the bill, while the position may be for an ethics commissioner, the position is certainly not independent. It is on this basis that I disagree with this bill.

I ask the obvious question of how an ethics commissioner appointed by and answerable solely to the Prime Minister can have any legitimate jurisdiction over backbench and opposition MPs. I urge all hon. members of Parliament to carefully consider these implications. This is nothing more than one more Liberal wolf dressed in sheep's clothing. How can an ethics commissioner for all members of the House of Commons have any validity when he or she would be appointed by the Prime Minister without an endorsement by the rank and file members of Parliament?

As we have seen in the past, situations arise where an investigation by an independent ethics commissioner is required. If an investigation of a minister is requested by a senator or an MP, the ethics counsellor is obliged to investigate. However under Bill C-34, any public report arising from the investigation can be suitably sanitized by withholding any information considered confidential.

An independent ethics commissioner must report to the House of Commons ideally through one of the committees, not through the Prime Minister's office. Without this provision there is no independence and the position continues as a lapdog to the Prime Minister.

I know the government House leader has indicated that Bill C-34 meets all the recommendations of the standing committee in its report tabled just before Easter. However that is not necessarily the case. The method of recruitment and the appointment of the ethics commissioner is key to guaranteeing his or her independence. Unlike all other officers of Parliament, the ethics commissioner reports on the conduct of members of Parliament and not the government. Therefore, faith in his total independence is essential.

I note the standing committee made favourable reference to the practice in the provinces where there is direct involvement by their members in the selection of their commissioners.

In my home province of British Columbia he is selected by an all party committee, which makes a recommendation to the premier, who must then obtain a two-thirds confirming vote by the legislative assembly to make the appointment. Alberta uses a similar method without the two-thirds requirement. In this package the House will have, arguably, no real involvement in recruitment and appointment, and in the end the government majority will simply prevail.

There are many other issues that arise out of this bill that time prevents me from addressing. I know that opposition parties and many backbench government members have grave concerns over this bill.

Some of the issues I have had the opportunity to speak to but there are many others. I am concerned over the confidential advising to the Prime Minister and the ability of the PMO to clean up the report over confidential issues between the Prime Minister and his ministers. The bill provides no real role for the House in the selection of the ethics commissioner, therefore arguably not really truly independent.

I am strongly in favour of a code of ethics by which all members of the House can abide. I affirm the need for a truly independent ethics commissioner to uphold this standard. Unfortunately, the Liberal government thrust its own definitions on the role and position and in so doing, have circumvented the legitimacy of a truly independent ethics commissioner.

● (1220)

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, what we debate here briefly today and what the committee will study indepth is more Liberal smoke and mirrors, touchy-feely stuff that is supposed to make some public relations spin very positive out there and it is not going to happen.

We have studied this proposed legislation very carefully and it is more Liberal litter scattered down a very long and twisted trail of broken promises, right back to the first red book in 1993.

The problem seems to be that the Liberals have no grasp of the meaning of the word ethics or any understanding of what constitutes ethical behaviour, bottom basic stuff in politics. If they knew the meaning of the word ethics or practised ethical behaviour, there would be no GST today and there would not have been $1 billion lost in the HRDC boondoggle or another $1 billion flushed down the gun registry.

If Liberals had a grasp of what ethics means to ethical people, there would not be a long page filled with the names of disgraced cabinet ministers who had to be fired for unethical behaviour and there would be no new ambassador to Denmark who was sent into hiding in that country.

We know the Liberals hate to be reminded of all their scandalous betrayals of Canadians' trust. We know there are even some over there who profess to be embarrassed by the antics of their frontbench colleagues. However professing embarrassment and resigning in disgust are two different matters. The former is smoke and mirrors. The latter is what Canadians expect of hon. members, especially frontbench government members.

When the Liberals in the 1993 election made the promise of an ethics commissioner, Canadians took that to mean Parliament would have an independent overseer of the ethics of members of Parliament, including those frontbench cabinet ministers. What they got was a dependent business counsellor answerable only to the Prime Minister and serving at the pleasure of that same Prime Minister. If Canadians who care about the ethical behaviour of members of Parliament, including the Prime Minister and his cabinet, were disappointed, we on this side can certainly understand why.

The bill is part of the Prime Minister's so-called ethics initiative first announced a year ago, right in the middle of a lot of his trials and tribulations. As is the case so often with Liberals, the right words are used but in such a way as to confuse Canadians and lull them into believing that the Liberals have finally seen the light; a false sense of security.

There will be no "independent ethics commissioner" because the Prime Minister will make the appointment. As many Liberal backbenchers will attest, this Prime Minister might consult but he does not listen and does not take advice, nor does he ever change his mind.

We know when the Prime Minister's choice for another lapdog ethics consultant is announced, no matter what other party leaders say, the whip will be cracked and the majority Liberal government will vote in favour of the Prime Minister's chosen candidate. This is the Liberal track record and that is how the Liberals operate.

Surely if the promise of last year and the promise of 1993 are to be honoured, the Liberals would grant the House the authority to seek out and nominate a truly independent ethics commissioner. The ethics commissioner would report to the House as a whole either through a select committee or an appropriate standing committee. That would remove the influence of the Prime Minister and his office.

We know that British Columbia has the best process for selecting an ethics commissioner and cannot understand why the Liberals would not use the same process. They profess that they are picking this up from the provinces, but we do not see that mirrored in what they are proposing.

In that ethically advanced legislature members are directly involved in the selection process. An all party committee makes the selection and the recommendation to the premier. The premier, in turn, must obtain a two-thirds confirming vote in the assembly to make the appointment. Alberta is also an ethically advanced province, except the two-thirds majority is not a requirement there.

It should be noted that in British Columbia everyone knows that any person considering accepting the ethics commissioner position would not likely accept the appointment with a mere two-thirds vote of confidence. Here in this House members will have no real involvement in seeking out an appointment of that ethics commissioner. In the end the will of the Prime Minister and the government majority will prevail.

One has to wonder if an ethical person would accept such an appointment by the Prime Minister if all parties in opposition voted against that particular appointment. It really puts that person between a rock and a hard place. The bill, without amendment, does not meet the concerns of the standing committee because it does not provide for a meaningful role or involvement of all of the members in the selection process.

As it stands, the bill allows the ethics commissioner to wear two hats. He or she will continue to serve as a confidential adviser to the Prime Minister on the conduct of cabinet ministers. It would probably be more accurate to call this individual an ethics consultant. Much like the person holding the position now, the new candidate could very well wind up serving as a consultant to the member for LaSalle—Émard.

● (1225)

If Canada Steamship Lines dumps some bunker oil in the Canadian harbour, will it be the responsibility of the newly appointed ethics consultant to call the member for LaSalle—Émard with a heads-up to a potentially embarrassing business problem?

Let me reiterate. The method of recruitment and appointment of a truly independent ethics commissioner is the key to a guarantee of dependence. This is important because unlike other officers of Parliament, the ethics commissioner reports on the conduct of members, not the government.

Total faith in the total independence of the commissioner is critically important if Canadians are to truly believe that their Parliament takes the matter of ethical behaviour seriously. Canadians will have the right to be disappointed and cynical if Parliament's ethics watchdog turns out to be just another Liberal lapdog.

Members should also be wary of the fact that it is not clear in the bill that a minister of the crown or state can be held accountable under the same rules that apply to ordinary members of Parliament. That is a double standard. There is the possibility of two sets of standards, which is not surprising considering this is coming from the Liberals. That party is, after all, widely known as the party of double standards, the party that says, "Don't ever do as we do, just do as we say".

The possibility of two sets of standards is assumed but not specific. The bill should be amended to make it specific. It is simply not safe to assume anything when Liberals hold a majority in Canada's Parliament.

Canadians made an assumption in 1993 when they hard the Liberals promise to scrap, kill and abolish the GST. They assumed the Liberals were telling the truth at that time.

They made an assumption when the member for LaSalle—Émard said that registering guns would only cost a couple of million dollars. They assumed he was a straight shooter and telling the truth.

They made another assumption when the Liberals promised them that the only highest ethical behaviour of cabinet ministers would be accepted in the Liberal government. Does the name Alfonso Gagliano ring any bells? How about that long list of ethically challenged cabinet ministers perched off like crows to the right and left of the frontbench ministers?

It is unwise, dangerous and always costly to assume the Liberals mean what they say and will do what they had promised.

Parliament and the committee should be prepared to approach this bill with healthy cynicism. History shows us again and again that if we accept what Liberals say at face value, we are in for a major disappointment.

If they promise a program will not cost much, the best advice is to put our money in a vault, lock it and throw any the key. Then we should bury the vault 20 feet underground and put tons of cement on the surface. They will still get our money, it will just simply take them a little longer to find it.

What I say makes Liberals wince. I understand that our grannies always told us the truth hurts.

In conclusion, the bill is a disappointment. It is a cynical attempt to use smoke and mirrors to convince Canadians that the Liberals finally looked up and understood the definition of ethics. They did not because why waste time on such trivia, they decided.

Instead, they give us a bill that is so full of holes it makes a joke of the Liberals promises of independent ethics commissioners from 10 years ago. It does not deserve support as much as it deserves critical study and thoughtful amendments. Hopefully those will happen at committee.

● (1230)

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, my party has raised this issue at length, as have members from all political parties because it goes to the heart of our job. We obviously oppose what the government is doing because the ethics commissioner will not be truly independent as the government has mentioned.

The ethics commissioner will be chosen by the Prime Minister and ratified by the House. On the surface one may think that would be appropriate. The Prime Minister certainly has the right to appoint individuals, but the ethics commissioner is someone entirely different. The ethics commissioner will be a watchdog over all of us, including the Prime Minister.

The reason this came about is the number of debacles that have occurred with respect to cabinet ministers, some of whom have been forced to leave because of a breach in ethics.

The fact is that this institution needs firm guidelines on what we can and cannot do. All MPs would like that. If we know what the rules are, then we know what we can and cannot do. Intuitively we already know that. All of us on this side of the House are asking for an independent ethics commissioner, one not appointed by the Prime Minister, but one perhaps chosen from outside or a group of people chosen by cabinet who would then be ratified by the House in a secret ballot. In that way we could prevent the application of the Westminster type system, the whip system, which presently occurs in the House and which prevents individuals from voting their conscience and doing the right thing. I would like to expand on that thought.

Notwithstanding health care, the economy, the job losses that people have endured, the lack of support for education, the lack of support for our seniors, the lack of opportunity we have compared to other countries, notwithstanding all of those issues, the biggest problem we have is that we have an elected dictatorship in Canada. With so much power centred in the Prime Minister's Office, it prevents members across party lines from doing their job.

All of us in the House have talents, passions and desires. They are why we came to the House and what we wanted to do when we arrived here. We wanted to accomplish things for our constituents and for all Canadians. That is what Canadians want. They have asked us to come here. They pay our salaries to do their bidding. We are their public servants, but when we get here can we actually do what they ask? Can we fulfill that expectation? The tragic answer is no.

The Westminster system has been bastardized in Canada. We have a system where the Prime Minister's Office has so much power that even the Prime Minister's own cabinet members are unable to fulfill what they think needs to be done and what their respective departments think needs to be done. Cabinet takes its marching orders from people in the Prime Minister's Office, most of whom are unelected. Power is being wielded by unelected people. That is not a democracy. We have an executive with virtually unrestrained power. We have the worst of the presidential system and the worst of the Westminster system. An uncontrolled executive is not good for the country, it is not good for the House and it is not good for the executive itself.

The problems the Prime Minister and his cabinet are facing are in many ways a result of the structure created by the Prime Minister. He has uncontrolled power. The ability to encourage different viewpoints and have those viewpoints fleshed out in a manner that enables the best ideas to percolate to the top is absent. When there is an uncontrolled executive where contrary views do not act as a check and balance on what the Prime Minister and his people want to do, it creates not only an unhealthy situation but an entirely damaging situation for our nation, for the House and for the executive. If we look back in history, any time there was power centralized to such a degree among so few people, it created a situation rife with problems.

● (1235)

Many of our country's problems have not been dealt with in a meaningful fashion. There has also been an erosion of our country's democratic institutions and potential. Rather than doing what we are capable of and aiming high, we as a nation are shooting low. That is a violation of ourselves as individuals and worse, it is a violation of the people of our country.

We have not tapped into the potential in the House and the potential of our nation and indeed the potential of our public service to bring all those good minds together, to apply those minds to the problems of our nation. If all members of the House looked into their hearts, they would have to agree with that analysis. However, things can be done.

The prime minister in waiting, if I can call him that, has spoken about the democratic deficit. The democratic deficit must be dealt with. If it is not, then we will not see action on health care to ensure that Canadians get access to better health care. We will not decrease our unemployment. We will not increase salaries. We will not release the potential of our private sector. We will not improve the education system in Canada. We will not have better relations between the feds and the provinces. We will not have more efficient government. We will not see the reform of the public sector that is so desperately needed. None of that is going to happen because the great minds in our country cannot apply their ideas to those pressing problems.

If whoever takes the helm of this country chooses to deal with that democratic deficit, that person would leave a mark and a legacy that would be remembered for many, many years to come. It would be the most significant change our country has seen in decades. That is something that whoever takes over the helm in the future may give pause for thought.

It will not be good enough to merely pay lip service to this in the time up to when that person is chosen. It will not be good enough to speak about it in generalities. The only thing that will be good enough is if that person gives specific solutions to deal with the democratic deficit of our country so that we will reform our system and change it from an elected dictatorship to a true democracy. That is our duty as individuals and it is the duty of the Prime Minister.

Think of what we could do if that changed. Think of what we would have if we had free votes in the House of Commons, true free votes done in an electronic system like it is done in many other countries. Developing countries have an electronic voting system that is efficient, timely, cost saving, effective and democratic. A person's voting record could be released when a writ is dropped. The person's constituents would know how that person voted on various bills.

Reform of the committee system is needed. It is no longer acceptable for committees merely to be make work projects for MPs. No longer is it acceptable for the government to use taxpayers' money to merely keep MPs running around and around in circles doing studies that nobody listens to. No longer is it effective and worthy for the government to tolerate a system that merely makes the vast majority of the people in this House run around like chickens with their heads cut off, and do not use the good work that they have done.

There is tremendous potential in the House. Much of it is drawn from the constituents who brought us here. All of us use the ideas that our constituents give us. We bring them to the House. What if those ideas were able to have life? What if those ideas were employed as public policy, even as a pilot project? Imagine what we could do as a nation domestically. Imagine what we could do internationally.

I have given some suggestions that my party and members from across party lines have put forward. We can only hope that the government listens for the collective good of all of us.

● (1240)

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC): Madam Speaker, I will be brief on this particular debate. My good friend from Acadie—Bathurst has a private member's bill which I know he is champing at the bit to get on the floor of the House and legitimately so because it is a relevant bill that deals with the employment insurance issue.

On Bill C-34, I have a lot of respect for the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. He speaks from the heart. The issues he put forward with respect to the democratic deficiency and certainly with respect to ethics in the House were very appropriate.

Madam Speaker, as you and I and other members of the House know, one of the worst things we have to deal with as members of Parliament is the impression that we have in the community. I think we are our own worst enemies. Too often people will approach us and say “The House is dysfunctional. The democracy that we have is dysfunctional. In most cases members of Parliament are there for all the wrong reasons. They are selfish and they are crooked”.

That cuts me to the core. Quite frankly I consider myself to be a very honest person, someone who has been a public servant and who has represented not only my community but my constituency for well over 20 years.

When people tell me this of other members, they always say "but that does not mean you; this is about other people that we see in the House of Commons". It hurts and I know that we are our own worst enemies.

We have to put in place not only legislation that we have to deal with but also consider the ethics bill that we are talking about today. We as members of Parliament must be seen to be as pure as the driven snow. In our own operations we have to recognize that we have to set a higher example, a better example not only of our own selves in the House but certainly of our colleagues in the House, so that people will respect us more as politicians than they have in the past.

I sit on the procedure and House affairs committee and I look forward to having this piece of legislation referred to it. I have had the opportunity to deal with the ethics package and to debate the issue of the ethics commissioner over the past number of months. I can assure the House that provincial jurisdictions are far ahead of the federal jurisdiction.

My own jurisdiction of Manitoba had the opportunity to deal with the issue of an ethics commissioner. I assure the House that just having the rules in place is absolutely vital. It is not so much even for the public to say that there are some rules to gauge and see what politicians are following but it is a preventative measure also for the members of the jurisdictions. It is easy for us to get wrapped up in our own lives and not see the shades of grey between the black and white of ethics.

What I see as part of the job function of the ethics commissioner here is as a preventative action for members of Parliament. When we have some difficulty as to where we are heading in our own lives with our own investments and our own constituencies, we now have somebody to go to and ask whether or not we are on the right track. None of us has all the answers. Anyone here who thinks he or she has all the answers obviously would be much better than the opposition side or for that matter even the Prime Minister because even he does not have all the answers. It is good to be able to share and ask other people what it is we should or should not be doing.

There are two issues. One which I could not get over is the squeamish acceptance by the government at committee when we talked about spousal disclosure with respect to the ethics bill. The regulations will be drawn up. As part of the regulations it should be required that not only should the member of Parliament disclose his or her assets but we are saying that in order to make this up front and to make it totally transparent and believable, spousal disclosure has to accompany that of the member. That is just open, honest common sense.

Every other jurisdiction has it but the Liberal members had some difficulty with that. They thought perhaps there should be a backdoor way of getting around the regulations or the ethics. I do not see it that way.

In another life I had the requirement to disclose and declare what my assets and interests were. My spouse and also my dependants at that point in time were part of that declaration also.

● (1245)

It is only fair that we look seriously at that spousal disclosure when we go to the regulation. I think we finally convinced the Liberals that they should be seen to be above that and go with spousal disclosure.

The other thing is the ethics commissioner. I am absolutely astounded that it took the Prime Minister 10 years to embrace the idea of ethics. In his original red book of 1993, it talked about open government, open Parliament and open ethics. Now, 10 years later, when he is leaving, when he has his foot out the door and the door is about to hit him on the way out, he has embraced this wonderful concept of ethics. I do not know why it was not necessary for the last 10 years that he follow his own rules, that in fact he be more ethical in his position as Prime Minister, but I guess sometimes it is better late than never.

One of the things with the ethics commissioner, as part of the jurisdictions we talked to, is that the individual, he or she, must have the respect of either the legislature or the Parliament. It is difficult to have that individual give us advice, as members, when we do not have respect for him or her, or vice versa.

In order to achieve that, not only do we need to have, and should have, all the leaders of every party in the House to be part of that process of appointment, I honestly believe that the House must have a very serious part in that process of appointment. We must have the ability to vote, not unlike what we do with the Speaker. When every Parliament is opened, we have the opportunity to put forward the name of an individual who we believe will best represent our rights in the House. I think it is necessary that we do the same thing with the ethics commissioner.

Should it be 50 plus 1? We have had that argument. We have that argument in referendums all the time, I think. Quite frankly, I believe it should be more than that. I think it should be more than simple majority. In fact I would love to see unanimity but we will never get that. However I would hate to see just simply the majority government of the day being able to tell me who my ethics counsellor or commissioner will be. There should be more than just simple majority. Perhaps two-thirds or three-quarters. Let us pick a number. However I think we can do that at committee.

I do not want to take up any more time at this point but I will take up a substantial amount of time at the committee when this bill comes forward. I can assure all hon. members that when it comes back to the House it will be in a much better fashion, with some changes made to it. I know we can do it with the help of the government in the committee.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): In my opinion the nays definitely have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Pursuant to Standing Order 45 the division stands deferred until Monday, May 5, at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

Mr. Geoff Regan: Madam Speaker, discussions have taken place between the parties and I think you would find agreement, pursuant to Standing Order 45(7), to defer the recorded division until Tuesday, May 6, at 3 p.m.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): The vote is deferred until Tuesday May 6, at 3 p.m.

Mr. Geoff Regan: Madam Speaker, I wonder if you might seek consent to see the clock at 1:30 p.m. so we can begin private members' business.

● (1250)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP) moved that Bill C-406, an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act , be read a second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am very happy to rise today to elaborate on my bill to amend the Employment Insurance Act.

As you know when I was elected in 1997, I was extremely concerned about the employment insurance issue and the changes made by the Liberal government in 1996. I then travelled across Canada and visited 10 provinces. I went to the Yukon. I took part in over 52 public meetings in every single province of Canada.

After meeting with Canadian workers, I presented a report to the minister. I then moved a motion in the House of Commons. It was unanimously passed in the spring of 2000, just before the election. Today, at long last, here is this bill, the result of a lot of hard work and those many meetings with people.

The bill is aimed at restoring justice for unemployed workers and beneficiaries of the program who were the victims of the changes made to the program in 1996.

The United Nations even condemned the cuts made to the employment insurance program and reiterated a request that it be reformed immediately.

Unfortunately, this government had only one thing on its mind: money. There are less people collecting EI, but more money in the coffers, which allowed the Minister of Finance to build a wonderful reputation by bringing down budgets with no deficits on the backs of workers who had lost their jobs.

I would like to remind the House that these wonderful budgets he was proud of were balanced on the backs of Canadian workers and businesses, the only contributors to the fund.

Today, I would like to talk more about my bill, which I hope will receive the support of the House.

First, I am asking that the name of the employment insurance program be changed back to the "unemployment insurance program", as it was known before. This program does not provide employment, it provides assistance during periods of unemployment, so the former name is more appropriate.

The number of hours required to qualify for benefits would be 350 hours, or 20 weeks of insurable employment of at least 15 hours per week, instead of the current 710 hours required.

Benefits will be 66% of the insurable earnings, based on the 10 highest paid weeks in the last year, or 52 weeks.

This would solve the problem known as "accumulating hours". This is a problem people in the southwest of New Brunswick are currently facing in fish processing plants. There are studies being done on them because of this phenomenon. The member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac claims to be their advocate and says he will sort the problem out, but the minister is refusing to allow hours to be accumulated. I am anxious to see how these members will vote on my bill and if they will support the concept of the 10 highest-paid weeks over the last year.

Right now, the program provides only 55% of one's salary, which is minimal when it comes to the actual cost of living. This is effectively pushing people under the poverty level. Take someone who earns $8 an hour, and would then receive 55% of that. How can this person live? This is even lower than social assistance benefits.

The benefits period will be one week for each week of employment, to a maximum of 52 weeks. This would eliminate the problem of small weeks, while including part-time workers.

The adjustment for additional weeks of benefits would be calculated as follows: two weeks for each percentage point in the regional unemployment rate above 4% to a maximum of 10% and three weeks for each percentage point in the regional unemployment rate above 10%.The two-week waiting period is completely eliminated.

Looking at the SARS problem in Toronto, when this happened the government immediately adopted a regulation to do away with the two-week waiting period. Why just do away with those two weeks in response to a perceived immediate need in that region? I agree with it, but what I am saying is that anyone who loses a job today is in the same situation. There is no more money coming in. The two-week waiting period should be done away with for all Canadians who lose their jobs.

● (1255)

The government has set a good example with what is going on in Toronto.

By eliminating the divisor rule and the recovery provisions, by eliminating the 910 hours required for new entrants and re-entrants, special benefits would be 350 hours.

If this bill is passed, self-employed and contract workers will be considered employees and be protected by the EI program.

They are no different from any other workers. When one looks at today's labour market and the new way of life today, one can see that these self-employed workers need to be included.

As for the two weeks of benefits accumulated for each year worked, in the case of special lay-offs, these benefits are available only to workers with 10 years in the work force and aged 45 or older. The maximum benefit period would be 26 weeks.

This is to help people aged 45 or older who lose their jobs and do not have much prospect of finding another. This would be more assistance for them. It would be a little more to help them adapt and find something else.

Retirement pensions, separation pay and vacation pay are eliminated from the definition of earnings.

It is not fair that a person who receives holiday pay or severance pay on losing his or her job is not entitled to EI benefits because this qualifies as income under EI. That defies common sense. This money could help people find jobs instead of collecting benefits indefinitely.

Employees are entitled to up to five weeks of training every year, provided it is geared to their job. There would be a maximum of 52 weeks, the idea being to get people back to work. This would encourage them to work. It would get them back and help them find work.

This is a useful bill. Instead of using the money in the EI fund to balance its budget in order to achieve zero deficits, the government should put money where the needs are.

Financial penalties would be eliminated. No interest or amount would be payable in the event of a violation of the act, penalty or overpayment.

As for the EI account, it would be replaced with a trust fund. This fund would be credited with the contributions paid. At present, there is $42 billion in the EI account. That is well beyond the $15 billion necessary to make the program cost-effective. By establishing a trust account, we will be ensuring that the money put into the account will go to the program, and only to the program.

The Employment Insurance Commission will be comprised of members appointed by the governor in council for terms not exceeding five years from lists of persons nominated by labour organizations and employer organizations determined by the minister. The commission shall administer the act and the employment insurance program, the trust fund, and the appeal system.

In short, this is a far-reaching bill, which is nevertheless necessary to address the major deficiencies in the EI program.

Since I was elected as a federal MP, I have been receiving phone call upon phone call from people who are having serious problems with the existing program.

More and more people have trouble qualifying, which should not happen, especially when people have just lost their job. In fact, two-thirds of those without a job do not qualify for the program.

The 2002 monitoring and assessment report tabled this week by the Minister of Human Resources Development paints a rosy picture of the situation of the unemployed and the EI program.

Yet at my office, I receive approximately 30 calls a day about employment insurance issues. In my view, these calls are more consistent with the reality than the great report card the minister has presented to us.

There are cases such as the one I saw this week when I went to my riding. These are people who worked in construction in Western Canada. They left their families behind for over three months.

I have here the employer's severance form that says that the reason for the layoff was shortage of work. The government took the trouble to call the employer to see whether this was true or not. It conducted an investigation. Maybe it wanted to cut their employment insurance benefits.

● (1300)

How greedy is the government that it would steal money from taxpayers and workers even though it has a document from the employer saying there is no work in his plant? They are now investigating.

It is simple; it is because of the quotas. That is the problem. The government is more interested in taking money from companies and workers to pay its debts than helping people.

This past week, I spoke with a woman who had called my office. When I called her back I asked her how she was. She said that the rope was next to her. It was not very nice to hear. That is the problem and that is what we call the employment insurance deficit.

We have only to look at people in Toronto who are losing their jobs, women who work only 20 hours a week and who do not qualify for employment insurance because they are short a few hours. If we made the changes to employment insurance that we need now, we would not be in such a panic.

The employment insurance program was there to help people who lost their job. It was not there to help the Minister of Finance pay down the debt. It was not there to help pay for social programs. It was there for one specific reason, to help people who lost their job.

The Liberal government should be ashamed of continually saying that, for example, people should stop using employment insurance as an income supplement, when it is using it to pay down the debt. How can Liberals stand up and be proud to say such things?

At the beginning of the last election campaign, the member for Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok made a heartfelt appeal to the minister. He asked her to change the employment insurance program. He campaigned on employment insurance. The member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, as well as the member for Madawaska—Restigouche, were elected because they campaigned on the employment insurance program. Today, there is no change.

Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development will say: "We made some changes. We included 52 parental benefit weeks". She might say that they will go up from 50% to 55%. The problem is not there.

There are now 800,000 people who do not qualify for employment insurance in Canada. There are 1.4 million children who are going hungry in Canada. If there are 800,000 adults who do not qualify for employment insurance, these are people who have families and children, so we can calculate that 1.4 million children are going hungry in Canada.

The Liberal government and the changes made in 1996 are to blame. Before that, in 1993, when the Liberals were in the opposition, they spoke out against the changes made by the Conservative Party and said that it was shying away from economic problems in Canada. Back then, they said that we had to deal with economic problems. Today, they turn around and come to us with the same changes that the Conservatives made.

This is 2003. Our wonderful country, Canada, has a program for employers and employees. Yet, it is not able to give this program to those to whom it belongs.

I was proud to hear this week that the FTQ and the CSN had finally gone to court. I pray to God that they win their case against the federal government to give the money back to the people to whom it belongs. I hope that that is how the court will rule, since the government is not able to fulfill its responsibilities. The Liberals are too greedy. It is the Liberal government that is living off employment insurance. They are the ones who are greedy when it comes to EI.

It is hungry children who have no food in the fridge who should be benefiting. They are the ones who should be benefiting from EI. The responsibility of the government is to ensure that there are jobs for people in the regions to go to. People need to have jobs to go to.

I sincerely hope that Parliament will vote in support of my bill, so that it can at least be referred to the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development where there will be a real review of it, and where we can finally make the changes that will benefit workers and our children.

● (1305)

[*English*]

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to start off by thanking my colleague for Acadie—Bathurst. Year after year, since we were both elected in 1997, he has been a tremendous advocate for the unemployed and for the injustice that the government has forced on workers in Canada.

He probably does not know this, but his grandson, Jonathan, is in the lobby and was staring up at the TV. He was totally enthralled. When he watches this in the future he should be proud of what his grandfather has done for the people and children of Canada. On the contrary, every member on the governing side should sit in shame for what the government has done to the unemployed.

I specifically want to ask my colleague a question regarding the waiting period for journeymen apprentices in carpentry, welding, and mechanics. The government had a two week waiting period for people who still had their job, but were going to take an apprenticeship program to get their upgrading. There was a waiting period before they could claim benefits.

The government talked about reducing this period. It may have reduced it to about a week. However, does the member think there should be a waiting period for apprentice workers? For people who want to continue their education, why should they have a waiting period before they collect employment insurance?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and, perhaps above all, say hello to my grandson, Jonathan, who is outside the House, although I was unaware of the fact.

The bill I introduced today is clear; it cancels the two-week waiting period. People should not be penalized, as is the case for those who have a trade.

Let us use the example of someone who is learning a trade, working for an employer and, finally, is required to take courses at a community college. While that person attends the community college to acquire journeyman papers, he suddenly loses two weeks of wages. This makes no sense whatsoever. Employment insurance is there to help people and allow them to have an income when they are not working.

Now, it has gone beyond that. People who want to upgrade their skills, something that will be good for the employer and for everyone else, is penalized because of the two-week waiting period. Many people no longer want to learn a trade because of the loss of income.

My bill specifies that this is for everybody. Even if someone loses his job, he should not be penalized. We are not talking about someone who has quit his job, left it voluntarily, but someone who has been told by his employer that there is no more work, that he should not show up the following week. Why should his family suffer? It is not the employee who is abusing the system, it is the employer. There is quite simply no more work.

This is why my bill is important. I think the government recognizes this, judging by what it did during the emergency in Toronto; in that instance, the government cancelled the two-week waiting period, because people do need to have money coming in. I have always held that when someone loses his job, it does not matter whether he is in New Brunswick, Manitoba, British Columbia or Ontario.

That is why it is important to cancel the two-week period by passing this bill, so that this program will really work for workers.

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased today to speak during second reading of Bill C-406 to amend the Employment Insurance Act.

First, I want to set the record straight. Some people live in difficult circumstances, but overall, employment insurance works well. According to Statistics Canada, the labour force participation rate is now 67.5%. This figure is for March 2003 and nears the high for the past twelve months.

For adult women, the participation rate is 60.6%. Furthermore, the government pays over $2 billion each year to the provinces and territories so that they can take the necessary steps to help Canadians find and keep employment.

Since 1997, we have invested over $1 billion in the youth employment strategy, which helps young people gain valuable work experience through programs such as Youth Service Canada, Youth Internship Canada and Summer Career Placements, which have created 96,000 jobs each year just since 1997. Our goal is to promote labour force participation.

That said, the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst knows just how important the employment insurance program has been, for the past 60 years, to Canada's safety net. The government wants this program to continue to help the workers who need it, and so it will to the best of its abilities.

The goal of the employment insurance program has evolved over the years to suit the changing needs of Canadian workers.

Employment insurance now provides temporary income support to Canadians who have no employment income for a particular period, due to job loss, illness, the birth of a child or because they must care for a seriously ill child or parent. Furthermore, employment insurance provides unemployed Canadians with guidance and training so they can reintegrate the labour market.

In 1996, following broad consultations of Canadians, the Canadian government replaced unemployment insurance with employment insurance so as to meet the new needs of the economy, the labour market and workers. Furthermore, the Canada Employment Insurance Commission committed to monitoring the impact of this system on individuals, communities and the economy.

Following up on the annual monitoring and assessment activities, the government has readjusted the program to respond better to needs. Since that time we have, as the member for Acadie—Bathurst has pointed out, improved parental benefits, adjusted the small weeks, eliminated the intensity rule, changed payback provisions, modified the rule on undeclared earnings, and provided a new six-week compassionate benefit for eligible workers who will be looking after a seriously ill parent, child or spouse once this comes into effect in January 2004.

As hon. members are already aware, the most recent annual report, the 6th annual Employment Insurance monitoring and assessment report, came out at the end of April.

It indicates that the EI program continues to work well and that the changes made allow it to serve clients and their families better.

I will provide some examples from 2001 and 2002. The program provided sufficient coverage. According to the figures, 88% of salaried workers would have been eligible for benefits had they lost their job.

More Canadians received assistance, 1.9 million people receiving a total of $11.5 billion in employment insurance benefits.

Active re-employment measures were also successful. Over that period, $2.1 billion was invested in employment benefits and support measures via such programs as employment assistance, and skills development, which enabled 570,000 individuals to improve their skills, and another 190,000 to get back into the work force quickly.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to that last figure. It is a clear indication that the best support we can give unemployed Canadians is not higher EI benefits, but employment. We are making some progress, because the employment rate rose 3.7% in 2002, the highest annual rise since 1987.

The employment insurance program clearly reflects the balanced approach adopted by this government, combining improved EI benefits and constantly decreasing premiums.

● (1310)

It is important to remember that the government must cover the costs of employment insurance under any circumstances, even when there is a deficit, as was the case during the recession at the beginning of the 1980s and the 1990s.

Bill C-406 proposes creating a separate unemployment insurance trust fund in addition to an independent commission to administer the act. This proposal would be incompatible with the government's limitless responsibility to pay employment insurance benefits. It would also go against the government's objective to consolidate its revenues and expenses, an objective recommended by the Auditor General in 1986.

I would remind the House that the process for setting EI premiums is currently being reviewed. This review will be guided by certain key principles: transparency is critical in setting the premiums; these premiums must be based on the advice of independent experts; revenue levels from premiums must correspond to the expected costs of programs; premiums should be set at levels that reduce the impact on economic cycles; and finally, the premiums should remain relatively stable.

The government has made every possible effort to reduce the cost of employment insurance for both workers and employers. In fact, we have reduced premiums every year since 1994. Employers have told us that these reductions have stimulated employment.

As for workers, they have the safety net of employment insurance without having to assume the financial burden. I do not think that Canadians would view any considerable increase in premiums very positively.

The employment insurance program is working well. We continue to monitor and assess it. We do not hesitate to make required changes when there are compelling reasons to do so.

I believe the approach proposed in this bill raises several questions. Why move backwards? Why give up on an accounting system that is open and transparent? Why spend billions of dollars more on a new system when we have one that meets the needs of workers?

This government is working toward the future, as our proposal for new EI benefits for compassionate care leave demonstrates. However, this bill seems to me to be a major step backwards.

● (1315)

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak on this today. While I disagree with a lot of the premise of what the member has presented and proposed today, I still nonetheless want to recognize that he believes in this and that he is doing it for very altruistic purposes. It is not a personal benefit thing. It is something that he truly believes will be of benefit to workers.

Unfortunately, I do not think he is going about it the right way. In fact it starts with the very alarming premise that we should change the name of the program from employment insurance to unemployment insurance. Frankly, when it used to be called unemployment insurance, I never thought it should have been changed. I thought that was the stupidest thing the government did. It cost taxpayers, and ultimately workers, $5 million to change the name from unemployment insurance to employment insurance. Why? Because it is supposed to make people feel better. I thought that was pretty stupid. However it is equally unsound to spend another $5 million to change it back to a name that will make people feel worse, not that I think people felt a whole lot better having changed the name in the first place.

What the bill proposes is that we will get bigger benefits for a longer period of time. People will have to do less to receive them. It will eliminate severance pay and vacation pay before one can start collecting. On that specific point, the NDP member who presented the bill said that it was unfair that vacation and severance pay should be included and that people should be using it to help them find a job.

The reality is that when people end their jobs and get six weeks pay as a severance package and three weeks vacation pay, they are technically not unemployed until that runs out. Employers are saying that although they will not have the people working, they will still pay them as if they were working for the period of severance and vacation. I just wanted to make specific comment on that.

It also provides benefits for those who quit their jobs without just cause. The member has left a qualifier on it that there will be a waiting period, which he wants to eliminate in other places.

People are insured to have a job. If people personally choose to quit their jobs, it is not unlike people who insure their houses and then burn them down because they do not want their houses any more. First, aside from the concept of any criminal act of burning the house, one can imagine how any employer would feel if it was told it had to insure the house and if the person decided to burn it down, then employer would have to pay the person for the amount for which the individual insured the house. There would be an awful lot of people who would not worry about selling their houses. They would just light a match. Imagine the havoc that would cause.

Frankly it will create the same form of havoc inside the employment insurance program if people were to say that they have enough weeks now to quit their job, take a year long vacation while collecting these benefits and then find another job, work for the minimum period required and quit that job.

This bill promises more for less. Who can resist that? What a wonderful concept: sign on to this bill and people will more money, get it easier and get it for longer. However what will it cost society, employers and the workers themselves, the very people the hon. member wants to help, in terms of premiums?

I have looked, as I am sure he has, at the obscene surplus that is there right now. At least in theory it is there. In reality, it is gone. Just like Blackbeard used to run the high seas in days of past, looting and plundering at every opportunity, grabbing every dollar possible from every source, we have a government that taxes people. I think this comment has been attributed to the candidate who was the former finance minister and now running for leadership. Whether it is true, I have often heard it attributed that he said, “I have never met a tax I didn't like”.

The Liberals have said that they have lowered income tax and employment insurance taxes. However they raise so many other things in so many other ways that they are a net increaser of taxes, a net plunderer of the wealth, income and revenue of ordinary Canadians.

● (1320)

That is something we should probably look at because if something like this were to pass and even if the government, in a fit of remorse, repaid the incredible surplus it has, and I do not want to say an unparliamentary word as tempting as it might be, absconded from the fund and spent, this would erode that money down to a point where we no longer would have a sustainable margin or a rainy day fund, as it refers to it.

The current surplus nonetheless is on paper. This would mean ultimately that we would see not only no further premium reductions, which we should be seeing right now, but we would start to see increases in premiums in the future. We absolutely know that employment taxes kill jobs. The taxes that employers and employees have to pay are the things that kill jobs.

Employees say that they cannot afford to work below a certain net income, yet there are all these taxes that they have to pay on their income over and above income tax, which still goes into the pockets of the government.

Employers say that to have jobs for people, they have to get a certain return. They have to make a certain amount of money that covers not only wages, but all of the costs incurred by having people work for them. One of the those is the employment insurance premiums which they have to pay. This is something that will likely cause these things to be put up.

Our position is that families would be far better served if we in the House start working together, including the hon. member who brought this in who truly is concerned about workers, to develop policies that create real long term sustainable employment. After all, this is a safety net. This is for people who lose their jobs. Instead of figuring out how to treat them better when they lose their jobs, we should be working together to try to find ways not only so they do not lose their jobs, but so they do not continue to be, as in many cases, underemployed and where they can aspire to maybe a job with more responsibilities, more personal reward in terms of the type of work that they do and of course the pay that they take home.

The Canadian Alliance written policy on this is long established. EI premiums would be set by an independent EI commission based on recommendations from the Chief Actuary. The fund should be enough to cover the emergencies when people suddenly finding themselves out of work with a reserve that is sufficient to ensure that we can cover this in the event of a sudden downturn. A separate hard reserve, not unlike the trust the hon. member suggested, would be established to ensure the payment of benefits in periods of economic downturn.

Employer premiums would be experience rated, not unlike any other insurance plan that is out there, so employers that have a record of fewer layoffs than other employers in the same sector, not across the board, will pay lower premiums. In other words, employers that do not work the system within a given occupation will be rewarded for that. Employers that keep employees employed rather than this continual cycle of layoffs, which is again what I believe the hon. member ultimately wants to get at, will get a bonus in terms of lower premiums.

The frequency of maternity leave or sickness leave, however, will not affect those premiums. That is something which is beyond the control of employers and they will not be penalized for it.

Further, we continue to argue the concept that the best social policy for workers is a job, not a sum of money that they get because they do not have one. That is at best a crutch to prop up the system. The real answer is that we need to do something to create more jobs.

I believe it is irresponsible to place a great burden on the employment insurance account just because it has a paper surplus at this point in time. Premiums could be lowered for workers and employers rather than treating this non-existent surplus like some kind of lottery jackpot to be exploited. The hon. member offers basically a land of milk and honey to everyone without concern where these resources would come from and to afford the ideas that have been dreamt up.

Well meaning though it is, it would be far better if he would turn his attentions toward working with us to create real jobs, real employment, rather than how we will help and prop up people when policies of the government let them down and they lose the job they would far sooner have.

● (1325)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to announce from the outset that we support the principle of Bill C-406, which is to relax the employment insurance eligibility rules and to enhance both the benefits and the benefit period. A number of clarifications and changes will, however, need to be considered more closely and made in committee.

I will elaborate on a few points where we feel minor changes would be beneficial. I have touched on this earlier, in speaking with my hon. colleague from Acadie—Bathurst, who has looked at the Bloc's recommendations with an open mind.

First, I wish to say that the fact that 800,000 workers are not eligible for employment insurance is totally unacceptable. These are workers, all 800,000 of them, who contribute to the EI program and yet cannot benefit from it. When I take out an insurance policy, I do so to make sure that, should something happen to me, I have something to fall back on. With EI, workers pay into the fund but they end up being told that they are not eligible because they did not work enough hours to qualify, or they are penalized because the work they do is seasonal, or for some other reason.

This should not still be happening, especially when we see the billion dollar surpluses in the employment insurance fund. This is totally unacceptable. I would have liked to see, in this House, a more unified front from the opposition on an issue as important as this one. We have been fighting for years to ensure that everyone is treated fairly and equitably, and that is not how they are being treated.

A case in point is something very close to my heart, which I have been pushing for in this place for years now: preventative withdrawal from work for women who are pregnant or breastfeeding. The government has yet to do something, anything, on this issue. The amounts involved are not huge; all it would take is political will, but there is none here.

The point we are wondering about is the arm's length relationship. The Employment Insurance Act states that employment is not insurable if the employer and employee are related and do not have an arm's length relationship with each other. The Minister of HRDC, however, has discretionary power that enables him to consider employment of a relative as insurable employment if the claimant can demonstrate, given all the circumstances, that they would have entered into a substantially similar contract of employment if they had been dealing with each other at arm's length. Despite this discretionary power, the law's practical application remains harsh. The burden of proof is always on the claimant. My hon. friend's Bill C-406 puts the burden of proof regarding the arm's length relationship between employer and employee on the Employment Insurance Commission.

In its report, the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development recommended that the government amend the Employment Insurance Act to eliminate the presumption of guilt in cases of non-arm's length relationships between employers and employees.

My party's position is this: the Bloc Quebecois, like the Law Commission of Canada—since the commission made the same recommendation—proposes that the act be amended so that employment by a related person is not presumed to be uninsurable. Bill C-406 will not go that far and an amendment would be required to cover this.

In regions such as mine or that of my hon. colleague, there are often small family businesses. Particularly in Quebec, many small businesses are run by families. Both spouses may work for the same company, often alongside their sons, daughters or cousins. When one of them needs employment insurance for a period of time, or for any reason, this person is instantly refused; the onus of proof is on the person. This should not be. Just because two people are related does not mean that they are trying to beat the employment insurance system. Having to prove one's case can be very difficult.

● (1330)

I know people who have had to wait two years before their case was settled. Not too long ago, I learned of a very good strong case. But these people are being harassed, and this is unacceptable. Their case has been pending for three years. This does nothing to help the family or a situation where employment insurance is at issue, and this certainly does not help a company survive. These people paid into employment insurance like everyone else. This kind of thing must be addressed and changed.

Bill C-406 talks about creating a separate fund. The bill creates an unemployment insurance trust fund to replace the employment insurance account, which comes under the Treasury Board. Obviously, the goal is to increase the transparency of the employment insurance fund.

Furthermore, an independent commission would replace the current commission and serve as trustee of the fund. The members of this independent commission would be appointed by the governor in council from lists of persons nominated by labourorganizations and employer organizations selected by the minister.

A bill introduced in the past by the Bloc Quebecois called for the creation of an employment insurance fund separate from the current consolidated revenue fund.

Four objectives were pursued: contributors must control the fund and play a part in determining the premium rate; any surplus in excess of the $10 billion to $15 billion reserve must be returned to contributors in the form of greater flexibility in the act, or lower premiums; the money paid into the fund by contributors must not be used to finance other government programs, and thus not to pay down the debt; finally, the surplus accumulated since 1995 belongs to the contributors and must be credited to the new independent fund.

In this connection, Bill C-406 is a bit unclear as far as the creation of this fund is concerned. Few details are given on the trust aspect of the fund. What will the real implications of this be? What will be done with the surplus? How will it be credited?

Moreover, the mechanisms for appointment of the independent commission suggest that it will not be all that independent. The reference to labour and employer organizations selected by the minister makes us wonder whether there might not be a way to make the process even more democratic.

As for the rate of weekly benefits payable to a claimant, Bill C-406 says that it is 66% of their weekly insurable earnings, based on the average of the 10 weeks during the 12 months period preceding the week in which the interruption in earnings occurred. The 10 weeks taken into account must be the ones in which the claimant received the highest earnings.

The Standing Committee on Human Resources Development recommended in its report to only take into account the weeks with the highest earnings. It did not say anything about the rate of benefits. In the report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development, the Bloc Quebecois also specified it wanted the average rate of benefits to be increased from 55% to 60%.

Bill C-406 goes a little bit further than the report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Bloc Quebecois, but the principle of more generous benefits remains the same. Therefore, I do believe that on this issue we are on the same wavelength. Adjustments are always possible.

Bill C-406 makes the maximum benefit period 52 weeks. We had asked for 45 to 50, so we are on the same page there.

I do not have time to go into them all, but I think we will certainly have the time in committee to find some areas of agreement. What is important is that we came back with an independent fund with the possibility of creating one that will belong to all working men and women. There are 800,000 Canadian workers who do not have access to EI at the present time, but who pay in to it and must be able to draw from it. That will be our goal in supporting the bill of my colleague for Acadie—Bathurst.

● (1335)

[*English*]

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to the bill today from my colleague, the member for Acadie—Bathurst, an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act.

I want to start by noting the comment made by my colleague from the Canadian Alliance. He made the comment that changing the name from unemployment insurance to employment insurance cost $5 million, and, as my colleague from Acadie—Bathurst has suggested, changing it again would maybe mean another $5 million.

From my perspective, if the name were the only issue and it would save $5 million, I am sure none of us would object. We would not change the name. We would keep the $5 million. We would make sure the workers and employers who paid into the plan would receive some benefit or, quite frankly, because the government uses the money for numerous other things, we would make sure it went into health care, into housing, which is needed throughout the country, and into infrastructure. There are certainly a lot of valuable uses for $5 million.

Therefore his comment that the name does not make a big difference is a point. However, as he was saying that, I was thinking that it really did not matter whether we called it unemployment insurance or employment insurance, it was kind of like calling it life insurance or death insurance. The reality is that if people receive that insurance because they are dead or they are unemployed they do not feel any better one way or the other. The name is really not the big issue here. Let us not get caught up in that.

However, I continued thinking about the name as he was speaking and I wondered what else we could call it. I thought about cash cow for the Liberal government or cash cow for finance ministers running for the leadership. One could call it a one-armed bandit because it takes in a lot more money than it gives out to the unemployed. There are lots of names out there if we ever decide to not get caught up with employment or unemployment.

My colleague brings up a number of issues related to the employment/unemployment insurance fund. I have dealt with most of the issues to which he has referred on an ongoing basis in my riding.

I want to take this opportunity to say that if it were not for the excellent work of the employees who work out of the northern employment insurance offices and the Brandon regional offices it would be a whole lot worse. They have been excellent to deal with. They have an excellent knowledge of the program. When we bring an issue to them they get back to us quickly. We have a good working relationship with them and we have been able to resolve a number of problems that have arisen as a result of employment insurance benefits being paid out.

Although those employees have been great to deal with, the bottom line is that we do have a number of problems. A lot of times the problems are directly related to the policies and rules that have been put in place by the department. The cards and the forms that have to be filled out are too darned convoluted.

I consider myself to be a relatively intelligent human being, as I consider are the staff of my offices, who are great individuals, but when we go through the process of trying to understand the cards and the forms, and everything it entails, it is not an easy system. I challenge anyone to try to fill out those cards with all the information that is required. It is hard for people who have lost their jobs and are trying to put food on the table for their family and get everything done. Sometimes there is some little clincher that they miss or they fill in the wrong box and then, because they have filled in the wrong box, God forbid, they have been fraudulent. This has happened. I am not joking. I say thank heaven for the excellent workers in those EI offices because we have been able to resolve some things.

Therefore, on top of being fraudulent, they have to pay back that employment insurance that they may have received, even though they really should have received it but EI says that they should not have. On top of that, EI fines them the equivalent amount of what they had to pay back. People must bear in mind that these are unemployed people making 55% of their salary, at the most, on employment insurance because it does not give the benefits that it used to give.

In the cases with which I have dealt it was rare, if ever, that anyone had been fraudulent. However they have been caught up in this whole convoluted process. There are a lot of issues related to that and I sometimes think it has been done deliberately.

● (1340)

The other thing is people in this position do not have recourse in the sense that they really do not have the right to go to court over any of this. People hope and pray that their member of Parliament or someone can advocate on their behalf, that they have a good regional office or that the people they are dealing with in their area can bring their issue forward, understand it and resolve it for them.

That does not happen in all cases throughout the country. There are people in certain regions who have ongoing problems because of the attitude some people take toward unemployed people.

Over the course of my lifetime I have been unemployed. As a high school student, and actually as an adult, I worked during the summers and then the employment was gone. I was a seasonal worker. I married and moved somewhere else and because I had worked the required period of time I was able to collect unemployment insurance.

Contrary to what my hon. colleague from the Alliance says, I did not relish the fact and say, "This is great. I do not have a job and I get to collect all this money on unemployment insurance". I still wanted to get out there and work. This may shock the heck out of some people, but there was not always a job there, but I was lucky. I was able to find a job.

Over the course of my working life I also was on unemployment insurance because of maternity leave. As well, despite having a reasonably decent sick benefit plan in my workplace, in the course of one year I had the problem of having to have surgery and then had a sickness related to an injury. I used up all of my sick leave and I had to go on unemployment insurance.

I had been working all those years and paying into unemployment insurance and met all the criteria that used to be there and still had waiting periods. Quite frankly, why should people have to wait? They have paid the money into the insurance program.

This is probably one of the biggest bones of contention I have with my colleagues from the Alliance Party on the issue of pensions and insurance, mainly the Canada pension plan and employment insurance. I do not see it as a tax when I am paying it. I see it as an insurance. It is an insurance I pay as a worker. I do not begrudge paying employment insurance. Quite frankly, I consider the money I pay in employment insurance a very low cost insurance plan for a time when I might need it.

When I used that employment insurance plan it at least gave me a reasonable amount of money to survive on. Right now it does not do that. It has been cut so harshly by the Liberal government that it does not do the job any more.

When there is an insurance plan that 800,000 members of that insurance plan cannot ever collect from it when they meet the main criteria of the insurance plan, which is loss of employment, something is wrong. I go back to changing the name of the plan to a one armed bandit or a cash cow. Something is seriously wrong.

My house insurance covers a variety of different aspects. When things have happened, I have never had a problem collecting the money. The money has been there.

For unemployed people in this country it is a real problem not being able to collect.

I want to make a comment on behalf of workers. It has been mentioned a number of times in the last week or so in the House that workers in Toronto as a result of either being in a workplace that may have had SARS or in the hospitality industry which is not doing that well and workers have been laid off, because of the criteria behind employment insurance, those people cannot collect. Something is seriously wrong.

Another thing has been bothering me more and more over the last year or so and I do not want the government side to groan over this. Quite frankly I do not see myself as a pro-feminist kind of person but one thing that is becoming quite annoying to me and I am concerned about is that so many of the cuts and the changes the government has made have affected women in low income jobs and other areas far more greatly than anyone else. That bothers the heck out of me.

Obviously I could use much more time to speak to the problems associated with the employment insurance plan as it exists today. I support my colleague's recommendations. I hope the bill is passed by the House and goes to committee. If some fine tuning has to be done, as my Bloc colleague has mentioned, then let us do it.

Let us have an honest to goodness look at changing the plan so that it meets the needs of unemployed workers and of employers in this country.

● (1345)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I will just take a few minutes to speak on the bill. When I rise during private members' business, I am always in the habit of congratulating the person for being drawn. In this particular case he was high enough on the list so that he actually has a bill that we can debate.

Interestingly, one of the bills that I have in the works also deals with unemployment insurance and I will call it by that name because that is what it is. It is not employment insurance. It does nothing to insure that one has employment. It would be better if it was called perhaps income insurance. That might be a better name, but employment insurance is definitely a misnomer. I for one objected vehemently when the government spent millions of dollars to change this name two or three years ago.

Undoubtedly employment is a more positive word than unemployment, which is what the objective should be. We should have government policies and do everything we can to drive our economic indicators so that we have the maximum number of jobs. The ultimate program is one that would create long term meaningful jobs with benefits available to the workers and their families.

I would like to commend the member for being able to have his bill debated and to talk about the employment insurance act as it now stands.

There is no doubt that the government has done the workers and particularly small businesses of the nation a tremendous disservice by taking billions of dollars out of their pockets and rolling it into general revenue where unfortunately the government wastes so much of it through boondoggles. The overrun on the gun registry is the biggest one that we have in front of us these days. What a shame it is when there are many people who are either overtaxed or, as the member contends, not benefiting from the insurance program for the unemployed.

As my colleague from Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan said earlier, we cannot say theft or embezzlement, so we have to say some other things. However, it is money that is taken inappropriately for reasons for which it was not originally intended.

I also wish to commend the member for wanting to have a trust fund independently administered so that the government cannot get its clammy hands on the workers' money.

● (1350)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): 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.

[*Translation*]

It being 1:51 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1:51 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. ANDY MITCHELL

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. JACQUES SAADA

MR. DALE JOHNSTON

MR. JOHN REYNOLDS

HON. DON BOUDRIA

MR. LOYOLA HEARN

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Thirty Seventh Parliament

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	PC
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (4)		
Barnes, Rex	Gander—Grand Falls	PC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Efford, R. John	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
Hearn, Loyola	St. John's West	PC
Matthews, Bill	Burin—St. George's	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence	Labrador	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Cuzner, Rodger, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister	Bras d'Or—Cape Breton	Lib.
Eyking, Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Geoff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	West Nova	Lib.
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Nunavut	Lib.
ONTARIO (101)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Hon. Jean, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald, The Acting Speaker	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Ottawa—Orléans	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Murphy, Shawn	Hillsborough	Lib.
QUEBEC (69)		
Allard, Carole-Marie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Laval East	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, The Acting Speaker	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères—Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—Petite-Patrie	BQ
Binet, Gérard	Frontenac—Mégantic	Lib.
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carignan, Jean-Guy	Québec East	Lib. Ind.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière—L'Érable	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Hon. Claude, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Beauce	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Duplain, Claude, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Portneuf	Lib.
Farrah, Georges, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Frulla, Liza	Verdun—Saint-Henri—Saint-Paul—Pointe Saint-Charles	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Marcel	Champlain	BQ
Gagnon, Sébastien	Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay	BQ
Gaudet, Roger	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans	BQ

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

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

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

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

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

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

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairs: Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Maurice Vellacott

Gérard Binet	John Godfrey	Inky Mark	Brian Pallister	(16)
Serge Cardin	Charles Hubbard	Pat Martin	Julian Reed	
David Chatters	Yvan Loubier	Anita Neville	Benoît Serré	
Stan Dromisky				

Associate Members

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

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairs: Jim Abbott
Paul Bonwick

Carole-Marie Allard	Christiane Gagnon	Wendy Lill	Alex Shepherd	(16)
Sarmite Bulte	John Harvard	James Lunney	Caroline St-Hilaire	
R. John Efford	Loyola Hearn	Dennis Mills	Chuck Strahl	
Liza Frulla				

Associate Members

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

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Joe Fontana

Vice-Chairs: Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Jerry Pickard

Diane Ablonczy	Libby Davies	Grant McNally	David Price	(16)
Sarkis Assadourian	Sophia Leung	John O'Reilly	Yves Rocheleau	
John Bryden	Inky Mark	Massimo Pacetti	Lynne Yelich	
Yvon Charbonneau				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Dale Johnston	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Jim Karygiannis	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	Werner Schmidt
Roy Bailey	Brian Fitzpatrick	Francine Lalonde	Carol Skelton
Rex Barnes	Paul Forseth	Yvan Loubier	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Gary Lunn	Kevin Sorenson
Bernard Bigras	Peter Goldring	James Lunney	Larry Spencer
Bill Blaikie	Jim Gouk	Peter MacKay	Darrel Stinson
Rick Borotsik	Gurmant Grewal	Keith Martin	Chuck Strahl
Garry Breitkreuz	Deborah Grey	Brian Masse	Greg Thompson
Scott Brison	Art Hanger	Philip Mayfield	Myron Thompson
Andy Burton	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Chuck Cadman	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
Serge Cardin	Loyola Hearn	Bob Mills	Joseph Volpe
Bill Casey	John Herron	James Moore	Judy Wasylycia-Leis
Rick Casson	Grant Hill	Anita Neville	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	Jay Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Joe Clark	Howard Hilstrom	Brian Pallister	Ted White
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	James Rajotte	

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Charles Caccia **Vice-Chair:** John Herron

Mark Assad	Sébastien Gagnon	Bob Mills	Hélène Scherrer	(16)
Roy Bailey	Joe Jordan	Julian Reed	Paul Szabo	
Bernard Bigras	Rick Laliberte	Andy Savoy	Alan Tonks	
Joe Comartin	Gary Lunn			

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Bev Desjarlais	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
Peter Adams	Norman Doyle	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Jason Kenney	Svend Robinson
David Anderson	Reed Elley	Robert Lanctôt	Werner Schmidt
André Bachand	Ken Epp	Clifford Lincoln	Carol Skelton
Rex Barnes	Brian Fitzpatrick	Yvan Loubier	Monte Solberg
Leon Benoit	Paul Forseth	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Stéphane Bergeron	Cheryl Gallant	Peter MacKay	Larry Spencer
Rick Borotsik	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Darrel Stinson
Garry Breitkreuz	Jim Gouk	Keith Martin	Peter Stoffer
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Pat Martin	Chuck Strahl
Andy Burton	Deborah Grey	Philip Mayfield	Greg Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Art Hanger	Grant McNally	Myron Thompson
Serge Cardin	Stephen Harper	Val Meredith	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	Grant Hill	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Joe Clark	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Ted White
Paul Crête	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	John Williams
John Cummins	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich

FINANCE

Chair: Sue Barnes

Vice-Chairs: Nick Discepola
Richard Harris

Scott Brison	Rahim Jaffer	Pierre Paquette	Tony Valeri	(18)
Rick Casson	Sophia Leung	Charlie Penson	Judy Wasylycia-Leis	
Roy Cullen	Maria Minna	Pauline Picard	Bryon Wilfert	
Albina Guarnieri	Shawn Murphy	Gary Pillitteri		

Associate Members

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

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Tom Wappel

Vice-Chairs: Bill Matthews
Peter Stoffer

Andy Burton	Reed Elley	Loyola Hearn	Carmen Provenzano	(16)
John Cummins	Georges Farrah	Dominic LeBlanc	Jean-Yves Roy	
Rodger Cuzner	Ghislain Fournier	Joe Peschisolido	Bob Wood	
R. John Efford				

Associate Members

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

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair: Bernard Patry **Vice-Chairs:** Stockwell Day, Diane Marleau

Stéphane Bergeron	Irwin Cotler	John Harvard	Alexa McDonough	(18)
Murray Calder	John Duncan	André Harvey	Deepak Obhrai	
Aileen Carroll	Art Eggleton	Francine Lalonde	Karen Redman	
Bill Casey	Mark Eyking	Keith Martin		

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chair: Mac Harb **Vice-Chairs:** Stéphane Bergeron, Mark Eyking

Bill Blaikie	Rick Casson	Bob Speller	Tony Valeri	(9)
Bill Casey	Pat O'Brien			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Irwin Cotler **Vice-Chairs:** Colleen Beaumier, Deepak Obhrai

Bill Casey	Gurbax Malhi	Svend Robinson	Yves Rocheleau	(9)
Karen Kraft Sloan	Beth Phinney			

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair: Reg Alcock **Vice-Chairs:** Paul Forseth, Tony Valeri

Carolyn Bennett	Raymonde Folco	Pat Martin	Judy Sgro	(16)
Scott Brison	Robert Lanctôt	Gilles-A. Perron	Paul Szabo	
Roy Cullen	Steve Mahoney	Gerry Ritz	Tony Tirabassi	
Ken Epp				

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES PROCESS

Chairs: Gerry Ritz, Tony Valeri **Vice-Chair:**

Gilles-A. Perron	Paul Szabo	Tony Tirabassi	(5)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SERVICE RENEWAL

Chairs: Roy Cullen, Paul Forseth **Vice-Chair:**

Carolyn Bennett	Monique Guay	Pat Martin	Judy Sgro	(6)

HEALTH

Chair: Bonnie Brown

Vice-Chairs: Stan Dromisky
Réal Ménard

Carolyn Bennett	Raymonde Folco	Rob Merrifield	Carol Skelton	(16)
Diane Bourgeois	Hedy Fry	Svend Robinson	Yolande Thibeault	
Jeannot Castonguay	Betty Hinton	Hélène Scherrer	Greg Thompson	
Brenda Chamberlain				

Associate Members

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

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Judi Longfield **Vice-Chairs:** Eugène Bellemare, Monte Solberg

Peter Adams	Peter Goldring	Ovid Jackson	Larry Spencer	(18)
Libby Davies	Jim Gouk	Gurbax Malhi	Diane St-Jacques	
Norman Doyle	Monique Guay	Larry McCormick	Suzanne Tremblay	
John Finlay	Tony Ianno	Raymond Simard		

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair: Carolyn Bennett **Vice-Chair:**

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK

Chair: John Godfrey **Vice-Chair:**

Sébastien Gagnon	Wendy Lill	Larry Spencer	Tony Tirabassi	(9)
Loyola Hearn	Anita Neville	Diane St-Jacques	Alan Tonks	

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: Walt Lastewka

Vice-Chairs: Dan McTeague
James Rajotte

André Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Brian Masse	Brent St. Denis	(16)
Larry Bagnell	Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Gilbert Normand	Paddy Torsney	
Paul Crête	Serge Marcil	Andy Savoy	Joseph Volpe	
Brian Fitzpatrick				

Associate Members

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

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Andy Scott

Vice-Chairs: Chuck Cadman
John McKay

Garry Breitkreuz	Robert Lanctôt	John Maloney	Joe Peschisolido	(18)
Irwin Cotler	Derek Lee	Richard Marceau	Kevin Sorenson	
Hedy Fry	Peter MacKay	Lorne Nystrom	Vic Toews	
Marlene Jennings	Paul Harold Macklin	Pat O'Brien		

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair: Derek Lee

Vice-Chairs: Marlene Jennings
Kevin Sorenson

Robert Lanctôt	John McKay	Lorne Nystrom	Geoff Regan	(11)
Peter MacKay	Lynn Myers	David Pratt	Vic Toews	

LIAISON

Chair: Walt Lastewka **Vice-Chair:** Judi Longfield

Peter Adams	Bonnie Brown	Gurmant Grewal	Andy Scott	(19)
Reg Alcock	Charles Caccia	Clifford Lincoln	Paul Steckle	
Sue Barnes	Joe Comuzzi	Bernard Patry	Tom Wappel	
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	David Pratt	John Williams	
Raymond Bonin				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Yvon Godin	Bill Matthews	James Rajotte
Eugène Bellemare	Mac Harb	John McKay	Benoît Sauvageau
Paul Bonwick	Richard Harris	Dan McTeague	Monte Solberg
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Réal Ménard	Peter Stoffer
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Howard Hilstrom	James Moore	Yolande Thibeault
Stockwell Day	Dale Johnston	Carolyn Parrish	Rose-Marie Ur
Nick Discepola	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Beth Phinney	Tony Valeri
Stan Dromisky	Derek Lee	Jerry Pickard	Maurice Vellacott
Paul Forseth	Diane Marleau	David Price	Elsie Wayne

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ROOMS

Chair: **Vice-Chair:**

Peter Adams	Gurmant Grewal	Judi Longfield	John Williams	(6)
Mauril Bélanger	Walt Lastewka			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair: Walt Lastewka **Vice-Chair:**

Reg Alcock	Bonnie Brown	Judi Longfield	Tom Wappel	(9)
Mauril Bélanger	Joe Fontana	Andy Scott	John Williams	

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair: David Pratt **Vice-Chairs:** David Price, Elsie Wayne

Rob Anders	Bill Blaikie	Dominic LeBlanc	Lawrence O'Brien	(16)
Claude Bachand	Cheryl Gallant	Joe McGuire	Janko Peric	
Leon Benoit	Ivan Grose	Anita Neville	Louis Plamondon	
Robert Bertrand				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Brian Fitzpatrick	Yvan Loubier	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Peter Goldring	James Lunney	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Jim Gouk	Peter MacKay	Svend Robinson
Roy Bailey	Gurmant Grewal	John Maloney	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Deborah Grey	Inky Mark	Carol Skelton
Stéphane Bergeron	Monique Guay	Keith Martin	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Art Hanger	Pat Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitkreuz	Stephen Harper	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Scott Brison	Richard Harris	Alexa McDonough	Darrel Stinson
Andy Burton	Loyola Hearn	Grant McNally	Peter Stoffer
Chuck Cadman	John Herron	Dan McTeague	Chuck Strahl
Bill Casey	Grant Hill	Val Meredith	Greg Thompson
Rick Casson	Jay Hill	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Marlene Catterall	Howard Hilstrom	Bob Mills	Vic Toews
David Chatters	Betty Hinton	James Moore	Rose-Marie Ur
Joe Clark	Rahim Jaffer	John O'Reilly	Maurice Vellacott
John Cummins	Dale Johnston	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Stockwell Day	Gerald Keddy	Brian Pallister	Ted White
Norman Doyle	Jason Kenney	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Stan Dromisky	Francine Lalonde	Carmen Provenzano	Bob Wood
John Duncan	Wendy Lill	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Reed Elley			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair: Bob Wood **Vice-Chair:**

Roy Bailey	Ivan Grose	Louis Plamondon	Rose-Marie Ur	(9)
Bill Blaikie	Dan McTeague	Carmen Provenzano	Elsie Wayne	

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair: Mauril Bélanger

Vice-Chairs: Yvon Godin
Yolande Thibeault

Carole-Marie Allard	Jeannot Castonguay	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid	(16)
Mark Assad	Christiane Gagnon	Jason Kenney	Benoît Sauvageau	
Eugène Bellemare	John Herron	Dan McTeague	Raymond Simard	
John Bryden				

Associate Members

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

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair: Peter Adams **Vice-Chairs:** Dale Johnston, Carolyn Parrish

Rick Borotsik	Michel Guimond	Geoff Regan	Benoît Sauvageau	(16)
Marlene Catterall	Joe Jordan	John Reynolds	Werner Schmidt	
Rodger Cuzner	Lynn Myers	Jacques Saada	Guy St-Julien	
Yvon Godin				

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair: Carolyn Parrish **Vice-Chair:**

Rick Borotsik	Lynn Myers	Benoît Sauvageau	Chuck Strahl	(7)
Yvon Godin	David Price			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT

Chair: Paddy Torsney **Vice-Chair:**

Rick Borotsik	Michel Guimond	Marcel Proulx	Scott Reid	(6)
Yvon Godin				

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chair: John Williams

Vice-Chairs: Mac Harb
Beth Phinney

Colleen Beaumier	Roger Gaudet	Philip Mayfield	Massimo Pacetti	(17)
Odina Desrochers	Gerald Keddy	Val Meredith	Tony Tirabassi	
John Finlay	Sophia Leung	Shawn Murphy	Judy Wasylycia-Leis	
Paul Forseth	Steve Mahoney			

Associate Members

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

TRANSPORT

Chair: Joe Comuzzi **Vice-Chairs:** John Cannis, James Moore

Larry Bagnell	Roger Gallaway	Stan Keyes	Pat O'Brien	(16)
Rex Barnes	Jim Gouk	Mario Laframboise	Marcel Proulx	
Bev Desjarlais	Ovid Jackson	Robert Lanctôt	Lynne Yelich	
Liza Frulla				

Associate Members

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION

Chair: Roger Gallaway **Vice-Chair:**

Rex Barnes	John Cannis	Bev Desjarlais	Roger Gaudet	(9)
Andy Burton	Joe Comuzzi	Liza Frulla	Stan Keyes	

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Chair: Paddy Torsney **Vice-Chairs:** Carole-Marie Allard, Randy White

Bernard Bigras	Mac Harb	Réal Ménard	Kevin Sorenson	(13)
Libby Davies	Dominic LeBlanc	Jacques Saada	Greg Thompson	
Hedy Fry	Derek Lee			

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

Chair: Bob Kilger

Vice-Chairs: Don Boudria
John Reynolds

Libby Davies	Michel Gauthier	Loyola Hearn	Dick Proctor	(11)
Norman Doyle	Monique Guay	Stan Keyes	Werner Schmidt	

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Carolyn Bennett
Yves Morin

Joint Vice-Chair: Deborah Grey

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc	Jean Lapointe	Mauril Bélanger	Wendy Lill	(21)
Michael J. Forrestall	Vivienne Poy	Robert Bertrand	Jerry Pickard	
		Rick Borotsik	Louis Plamondon	
		Marlene Catterall	Jacques Saada	
		Marcel Gagnon	Guy St-Julien	
		Grant Hill	Darrel Stinson	
		Jim Karygiannis	Andrew Telegdi	

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Norman Doyle	Dale Johnston	John Reynolds
Diane Ablonczy	John Duncan	Gerald Keddy	Gerry Ritz
Rob Anders	Reed Elley	Jason Kenney	Benoît Sauvageau
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Gary Lunn	Werner Schmidt
André Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	James Lunney	Carol Skelton
Roy Bailey	Paul Forseth	Peter MacKay	Monte Solberg
Rex Barnes	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Peter Goldring	Keith Martin	Larry Spencer
Garry Breitkreuz	Jim Gouk	Philip Mayfield	Chuck Strahl
Scott Brison	Gurmant Grewal	Grant McNally	Greg Thompson
Andy Burton	Art Hanger	Val Meredith	Myron Thompson
Chuck Cadman	Stephen Harper	Rob Merrifield	Vic Toews
Bill Casey	Richard Harris	Bob Mills	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Loyola Hearn	James Moore	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	John Herron	Deepak Obhrai	Randy White
Joe Clark	Jay Hill	Brian Pallister	Ted White
John Cummins	Howard Hilstrom	Charlie Penson	John Williams
Libby Davies	Betty Hinton	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Stockwell Day	Rahim Jaffer	Scott Reid	

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Gurmant Grewal
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Joint Vice-Chair: Derek Lee

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron	Wilfred Moore	Paul Bonwick	John McKay	(24)
James Kelleher	Pierre Claude Nolin	Joe Comuzzi	Lynn Myers	
Pana Merchant	Gérard Phalen	John Cummins	Caroline St-Hilaire	
		Liza Frulla	Greg Thompson	
		Michel Guimond	Maurice Vellacott	
		Paul Harold Macklin	Tom Wappel	
		John Maloney	Ted White	
		Pat Martin		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Duncan	Dale Johnston	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Reed Elley	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	Jason Kenney	John Reynolds
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	Robert Lanctôt	Gerry Ritz
André Bachand	Paul Forseth	Gary Lunn	Benoît Sauvageau
Roy Bailey	Cheryl Gallant	James Lunney	Werner Schmidt
Rex Barnes	Peter Goldring	Peter MacKay	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Jim Gouk	Inky Mark	Monte Solberg
Rick Borotsik	Deborah Grey	Keith Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Garry Breitkreuz	Art Hanger	Philip Mayfield	Larry Spencer
Scott Brison	Stephen Harper	Grant McNally	Darrel Stinson
Andy Burton	Richard Harris	Val Meredith	Chuck Strahl
Chuck Cadman	Loyola Hearn	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Bill Casey	John Herron	Bob Mills	Vic Toews
Rick Casson	Grant Hill	James Moore	Elsie Wayne
David Chatters	Jay Hill	Lorne Nystrom	Randy White
Joe Clark	Howard Hilstrom	Deepak Obhrai	John Williams
Stockwell Day	Betty Hinton	Brian Pallister	Lynne Yelich
Norman Doyle	Rahim Jaffer	Charlie Penson	

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILL C-17, PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

Chair: Bob Kilger

Vice-Chair:

Sarkis Assadourian	Bev Desjarlais	John Maloney	Marcel Proulx	(16)
Claude Bachand	Mac Harb	James Moore	Andy Savoy	
Rex Barnes	Mario Laframboise	John O'Reilly	Paddy Torsney	
Garry Breitkreuz	Gary Lunn	Beth Phinney		

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. RÉGINALD BÉLAIR

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MS. ELENI BAKOPANOS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
Hon. David Collenette	Minister of Transport
Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Ralph Goodale	Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
Hon. John Manley	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance
Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Health
Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Industry
Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
Hon. Don Boudria	Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Herb Dhaliwal	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
Hon. Robert Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Denis Coderre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Sharon Carstairs	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Robert Thibault	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Rey Pagtakhan	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
Hon. Susan Whelan	Minister for International Cooperation
Hon. Bill Graham	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Gerry Byrne	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. John McCallum	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Wayne Easter	Solicitor General of Canada
Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
Hon. Paul DeVillers	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Gar Knutson	Secretary of State (Central and Eastern Europe and Middle East)
Hon. Denis Paradis	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) (Francophonie)
Hon. Claude Drouin	Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Stephen Owen	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)
Hon. Jean Augustine	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
Hon. Steve Mahoney	Secretary of State (Selected Crown Corporations)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Rodger Cuzner	to the Prime Minister
Mr. Marcel Proulx	to the Minister of Transport
Mr. Alan Tonks	to the Minister of the Environment
Ms. Judy Sgro	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Ms. Carole-Marie Allard	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Bryon Wilfert	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Jeannot Castonguay	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Serge Marcil	to the Minister of Industry
Mrs. Marlene Jennings	to the Solicitor General of Canada
Mr. Tony Tirabassi	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Paul Harold Macklin	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Ms. Diane St-Jacques	to the Minister of Human Resources Development
Mr. Joe Peschisolido	to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Murray Calder	to the Minister for International Trade
Mr. Geoff Regan	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Claude Duplain	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Gurbax Malhi	to the Minister of Labour
Mr. Charles Hubbard	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Ms. Colleen Beaumier	to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Sarkis Assadourian	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Georges Farrah	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Ivan Grose	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Ms. Aileen Carroll	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. André Harvey	to the Minister of International Cooperation
Mr. Dominic LeBlanc	to the Minister of National Defence

CONTENTS

Friday, May 2, 2003

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Parliament of Canada Act
On the Order: Government Orders ... 5743
Bill C-34. Motion ... 5743
Mr. Boudria ... 5743
Mr. Epp ... 5744
Mr. Sauvageau ... 5746
Mr. Godin ... 5747
Mr. Clark ... 5748

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

2010 Winter Olympics
Mr. Reed ... 5750

Private Members' Bills
Mr. Gouk ... 5750

Chinese Cultural Centre
Ms. Leung ... 5750

Fédération des caisses populaires de l'Ontario
Mr. Bélanger ... 5751

HMCS *Winnipeg*
Mr. O'Reilly ... 5751

Ride for Sight
Mr. Goldring ... 5751

United Nations
Ms. Bennett ... 5751

Msgr. Léonce Bouchard
Ms. Girard-Bujold ... 5751

Sea Lamprey Control Program
Mr. Harb ... 5752

David Eckmire
Mrs. Yelich ... 5752

Aline Chrétien
Ms. Allard ... 5752

Health
Mrs. Desjarlais ... 5752

Paul Massicotte
Mr. Gagnon (Champlain) ... 5752

National Defence
Mr. Regan ... 5753

Canadian Alliance
Mr. Borotsik ... 5753

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Immigration
Mrs. Ablonczy ... 5753
Mr. Coderre ... 5753
Mrs. Ablonczy ... 5753
Mr. Coderre ... 5753
Mrs. Ablonczy ... 5753
Mr. Coderre ... 5754

Agriculture
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands) ... 5754
Mr. Goodale ... 5754
Mr. Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands) ... 5754
Mr. Goodale ... 5754

Employment Insurance
Ms. St-Hilaire ... 5754
Mr. Wilfert ... 5754
Ms. St-Hilaire ... 5754
Mr. Wilfert ... 5754
Ms. Guay ... 5755
Mr. Wilfert ... 5755
Ms. Guay ... 5755
Mr. Wilfert ... 5755

Marriage
Ms. Davies ... 5755
Mr. Cauchon ... 5755

Foreign Affairs
Ms. McDonough ... 5755
Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale) ... 5755

National Defence
Mr. Clark ... 5756
Mr. Goodale ... 5756
Mr. Clark ... 5756
Mr. Goodale ... 5756

Health
Mr. Hill (Macleod) ... 5756
Ms. McLellan ... 5756
Mr. Hill (Macleod) ... 5756
Ms. McLellan ... 5756

Iraq
Ms. Lalonde ... 5756
Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale) ... 5756
Ms. Lalonde ... 5757
Ms. Whelan (Essex) ... 5757

Foreign Affairs
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ... 5757
Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale) ... 5757
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ... 5757
Mrs. Jennings ... 5757

Excise Tax Act
Mr. Paquette ... 5757
Mr. Wilfert ... 5757
Mr. Paquette ... 5757
Mr. Wilfert ... 5757

National Defence
Mr. Ritz ... 5758
Mr. Goodale ... 5758
Mr. Ritz ... 5758
Mr. Goodale ... 5758

Foreign Affairs
Mr. Harb ... 5758
Mr. Kilgour ... 5758

Canadian Television Fund
Ms. Lill ... 5758
Ms. Allard ... 5758

Social Programs
Ms. Lill ... 5758
Ms. St-Jacques ... 5759

Health
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) ... 5759
Ms. McLellan ... 5759

Agriculture
Mr. Borotsik ... 5759
Mr. Duplain ... 5759

Technology Partnerships Canada
Mr. Rajotte ... 5759
Mr. Rock ... 5759
Mr. Rajotte ... 5759
Mr. Rock ... 5759

Agriculture
Ms. Girard-Bujold ... 5760
Mr. Duplain ... 5760
Ms. Girard-Bujold ... 5760
Mr. Duplain ... 5760

Employment Insurance
Mr. Jaffer ... 5760
Mr. Wilfert ... 5760
Mr. Jaffer ... 5760
Mr. Wilfert ... 5760

Housing
Mr. Eggleton ... 5760
Mr. Mahoney ... 5760

Public Works
Mr. Elley ... 5761
Mr. Goodale ... 5761
Mr. Elley ... 5761
Mr. Goodale ... 5761

Immigration
Mr. Sauvageau ... 5761
Mr. Coderre ... 5761

International Aid
Ms. Bennett ... 5761
Ms. Whelan (Essex) ... 5761

Taxation
Mr. Fitzpatrick ... 5761
Ms. Beaumier ... 5762

Cannes Festival
Mr. Bigras ... 5762
Ms. Allard ... 5762

Health
Mr. Comartin ... 5762
Ms. McLellan ... 5762
Mr. Clark ... 5762
Ms. McLellan ... 5762

Points of Order
Oral Question Period
Mr. Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale) ... 5762
Report of the Standing Committee on Official Languages
Mr. Bélanger ... 5762
Mr. Godin ... 5763
Oral Question Period
Mrs. Jennings ... 5763

Privilege
Firearms Act
Mr. Regan ... 5763

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions
Mr. Regan ... 5764

Petitions
Marriage
Mr. Gouk ... 5764
Child Pornography
Mr. Gouk ... 5764

Questions on the Order Paper
Mr. Regan ... 5764

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Parliament of Canada Act
Bill C-34. Consideration resumed of motion. ... 5764
Mr. Elley ... 5764
Mr. Ritz ... 5766
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ... 5767
Mr. Borotsik ... 5768
Division on motion deferred ... 5770

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Employment Insurance Act
Mr. Godin ... 5770
Bill C-406. Second reading ... 5770
Mrs. Desjarlais ... 5772
Ms. St-Jacques ... 5773
Mr. Gouk ... 5774
Ms. Guay ... 5775
Mrs. Desjarlais ... 5777
Mr. Epp ... 5778

MAIL POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid | Port payé

Lettermail | **Poste–lettre**

1782711
Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
PWGSC, Ottawa, ON K1A 0S5
Internet: http://publications.gc.ca
1-800-635-7943 or Local 613-941-5995

En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
TPSGC, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Internet: http://publications.gc.ca
1-800-635-7943 ou appel local (613) 941-5995

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

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

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :
http://www.parl.gc.ca
