



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 081 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, April 7, 2000**

---

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

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

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

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 7, 2000

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*English*]

### INCOME TAX AMENDMENTS ACT, 1999

The House resumed from April 6 consideration of the motion that Bill C-25, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Tax Act and the Budget Implementation Act, 1999, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Okanagan—Coquihalla to speak to Bill C-25, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Tax Act and the Budget Implementation Act, 1999.

• (1010)

It is said that the certainties in life are death and taxes, and that certainly is true. I will tell the House a true story about something that happened in my riding of Okanagan—Coquihalla.

I was elected in 1993. In 1994, while opening my mail in the constituency, I received a letter from a man who was living on the poverty line. I was shocked when I read his description of the desperate situation he was facing. The man was living on a very limited income in a hotel in Princeton, British Columbia. He was paying weekly rent. He had very minimal things in his life, no furniture, no excesses and no extravagances. He went on to explain that Revenue Canada was after him for back taxes. The letter went on to say that this man was going to end his life by committing suicide and that he was writing to his member of parliament in desperation.

I did not know for sure if what the man was saying was true or not, but I did what I felt was my duty and picked up the phone and contacted the RCMP. Several hours later the RCMP called me back and told me that the man was preparing to commit suicide. Thanks to my intervention, the RCMP prevented that from happening.

As I started off today, I said that death and taxes are the two certainties we face in this world, but I think it is reasonable that Canadians would expect that taxes should not be the reason for our demise.

I will open my remarks today by first giving slight congratulations to the Liberal government for eliminating bracket creep in its current budget by tying income tax rates to inflation. That is a very important step. This does protect taxpayers against automatic tax increases caused by inflation, and all Canadians do benefit from that action.

However, the reality is that the Liberals have only ended tax increases through stealth. Tying tax rates to inflation is not a tax break. It does nothing more than cancel scheduled tax increases that the finance minister and the finance department had planned.

Having said that, I have some other concerns as well. My first concern is the way the Liberal government continues to tax Canadians. My second concern is its refusal to tackle the massive national debt facing Canadians. My third concern is the way it mismanages the spending priorities, the priorities that Canadians are saying very clearly they are concerned about, things like health care.

These are the issues I will be dealing with in my remarks today. I will then leave Canadians with an alternative vision to that of the Liberal government, how Canadians should be taxed and that is through solution 17, the Canadian Alliance proposal for a single rate of tax.

The Liberal government claims that the 2000 budget proposes a five year tax reduction plan that includes the most important structural changes to the federal tax system in more than a decade. This was supposed to be a tax relief budget. In fact, the finance minister said “Today, we are setting out a five year plan so that individuals, families, small businesses and others will know for certain that their taxes will fall this year, next year and in years to come”.

*Government Orders*

The finance minister proclaimed loud and clear that Canadians could expect tax relief equalling \$58.4 billion over the next five years. He even admitted that tax dollars were really the property of the Canadian taxpayer, something we do not often hear from Liberal members in the House. "It is your money", he said, "after all". Speaking to Canadians, he said that the tax dollars were their money. That is a significant step forward for the Liberal government.

Can Canadians really expect to receive \$58.4 billion in tax relief from this same government and that same finance minister who made those comments?

• (1015)

The answer is clearly no, Canadians cannot. After all the hoopla died away, it became pretty clear that new spending initiatives, combined with tax increases from previous budgets, will wipe away the vast majority of this \$58.4 billion tax cut.

Over the next five years spending on programs will increase by \$7.5 billion. This brings the supposed tax cuts down to just over \$50 billion. Then subtract from that \$50 billion the whopping \$29.5 billion payroll tax hike caused by the massive multi-year increase to the Canada Pension Plan premiums. Every January Canadians have to pay more of their hard earned dollars to bankroll a public pension plan that for all intents and purposes is broke.

Now the tax cut is down to about \$20 billion, but \$13.5 billion of this amount is nothing more than a cancellation of scheduled tax hikes. Again, I would ask, is cancelling scheduled tax hikes really a tax break? I do not think so, and judging from the response of my constituents they do not either.

That leaves a grand total of \$7.9 billion for tax relief. To put it another way, \$107.60 per year, or \$8.97 per taxpayer per month. Or, a taxpayer can pop down to the local Tim Horton's, or whichever coffee shop, and use that tax break to buy a cup of coffee because it equals about \$2.07 per week.

Canadian taxpayers are getting no meaningful tax relief from the Liberal government's latest budget. Each Canadian is still paying over \$2,000 more in taxes than they were in 1993 when the Liberals formed government. This is a real blow to an already shrinking disposable income. The disposable income of families who want to put some money away for retirement, a vacation or plan for their children's education, has shrunk under this Liberal government, leaving them unable to do those things.

The policy of high taxation of the Liberal government is also a blow to the economy of Canada on the whole. On Wednesday in Toronto a summit of 200 CEOs brought together by the Business Council on National Issues tried to come up with remedies for the poor economic performance of Canada compared with a number of other new economy jurisdictions. While Canada fell behind during

the 1990s, Ireland, a nation that traditionally had a lower standard of living than the United Kingdom and much of the European community, has become an economic hot spot.

Why has Ireland and not Canada been able to draw in so much high tech wealth and talent when high tech companies in Canada continuously lose many of their best and brightest to the United States and other markets? The answer is clearly high taxation.

During the past decade, Ireland has acted decisively to lower taxes, creating a pro-business atmosphere. Ireland now has one of the lowest tax rates and, as a result, one of the most buoyant economies. The standard of living of its citizens has also increased dramatically vis-à-vis its neighbours. At the same time, the standard of living in Canada has dramatically decreased vis-à-vis the United States.

Ireland has achieved financial prosperity for its people partly through the conscious policy decisions of a government that is not afraid to cut taxes.

Canadians are not so fortunate. The modest tax cuts in the current Liberal budget will do nothing to stem the slide of our standard of living or the flow of skilled Canadians to lower tax jurisdictions in the United States. Like Ireland, Canada must act decisively through conscious policy decisions. This is what Canadians expect of their federal government.

The Liberals have gone out of their way to make it difficult for small businesses to conduct business in Canada.

• (1020)

On this year's tax form small businesses found something new. Any contractor who subcontracts work to others is now forced by the government to police them by filing what is called a summary of contract payments form with the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency. This is in addition to the burden that small businesses already face with serious fines attached to this of up to \$2,500 for those who fail to file their summary of payment forms on time.

The Liberal's current budget also fails to make serious inroads into paying down the debt. Canada's current debt load is approximately \$580 billion. This has remained steady for the last two years with only a minute reduction of \$6.4 billion scheduled over the next five years.

At the rate we are going, it will take 100 years or more to pay off the national debt. Contrast that to the United States which intends to pay off its national debt in just 12 years. Without a feasible game plan to pay off our national debt in a timely manner that is consistent with our trading partners, the standard of living of Canadians will continue to decline. At the same time the lower tax, debt free U.S. market will continue to attract Canada's best and brightest. As we know, that is the brain drain that we all are so desperately concerned about.

*Government Orders*

To make matters worse, Canadians are deeply concerned about the way the Liberal government spends their hard-earned tax dollars. Just going through the clippings this morning, we read that the federal government handed out more than \$85 million to Liberal ridings to fund projects for the millennium. This apparently, according to the press, is double what was received in opposition members' ridings.

An article from the *National Post* this morning said that the PMO tried last month to force through cabinet the purchase, at an inflated price, of a 10-storey building belonging to a financially troubled Liberal supporter. Imagine, the treasury board committee refused to approve the deal, but it would have seen this 38,000 square metre building with an estimated market value of \$50 million being sold to the government for as much as \$78 million.

We see in the clippings this morning another RCMP probe into the HRDC scandal. The federal government asked the RCMP yesterday to look into another job grant in the Prime Minister's riding that went to a company whose officers have personal, political and business ties to, guess who, the Liberal Party of Canada. It goes on and on.

Our two critics, one for the prison system and one for national defence, yesterday held a press conference and showed to all of Canada where prisoners serving time in our penitentiaries actually have better living conditions than members of the Canadian Armed Forces living in bases such as CFB Petawawa.

The problem here is that the Liberal government is using taxpayers' money, not as the Liberal Prime Minister said, that it was actually the people of Canada's money, but is using it as if it was its own slush fund to promote its own particular interests. That is what Canadians are saying must not happen.

The scandal surrounding grants and contributions for a variety of ill-defined and unproven job creation schemes clearly shows the Liberal government has no sense whatsoever of financial accountability. The scandal does not stop at the department of human resources. The auditor general has pointed out that numerous other departments mismanage billions and billions of dollars in grants and contributions.

It would appear that Canadians' tax dollars are there to be spent on make-work projects that are designed to re-elect Liberals, not to serve the best interests of each and every Canadian. The fact that real permanent jobs and economic prosperity can only be created through a combination of real tax relief and business friendly policies is of no consideration at all to the current government.

The Liberals are so out of touch with the average Canadian that just recently, not that long ago, the industry minister was talking about actually subsidizing NHL hockey teams. That was in January. Canadians were appalled at how a minister of the crown could be so out of touch with the rest of the country. While the government continues to mismanage portfolios and grants and

contributions, it grossly underfunds portfolios such as health. Health care is the number one issue in Canada and the Liberal government continues to ignore the issue. It also continues to ignore the problems that we face with national defence.

• (1025)

The number one concern of Canadians is health care. By the year 2004 the Liberal government will have starved the provinces of \$35 billion for health care at a time when the population is rapidly aging and new technologies come with a hefty price tag.

Since 1993, the Liberal government's contributions to health have been slashed by 28%. The Liberals claim they will put \$2.5 billion back into the health care system every year for the next four years. That is a reality and yes, that is true, but this does not address the fact that they have cut \$35 billion out of that very system. The provinces are upset about this and rightly so.

The only premier who seems to like what the Liberals have done is the premier of my province of B.C., Ujjal Dosanjh, who was in Ottawa last week to curry favour with the Liberal Prime Minister and senior cabinet ministers. He looked like a whipped puppy in front of Canadians, his fellow premiers and members of all opposition parties, including the NDP in the House who have railed against the deterioration of health care in Canada and have unanimously called for the restoration of the money that has been cut out of health care.

All the provinces, with the exception of B.C., are rightly demanding that health care funding be completely restored to the tune of another \$4.2 billion annually. The Liberals would rather funnel this money into the riding of the Prime Minister and other senior cabinet ministers while waiting lines in hospitals in my riding and right across Canada are growing with people waiting for needed surgery. This is unacceptable.

In my riding the Okanagan Similkameen Neurological Society, the Child Development Centre as it is known as, is a registered non-profit society whose mission is to promote the physical, psychological and emotional well-being of children in the South Okanagan and Similkameen regions. This centre is so underfunded that each and every year I hold a charity golf tournament to raise money. Last year we raised about \$15,000. This year we hope to raise about \$20,000. One hundred percent of that money raised goes to the children at the OSNS Child Development Centre. I will continue to do this.

It is a shame that an institution such as OSNS, which looks after the well-being and psychological and emotional needs of our children in this country is without funding. It has to look for funding from other sources. It has to be creative, and it is. I do my charity work willingly for the constituency and for the CDC and I will continue to do it.

*Government Orders*

The government should also do something. It should put its priorities in line with the priorities of Canadians who clearly say that health care is the number one issue. Yesterday we heard one of the former cabinet ministers of the Liberal government speak out on the issue of health care, saying that the Prime Minister and his current cabinet are out of whack with the rest of the country.

Let me speak for a minute on defence because this is another portfolio that is severely underfunded. Since 1993, the Liberal government has slashed defence spending by a whopping 23%, drastically reducing our combat capability in the Canadian Armed Forces. The drastic cuts have literally gutted the Canadian forces. Many of my Liberal colleagues on the defence committee would agree with this.

I would like to offer in conclusion that the Canadian Alliance and many Canadians are looking at solution 17, our tax proposals, as one of the solutions that we would like to put forward. In the next election campaign, we look forward to bringing this to the Canadian public. Every single Canadian taxpayer would benefit from a 17% single rate of tax combined with a number of progressive deductions. We would take 1.9 million people off the tax rolls completely, the low income people that I started my remarks off about today.

• (1030)

I am speaking about the man in Princeton, British Columbia, who is living week to week, who is desperate because of the taxation strain that the Liberal government has placed on people like him.

In a country like Canada there is no excuse. Those people should not be taxed at all. Tax freedom day in the United States has come and gone, yet Canadians still have two months to wait before tax freedom day arrives for them.

We want to see changes. The country wants to see changes. Is the Liberal government up to the challenge? I think the answer is no.

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to my friend from British Columbia.

I understand that he is a good friend of a gentleman by the name of Stockwell Day. I have a newspaper clipping that puzzles me. I thought it was from the *National Enquirer*, but it turns out to be from the *National Post*. The headline reads: "Provinces should collect taxes, not Ottawa, Day says". The article quotes a speech given by Stockwell Day in Montreal. It reads:

The federal government should be stripped of its tax-collecting powers and depend on the provinces for its funding. . . . He said provincial governments should collect all taxes above the local level, and send Ottawa a cheque every year to sustain the federal administration.

I have not heard of an idea like that since 1776, when the American Declaration of Independence was signed, when a proposal came to the people writing the constitution that the states collect all the taxes. It was turned down as an idea that was far out in right field.

Does my friend from British Columbia agree with this fellow named Stockwell Day? We know he has some pretty extreme ideas in terms of social conservatism regarding abortion, gay rights, capital punishment and those sorts of things. His extreme views are very well known. But I think this view that the federal government collect zero taxes is even more extreme. Imagine that, no taxes at all and every year the provinces would send a cheque to Ottawa for the administration of the federal government. Does he agree with Stockwell Day?

**Mr. Jim Hart:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the hon. member, who has the respect of the House. He has spent many years as a parliamentarian, but I do not know if he goes back as far as 1776.

If he wants to talk about extreme views, let us look at his party's namesake in the province of British Columbia.

I mentioned in my speech that Premier Ujjal Dosanjh was here. He is a man who has no mandate, by the way, in the province of B.C., because he was recently elected as leader of the NDP by default, by some 1,100 or 1,200 people. He does not have the courage to call an election to put the issue of health care to British Columbians. That is an extreme view when it comes to politicians in this country.

As for Stockwell Day, until recently he was the treasurer of Alberta. Yes, he is a leadership candidate for the Canadian Alliance, but what we are hearing is the frustration being faced by ministers of finance right across the country. The provinces want to have more control over their funding. The situation with health care again comes back to the provinces being at the mercy of a federal government which at one time guaranteed to pay 50%, half of the funding, for such things as health care. Does it do that? No, it does not.

What we are seeing is the honest frustration of a person at the executive level in a province that has lived under this big central government philosophy. The hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle would probably agree that he likes that model. He likes to have the big central government in Ottawa. That is what his party stands for. Folks like Stockwell Day want to see a smaller government. They want to see more of the resources going into priorities like health care.

The hon. member is frustrated with the system, and I do not blame him. I am, too.

*Government Orders*

• (1035 )

Stockwell Day as a leadership candidate for the Canadian Alliance will be an interesting element to what is going to be a great race over the next couple of months. The hon. member for Calgary Southwest will also be putting forward some interesting ideas with respect to taxation. Also, the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca will be entering the debate. They will be able to take those issues, sell them to Canadians and start the debate. That is what will be exciting, as Canadians focus their attention on this great movement across the country called the Canadian Alliance.

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member gave a very interesting psycho-analysis of Stockwell Day and why he said what he said.

My question is very simple. Does the member agree with Stockwell Day when he says that the federal government should collect no taxes, that the only taxes collected above the local level should be done by the provinces and each year the provinces should write a cheque and send it to Ottawa? In other words, no taxes—income taxes, corporate taxes, the GST and excise taxes—would be collected by Ottawa. That is what Stockwell Day is saying. Does he agree with that?

**Mr. Jim Hart:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to study exactly what Mr. Day said in his analysis. As I explained to the member once already, we are hearing the frustration of a person who is at the executive level of the province of Alberta who is trying to wrestle with the issues of a large federal government which does not spend its money wisely.

Billions of dollars go to grants and contributions each and every year. The auditor general has said that he has severe concerns about that. There are mismanagement issues that have to be dealt with. That creates frustration.

The level of funding to health care should be restored. Priorities should be set by the federal government, but it is clearly not doing that.

Stockwell Day is accurate in his recognition that the federal government does not responsibly operate in the fiscal arena. That should be addressed. If Stockwell Day has a solution, then I am one Canadian who is willing to listen. I am one Canadian who will vote during the leadership race. I will be happy to hear and assess what the other candidates say as well.

**Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my hon. colleague. I want him to explore another facet that he did not touch on too much in his speech. I think that Canadians are quite willing to pay taxes. They want to do their part to contribute to the state of the nation. However, one of the things that frustrates them is that when they pay their taxes, where does the money go?

I noticed in the finance minister's budget that he proposed to give another billion dollars to HRDC for grants and contributions, in spite of the condemning audit we recently had. Eighty-seven per cent of the files that were audited showed no evidence of any kind of supervision. There was no estimate of job participants or cash flow forecasts for these grants. Ninety-seven per cent showed no evidence that anyone had even checked to see if the grant participants already owed money to HRDC. One grant in particular stands out. The grant recipient submitted a proposal requesting \$60,000 and received \$160,000. He only asked for \$60,000. When the details were examined by those performing the audit they discovered that he should have been granted only \$30,000.

Canadians are frustrated. They do not mind paying taxes, but for goodness sake, if they are going to pay, they want that money to be used wisely.

**Mr. Jim Hart:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. In my remarks I stated that the finance minister said that the government should treat taxpayer dollars as if they belonged to Canadians. However, the example of the HRDC grants which the member gave is clearly an indication that the government uses the money collected for its own purposes.

• (1040 )

It is not used for job stimulation or job creation. The way to create jobs is to put more money into the pockets of the average family, the average taxpayer, the average entrepreneur, those people who actually create jobs. The government does not create jobs. People who think that the government actually creates jobs are wrong. I know there are some bright people across the way. They are not stupid, they are just simply wrong when it comes to the concept of the redistribution of wealth. Canadian dollars should be left to Canadians.

Priorities such as health care and education should be addressed. We must ensure that we have an adequate monetary system. Those things should be looked after, but the government cannot get its priorities straight. Until the government does that, the hon. member from the NDP will be fighting hard for an increase in health care dollars, as will I and every other opposition member of the House.

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-25 is largely a technical bill which will implement many of the changes made in past budgets concerning the GST and other tax changes, customs changes and the like. It also gives us an opportunity to talk about the general direction in which we want to go as a country, in terms of what vision we should have about the fiscal and monetary system and about some public policy issues that are very important.

A few minutes ago I had an exchange with my friend in the Reform Party—

*Government Orders*

**An hon. member:** The Canadian Alliance.

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom:** The Canadian Alliance. I get mixed up. It was the Reform Party, then it was the united alternative, then it was C-R-A-P, then it was the Canadian conservative and reform party of Canada, and now it is the Canadian Alliance.

I was asking a question because a proposal came from one of the leadership candidates for that party which was very intriguing. The headline read: "Provinces should collect taxes, not Ottawa, Day says". As I said before, I thought I was reading the *National Enquirer*, not the *National Post* when I saw the headline. I have not seen such a radical idea for a long time.

Stockwell Day is a leadership candidate for the Alliance. He is aspiring to lead that party. I see that some of the Reform Party members are a bit embarrassed by what he said. The article read:

The federal government should be stripped of its tax-collecting powers and depend on the provinces for its funding. . . . He said provincial governments should collect all taxes above the local level, and send Ottawa a cheque every year to sustain the federal administration.

Here we have someone aspiring to be the leader of a national party who is advocating that the federal government collect no taxes, zero taxes. I have not heard an idea like that for a long time. It is far out in lulu land. I know this guy takes some pretty extreme positions on a lot of social issues, but now he is taking a position that is very extreme in terms of public, fiscal and monetary policies. Imagine, a person aspiring for federal office who is advocating that the federal government collect no taxes at all. I am really curious to know whether members of the Alliance caucus support that position.

If we go back in history to the conference held in Philadelphia on the foundation of the United States and its federation, one of the ideas was that the states should collect the taxes and then submit a check to the federal government every year to pay for the federal administration. That idea was rejected back in 1776.

People talk about the Alliance-Reform party being a throwback to the 1920s and 1930s, but here is an idea that is a throwback to the 1770s, and even then the idea was rejected. It was an idea that was unworkable to govern a country at that time.

I think people should be aware of what this leading contender for the Alliance-Reform party is saying he would like to have as his vision for the country, where the federal government would have its hands totally tied and would collect no taxes whatsoever, but would depend on the provinces for every single penny required to run the federal administration.

• (1045)

Is that the kind of vision we want? Is that the kind of country we want? Is that the kind of holding company vision of the country we

want? The federal government and the federal parliament would be subject to the whims of the provinces to collect taxes and send a cheque every year to the federal government. I suggest not. The reason I raise it in this debate is that the debate is about our taxation system and our monetary system.

I see the member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands has just arrived in the House. I know he is a very sensible man from Saskatchewan and I am sure he is upset with Stockwell Day for suggesting such an idea of lunacy that the federal government would collect no taxes and that all the taxes would be collected by the provinces. I have never heard anybody put forth that kind of idea before.

It is important that Canadians know where this new party is heading in terms of its vision of federalism and its vision of Canada. It does not want the federal government to collect any more taxes. The provinces would do that and send a cheque every year to the federal government. That is a very intriguing and very interesting idea from a person who is aspiring to federal office.

The bill before us talks about a number of changes in the sales tax system, the excise tax system, the GST and other taxes in the country. Concerning the GST we suggested during the prebudget debate that the federal government make it a priority in terms of starting to phase out the GST by cutting it back by 1% in the budget, another per cent next year and so on, until the GST is eventually rolled out and scrapped.

A few years ago, going back to the 1993 campaign, the Liberal Party across the way was in opposition. It was campaigning for the election in the fall of 1993 and saying that if it were elected it would eliminate the GST. That has not happened. It has not eliminated the GST. It has kept the GST. The GST is still here today.

It seems to me the Liberals have broken a pretty fundamental political promise by keeping the GST. The only member across the way who has actually done something about it is the former deputy prime minister, the Minister of Canadian Heritage who resigned her seat because she had made that promise. She put her seat on the line in a byelection. She is the only one who has done something honourable in terms of trying to address the promise made in 1993 to abolish the GST.

They have not kept their word. If we look at the polling of the Canadian population done by the Department of Finance about a year or so ago, it shows that the number one priority of the Canadian public in terms of tax cuts and tax changes was the elimination of the goods and service tax.

When we talk about a bill that implements many changes coming from the budget, we have to look at some of the priorities of the federal government as well. As I look at federal government priorities, the number one issue that should be addressed today is



the issue of the funding of health care. For every dollar of tax cuts in the budget only two cents went into increased funding for health care. No wonder health care is in a crisis. No wonder Canadians from every province and territory say that this is the number one issue.

It is in crisis largely because the federal government has cut back transfers to the provinces under the CHST for health care and education by billions and billions of dollars. The health care system is now funded by about \$4 billion a year less than it was in 1993 when the Liberal Party took over government. It has cut back on health care and social programs more than any Conservative government has ever done in our history. That is why we see lineups in emergency rooms and a crisis in the funding of health care across the country.

I suggest that the priority should be to bring funding back up to the level it was in 1993, to add an additional \$4 billion per year in transfers to the provinces.

• (1050 )

The health care system was started back in the 1960s when Lester Pearson was prime minister, after being founded in Saskatchewan in 1961 under the then CCF government of Woodrow Lloyd, the successor of Tommy Douglas. After it became a national policy, a national goal and part of a national dream and vision, the federal government committed to funding health care on a 50:50 basis with the provinces: 50 cents from Ottawa and 50 cents from the provinces. Health care went along relatively smoothly for a number of years.

Then a number of years ago it started to change with new funding arrangements, to the point today where the federal government contributes only about 13 or 14 cents on the dollar depending on the province in terms of cash support for health care. I suggest that is not good enough. Government priorities should change and the number one priority should be health care.

Another matter should be addressed in terms of the government's fiscal policies. It should look more seriously at what is happening to farmers, in particular prairie farmers. Prairie farmers are going through the biggest crisis they have gone through at any time since the 1930s. In the 1930s there was a world-wide crisis in terms of a great depression and in the prairies there was a great drought, so there was the combination of a drought and a depression. Now we are seeing the biggest crisis since that particular time.

One reason for the crisis is that the United States and Europe are subsidizing grain farmers to a large degree compared to what we are doing in this country. In Europe a grain farmer gets about 56 cents on the dollar from the treasury of the European Union in Brussels. American farmers who farm just across the border from my province of Saskatchewan in Montana or North Dakota get about 38 cents on the dollar from the federal treasury in Washington.

### *Government Orders*

Despite public opinion, despite what Canadians are saying to us and to the pollsters every day, the federal government decided not to cut the GST. It decided to address tax changes in terms of general income tax, corporate tax and the like. I suggest it is out of touch in terms of its fiscal policy as it pertains to tax cutting.

Does the House know what it is in our country? Farmers receive about nine cents on the dollar from Ottawa in terms of a support payment under various programs to our grain farmers. Our farmers receive nine cents on the dollar. American farmers get 38 cents on the dollar. European farmers get 56 cents on the dollar. We see right away that we have a very unlevel playing field. That is why we have a crisis in prairie agriculture such as we have not had since the 1930s.

A gentleman by the name of Nick Parsons drove his Massey combine from British Columbia to Ottawa and parked it on the street in front of Parliament Hill about two weeks ago as a way of drawing attention to the crisis. He then had a chance to go over to 24 Sussex Drive and have a whiskey with the Prime Minister and exchange some ideas. He enjoyed the whiskey. He enjoyed the conversation, but what Mr. Parsons and farmers want is to put some beef in the sandwich. They want more money for prairie farmers so that they and their families can survive, pay their bills and seed their crops next spring to feed the people of this country and the people of the world. That is what should be done.

For the first time in many years we now have the fiscal capacity to do that. In the fiscal update last year we had a projected surplus over five years of around \$100 billion. Surely to goodness, in addition to health care, farmers could receive a couple of billion dollars extra with about \$1.3 billion targeted for Manitoba and Saskatchewan. That would help them survive as farmers, pay their bills, seed their crops, maintain their way of life, maintain the rural fabric which is so important to our country, and maintain the small towns and small villages.

That is what we are asking on this side of the House. That is what Manitoba and Saskatchewan are asking of the government. That is what our people are asking for, but we do not see it coming from the federal government across the way. These are some of the priorities which the federal government should be addressing and they are not being addressed.

We also need a tax system which is fair, a tax system which is progressive, and a tax system which is based on the ability to pay. That is becoming a very important issue today. The Canadian Conservative Reform Alliance Party of Canada is a long name. It will require a longer ballot in the next election campaign. It is saying that it has a new idea for taxes. It wants a 17% flat tax rate right across the board: regardless of what one makes, one would pay 17%. That is an idea that even right wing Republicans in the United States have rejected with the exception of Steve Forbes. Even the George Bush campaign has said that idea is too

*S. O. 31*

reactionary and too conservative for right wing Republicans. Yet it is an idea being pushed by the Canadian Alliance Party.

• (1055)

Why is it an idea that is not acceptable to good progressive thought? If everybody pays the 17% bracket, those who make \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year in taxable income would pay 17% as they struggle to meet needs in terms of themselves, their spouses and their families, while those who make \$1 million or \$2 million a year would still only pay 17%. The big tax break would be for the the millionaires and the wealthy.

That is not the way the country should go. We need a good progressive tax system based on the ability to pay. Those who make a lot of money would pay a higher percentage in taxes. Those who make less money would pay less in taxes. That is the Canadian way. Our tax system should be more progressive, not less, and certainly should not go back to a flat tax where everybody pays the same percentage rate regardless of one's income, which is the way the Reform Party wants to go.

I conclude by saying what I said at the beginning. I would like to hear the Canadian Alliance Party respond today in this very important debate on the fiscal future of our country. I would like to hear Canadian Alliance members respond today on whether or not they support their leadership candidate, Stockwell Day, who has made the radical proposal that the federal government withdraw entirely from the field of collecting taxes. I repeat that in case there are hon. members in the House now who were not here a few minutes ago when I mentioned it.

According to a copy of an article from the *National Post* last weekend headlined "Provinces should collect taxes, not Ottawa", Stockwell Day is saying that the federal government should be stripped of its powers to collect taxes and that all taxes in the country, except local taxes, should be collected by the provinces. Every year the provinces would then send a cheque to Ottawa for the federal administration of the country.

I have not heard an idea like this for an awful long time. I am very interested to see whether or not the people on my left will rise to say they support Stockwell Day and his radical idea, his vision of Canada that the federal company is a sort of holding company funded by the provinces. I would like to know the response of Canadian Alliance members to that.

The Liberals can respond to that too. If there are any Liberals out there who support Stockwell Day in his vision of fiscal federalism where the federal government collects nothing, I wish they would rise and tell me. If members have any questions or comments, I will take them now.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I would love to have questions and comments, but unfortunately it is time to move to Statements by

Members. When we come back to this debate later this day the hon. member will have three minutes remaining in the time for his remarks and ten minutes for questions and comments.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### AIR INDIA

**Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago 329 people were killed by the Air India bombing. Since then a dark cloud of injustice has been hanging over the families of the victims. The current Prime Minister while in opposition said:

It is of fundamental importance that people who get involved in these tragic events know that there is no place they can land safely any more.

The current Deputy Prime Minister said in 1985:

We call on the government to do everything possible to assist the families of those who lost their lives in the Air India explosion.

Liberal government members when in opposition were demanding justice, but what have they done as a government in the last seven years? What help have they been to those families?

After a most expensive and lengthy investigation no charges have been laid. Instead of doing everything possible, for over a year they have stonewalled and denied me my right to have access to the RCMP investigation file. Justice delayed is justice denied.

\* \* \*

### CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, April is Cancer Awareness Month in Canada. During the month thousands of volunteers from the Canadian Cancer Society will be knocking on doors across the country trying to raise millions of dollars needed for the fight against cancer.

• (1100)

The Canadian Cancer Society is a national community based organization of volunteers whose mission is the eradication of cancer and the enhancement of the quality of life of people living with cancer.

The Canadian Cancer Society, in partnership with the National Cancer Institute of Canada, achieves its mission through research, public education, patient services and advocacy for healthy public

policy. These efforts are supported by volunteers and staff and funds raised in communities all across Canada.

I urge all members to lend their support and efforts in helping to fight cancer.

\* \* \*

### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North—St. Paul, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, medicare, the crown jewel of our social programs, faces the challenges of an aging population, costly diagnostic and treatment modalities, long waiting lists, crowded emergency rooms and overburdened doctors and nurses.

We need an integrated health care system where hospital care, community care, home care, pharmacare, primary care, illness prevention and health promotion are seen as a continuum. This is best achieved within the five principles of the Canada Health Act, not by creating a private for profit system.

The Government of Canada has guaranteed more funding to renew medicare. But money alone and a renewed vision without a plan are romantic at best. A modernized plan without a renewed vision is simply rearranging the existing order of things.

May provincial and territorial governments work with the Government of Canada to effect a plan of action and achieve a renewed vision of medicare for the 21st century.

\* \* \*

### BLOOD SUPPLY

**Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a blood safety day has been declared this year by the World Health Organization, commonly known as WHO, as the focus for World Health Day on April 7, WHO's birthday.

Canada has a highly regulated blood system which meets and often exceeds international standards for blood safety. During the past several years Canada has implemented a number of new safety initiatives, including leukoreduction, nucleic acid testing and deferral of donors based on theoretical variant Creutzfeld-Jacob disease risk. Canada is a world leader in implementing these safety initiatives.

In addition to regulation, Health Canada provides ongoing surveillance for blood borne pathogens and other transfusion related adverse events.

Lastly the National Blood Safety Council has been appointed by the Minister of Health to provide public oversight of all elements of the blood system.

Health Canada avails itself of scientists, physicians, analysts and decision makers with expertise in processing bad blood borne pathogens. The therapeutic products program, Health Canada's

*S. O. 31*

regulator, also maintains a standing expert advisory committee on blood regulations—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada.

\* \* \*

### BATTLE OF VIMY RIDGE

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this Sunday on the anniversary of the Battle of Vimy Ridge, the flag on the Peace Tower will fly at half-mast to commemorate this historic battle.

We will be reminded of our coming of age as a nation. Let me read the words of General Byng, commander of the Canadian Corps and later one of our governors general:

There they stood on Vimy Ridge. . . men from Quebec stood shoulder to shoulder with men from British Columbia and Alberta and there was forged a nation, a nation tempered by fires of sacrifice—

Out of Vimy a renewed confidence and sense of patriotism filled our nation. Sadly, more than 10,000 Canadians were killed or wounded in that heroic battle. May we honour their memory as well as they honoured our country.

\* \* \*

### DAVID SUZUKI FOUNDATION

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the rules governing registered charities strictly limit the percentage of funds raised that may be used for partisan indoctrination.

A begging letter which I recently received from the David Suzuki Foundation describes its mission to initiate "profound changes in our economic systems, in government structure and priorities, in the organization of our communities and in the way we live". That sounds pretty political to me.

There are far too many registered charities whose principal activities are raising lots of money and distributing propaganda.

If Dr. Suzuki wants to change the system, he should stop abusing it and run for parliament instead.

\* \* \*

### EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, March 2000 saw the unemployment rate at 6.8%, the lowest since April 1976. New jobs increased by 30,000. That represents almost two million since this government took office in 1993. Every Canadian benefits from this success.

● (1105)

In Ontario employment grew by 28,000 new jobs for March and unemployment edged down to 5.6%. Nova Scotia employment

*S. O. 31*

grew by 4,000 more jobs in March 2000. Its unemployment rate is also falling and shows the lowest rate since February 1989.

This Liberal government is making very positive changes for all Canadians. Budget 2000 reflects that good news for small and medium size business. Congratulations to the Minister of Finance for his excellent budget.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**LÉVIS SHIPYARD**

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, with the recent acquisition of Davie Industries by the Syntek-Transnational consortium and the current negotiations on the possibility of management and employees buying into the company, the Lévis shipyard is off to a new start.

As justification of this acquisition, the new owners stressed Davie's excellent international reputation, based primarily on the quality of its workers.

Anyone familiar with shipbuilding knows that Davie is ranked in the top five in the world, as far as engineering is concerned. It is the best builder of oil rigs in Canada.

What is still missing, however, is a true federal shipbuilding policy to enable our companies to hold their own against foreign competition.

Now that the legal matters surrounding Davie has been settled, I wish its new directors good luck, for the sake of the workers and the economies of Quebec City and the Chaudière—Appalaches region.

\* \* \*

**GROUP OF TWENTY**

**Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.):** This week, Finance Minister Paul Martin today announced that the second meeting of the Group of Twenty finance ministers and central bank governors will take place on October 24-25, 2000 in Montreal. The Group of Twenty is also known as the G-20.

Ministers and governors will review the global economic outlook and discuss ways to make the world less vulnerable to financial crises.

The G-20 was created in September 1999. It consists of finance ministers and central bank governors from 19 industrialized and emerging market countries.

The purpose of the G-20 is to ensure broader participation in discussions on international financial affairs among countries whose size or strategic importance gives them a particularly crucial role in the global economy.

We wish the participants good luck in their discussions.

[English]

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians want an immigration system that will accommodate independent immigrants who will quickly add to our economy, which will welcome genuine refugees and which will reunite these people with their families as soon as possible. The government has failed to deliver what Canadians want in the new immigration act.

The immigration minister says that she has brought in tough new measures to deal with people smugglers and illegal migrants. The finance minister has said three years in a row that he has substantially lowered taxes to Canadians, but have they looked at their paycheques lately? The minister has not delivered what she says.

The new act does provide for higher maximum penalties for people smugglers. However, it is important to note that under the current act the maximum sentence is 10 years. As of the end of 1999, the maximum penalty ever handed out was 10 months, so how much good will a higher maximum penalty do?

Unfortunately the new immigration act will not help the very people that it should help. It will not keep people smugglers from operating into Canada.

\* \* \*

**YOUNG AT HEART**

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great joy that I extend a warm welcome to a group of senior citizens from the Pontiac who are visiting parliament today.

The Young at Heart group from Chapeau wanted to see firsthand how parliament and the House of Commons works. They are accompanied on this occasion by Mr. Jerome Sallafranque, the organizer of this odyssey to Ottawa.

[Translation]

I hope they will have a lovely day filled with all sorts of new discoveries, and a pleasant trip back to the magnificent Pontiac region.

\* \* \*

**BILL C-20**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the controversy surrounding the bill on the clarity of the referendum process has perhaps abated, but Canadians opposed to Quebec's separation must not be lulled into a false sense of security.

• (1110)

Bill C-20 was part of what was called plan B, which had as its objective to ensure that separation, should it occur, would comply with democratic principles. Plan B will never suffice on either moral or political grounds.

Canada needs a plan A, a plan that would neutralize separatism by proposing a vision of Canada that would reflect the aspirations of the people of Quebec, by having the rest of Canada recognize their past and present uniqueness.

This is the political legacy the Prime Minister should leave us.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### VICTORIA HARBOUR STUDENT PARLIAMENT

**Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, recently I received a calendar from the foreign affairs committee of the student parliament of Victoria Harbour Elementary School in Victoria Harbour, Ontario. This is a group of 25 children in grades five, six, seven and eight who meet monthly to plan ways to help ease the suffering of the children of Sierra Leone who are innocent victims of violence.

This is the fifth year the students have published a calendar filled with their own artwork to raise funds in support of the children of Port Loko Catholic Secondary School and St. Martin's Orphanage in Port Loko, Sierra Leone. This year alone these children raised \$5,000.

I salute these young Canadians who have taken it upon themselves to provide aid to others and to provide an example to all with their generosity of spirit and commitment to global peace.

In the words of Stephanie Chapman, grade 6, "I wish we could help more, and then celebrate their liberty and peace. Please help".

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### THE LATE VICTOR TREMBLAY

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, with the death of Victor Tremblay, the valley of the Matapédia and in particular the town of Causapsca are in mourning.

Victor Tremblay died on March 24 at the age of 52 following a brief illness.

He was the youngest president of the Société nationale de l'est du Québec. He also headed the Société d'aide au développement des collectivités. He belonged to a host of organizations focussed essentially on regional development.

An exceptional individual, Victor Tremblay had a passion for the outdoors, and his commitment changed the approach of an entire

*S. O. 31*

region toward a vital resource, salmon. This commitment led him to assume a national position, that of director general of the Fédération québécoise pour le saumon atlantique.

To his wife, Françoise and his children and to the friends of this exemplary regional advocate, this proud and courageous man, the Bloc Québécois offers its sincere condolences.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### TALL SHIPS 2000

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC):** Mr. Speaker, Halifax, Nova Scotia is going to be hosting Tall Ships 2000 in July after they complete the four month journey across the Atlantic Ocean. Two of the ships taking part in this event are particularly noteworthy.

One is *Eye of the Wind*, a 40 metre brigantine based in England that will be training young sailors as it sails to Nova Scotia. One high school student from South Shore will be leaving for England in early April to spend one week aboard the ship as it makes its way across the Atlantic. Molly Kleiker is a grade 10 student at Park View Education Centre in Bridgewater. She was selected as one of the hundreds of students who will have an opportunity to learn or improve sailing skills while the ship travels to Halifax.

The *Picton Castle* is a 44 metre barque that returned to Lunenburg, Nova Scotia last year following its 19 month world tour. This ship will also be participating in Tall Ships 2000.

I know that the students participating in this event will have a wonderful learning experience as they complete this extraordinary voyage. I wish them all best luck.

\* \* \*

#### ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is important that we all take a moment to share responsibility for the environment.

Yesterday members of parliament from all sides of the House gathered to recognize 313 plants and animals that are endangered in Canada. We all took a pledge to become foster parents to one of the species at risk. I promised to take responsibility for the small flowered lipocarpha which is extremely sensitive to changes in the environment and can only be found in certain parts of the country.

All of us must make a small piece of the environment a large part of our lives.

To my dear lipocarpha, I will do all I can to support you in providing education, nutritional information, respect and above all, protection.

*Oral Questions***HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the grants and contributions scandal at HRDC keeps getting more and more sordid.

• (1115)

Yesterday the national president of the union that represents HRDC workers testified before the human resources committee. We learned that employees at Human Resources Development Canada were ordered to review their job creation grant project files, fill in any blanks and backdate documents so record keeping would appear in order. That is file tampering. They were given that verbal directive in January, right after it was revealed by an internal audit that HRDC had mismanaged and improperly monitored \$1 billion worth of job creation projects.

We are hearing a consistent message from many credible parties: from the auditor general, from the information commissioner and from the employees at HRDC. We are hearing that the problem of HRDC lies with the Liberal political masters and the very top officials in the department who do their bidding.

\* \* \*

**BUDGET 2000**

**Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the members opposite quoted budget 2000 today and I am glad they did. I call on the government to use budget 2000 to address regional disparities in the country. I ask the government to make investing in regions of high unemployment a national priority.

Investments in the budget for geoscience initiatives in mining, the sustainable technology fund for the development of new environmental technologies, Canadian research chairs and new National Research Council facilities should be located in areas like Cape Breton and regions of high unemployment in order to generate lasting economic opportunities for that region and for the benefit of all Canadians.

Let us use the budget to create jobs in areas of high unemployment.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES**

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, it seems there is no price too high to pay, or at least lobby for, if you are a friend of the Prime Minister.

Pierre Bourque, a close personal friend of the Prime Minister, has found himself in financial trouble. He came up with a plan to have the government buy his \$50 million building in Hull for \$78 million. Taxpayers expected the Prime Minister to say no. However, for golf buddies, ethics are merely an obstacle. Instead, the PM put his chief of staff to work convincing Treasury Board to pay up.

Why was the chief of staff to the Prime Minister lobbying to have taxpayers pay an inflated price for a building owned by a friend of the Prime Minister?

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on March 3 my department offered to purchase the Louis St. Laurent building for a price equivalent to the value of the lease. This is a lease-purchase building and is part of our long term strategic plan for accommodating government needs. The offer was rejected by the owner on March 31.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I guess the relevant price is somewhat in doubt.

No one dares stand in the way of this Prime Minister. In order for the Bourque scam to work it had to pass the cabinet Treasury Board committee. The PMO convinced the justice minister and the solicitor general to go along with it. However, Peter Harder, a senior civil servant, defended the taxpayers and resisted the deal. The Prime Minister swiftly had Harder transferred out of the department.

Why is it always those who try to protect taxpayers who find themselves punished by this Prime Minister?

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I repeat again that this was a very simple transaction. We decided to buy the building, and the hon. member should know the history of the building. We offered the residual value, whatever was left of the value in a contract signed in 1991 by a Conservative government, with which the hon. member is now trying to unite.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt it is a simple deal. It is simple: If you are a friend of the Prime Minister you get special treatment.

Back in 1990, when the Prime Minister was fighting the finance minister for the Liberal leadership, Pierre Bourque apparently donated heavily to the Prime Minister's campaign. Now Mr. Bourque is in trouble and the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, the Prime Minister's chief of staff and John Rae are scrambling to find him money. They even went as far as to attempt funnelling Bourque \$28 million of taxpayer money through this real estate scam.

Does Mr. Bourque warrant this special treatment just because he is a friend, or because he has something on the Prime Minister?

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there was no special treatment. We offered whatever was left on the lease signed by a Conservative government in 1991. We offered \$68.5 million, which was the value of the lease. There was no special treatment, and to prove there was no special treatment, the owner rejected the offer.

• (1120)

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, we know that the minister of public works is in favour of this simple transaction, as he calls it. This simple transaction would have paid \$25 million more than the building was really worth.

We have canoe museums, HRDC grants, loans for hotels, fountains, CIDA grants and now inflated real estate scams. You name it, as long as it benefits friends of the Prime Minister. No price is too high to pay by the taxpayer.

Why does this Prime Minister continue to believe he can use taxpayer dollars to help his friends?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the premise of the hon. member's question is completely wrong, as usual, *comme d'habitude*, because there is no deal.

The hon. member's question is not relevant whatsoever. He should realize he has a wrong premise because, as the minister of public works has said over and over in this House, no deal was made. In fact, there was no special treatment. The owner of the building decided not to accept the government's offer.

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, what is wrong is the way this government tries to do business.

The Prime Minister has been in trouble in the past for making deals with unregistered lobbyists. I am sure we all remember René Fugère. Mr. Riopelle, a mutual friend of Pierre Bourque and the Prime Minister, did not register Bourque as a client when he lobbied the ministers to approve this scam. Failing to register a client can cost a lobbyist steep fines and up to two years in jail.

How can the Prime Minister explain his involvement in yet another shady, unregistered lobby deal?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, every time there is an accusation that somebody has failed to register under the Lobbyists Registration Act the ethics counsellor looks into it, which is exactly what would happen.

### Oral Questions

What is clearly disappointing to the members of Alliance Party in this case is that they wish a deal had been done so that they could get up and criticize it. However, not to let the facts stand in their way, they get up and criticize something that has not happened.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a witness told the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities that HRDC employees had received oral directives to review their files, fill in the blanks, and backdate documents if necessary so that everything looked shipshape.

Can the minister tell us whether it is on the basis of these doctored documents that she has been rising in the House for several months now and telling us that everything is just fine and that there are no skeletons in her department?

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be able to set the record straight. Human resources development employees have been instructed, as always, to obey the law. It is clear that we are reviewing our files. Part of our six point plan and our commitment to Canadians is to improve the system.

I would like to quote factually from a directive of February 16, 2000, which clearly states "Documents currently on file are not to be altered. If an amendment to an active agreement is required a formal amendment should be filed and dated the day of the amendment".

[Translation]

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister's revelations confirm our concerns about the department's refusal to launch an investigation.

Are we to understand that the sole reason for its refusal is to buy the necessary time to clean things up and get rid of anything that could incriminate the government?

We need a clear answer. We want clarity and nothing less.

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. If the hon. member has proof that there is wrongdoing in my department, I want her to give it to me so we can deal with it expeditiously. If she has proof, let her bring it forward.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, following the testimony of the representative of HRDC employees, it appears that the climate in the department makes it difficult for public servants to work with diligence and professionalism, as they would like to do.

Does the minister not realize that the only way to restore confidence in these job creation programs and to restore a healthy working climate is to launch an independent public inquiry?

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I looked at the transcripts from the committee yesterday, I saw that the representatives from the union were saying that I, as the minister, was taking it seriously and that the opposition should let me get on with doing the job of fixing the problems.

• (1125)

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister keeps touting her six point plan. Everyone knows this is a tactic to divert attention and avoid facing up to her responsibilities, including getting to the bottom of the HRDC scandal.

Does the minister not realize that, by refusing to initiate an independent public inquiry, she is destroying all credibility for these job creation programs, which are so important for the economic development of all the regions?

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member forgets that we are working with the auditor general, an independent office of the House. The auditor general has helped us to develop the six point plan and is watching us implement the six point plan. In October he will be reporting the results of his study of the grants and contributions plan.

\* \* \*

**HEALTH**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. I want to re-engage him on the question of the Canada Health Act, something we have been talking about for the last little while.

The minister will know that there are now a variety of private clinics across the country providing insured services, sometimes for fees which go beyond what is provided for in the health care plan.

The minister has said that he stands by the Canada Health Act and wants to enforce it. What is the status of all these clinics

operating now? Is he saying that they comply with the Canada Health Act, or is he saying that he is actually not enforcing the Canada Health Act now?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there are private clinics for profit around the country. In some cases they are regulated by provincial legislation, such as in Saskatchewan where such clinics are prohibited from charging fees to patients for any service, or in Ontario where basically the same arrangement is provided for in the statute.

Let me stress that if there are private-for-profit clinics charging for insured services to patients, that would be against the Canada Health Act and we would take action. If the hon. member is aware of any such practices, I wish he would let me know and we will respond.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there are clinics which provide insured services but nevertheless, by paying a fee, people are able to get a service earlier than they might otherwise get it from a public system.

Given what is happening in Alberta with bill 11 and the prospect of a greatly increased significance of private clinics in the system due to bill 11, is the minister prepared to change the Canada Health Act and not just to stand by the Canada Health Act? Would he be willing to change the Canada Health Act if that is what is necessary to protect medicare from this growing abundance of private clinics within the system?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I share the concern that the hon. member expresses. However, I do not believe it is necessary to change the Canada Health Act because the principle of accessibility is there to be respected.

The concern is that on the ground in a given clinic uninsured services might be sold at the same time as insured services are provided in such a way that the principle of accessibility is threatened. If the hon. member knows of any instance of that, I would want to know because it could be troublesome in terms of the Canada Health Act.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES**

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, another day, another story about the Prime Minister wasting taxpayers' money to bail out campaign donors.

Like a scene from *The Godfather*, Liberal donator Pierre Bourque, senior, needed a financial favour. Reports have said that the Prime Minister's cronies tried to force cabinet to accept the purchase of a Hull office building for almost \$30 million more than the appraised value.



*Oral Questions*

The estimates show that as of March 31, 2000, \$70 million had been pegged for the purchase of Place Louis St. Laurent. How can the government justify such a dubious and blatant waste of taxpayers' money?

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me repeat for the hon. member that my department made a reasonable and fair offer to buy the building at a price that represents the value of the lease signed in 1991 by a Conservative government. I recommend that the member does some research to see who was the minister who signed that lease in 1991.

• (1130)

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, obviously this government is not against breaking contracts signed by Conservative governments. It turfed the helicopter contract then bought the same helicopters. We know that the cheques may not have been written as yet, but it was the clear stated intention of the government to go against the wishes of the treasury board and pay off Mr. Bourque. It is obvious that when you get in the way of the Prime Minister's slush fund efforts, you will pay the price.

Treasury board civil servant, Peter Harder, who resisted the sale of the building at such an inflated price, has been transferred out of the department. Now that the Prime Minister transferred him out, does he feel that this is the best way for the government to function—

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first, the hon. member's premise about Mr. Harder is totally wrong. Mr. Harder has been promoted to another senior deputy minister's position. Second, the next premise in the hon. member's question is wrong because no deal has been made. A provision for a possible deal in the estimates is not the same as making a deal. By now the hon. member should realize that and, if he cannot, he should check with one of his relatives about how the original deal was made in 1991.

\* \* \*

**CINAR**

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, this government loves a botched investigation. If it cannot do it itself, it messes up someone else's.

The RCMP is trying to get to the bottom of whether Montreal's animation company CINAR is guilty of tax fraud, but the government is refusing to co-operate. It is refusing to provide the RCMP with copies of CINAR's tax credit application forms. These documents are obviously central to the investigation.

Why is the government not co-operating with the RCMP investigation into this matter?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that under the law Canada Customs and Revenue Agency must keep taxpayer's information confidential until such time as charges are laid in a case, if laid. At that point information is transmitted to the police if and when charges are laid, and only then.

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, do they have to keep that information confidential even from the police?

This government is rolling in so much tax revenue that I guess it does not care about a little fraud here or there. But the RCMP is interested in getting to the bottom of these allegations of criminal wrongdoing. It wants documents that only the government can provide. Why will this government not co-operate?

[Translation]

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reply to the hon. member and to provide him with additional information.

I draw his attention to subsections 241(2) and (3) of the Income Tax Act, which clearly state, and I quote:

Notwithstanding any other Act of Parliament or other law, no official shall be required, in connection with any legal proceedings, to give or produce evidence relating to any taxpayer information.

That is clear.

\* \* \*

**HEALTH**

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, instead of restoring transfer payments to 1994-95 levels, the Minister of Health has decided to meddle even further in Canada's health care systems.

Yet, according to the Canadian Health Coalition, the government is footing only 13.6% of Canada's \$61 billion health care bill.

How can the minister justify his approach to health care funding, with its single-minded focus on calling all the shots?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to transfers, it is obvious that we increased them by \$1.5 billion in a previous budget. In this year's budget, we increased them by another \$2.5 billion.

We are up to \$31 billion, higher than ever, and we have said that we would contribute even more if an agreement were reached with the provinces concerning health care.

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in order to justify its unacceptable intrusions into the

*Oral Questions*

health sector, the government is adding together equalization payments, the Canada social transfer, and tax points.

Yet, in February 1996, the National Forum on Health wrote, and I quote: “—the Forum considers the inclusion of tax points in the federal contribution to be confusing and unhelpful”.

When will the minister restore the Canada social transfer to the 1994-95 level, and quit trying to confuse the issue?

• (1135)

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is suggesting that the transfer of tax points will not mean money in the pockets of provincial governments, she is mistaken

\* \* \*

[English]

**CINAR**

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, the government says that it will not release these documents on CINAR because of confidentiality.

The problem with that is that CINAR is accused of tax fraud. One would think the government would want to get to the bottom of this.

Why does it not just release these documents so the RCMP can do its work?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has just said that this company has been charged with tax fraud.

If he wants to say so, perhaps he can do it outside the House. As far as I know, no charges have been laid.

[Translation]

Let me elaborate. Subsection 241(3) is clear. It states the following about communication where proceedings have been commenced. The only time taxpayer information may be provided is in respect of, and I quote:

criminal proceedings, either by indictment or on summary conviction, that have been commenced by the laying of an information or the preferring of an indictment, under an Act of Parliament.

In other words, charges must—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Okanagan—Coquihalla.

[English]

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, let us review the CINAR tax fraud investigation.

A division of the Department of Canadian Heritage, as the public understands it, is withholding documents central to an RCMP

investigation. It would seem to the average Canadian that the release of this documentation is in the best interests of the taxpayers of the country and the Government of Canada, unless of course the documents show that the mismanagement was at the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Why will the government not release those documents to the RCMP?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again I hate to inconvenience the member by suggesting that all of us have to live within the law, but that is an inconvenience we live with in a democratic society and I am proud of it.

Income tax information remains private for an individual until, and only if, charges have been laid.

Another member has said that the company has been charged. I challenge him to make that accusation outside the House. Perhaps the member would like to join him.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, again in connection with the CINAR affair, the government House leader has just cited section 241 of the federal Income Tax Act as a pretext for why the RCMP is not empowered to enter and search the Canadian Audio-Visual Certification Office, the federal counterpart of SODEC, by virtue of the principle of confidentiality.

How is it possible to bring the entire situation in the CINAR affair into the open, if this section is cited as the grounds not to search?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of invoking a specific section, but a matter of ensuring that the law of Canada is respected.

The hon. member across the way must be aware—and if he is not, he can ask one of his colleagues—that it is important to preserve the confidentiality of tax files. He knows very well that a colleague of his has fallen victim to this.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the House leader ought to know that, under section 231.4 of the Income Tax Act, the Minister of Revenue may waive section 241 when he deems this necessary.

Can the minister assure us that he will provide the RCMP with the necessary means to do its job properly, to borrow a favourite line of his colleague at Canadian Heritage?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I said earlier, and I will quote again.

*Oral Questions*

Subsection 241(2) states the following:

Notwithstanding any other Act of Parliament or other law, no official shall be required, in connection with any legal proceedings, to give or produce evidence relating to any taxpayer information.

This was cited in *Glover vs. Minister of National Revenue, S.C. C.*, 82 DTC 6035.

\* \* \*

• (1140)

[English]

**CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, on July 6 the Ethics Counsellor acknowledges sending CDC minutes to the finance department and informing the department that the documents had to be released under the Access to Information Act. Two days later the finance minister sent a letter to the Leader of the Opposition pretending the department did not have the documents.

What is the department hiding? Why will it not obey the law and release the documents that everybody knows that it has?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister has made it very clear that he has asked his finance department to make a thorough review of this matter. He has also asked that the Information Commissioner be part of this review. He has also made it very clear that all of the relevant documentation is in the hands of the Ethics Counsellor and that he hopes that this review will be made public as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, hon. members have been talking about obeying the law, so why do they not obey the law?

The Ethics Counsellor stated quite clearly that the documents had to be released under the Access to Information Act. We know that the finance department had the documents on the day they wrote to the Leader of the Opposition stating that they did not. The Ethics Counsellor told the finance department to release the documents and yet the finance minister's department not only withholds the documents but also denies their existence. Why?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I said earlier. The finance minister has asked his finance department to make a full review of this matter and he has asked that the Information Commissioner be brought into this very examination and discussion. As well, the Ethics Counsellor has been involved and will be issuing a report, we suspect, very soon.

[Translation]

**CINAR**

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the government House leader earlier read a decision that referred to any other law or regulation.

Will he deny that section 231.4 of the Income Tax Act provides that:

The Minister may, for any purpose related to the administration or enforcement of this Act, authorize any person, whether or not the person is an officer of the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, to make such inquiry as the person may deem necessary with reference to anything relating to the administration or enforcement of this Act.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into a detailed discussion on the wording of an act except to repeat, as I said to the member opposite, what I said earlier: regardless of any other law or rule of law. So this section indeed provides “any other”. Second, I draw the member's attention to the paragraphs following section 241(3), which provide that the exception therefor, for disclosure of information, applies only, one, to an indictment after charges have been made or, two, to a conviction. These are the only two exceptions.

\* \* \*

[English]

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

The minister will know that many school-aged children in the province of Ontario are not allowed to go to school because of their immigration status.

Can the minister assure the House that the new immigration act will protect these children's right to an education?

**Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and proud to have the privilege and opportunity to table yesterday the new immigration and refugee protection act, Bill C-31. I want to assure the member that the government takes very seriously the best interests of children. That is enshrined in the legislation and the act states very clearly, and I would point him to clause 26.2, that the immigration bill that I tabled in no way requires an immigration student authorization for children to attend primary, elementary or secondary school. Education is provincial jurisdiction—

*Oral Questions***MILLENNIUM BUREAU OF CANADA**

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, as if the HRDC scandal were not bad enough, now we have the Millennium Bureau funnelling millions of dollars into Liberal ridings.

I suppose we should not be surprised—yet another program set up to provide Liberals with a slush fund. For example, the Deputy Prime Minister's riding is receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars funnelled from this fund into his riding.

The HRDC scandal was bad enough. Why are the Liberals allowing the Millennium Bureau to pick up where the HRDC scandal left off?

• (1145)

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the premise of the hon. member's question is wrong. I point out that there are projects which have addresses in Liberal ridings but in many, if not all cases, they carry out activities in many other ridings. This is the case as well for Reform ridings.

I might mention, for example, Reform members have 18% of the seats but 19% of the approved projects have addresses in Reform ridings. That does not seem unfair, does it, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I think the premise of that answer is all wrong. The Deputy Prime Minister certainly has the Midas touch when it comes to pumping boondoggle money into Liberal ridings.

He administered the Millennium Bureau of Canada. Three-quarters of a million dollars went into his own riding. A million dollars went into the justice minister's riding and next door they got \$23,000; \$850,000 went into the the foreign affairs minister's riding and next door they got \$70,000; and \$600,000 went into the Prime Minister's riding and there are four RCMP investigations there already. Why does it cost so much to buy votes in Liberal ridings?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the premise of my hon. friend's question is wrong. For example, the Provincial Museum of Alberta is in the justice minister's riding. If it has a project, does that museum not serve people in the entire province? Is there any law preventing the constituents of Reform members from visiting that project? No, there is not.

An address may be in a Reform riding or a Liberal riding, but the money may well be spent all across the region and in fact all across the country like the Trans-Canada Trail, for example.

[Translation]

**OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

**Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, an article published in today's edition of *L'Acadie nouvelle* says the following:

According to Mrs. Adam, RCMP officials and those who complained, fearing that francophones from New Brunswick would lose their vested rights to French language services because as a result of the new policy on linguistic requirements, are currently stuck in "radically opposed" positions.

Will the minister responsible for official languages make sure that Acadians and francophones will not lose their vested rights?

**Mr. Jacques Saada (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a fundamental principle of this government to preserve official bilingualism, and to preserve the status of French as well as that of English throughout the country, or from coast to coast to coast as we say.

Our government is committed not only to protect this principle, but to promote it energetically.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HEALTH**

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, home care is more than just a more efficient and cost effective use of health care dollars. It allows patients to live in dignity in their own homes. Most home care users are seniors, but instead of a national home care system the Liberal government is giving them for profit American style health care.

The health minister said it takes more than money. I agree. We need a plan, so why has the government not come up with a plan in seven years? After seven years, why is it still blaming the provinces and making excuses? When will the government stop the excuses and the blaming of others and start doing what is right for seniors and all Canadians?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member is right about the need for the Government of Canada to work to support what the provinces are doing in terms of broadening access to home and community care. Indeed, when I invited my colleagues to work with me this spring, and we started last week in Markham, it was to discuss that very subject among others.

Last weekend unfortunately we ran into ministers who wanted to talk only about the money. Their first ministers would not let them go beyond that, but there are hopeful and encouraging signs. The Government of British Columbia has now said it wants to sit and speak with us about substantive matters, including broadening

home and community care. I look forward in the weeks and months ahead to working with that and other governments so that in the last analysis we will have better services for Canadians.

\* \* \*

### HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the minister likes to quote transcripts. Let me quote transcripts from yesterday's HRDC meeting. The president of the employees' union on questioning said:

Have you ever received any comments from staff from any office in Canada of this directive by HRDC to fill out forms, to fill out these files that were empty and backdate them? Have you ever received this information?

The answer was:

Mr. Chair, we have got similar directions and the answer is yes.

This is a very serious accusation. Could the minister shed some light on these accusations?

• (1150)

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, indeed this is very serious and I want to say to the House very clearly that the position of my department, formally and informally, in writing and verbally, is that the law will be obeyed.

Let me continue to quote from the formal directive of February 16 that states:

It should be clear and apparent on the file what changes have been made to the file and the date the change was made.

If the hon. member has proof which would suggest that this is not being done, I would very much appreciate him bringing it forward because I will act on it very aggressively.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC):** Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we are doing, bringing it forward.

Yesterday, in committee, the national president of the department's employees reiterated the department's guidelines to check all files and, where information or documents were missing, fill out the empty files and backdate them. We are bringing these facts to the attention of the department today. These are very serious accusations.

Will the minister call for yet another police investigation?

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as a result of that testimony the

### Oral Questions

particular individual will be called and asked for the proof that he has.

I too ask the hon. member that if he has proof, not just allegations, not just hearsay, to please bring it forward so I can deal with it.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### HEALTH

**Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

For some days now, the Bloc Quebecois has been accusing the Minister of Health of interfering in areas of provincial jurisdiction as far as health care is concerned, particularly in relation to nurses and health insurance.

Can the minister tell the House whether he intends to respect provincial jurisdictions in relation to health care?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to clarify the position of the federal government.

It is our intention to work in co-operation with the provinces, respecting provincial jurisdictions.

I would like to point out that we have proposed new federal programs for home care, community care and pharmacare, and have offered our support to help the provinces pursue their collective priorities. We have also made a commitment to increase funding to the provinces in order to—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Wild Rose.

\* \* \*

[English]

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, this week members of the First Nations National Coalition for Accountability were in town. The Indian affairs minister says they do not have anything to worry about.

Now they are back home and already they are once again being threatened for speaking out against their chiefs and councils. When will the minister take some responsibility and protect these grass-roots natives?

**Hon. Robert D. Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is news to me. If the member has any information as it relates to the accusations he continues to make, I suggest he bring it over here.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**EXPORT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, an NGO group released a very troubling report on the activities of the Export Development Corporation.

The report points out that EDC has provided financial assistance for a number of environmentally disastrous projects: relocation of people in Colombia and China, pollution of rivers in the Philippines, threats to endangered species, and that is not all.

My question is for the Minister for International Trade. When will he require EDC to comply with Canada's official foreign policy and its international commitments?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the minister were here today, he would certainly say that the government will soon respond to House of Commons and Senate committees with respect to EDC and general concerns such as those raised by the member.

\* \* \*

[English]

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the development of the oil rich Laurentian sub-basin presents an enormous economic opportunity to the people of Cape Breton, the people of Newfoundland, and Canadians.

• (1155)

The Conservative Government of Nova Scotia and the Liberal Government of Newfoundland are engaged in a jurisdictional fight. The project is in jeopardy. The companies are looking at setting up in St. Pierre and Miquelon, taking with them hundreds of jobs and millions of dollars in royalties.

When will the federal government exercise a leadership role, help settle the dispute and ensure that the economic benefits come to the people of Atlantic Canada and not to the treasury of France?

**Mr. Brent St. Denis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. The report of the agent is still being evaluated.

As the member knows, this is a longstanding dispute between the province of Nova Scotia and the province of Newfoundland. At any time they wish they could settle the matter. In due course a response will be made on the report of the agent.

[Translation]

**RCMP INVESTIGATIONS**

**Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

With the number of RCMP investigations on the rise, does he think that the RCMP will have sufficient resources to conduct all of them and protect the interests of Canadian citizens?

**Mr. Jacques Saada (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to reaffirm two fundamental points. The first is that the RCMP is doing an exceptional job of fulfilling its wide range of responsibilities.

The second thing I want to remind the member is that the RCMP budget was increased in the last budget and that allocations for all investigation-related items went up.

The RCMP has the resources it needs to do its job and I have the utmost confidence in the results it achieves.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HEALTH**

**Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. There are 350,000 Canadians alive today who have suffered a stroke and there are 50,000 new cases of stroke each year. What is the government doing to help eradicate this devastating and debilitating medical condition?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was delighted earlier today to announce the establishment of the Canadian Stroke Network, another of the networks of centres of excellence that we have established across Canada.

This is an investment in the first phase of just under \$19 million over four years. It is subject to renewal based on peer review. This network will create a unique world class infrastructure on stroke prevention, stroke treatment and repair of the brain after injury.

It is cause for hope for all Canadians and their families who have suffered from this dreadful affliction.

\* \* \*

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, of course it is news to the minister regarding the threats on reserves that are going on. When they work only government to government why would they ever care about what happens to grassroots natives? They do not give a hoot.

The minister will not even return calls to the people who are calling him and asking him to call. They are calling my office and I am passing on the numbers. This is very serious. These people are being threatened for speaking out. Instead of bowing down to the chiefs, when will the minister protect the grassroots people and stand up for them?

**Hon. Robert D. Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I suggest what the member should do, even though he has no respect for the RCMP, is call the RCMP.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOODS

**Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, a poll by Environnics published this weekend reveals that 75% of Canadians are concerned about the safety of genetically modified foods. This poll reveals as well that 95% of Canadians think genetically modified foods should be labelled.

Will the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food act on the on the almost unanimous demand by consumers by labelling genetically modified organisms, without delay?

[English]

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member checks the record, I believe he asked the very same question yesterday.

The government has responded. We have asked the Standards Council of Canada to work with consumer associations, provincial government associations, producer associations, representatives of the agricultural community and the agri-food industry to create a set of criteria that can be meaningful, enforceable and credible. Until we have that, nothing can be done. That is the first step, and that is the step that is being taken at the present time.

\* \* \*

● (1200)

### HEALTH

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in an earlier question to the Minister of Health, the minister asked me to come forward with examples of where I felt the Canada Health Act was being violated by private for profit clinics. A number of examples have been brought to the minister's attention in the recent past.

Is the minister really saying that, in his view, there is nothing happening now in these for profit private clinics that violates the Canada Health Act? Is there nothing under investigation by his department pursuant to the Canada Health Act? Could the minister clear that up for us? Would he tell us what he thinks of situations

### Routine Proceedings

where things are being deemed not medically necessary, like MRIs, where people have to pay \$600 if they want to have one immediately rather than waiting for nine months?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, indeed there are specific instances in relation to which my department has made and is making inquiries. As I said earlier, any time there are insured services and enhanced or uninsured services together, we have to worry about the principle of accessibility.

I want the member to know that my department and I are always alert to issues that arise and will investigate and pursue cases as appropriate.

\* \* \*

### POINTS OF ORDER

#### TABLING OF A DOCUMENT

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, during question period today the Minister of Human Resources Development Canada, in response to a question from a member of one of the other opposition parties, referred to a ministerial directive. I believe she read from it. I wonder if she would be able to table it for the House.

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would love to table it. I have it here, in both official languages.

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

#### REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the pleasure to table, in both official languages, the 1998 report on Canada's participation in regional development banks.

\* \* \*

#### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 15 petitions.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34, I

*Routine Proceedings*

have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the 11th Canada-Mexico parliamentary meeting held from March 6 to March 10 in Mexico City.

\* \* \*

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 25th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the selection of votable items in accordance with Standing Order 92. This report is deemed adopted on presentation.

\* \* \*

**BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2000**

**Hon. Jim Peterson (for the Minister of Finance)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-32, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in parliament on February 28, 2000.

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

\* \* \*

• (1205 )

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 21st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of the Standing Committee on Industry, presented to the House on March 22, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

**Mr. Derek Lee:** Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the following member be added to the list of associate members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs: David Chatters.

(Motion agreed to)

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## MAMMOGRAPHY

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by a number of Canadians, including those from my riding of Mississauga South, on the subject of breast cancer.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that Canada has the second highest incident rate of breast cancer in the world.

The petition outlines a number of details, but specifically states that Canada has no legislation for mandatory mammography quality assurance standards, that breast cancer results in the potential loss of 94,000 years of life each year, and that early detection remains the only known weapon in the battle against this disease.

The petitioners therefore call upon parliament to enact legislation to establish an independent body to develop, implement and enforce uniform mandatory mammography quality assurance and quality control standards in Canada.

## HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present which has been signed by 154 people living in the riding of Peace River.

The petitioners call upon parliament to demand the immediate resignation of the Minister of Human Resources Development, and for the auditor general to conduct a full and independent inquiry into HRDC's management and accounting practices.

## MARRIAGE

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present, which call upon parliament to withdraw Bill C-23, to affirm the opposite sex definition of marriage in legislation, and to ensure that marriage is recognized as a unique institution.

The petition is signed by a total of 204 constituents of Peace River.

## MAMMOGRAPHY

**Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition from Canadians who draw to the attention of the House that Canada has the second highest incidence of breast cancer in the world, that there is no legislation for mandatory mammography quality assurance standards in Canada, that one in nine Canadian women will develop breast cancer in their lifetime, and that early detection remains the only weapon in the battle against the disease.

Therefore, the petitioners call upon parliament to enact legislation to establish an independent governing body to develop, implement and enforce uniform mandatory mammography quality assurance and quality control standards in Canada.

## THE SENATE

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of a number of people from the city of Regina, as well as one person from the town of Turtleford and two people from the village of Livelong, which is a fine community in Saskatchewan.



The petitioners bring to the attention of the House that the Senate of Canada costs \$50 million a year, that it is undemocratic, that it is unelected, that it is unaccountable, and that, therefore, the Senate of Canada should be abolished in accordance with the wishes of the people of this country.

NATIONAL TARTAN DAY

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present the following timely petitions signed by 26 interested constituents from my riding of Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale.

April 6 has special significance for all Canadians, especially those of Scottish descent, because the Scottish declaration of independence was signed on April 6, 1320.

Therefore, the petitioners pray and request that the Canadian federal parliament designate April 6 of each year as National Tartan Day.

• (1210)

MARRIAGE

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to table a petition from the residents of the town of Cochrane in my riding who add their names to the hundreds of thousands of names on petitions requesting that the government withdraw Bill C-23.

ABORTION

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present a petition from a number of people from Lindsay and the surrounding area, as well as Reaboro, who call on parliament to act immediately to request the provision of Canada's annual abortion statistics in order that more research can be done in other areas, such as infertility, sterility and post-abortion trauma.

MARRIAGE

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition signed by over 500 individuals who draw to the attention of the House that the value of marriage is the cornerstone of public policy. They ask that the definition of marriage remain as the union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of others.

The petitioners object to Bill C-23 which extends marriage-like benefits to same sex couples. They ask that parliament withdraw Bill C-23 and, instead, affirm the opposite sex definition of marriage in legislation and ensure that marriage is recognized as a unique institution.

*Business of the House*

EUTHANASIA

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to present another petition, containing the signatures of some 700 people. The petitioners ask that the long history of recognizing the rights and freedoms of religion and conscience in Canada be recognized, especially for those in health care institutions and training centres, and that they not be obliged to violate their conscience by being involved in acts of abortion or procedures of euthanasia.

MARRIAGE

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 125 of my constituents, primarily residents of the city of Swift Current.

The petitioners call upon parliament to withdraw Bill C-23, affirm the opposite sex definition of marriage in legislation and ensure that marriage is recognized as a unique institution.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions, which I would qualify as thorough, between the representatives of all the political parties regarding the following motion, and I believe that if you would seek it you would find unanimous consent for it. I move:

That notwithstanding any standing order, Bill C-445, an act to change the name of the electoral district of Rimouski—Mitis, be deemed to have been read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Does the chief government whip have the unanimous consent of the House to move this motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Government Orders*

(Motion agreed to)

[English]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, in the same spirit of co-operation, I believe you would find consent for the following motion. I move:

That notwithstanding any standing order, the bill entitled, an act to change the names of certain electoral districts, be introduced without notice, read a first time, read a second time and referred to a committee of a whole, considered in committee of the whole, reported, concurred in at report stage, read a third time and passed this day; and that the orders for Bills Nos. 317, 397, 449, 455 and 456 be discharged and the bills withdrawn.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Does the hon. chief government whip have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

\* \* \*

• (1215)

#### ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-473, an act to change the names of certain electoral districts.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to order made earlier this day, the House will now proceed to second reading of this bill.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bob Kilger** moved that Bill C-473, an act to change the name of certain electoral districts, be now read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair)

**The Chairman:** Order, please. The House is in committee of the whole on Bill C-473, an act to change the names of certain electoral districts.

(Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 4)

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to propose an amendment to clause 4, which I have not drafted but which is very simple. It reads as follows:

That the double hyphen separating Lotbinière and L'Érable be replaced by a single hyphen.

**The Chairman:** Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Verchères—Les-Patriotes?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 4, as amended, agreed to)

(Clauses 5 to 10 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 11)

**The Chairman:** Is clause 11 agreed to?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

(Clause 11 negatived)

(Clauses 12 and 13 agreed to)

(Title agreed to)

(Bill reported)

**Mr. Bob Kilger** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to third reading of this bill.

**Mr. Bob Kilger** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1220)

[English]

### INCOME TAX AMENDMENTS ACT, 1999

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-25, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Tax Act and the

*Government Orders*

Budget Implementation Act, 1999, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to summarize. Bill C-25 before the House today is an income tax bill. When we talk about collecting income tax in this country, we should also talk about the public policy priorities that go along with the role of collecting taxes. Once we collect taxes, on what do we spend the money?

I summarize by saying that the number one priority in this country is health care. It is preserving the medical care system.

Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed the daffodils on various members' desks. There is one on my desk, one on the desk of a member of the united alternative and one across the way on the desk of a Liberal member. Those daffodils symbolize a campaign by young people called Young People for Medicare. This morning they had a press conference in Room 130-S of this building, the Charles Lynch theatre. I was honoured to be at that press conference with them. They argued as young people that they are concerned about preserving our system of medicare in the country.

That is very significant. Young people as a rule do not use the health care system very much. It is encouraging to see a group of young people come here, organize a campaign and use the Internet to speak out in favour of preserving our national medicare plan.

When we debate a tax bill in the House and when we collect taxes from the Canadian people, we should make sure that the number one priority of those taxes will be social programs and, in particular, health care which is so important to each and every single Canadian from coast to coast.

Another point I wish to mention is that the farm crisis in Saskatchewan and Manitoba is still there despite a bit more aid from the federal government, a bit more help from the Saskatchewan government and a bit more help from Manitoba. The crisis is still there. We are in the midst of the worst farm crisis since the 1930s.

Almost every single small town in Saskatchewan and Manitoba is losing people because of the drop in farm income. Suicides are up, reaching a record high. Farm stress, with all its attendant problems, is now very serious. We should be addressing more of the money collected in taxes to alleviate the problem for farm families in rural communities across the country.

The last point I mention is the system of education. I think that is one system where we should spend more money. In terms of investing in research and development, training skills, education and post-secondary education, the country should train a workforce that is second to none. When we do that, we will build a strong country we can all be proud of as we move on into the 21st century.

**Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I could not help but notice the hon. member's comments about the farm crisis in Saskatchewan. I know that is his home province and he is very familiar with so many painful stories that have come out of the crisis in Saskatchewan.

I am also reminded that the minister of agriculture has informed the House that moneys will be made available to assist farmers in the crisis situation they are in.

Although it has been stated in the House that millions of dollars are available for financial aid, like so many federal programs, the process to apply and all the various levels of red tape and criteria, et cetera, exclude people who need access to that assistance. It provides, like many federal programs, good optics for the federal government to announce a big program. How much of this money is flowing back to the people that need it? As I understand it, of the farm assistance that has been offered so far only a small fraction, I think at most a third, has been put into the hands of farmers that need it. I would ask the hon. member to speak about the problem of getting through the red tape and actually getting access to the assistance that is so often lifted up by government members opposite.

• (1225)

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the member from Calgary Centre that one of the problems we have is the bureaucracy and the red tape in terms of getting money out to the farmers who need the cash. Somehow we have to figure out a way that is more efficient and speedy in terms of getting money out to people who actually need it.

It seems to me very strange in the modern age of technology with the Internet and computers that we cannot be more efficient in terms of speed and more expeditious in terms of getting money out to the farmers in this country who need it.

The other thing I wanted to say to the member for Calgary Centre is that we should at this time as well be looking at a long term farm policy, making sure that there is some program that guarantees the farmer a return that somehow reflects on the farmer's costs of production. That is not the case today. If the farmer got back the costs of production in the long run, then there would be some way that that farmer, he or she, could plan their lives.

Workers, for example, have trade unions and collective agreements, so there is some kind of a guarantee. Doctors, dentists and lawyers have fees that are negotiated and set so there is some kind of a guarantee of a fee level.

The farmers are at the whim of the international marketplace and the weather. Therefore, they have no guarantees or very few, except for crop insurance and some of those programs.

*Government Orders*

We should be addressing our minds to devising some kind of a long term program that is based on the costs of production for grain farmers in particular, but also for livestock farmers so that there will be some guarantees what the farmer receives in the fall from a crop or from the livestock produced.

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague to expand a bit on something I know he has already mentioned. That is the issue that one Canadian Alliance leadership candidate is suggesting, that the provinces should be collecting all the taxes. I am just wondering if my colleague can expand on that and comment on laying his trust in the Mike Harrises and Ralph Kleins of the world.

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom:** Mr. Speaker, we have here a leadership candidate for the Canadian Alliance who has a vision of what I call holding company federalism where the federal government is a sort of holding company for the provinces.

He said this in Montreal in a speech and I gather he has written a letter to some papers like *Le Droit* and others, saying that the federal government should no longer collect any taxes, that all of the taxes in this country should be collected by the provincial governments above the local level and that the provinces every year should send a cheque to the federal government.

I find that a very strange way to run a country, a very strange way to run a federal government and a very strange vision of what kind of a country we should have where the only tax collector would be the provincial governments that would send a cheque once a year to the federal government.

That might be acceptable in the case of the Senate. If the funds were insufficient, we could get rid of the place. However, in terms of all the other important programs like health care, education and the farm crisis, I know in the heart of the member from Calgary Centre he certainly cannot support Stockwell Day and the kind of vision that he has for our country where the federal government has no role and no say whatsoever on the most fundamental policy in this country, which is the right to tax.

I know he must be pretty disturbed by Mr. Day's new vision, a vision that was rejected by the founders of the United States in the independence state in Philadelphia in 1776 when they rejected the idea that all taxes should be collected at the state level and then a cheque every once in a while would go to the federal government.

I look forward to my friends in the Canadian Alliance Reform Party getting up in this house and putting some distance between themselves and Mr. Day. Let us shed some light on this topic that Mr. Day has raised. I see my friend from Calgary is champing at the bit to get up and make a statement that sets him apart from Mr. Day.

• (1230)

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be here on this day, April 7, and to have taken part in the speedy passage, with all the parties in the House, of a bill to change the names of two ridings in my region.

The riding of Lac-Saint-Jean, currently represented by a member with whom I have had the opportunity to work, will now be called Lac-Saint-Jean—Saguenay. As for my own riding, Chicoutimi, it will now be called Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, a name that will better reflect the reality of the whole riding.

A process is under way to bring together all the municipalities in that region. I think everyone will be happy to be represented in the House under a name that accurately describes the geographic reality of the riding. I am very happy to have taken part in the speedy passage of this bill to change the names of certain ridings, including mine and that of my neighbour from Lac-Saint-Jean.

I am now pleased to speak to Bill C-25, which amends the Income Tax Act, and to the whole issue of our tax system.

I am pleased but, at the same time, I am also very disappointed. When the people in our ridings are waiting for a budget, they are very anxious and, sometimes, they have great expectations. The measures contained in these budgets are always spread out over several years. They are almost like Soviet plans, spread out over three, four or five years.

The problem in all this is that the measures that would normally be the most beneficial to our fellow citizens are always postponed by three, four or five years. Try to go and tell people who live from hand to mouth, have trouble surviving and barely manage to provide for their family that, in three, four or five years, the picture will look rosier.

After the budget, I often hear the same comments at home, in the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean region. It is always the same after the tabling of the budget by the current Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister, since, as we know, budgets are dictated by the Prime Minister. The Minister of Finance is involved in the drafting of the budget, and the Prime Minister tells him "Look, you are going to do this and that". That is the way it is done usually. The comments I hear most often from my fellow citizens go something like this "Are they ever going to give us a budget for just one year with a real impact over the current year?"

Let them stop giving us Soviet-like budgets that keep on telling us that in five years things will start looking up. We want change this year. Canadians should be able to benefit this year from the measures taken by the previous PC government.

*Government Orders*

I have often said that the current government does not have an agenda of its own, that it is benefiting from measures passed by the Progressive Conservatives and that took years to be passed.

When we ask a question here in the House, day in and day out the answer is “Ah, the Progressive Conservatives”. In one sweep, this brings us all the way back to the beginning of Confederation. I can say this however. This year the GST, which got the Liberals elected after promising to scrap it, will bring in \$24 billion for the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister.

What they do not know is that when the GST was adopted in the 1990s—it goes without saying that the measure was unpopular at the time—its purpose was to bring about real tax reform, to scrap taxes.

This government pockets money daily from the measures adopted by the Progressive Conservatives, which unfortunately did not have the time to implement real reform, to scrap taxes. In 1993 I thought this government would at least be honest enough to say “The measures passed by the Progressive Conservatives make good sense but one element is missing. Our mission as the new government is to continue with real reform”.

• (1235)

What did the Liberals do? They increased taxes 50 times. Not many people know that.

They take in an annual surplus of \$6 billion, \$7 billion, \$8 billion in the employment insurance fund, instead of lowering contributions to \$2 per \$100, as they promised to do in the last election campaign. Consider how much they benefit from free trade. They campaigned against us and now they go around the world praising free trade.

Here again, they failed in their mission, which was to complement what we did. We said that once free trade was passed certain compensation measures would be required because it would involve all of the people affected by the globalization of trade. The government did absolutely nothing.

Do members know what that led to? A 50% increase in poverty, particularly among young children.

I have often asked the government why, given that it abdicated its responsibilities after the 1993 election, after the passage of the GST and free trade, it did not pass measures to lower taxes. It did not pass compensatory measures to offset the poverty arising from globalization.

I often have to say “Focus, quick”. There are 40 or so programs to help families in need but they accomplish nothing”. I say why not follow the lead of the European Economic Community? Why not follow the example of Portugal? Why not follow the example of the Government of Quebec which is going to put the issue of a guaranteed minimum income on the agenda in May?

Why will the federal government not be progressive for once in seven years and say “Yes, we will look into the question of a guaranteed minimum income?” This is something that has been called for by Quebec academics and those involved in social affairs, such as Michel Chartrand. They have taken the trouble to write a book about it.

Each time a question arises, the answer they give is this: “You Conservatives left a deficit behind you”. Yes, we left a deficit of \$40 billion. That is the same level as in 1984. We inherited a debt of \$200 billion, which had been multiplied eleven-fold by Pierre Elliott Trudeau in ten years. The Mulroney government only doubled it; in the meantime, however, it adopted measures which have now made it possible for the government to have wiped out the deficit.

This is why I say this government has no economic or social agenda. What does it do? It passes a bill like C-20 on clarity. It is unbelievable how many people on the street are now talking to us about the importance of passing a bill on referendum clarity. I have never met anyone at home who told me “Sir, you did a good thing in the House of Commons. You passed legislation on referendum clarity”.

It is only too clear that the sole purpose of this bill was to annoy Quebecers, to score points in the rest of the country and to try to divide the other parties. That is the government’s game plan.

Worse yet, we were given to understand that there would be an electoral reform. The government passed electoral legislation to muzzle third parties, which are hard up for funds and cannot even field any candidates in the next election because they will not even have enough money to meet the requirements of the new electoral legislation.

I would like one example of something that will improve the lot of Canadians. We are debating Bill C-25 to amend the Income Tax Act. This still just skims the surface. We have the impression that this government does not want to govern. Unfortunately, we sometimes wonder whether that is not what people want: a government that is not there. We on our side continue to say that a government is important to a country.

• (1240)

We often read in the media that people do not want a government. However a government is necessary because the present government manages the money for taxpayers. People tell me “André, we are working and every last cent of our pay cheque is spoken for”.

People no longer have anything to show for their efforts. The Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister are going too far. It is a bit much. And we think this is a democracy. The government says “We are at 45% or 50% in the polls. This means that people are happy”.

*Government Orders*

People are not happy. I want them to realize that this government is pocketing their money, that its measures do not meet the needs of their children and families, and that they do not help the development of outlying regions, which are slowly dying.

Let us take a look at what is going on in all the regions of the country, whether the Gaspé Peninsula or in my riding. Thousands of jobs have been lost because the government is only interested in reaping the benefits of the measures taken by the former Progressive Conservative government and its Prime Minister, Mr. Mulroney. When the Liberals were campaigning against us on the GST and free trade, they did not mince their words.

I am proud to be here to defend the former government's track record. I said so during my last speech and I am saying it again: I am prepared to defend our record before anyone from the current government and to show that the structural measures that we implemented at the time needed to be followed up with other measures. This government abdicated its responsibility to continue the work that had been started.

This government has no economic agenda and did not continue the reform undertaken. Sometimes, as members of parliament, we make speeches and we criticize the credibility of all politicians. I deplore this, because the vast majority of my colleagues are doing an excellent job. I am thinking, among others, of the hon. member for South Shore who works very hard for his area and for the whole country. Let me quote a line that is not from a member of this House.

Mr. Asper, the executive chairman of CanWest Global Communications and chairman of the board of Global Television Network, said to the minister, about the Canadian tax system, that it is a nightmare because of its complexity. That comment was not made 50 years ago. It was made on Wednesday, during a meeting of CEOs of the Business Council on National Issues. He said it this week.

This is not the member for Chicoutimi speaking, but Mr. Asper, who said that the Canadian tax system is a nightmare because of its complexity, that it is an ocean of uncertainty. He added that this system has an adverse effect on the business world, the private sector, entrepreneurship, and so on.

This means that the government is absolutely not carrying out its mandate. Instead of presenting these Soviet-style budgets over a five year period, the government should bring down one year budgets. Moreover, instead of meeting the needs of the provinces, the government spends its time quarrelling with them. We know the Prime Minister has been in politics for 30 or 35 years. Canadian federalism has been in trouble for 30 years now. We know why.

Mr. Speaker, you are a well informed man. You have followed politics over the last 30 years. Why did the sovereignist vote in

Quebec go from 15% to 49.4%? Is it the Progressive Conservative government's fault?

I cannot name all Canadians, because not all Canadians are responsible for the mess the Canadian federation is in, but I can name three, four, five or six members of the Liberal Party of Canada. If the country is in trouble, and I think the bad times are far from being over, it is because of the demagogic attitude of some politicians.

Instead of working toward reconciliation, they continue to play on concepts that will always be divisive.

• (1245)

They play on concepts like roots and founding nations of this country and they enjoy making political hay at the expense of 7 million French Canadians, particularly Quebecers, by passing divisive legislation. This will be at the back of the minds of French Canadians and of all Quebecers in the next referendum.

I have a few small things to ask this government. Instead of continuing to be divisive by alienating western Canada, and sometimes Quebec, and to govern with 37% or 38% of the votes, I am asking the government to give money back to the provinces so people can have surgery when they need it.

Is it too much to ask for the government to give back what provinces were getting in 1993 so that members of our families can get an operation elsewhere than in the United States? I think we can agree on that. Health is what is urgent. Let us give the funding back to provinces. Let us stop creating new programs.

Just think for a moment about home care: as far as running home care is concerned, my riding is far from Ottawa. If we want to work toward national reconciliation, can we give back to the various Canadian provinces the capacity to carry out the responsibilities they have under the constitution?

Let us talk about the millennium scholarship fund. A new program has been created, whereas, as we know perfectly well, that is not what was needed. The federal government does have to collect money, but it has to understand that people are sick and tired of paying.

People have accepted the GST and free trade. What irritates and disgusts them is that none of the money is coming back to them. On Friday night, the working father and mother want to see their work reflected on their pay check. They want to be able to support their family and to work for themselves, not for the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister. That is where the problem lies in Canada.

We should not be surprised if there are grumblings of discontent out west and in Quebec. Provincial premiers keep meeting, not to demand foolish things, but essential things for the future of each province in Canada.

*Government Orders*

What will make the Canadian federation perfect is the perfection and good performance of each provincial government. It is perfection of the sum of all the parts.

In pursuing its campaigns of provocation and harassment against the provinces, the current government, the Liberal Party of Canada, wants to continue to stay in power with 37% or 38% of the vote, or about a third of the vote. It is very important for this government to understand that on taxation people want to see and touch what belongs to them. They want the fruits of their labour to be given back to them.

People understand very well that our exports have been multiplied by 2.5 on the American market and that we are in a globalization period. They want the fruits of their labour back home in their families. They do not want the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister to manage surpluses for them.

I hear this every day from people in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean. Not one of my colleagues from the other provinces told me that Bill C-20 on clarity in a potential referendum was very important. However, what I hear is “Sir, is there a way to have money on our pay cheques? Is there a way for my parents not to have to wait four, six or eight months for surgery?”

What is happening in hospitals in the country makes no sense. We will have to wait months for the provinces to have the maximum budget to effectively manage health care. In the meantime, the federal government is creating new programs and squabbling. It occupies the premiers by letting them convene meetings, where they almost always end up asking the same thing “Will you give us the money that is rightfully ours?”

• (1250)

I am sorry but maybe what this country really needs is a true confederation, with people from the west, from Quebec, from the maritimes and from Ontario coming together. Certainly, through a redefinition of our respective roles, we would.

Members opposite do not stick to their role. They keep intruding into provincial jurisdictions. We should clearly redefine the roles. The federal government should stop piling up money at the expense of the provinces, of the citizens in Quebec and in the whole country.

I hope things will change in the next election. I know the members opposite are quite nervous. Support of 38% is a bit shaky. The 101 members from Ontario are concerned about their fate, and I can understand that.

[*English*]

**Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question for the member is on the point he made about the need for the provinces to have control over much of the programs. In effect what I hear him saying is that

the federal government should be nothing more than a cash cow for transfers money with absolutely no standards and no national requirements at all.

This country is a federation. The hon. member talked about confederation. While we all agree that the provinces have specific jurisdictions, it is important that we as a federal government remember that we believe Canadians have a right to the same quality and level of and same access to services wherever they may live in the country. Therefore we would like to see a strong federation with strong provinces, not a country that is really not a country at all but 10 nation-states doing their own thing whenever they feel like it. How does the hon. member see that unfolding?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question. Right now, there is no strength in the federation because the taxation system benefits the federal government. Instead of giving the provinces the tax resources they need through the transfer of tax points or otherwise, and instead of giving them the opportunity to carry out their responsibilities properly, it cuts left and right and intrudes everywhere.

The federal health act exists to protect universality. The government has to stop treating the provinces like big municipalities. This government treats the provinces and their premiers like children. It wants to see the provinces beg.

In my opinion, forcing the provinces to beg is not the best way to build a strong federation. The provinces do not have the budgets to carry out their responsibilities. The federal government grabs all the money and then haggles with the provinces on education, health services and the infrastructure programs. The federal government wants to do everything for the provinces and its spending power is out of control.

I believe that the only way to find a solution would be to hold negotiations according to the respective mandates of the provincial and federal governments. But I will not hold my breath. This has been going on for 30 years.

We all know what former Prime Minister Trudeau used to do with government members from Quebec. For 16 years, he won the elections by thumbing his nose at Quebecers. He was always speaking from both sides of his mouth. I think that the future of the Canadian federation should not be based on provocation or on the fact that the federal government sees itself as the father of all provinces, that it sees them as big municipalities. It is contemptuous.

I would not bet on the future of the Canadian federation if we go on with a government like this one, which does not respect provincial jurisdictions and forces the provinces to come begging to the Prime Minister of Canada.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Chicoutimi on his vision and I have a question for him.

Does he not think that a way to put an end to the abuse by the government opposite would be for the provinces themselves to be responsible for collecting both federal and provincial taxes?

• (1255)

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, I think the main problem lies in the attitude of the federal government.

I have an example of co-operative decentralized federalism. I recall, at the time of former Prime Minister Mulroney, that, in the negotiations on regional development plans, the provinces were held in the highest respect. At the time, it was a real partnership in both democratic and constitutional terms.

We will recall the Meech Lake accord. Was it scrapped by western Canadians? It took five or six Liberals, no more. Back in 1990, 92% of Canadians were in favour of reconciliation, control over federal spending and respect for the regions, particularly Quebec's cultural identity. It was a historic setback to the development of the country.

Both economically and constitutionally, I think it is through negotiation and mutual respect that people will arrive at a federation that could function effectively.

I repeat that the disaster of the failed Meech Lake accord, which was a landmark event, was due to four or five Liberals, not to all Canadians, and not even to Albertans or British Columbians. It took four or five Liberals, goaded on by a former prime minister and by the man who is now Prime Minister, to scrap the Meech Lake accord, which would have given us constitutional peace and would have freed us up to work on other more constructive things. If it had been signed at least it would not have been necessary to pass Bill C-20, which I think will remain in the back of the minds of all French Canadians and Quebecers.

I think that this will be a major weapon, should there one day be another referendum, to remind Quebecers that the federal government wanted to force them to stay in the Canadian federation. Force is not the way to keep someone in a family let alone seven million people in a country.

[*English*]

**Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill C-25 which is intended by the Minister of Finance to implement some of the changes in the most recent budget that have been spoken of in the House and reported in the press.

This most recent budget by the finance minister has received all kinds of accolades, pumped from the finance minister's office primarily. We have heard rhetoric about this budget and the changes that are going to be implemented giving Canadian taxpayers a break of about \$58.4 billion.

We want to do a reality check on that. As is so often the case Canadians are presented with certain optics from the Liberal government that sound right but when we start to analyze them and break them down to what they really mean, they do not affect the daily lives of Canadians who so desperately desire some relief from the burden of taxes the federal government continues to put on their backs. Let us break down this \$58.4 billion claim of tax relief.

About \$7.5 billion in the most recent budget is really a new social spending program. It is not tax relief at all. It is albeit increasing some of the child tax benefit but it does not impact the paycheque of a parent who has children at home. It is a spending program. It is not a tax relief program.

In addition there is a \$29.5 billion increase over the next five years, almost \$30 billion which will be taken out of the pockets of Canadians to increase the CPP premiums over the next five years. They are payroll taxes. Take that off the claim of \$58.4 billion.

Even more grievous and in a sense more deceiving to the Canadian public is that \$13.5 billion in scheduled tax hikes that have now been cancelled are included in the claims of tax relief. That is unbelievable. Is cancelling \$13.5 billion in scheduled tax hikes really a tax cut? The government says that it will tax us and then it tells us it will not and calls it a tax cut. That is nothing but a tax cut for suckers. Canadians are not going to fall for it.

• (1300)

When we net all this out, it leaves us with about \$7.9 billion in net tax relief spread over five years, which is about \$1.5 billion a year. What does that mean for us and families across this nation? For a taxpayer, that works out to about \$107 a year, \$8.97 a month or \$2 a week. That is the great lauded tax relief the finance minister delivered to Canadians in the last budget, which he wants us to implement with Bill C-25.

If \$2 a week is not a fake tax break, I do not know what is. Canadians are not being fooled by that. It is not the first time we have seen this kind of approach to tax relief. We have seen a litany of it year after year from the Liberal government and it is affecting Canada's international competitiveness.

More and more voices are saying that we are getting deeper and deeper into trouble and that it will be very difficult to catch up. This is not just my opinion. This is the opinion of financial experts working in the finance industry in Canada and abroad. CIBC Wood Gundy produced a report which said "From a tax competitiveness



*Government Orders*

standpoint, Canada ranks dead last in the G-7. While virtually every other G-7 economy lowered its personal tax burden over the last 15 years, Canada's rose sharply, both as a percentage of GDP and household income".

We are moving in the wrong direction. The Liberal government does not seem to get that through to the finance minister and the cabinet. It is so reluctant to let go of the tax dollars that it has grabbed onto over the last number of years since it was elected that we are having to pry the dollars loose through constant public pressure.

It is not just our party, the Canadian Alliance, although we have been leaders in this since we came into the House. The reason Canadians put us here was to voice their concerns and frustrations over the weight of a central government that is a tax and spend fanatic, a taxaholic.

Listen to the voice of one of the CEO's of a leading company right here in Ottawa, Nortel, which employs 12,000 employees. Its chief executive officer is Mr. John Roth. He had some interesting things to say about the Liberal government's approach. He said that the Liberal government was moving "way too slow" when it came to promises of lower taxes. He said that Canada still trails far behind the U.S. in providing an environment where companies can recruit and retain highly sought after talent, which is the most important aspect of companies in the Internet age. This man heads up a company that employs 12,000 people and he has said that the government is moving way too slow. We agree with him.

I hear some of the members opposite saying "Well, what about the lower and middle income Canadians who are under the tax burden of the government?". The differential between the Canadian marginal tax rate and the tax rate in the United States and in other countries is really highest at those low and middle income brackets.

This is what the CIBC study says, "Contrary to what most Canadians believe, the largest difference in tax burden in the two countries, Canada and the United States, is not at the top end of the income spectrum but in the middle band where most of the country's tax burden is carried. It is not that the rich do not pay enough, it is that the low and particularly the middle income earners pay far too much".

• (1305)

I have a chart in my hand that was prepared by this company. It clearly illustrates that if people are in an income bracket between \$30,000 and \$60,000 in Canada, they will pay a marginal rate of 40%. In the U.S. it is 26%. That is a difference of 14%. If they are in a higher income bracket in the United States, as opposed to Canada, the marginal difference is actually smaller. The Liberal government is hammering lower and middle income families with a high marginal tax rate. If Canadians are in a \$7,000 to \$30,000 income, the marginal tax rate is 25%. It is only 17% south of the

line. This is an 8% difference. Poor Canadian families pay more in Canada.

I am afraid that some of the members opposite have not really heard about what would bring about the revival we need in the corporate sector and the relief that low income and the working poor need from the high tax burden the government imposes on them. I will share with them the overall tax relief proposals that the Canadian Alliance has brought forward which has been endorsed by people right across the country.

What we are getting from the Liberal government is tinkering, tokenism, empty promises, window dressing and photo-ops of false, fake tax breaks that are making us nauseous on this side and frustrating Canadians. When are we going to stop and realize that taxing ourselves into oblivion and borrowing to a point where a third of every tax dollar goes to pay interest on the debt cannot continue? It has to stop. We have to turn it around. Alberta and Ontario have realized this. The two brightest lights on the economic stage in Canada right now are moving in a totally opposite direction to this Liberal government and it is working.

Prying those dollars from the hands of the tax and spendaholics across the way is a persistent challenge and one that the Canadian Alliance, and Reform Party before it, has championed on behalf of Canadians and will continue to do so.

I have some concerns with the amendments to Bill C-25 that the finance minister wants to put into the Income Tax Act. One of my frustrations is how complex the whole Income Tax Act, and all the things that go with it, is becoming. That is why we put forward a simplified tax plan that gives real tax relief.

The current federal tax code has grown from a simple 47 page document, at the end of World War II, to thousands of pages of special instructions, schedules and interpretations. The Canadian Income Tax Act fills more than 1,400 pages with another 700 pages of rules and regulations. The bureaucracy to collect taxes has grown to the point where almost 45,000 people are now employed by the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, formerly Revenue Canada. It is the only federal department that continues to add people to its staff. The whole armed forces, the navy, the air force and the army, only has 60,000 people. We literally have an army of tax collectors and bureaucrats in the country just to administer the taxes. It is getting way to big.

The C.D. Howe did a study on this and said:

Canada's Income Tax Act is no longer only about tax policy. Social policy has become an increasing integral part. Whatever the merits of that side of the Act, social policy considerations have crowded out legitimate tax policy objectives.

• (1310)

It costs a lot of money to collect the taxes in this country. Today we are talking about Bill C-25 which will add more tinkering and

*Government Orders*

tokenism and new layers of complexity to an act that is already too complex. That is why we have come forward with a simple, fair, single rate taxation solution.

It is time to significantly lower taxes for all Canadians and to reduce the cost of collecting those taxes. Our solution 17, as it has come to be known, has been endorsed by experts in the field. Some experts have said that it is a very good plan and that it is an approach to taxation that is easy to understand, fair and costs less to administer. Would that not be a breath of fresh air in a country that is so laden with tax complexity that more and more people have to take their taxes to a tax accountant and pay money to do that? I once read that it costs upwards of \$12 billion in overall human cost just to prepare the taxes. If we were to put a dollar figure on all the hours that Canadians put into filing their income tax and paying chartered accountants and others to do the work, it becomes very expensive to complete our taxes in this country.

Let me quote from the WEFA Inc. Group, which does economic forecasting. The finance minister even consulted with this group and prior to his budget. In talking about the tax reduction proposals that the Canadian Alliance put forward, the WEFA group says "They are well focused on the needs of Canadians today. They expand the economy and, most powerfully, personal disposable income, consumption and our standards of living". It also says that our tax proposals create jobs by lowering the marginal tax rates that are particularly effective in stimulating work effort and stemming the brain drain and other productivity enhancing features by powerfully reducing the level of personal income tax, particularly for Canadians of average and above average income, and are well directed at providing a more competitive tax environment in Canada relative to the U.S.

If I go back, that sounds a lot like what Mr. Roth, the chief of Nortel, said. He said that these are the kinds of changes we need, not at a snail's pace and not for photo-ops, but before we are so far behind that we cannot catch up.

The other aspect of solution 17, our simple and fair proposal that has been endorsed by the WEFA group and others, is that it addresses the need to take the working poor off the tax rolls. Why are we taking money away from working poor families in the form of taxes and then having them apply for some government program and go through whatever hoops are put in place and hopefully, some day after the kids have had to go through whatever stress the family has had, there might be a cheque that will trickle down from the big mother Liberal government to the family? That is the wrong way to go. The working poor should not be required to pay taxes. The federal government currently takes \$6 billion in taxes from people who make less than \$20,000 a year. It is shameful. It is picking the pockets of the poor.

Why do we tax people with low incomes? The government should not be taking the limited resources of the working poor.

Some of the key aspects of our package are that we would increase the basic deduction from what it is now, which is around \$6,000 or \$7,000, up to a clear \$10,000 basic deduction. People would not pay any tax on the first \$10,000 earned. That seems abundantly reasonable.

In addition, instead of saying to the stay at home spouse or the spouse who is not working in the workforce that they are somehow of less value when they contribute by caring for the family, we would give them an equal deduction, the same deduction as someone who is employed in the workforce. That is a \$10,000 deduction for the spouse. In addition, many working poor families have children. They are contributing greatly to the long term health of our nation by rearing the next generation, imparting character and caring for them.

● (1315)

That is why the Canadian Alliance has approved a plan that gives a straight basic \$3,000 deduction for every child in a family. They do not have to keep receipts. We do not care how they choose to rear them, whether they use a relative, a friend, an institutional day care, or whatever their need may be. Because they are rearing children we recognize that they are making a social contribution and therefore a basic \$3,000 universal deduction for every child would be extended to the parents.

We suggest a simple 17% marginal federal tax rate. The lowest rate that is available today would be available to all. In that way we would increase the deductions and exemptions so that lower income families and individuals are moved from the tax rolls. Some 1.9 million Canadians who are currently paying taxes would no longer have to pay tax. When they do pay tax they would pay at the lowest possible rate.

It is simple, straightforward and beneficial to families, yet the Liberal government cannot see it. According to the C.D. Howe Institute, current Canadian tax policy affords no universal recognition of children. In effect, it treats children in middle income or high income families like consumer spending, as if parents have no legal or moral obligation to spend money on their care. Those are not my words. Those are the words of the C.D. Howe Institute.

There is much that is grievous about the budget. In closing I point out that Canadians are willing to pay a certain portion of their taxes. They understand that they have to contribute to government for the benefit of our country. I do not think they mind doing it, but when taxes get so high that they can hardly breathe from the weight of it they get concerned.

Another concern is that in the budget the finance minister is proposing to give another \$1.9 billion for grants and contributions administered by HRDC. Billions of dollars will go to HRDC, the same department which an audit has shown that for 15% of the grant applications there was nothing on file. There was no descrip-

*Government Orders*

tion of the activities. There were no results described as to the outcome. There is a lot of waste in that department. It is a tragedy.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague was in the middle of explaining some important points and I would like him to finish them.

**Mr. Eric Lowther:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interest of the hon. member for Calgary East. He is a very honourable member. I want to drive home a point that I did not quite finish.

How in the world can we be giving another \$1 billion and more to the HRDC department that has been clearly shown by an audit funded by public money is totally out of control? For example, McGill University submitted a proposal for \$60,000 to HRDC. It received \$160,000. When the audit examined the claims it should have received only \$30,000.

• (1320)

A litany of these kinds of stories have been exposed by the audits. Did that stop the Minister of Finance from giving more money to that department? No, it did not. Yes, I will pay my taxes, but please do not send them to Ottawa to flush it away in a vote buying program.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during his speech the hon. member talked about the comparative tax regimes in Canada and the United States. I was not going to speak, but I need to raise with the House some facts of which the hon. member maybe is not aware.

He talked about a marginal rate of 46% in Canada for taxpayers with income between the levels of roughly \$30,000 and \$60,000. The member is quite right that there is a federal tax rate of 26%. Taking a notional average of 50%, being the provincial income tax rate on the federal amounts payable, it grosses that up by another 50% to about 39%. So 40% is a good estimate of the marginal tax rate. However, marginal is the rate paid on each additional dollar. For the person at that same level of income, his or her average tax would be much lower because the marginal rate on the first \$30,000 was only 26%.

I raise this issue because the member said that the comparative in the U.S. was 26% for the same income range. He has fundamentally missed a large portion of the U.S. burden in two instances. The first is that he did not take into account that there is also a separate state tax return required to be filed by people in the United States.

In Canada, except for in the province of Quebec, federal and provincial taxes are collected by the federal government. The hon. member's numbers for Canada reflect both the federal and

provincial components. The hon. member's number for the U.S., the 26% figure, represents only the federal tax component. He has left out state taxes and he is in error. I wanted to be sure the hon. member knew that and that Canadians knew that the member was fundamentally wrong in his facts.

Second, the hon. member did not take into account that Canadians pay for their health care system through their taxes. In the United States that is not the case. In fact, the last time I visited the United States and talked to legislators there, the average cost for a family of four for health care was about \$7,000 a year. This is an important reconciling item between the tax burdens in Canada and the U.S.

Finally, to wrap up, the hon. member talked about the Canada child tax benefit. He concluded that was not any increase in net take home pay. He is absolutely right because the Canada child tax benefit is not a taxable item. When it used to be the family allowance, it was included in the taxes. Exemptions were given for children and a bit of tax was paid on that benefit. When the whole system was taken outside the Income Tax Act, 80% of Canadian children received the Canada child tax benefit. It is not taxable and it does improve the amount of money in the pockets of Canadians.

I raise these three issues to demonstrate that the arguments the hon. member posed to the House and to all Canadians is underpinned by facts which are ultimately wrong.

**Mr. Eric Lowther:** Mr. Speaker, we have just seen a demonstration of the Liberal approach to dealing with facts. They throw up a smokescreen and try to undermine the facts I presented to the House. The member opposite accused me of misrepresenting the information in the marginal tax rates between Canada and the U.S.

I draw the member's attention to the fact that I was quoting from a CIBC-Wood Gundy report which very clearly stated a comparison of marginal tax rates of federal and provincial and states in the U.S. It has combined both the federal and the state tax rates. He stated that it did not do that, but it is exactly what the chart shows. If CIBC and Wood Gundy are misrepresenting the facts then maybe he would like to take it up with them. It clearly shows that the marginal tax rate between \$30,000 and \$60,000 for a Canadian is 40% and in the U.S. it is 26%.

• (1325)

This report accurately represents the state and the situation between Canada and the U.S. He has accused me that it has not. He should apologize. When we bring facts to the House, they try to undermine the facts—

**Mr. Paul Szabo:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The member has accused me of giving incorrect information.

*Government Orders*

**The Deputy Speaker:** We all have trouble sometimes with these kinds of allegations that fly around the House. The Speaker is cognizant of the fact that sometimes members disagree profoundly. For example, today during question period we heard the premise of a question disagreed with and the premise of the answer disagreed with on different occasions. This is not uncommon and we will have to sit here and listen to that kind of thing because members do sometimes disagree about facts. Their interpretations of them are different, or the views they take of them are different, or the facts they look at are selected and perhaps are not the same as the ones selected by someone on the other side.

**Mr. Eric Lowther:** I appreciate that ruling. I offer to the member opposite that I would table the facts that I presented in the House and he could review them at his leisure because I am confident of what I have presented.

In his second point he was singing the praises of the Canada child tax benefit. Our budget solution 17, our proposed solution to the burden the government has put on taxpayers, is not to cut it or remove it in any way. Our proposals are consistent with what the finance committee has heard from Canadians from coast to coast, to give a universal tax deduction for children to every parent for which they do not need to keep receipts and all the rest.

The government approach is to take the money away from poor families, funnel it into the bureaucracy and a year later send cheques to the families after they have had to pay for groceries, shoes, clothes and everything else. A year later here comes the cheque from the big state.

C.D. Howe pointed out that of \$1.40 that goes into the bureaucracy, a dollar in benefit comes out. Continuing to pour money into the child tax benefit program on and on has become a bureaucracy benefit more than it has become a child benefit. Why does the government not just do what Canadians have been saying to do: leave the money in the pockets of taxpayers by giving a basic tax deduction. If families need help beyond that, the child benefit can be there for that purpose. But why does the government not just stop taking it away so people will have it in their cheques in the month they earn it.

**Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I was asking a question about Stockwell Day earlier today. He is advocating a system where the federal government collects no taxes, none at all, and the provinces collect taxes and give a cheque once a year to the federal government. It was an idea rejected by the Americans in 1776. I wonder if our friend across the way endorses the vision of federalism in a country by Stockwell Day where the federal government collects no taxes, none at all, and the provinces do that and send a cheque to Ottawa.

It is rather bizarre. I know a lot of Reformers are hanging their heads in shame. I wonder if he is part of that group.

**Mr. Eric Lowther:** Mr. Speaker, I am so glad the hon. member is taking an interest in the Canadian Alliance policy. He would be wise to study the policy of the Canadian Alliance because like many other Canadians the lights may come on for the member. Who knows. Let us not give up hope.

The member will not find the statements to which he is referring in the Canadian Alliance policy. Why did that person make those statements? Let us think about it. He is the treasurer of one of the brightest lights in the country, Alberta. He is so frustrated because he could do so much within the province of Alberta but it is the weight of the federal government that limits the success of that province, the same problem that Ontario is having. I would suggest if the hon. member asked that same question of the Treasurer of Ontario, he would probably share some of the same sentiments as Mr. Day because he is so frustrated that the problem is here, across the way. He is so frustrated that he is willing to lay down his high position in Alberta to run for the head of the Canadian Alliance to see if something can be done.

• (1330)

I would suggest that the hon. member study that policy and maybe some day the lights will come on for him as well.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### MODERNIZATION OF BENEFITS AND OBLIGATIONS ACT

BILL C-23—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the report stage and the third reading stage of Bill C-23, an act to modernize the Statutes of Canada in relation to benefits and obligations.

Under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice that a minister of the crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stages.

**Some hon. members:** Shame, shame.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

**Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-206, an act to amend the Access to Information Act and to make amendments to others acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to rise and to speak to this, my private member's bill to reform the Access to Information Act. The bill has a very long history and it has been quite a struggle to get it to this point where it is being debated before the House.

I believe that Bill C-206 is legislation that has the potential of dramatically changing how government operates. Indeed, I believe Bill C-206, because of the new standards of transparency it would bring to government operations, could put Canada in the forefront of not only transparency, but in the forefront of the efficiency of the delivery of government services and, if you will, the spending of taxpayers' money.

The world has changed since the Access to Information Act was first introduced 17 years ago. It has changed in the sense that we now have the Internet, we now have different procedures of accounting and we now have the potential of putting documents that are generated by the government on the Internet for the entire world to see almost as soon as they are generated.

In order to take advantage of that potential we will have to modernize the Access to Information Act which, at the time it came in, was very, very good legislation, but over time has become more and more an instrument to retain government documents rather than to open government documents.

I became interested in this issue as soon as I became elected for the first time in 1993, and in 1994 and 1995 pressed the Department of Justice and the then justice minister to make reforms to the Access to Information Act.

Despite the various recommendations I made, those reforms were not forthcoming, and I soon came to realize that it was not the lack of will on the part of the justice minister of the day. The problem was that freedom of information, if you will, is something that affects every government ministry. Unfortunately, all government legislation emanates from the Department of Justice. That is not bad in itself, but the Department of Justice of course, because it is composed primarily of lawyers, would tend to opt for withholding information or protecting information rather than discovering ways of openness.

### *Private Members' Business*

Moreover, I realized that in legislation like this it would be impossible to get consensus across all the government departments. Can hon. members imagine, even from the Department of Justice, trying to get the approval for various prospects of change in the Access to Information Act? We would have to consult every government ministry, and not only would we have to consult with the deputy ministers, we would have to consult the ministers themselves. So I realized that the real reason why there would be no progress in reforming the Access to Information Act was the simple reality that it was almost impossible to do it with the kind of consensus that the bureaucracies normally operate when they develop legislation. Therefore, I undertook to write it myself.

• (1335)

I hired legislative counsel and we sat down together in my office at my desk. Side by side we went through the existing legislation and made the changes.

There has been some criticism to the effect that legislation of this importance should not be developed from Private Members' Business. The argument is that this should be put out in a forum, debated, there should be committees struck and so on and so forth, and another consensus developed. Indeed the current access to information commissioner has suggested just that. I think the justice minister at one point in time suggested that perhaps there has to be another round table to examine the reforms to the current Access to Information Act.

In making the reforms that I did make that are in the bill, what I relied upon was the recommendations that emanated in the 1993-94 reports of the then information commissioner who had more than a decade with the act. He also derived his recommendations from another parliamentary committee that studied reforming the act.

In other words, the recommendations that we see in this bill, the changes, the amendments that we see in the bill before us are actually derived for the most part from 10 to 12 years of consultation with the stakeholders, by not only previous MPs but by the access to information commissioner of longstanding, Mr. John Grace.

What we find in this bill are things that are directly from the recommendations made by these groups. That involves, to summarize, things like opening up crown corporations because of course crown corporations use the taxpayers' money and they should be subject to the same amount of transparency as exists with government departments, opening up opinion polls and opening up, which is quite controversial, some of the contractual arrangements between third parties. There is a great concern that when the government enters into negotiations or bidding contracts with private enterprise, it is sometimes in the public interest to know the details of those various proposals.

One of the things that I introduced, as my own contribution to the bill, is that all government documents more than 30 years old

*Private Members' Business*

should be automatically released unless there is a very apparent threat to national security or public safety. That actually conforms to something that was done not too long ago in the United States.

One of the most dramatic changes in the legislation that is before the House now is the total elimination of schedule II. Schedule II in the old act is a list of exemptions. It started out with five or six when the act was first passed and it has since grown to 42 exemptions from the scrutiny by the Access to Information Act. One of my amendments eliminates that schedule II entirely.

What that means is that every piece of legislation, like the Income Tax Act or any other legislation that has a section protecting information, that section has to be subject to the test of the Access to Information Act, the changed Access to Information Act. When I came to examine how to change the act, one of the things I tried to do was to develop a theme that runs through the act that gives the public service guidance in what to open and what to close.

That theme is that information should be only withheld if there genuinely is a concern with respect to the national interest, public safety or public security. There is an injury test that runs right through the changes that we see before us.

This is all dramatic stuff. In making changes like that, I had to consider how I could possibly bring it forward. The tradition of freedom of information legislation around the world is that it is very difficult to get it through legislatures because there is so much self-interest by some government departments and by some ministers perhaps. It is always difficult to overcome the political hurdles to move this kind of legislation forward. Actually, the word is fear. While we all speak of transparency, while we all speak of openness, while we all love to speak about these words as politicians, in fact though, even we as MPs sometimes are fearful about seeing everything we do open to the public. I believe improperly so because in the end transparency is good for everyone. Nevertheless, there is fear.

• (1340)

My first problem to advance this as private member's legislation was how to force my own government, the cabinet and the executive branch of my party to take this legislation seriously, to not discard it and to not turn away from it.

Therefore, the very first amendment in Bill C-206 is to change the name from the Access to Information Act to the open government act. How can any politician turn his or her back on legislation that calls for transparency and puts transparency in the very title?

The next amendment establishes the theme which is in the interests of government efficiency so the people can see how

taxpayer money is spent. The government should try to opt for openness wherever possible.

The default mode of the current Access to Information Act is to withhold. The default mode in my open government act is to disclose, the idea being if in doubt, the bureaucrat should release the information, not withhold it. This theme I hope runs right through it.

What is being called for is a change in cultural attitude in the bureaucracy and in the executive leadership of the government. We should be always thinking in terms of what we can disclose, not in terms of what we can withhold. Openness is a kind of contract. One cannot take the position that everything must be open because the government has to operate. The government has to have necessary secrets.

When I came to look at all these amendments, and I think there are some 42 amendments to the Access to Information Act, I tried to pay attention to the needs of government to function. I tried to make sure that the provisions as to why a document should be withheld were very, very clear. Consequently, members will see, for example, concepts like certain documents can be withheld if it is in the government's monetary interest or if it is in the interest of public safety or cabinet function. So it goes.

In the end, the government can pass whatever kind of legislation it wants, but if we do not have broad agreement from those who are going to be affected by the legislation, the legislation is not going to work.

I must tell you right at the outset that, while I enjoy tremendous support from the backbenchers here, there is no guarantee that the frontbenchers of my own side are in favour of this legislation. I am sure some are, I am sure some are not.

So the evolution of this bill is going to be the debate in this Chamber. Even more important, because it can be stretched out over a longer period and can be gotten into in greater depth, will be the time that this bill will spend in committee.

Just to go a little further, having presented the bill with all these changes and in particular the change to the open government act at first reading, I still had the dilemma of how to move it forward. Then, as chance would have it, there was a change in the standing orders to the effect that if one could get a hundred seconders to a private member's bill, that bill could bypass the lottery.

I think I am probably the first person to take advantage of the rule change and I did get a hundred seconders for the bill to bypass the lottery. Those seconders, I should say, were principally from my own side, of course, and as required by the rule change, from at least two opposition parties. At that time, the seconders were from the Reform Party and the Bloc Québécois.

*Private Members' Business*

• (1345)

Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a doubt about the utility of that change in the standing orders, I can tell you that when I had those 100 signatures, then everyone paid attention to Bill C-206, which was then Bill C-264 but is Bill C-206 now.

Then I had representations coming from the bureaucracy. I had Statistics Canada wanting to visit to explain why it needed a special exemption. I had the justice department come forward to make some very, very helpful suggestions. I had representations from the privy council office. They wanted to get in on it as well.

The reason that I suddenly got this serious attention from the bureaucracy was that the 100 seconders meant that this bill had a very, very high chance of going forward.

I took advantage of the advice I got at that time, and it got me into trouble in the end, I have to say, but I did take advantage of it because some of the advice was very good in my eyes. I thought it would solve the problem of the debate, when the bill finally got to committee, being derailed toward avenues which were not constructive.

I will give an example of one of the changes that was proposed. In my original legislation, Bill C-264, at first reading I proposed opening up the House of Commons and the Senate; everything that you, Mr. Speaker, might have, financial records and that kind of thing. The justice department people pointed out to me that I probably stood a good chance of losing the entire support of all my backbench MPs because the way I phrased that particular clause would have opened up the private files of individual members.

So one of the changes I made as a result was to eliminate that particular clause from the original version of the bill and transfer it, as you will see, into an amendment to the Parliament of Canada Act, which basically applies, thereby, only to the financial records of the House of Commons and the Senate, but not to the private records of members of parliament.

That kind of change I thought was in my interests and in the interests of the House of Commons, to change if I could, by unanimous consent, which I brought forward in June of 1997, and I did get unanimous consent to make that change. There was another change with respect to cabinet confidences. I can explain that in further detail either now or at another time.

The change that caused all the controversy, which I did not think was a very important change at all, was a change that gave the government the clear option of withholding documents if they were planning documents pertaining to the possibility of the secession of a province.

Much to my surprise, the Reform Party challenged that particular change on a point of privilege and required me to get all my 100 signatures again. I did get those signatures, but the sad part of that challenge, and I think it is a basic misunderstanding, is that particular change only reflected what already exists. It reflects what exists in the Quebec freedom of information law, because the Quebec legislation has similar protections for that kind of thing.

I thought I was doing something that was a mild change, but unfortunately, I feel that it was misunderstood by the Reform Party and probably, to a certain degree, poisoned my relations—or this bill's relations—with the Bloc Quebecois.

I am hoping as the debate goes on that the Bloc Quebecois will see that this change did not materially affect the legislation, it is not unreasonable, and that they will come back outside and examine this bill, Bill C-206, for the merits it really has, because I would really like to see broad support, not just two parties or three parties, I would like to see all five parties in the House, the backbench MPs here and all the opposition MPs—reasonably all the opposition MPs—get behind this legislation and make whatever changes are necessary to make it workable.

There are problems in the legislation. It is not perfect. There are areas that have to be developed and examined in committee. There may be some questions about whether I went too far in my changes to cabinet confidences. There has been some concern about giving the department the power to refuse frivolous requests. That was a proposal from the access commissioner.

• (1350)

Some concern has been expressed about forcing people who constantly use the service to pay a certain portion. The people who use the access to information law, or the open government law, when they use it for private or personal gain, for profit, my bill provides that they receive a certain charge for service, whereas people who use the open government legislation in the public interest would be charged nothing at all. There would be no user fee whatsoever. These are things that have to be clarified and debated.

Probably one of the most contentious things that I would like to see the committee examine is the clause dealing with solicitor-client privilege. As recommended by the access to information commissioner, in my original version of this bill I eliminated the exemption for solicitor-client privilege. I put it back in the new version. I am not sure that was a good idea. This is what my colleagues have to examine.

I have tried to do something that I think is in the interests of all Canadians and in the interest of government. If this legislation goes through, with whatever amendments we agree upon, in the end we will have the best freedom of information legislation in the world. I have compared this with the freedom of information legislation in

*Private Members' Business*

the United States and we would be miles ahead. If we are ahead, the government will be miles ahead because transparency leads to accountability and accountability leads to efficiency.

**Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the people of Surrey Central to speak to Bill C-206, an act to amend the Access to Information Act.

I listened very carefully to the hon. member and I found his comments surprising. On the one hand we can appreciate the efforts of the hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington, and on the other hand he clearly recognizes his government's dismal failure to provide timely and accurate responses to access to information requests. This weak Liberal government has an abysmal record when it comes to responding to ATI requests.

Last Tuesday the Canadian Alliance put forward a good and timely supply day motion. We asked for an order of the House that all departmental audit reports be tabled within 30 days of their completion and permanently referred to the appropriate standing committee. We asked that the audit reports since January 1, 1999 be tabled within 30 days after the adoption of our motion and that all audit reports requested under the Access to Information Act be tabled forthwith. We have since found out that the government has been less than forthcoming with respect to reporting and providing information to Canadians on how their tax dollars are spent.

Our supply day motion simply asked this weak, arrogant Liberal government to reaffirm its own regulations made by treasury board and the privy council. That day the hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington spoke against our motion. I have mixed feelings. On the one hand the member wants to do something about the Access to Information Act to speed up the release of information, but on the other hand he spoke against our motion.

This bill was originally introduced as Bill C-268 on October 23, 1997. As we know, it is a votable bill.

• (1355)

The hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington received the necessary 100 signatures of MPs for the bill so that it could be given priority on the order paper. Opposition members on this side of the House signed the bill because we feel that the ATI stonewalling by his own government is an attack on democracy.

Opposition members will do anything to force this weak government to hand over information that the public wants to know, and in fact has a right to know. It is the information on the spending of our hard-earned tax dollars that the government tries to hide by delaying and refusing to respond to ATI requests.

In June 1998 the member got the unanimous consent of the House to change the text of the bill, and the bill was re-introduced as Bill C-206, which we are debating today. We knew that the 100 signatures would be allowed to continue to apply to the bill, even though the bill had changed, so the deputy whip of the official opposition objected to that by raising a question of privilege. The ruling on that question of privilege saw the bill dropped to the bottom on the order paper.

Then the bill needed to have another 100 signatures and, with the co-operation of his colleagues on the Liberal side, the member got those 100 signatures twice, which was amazing.

The question is whether cabinet is hiding information so that it will not be released through ATI requests. We cannot understand, with the way this government is behaving, how it will withhold information when the hon. member is enlisting those members to sign his bill. The member, who is pursuing this bill because he could not get his cabinet buddies to listen to him, has now had the bill reinstated in its position of priority. Maybe the cabinet does not disapprove of the bill. We do not know. Maybe it is hiding behind the member's bill so that it does not have to take measures to strengthen our ATI legislation and system.

Canadians know that we cannot trust this government, and Canadians do not trust the Mulroney Tories either. Canadians now have an alternative in the Canadian Alliance and I am sure that we will test the waters at the next federal election.

The bill has a chequered past. It raises concerns and suspicions about who should change the ATI law. This weak Liberal government has lacked vision and now it should provide a transparent system for the changing of our ATI law. The ATI system needs to be kept up to date and constantly corrected with other housekeeping adjustments, but the Liberals do not want to do anything about it. "If the ATI system is broken, that is good. Don't fix it". That is their attitude.

To break the suspense, the people of Surrey Central will not be supporting this bill. Instead, we urge the hon. Liberal member to visit or perhaps revisit his cabinet colleagues and tell them to get going on changes to the ATI.

There are about 40 changes to the ATI act proposed in this bill. For the information of the House and the people watching, the act is 18 years old. It needs to be modernized, redefined, refined and amended. The current information commissioner has expressed concern over amending this most public of our laws with a private member's bill. I wonder if the government is so weak that it cannot even fix it.

Today we have a lonely Liberal member of parliament trying to make up for his government's billion dollar boondoggle, corruption and mismanagement. This bill is in fact regressive. It limits the



ability to access certain types of information and extends timeframes on access to certain information. Is the Liberal member of parliament unaware that his government lags behind, drags its feet and is late on the timeframe that already exists?

• (1400)

One of the most glaring drawbacks and concerns with the bill is that it proposes to exclude access to what it calls frivolous and abusive users of ATI. Who decides that? Who determines when too many ATI requests come from a certain specific source? Who decides what information is not important enough to send to Canadians? What criteria will cabinet apply to this provision in the bill?

Another thing is the fees. The bill proposes to charge a higher fee to those people who frequently use the ATI system. There are two standards here. This is so undemocratic that it is anti-democratic.

The government would be pleased if this bill passed. It could then control the ATI system, discriminate against certain users by monetarily penalizing them for the information they requested. Is this a new tax? The government loves to increase taxes because it thinks they are the best thing in the world.

The bill does not alter the government's ability to exempt and exclude certain files from access by specific sources. There is a section that allows the government to deny access if it would harm national unity. No wonder there were no amendments put forward by Bloc members. The revised bill also says that records injurious to the constitutional integrity of Canada can be kept secret for 30 years. That is the kind of information in the bill.

I would like to say that the people of Surrey Central and many members in the House cannot be fooled by this bill. We will not be supporting it.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC):** Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to address Bill C-206, an act to amend the Access to Information Act.

The bill seeks to amend the act by defining more precisely what records held by the government are to be disclosed and by providing more severe penalties for those who would wilfully circumvent the intent of this legislation.

Before I proceed any further, the PC Party will support the bill at second reading with the hope that further improvement may be made at the committee stage.

As background, the Access to Information Act was adopted in 1982. The act gives Canadians a right to access to information held by federal government departments and its many agencies. It is an important tool for a number of reasons, not the least of which is maintaining public accountability within the federal government.

### *Private Members' Business*

While the Access to Information Act is a useful and necessary tool that Canadians have at their disposal to ensure government transparency, it is clear to most of us that the Access to Information Act is an outdated piece of legislation. Dating back to the early 1980s, this act has yet to be revised to improve upon its current protections and to accommodate the changing needs and demands of changing times.

This has not been for lack of effort. It is important to note that a number of our colleagues have recognized the pressing need to revamp the act. As such they have proposed their own bills toward this end. One of these bills was brought forth by the member for Nanaimo—Alberni in 1998. As expected, it was voted down by the Liberal majority in the House.

Today we are presented with the most recent attempt to amend the Access to Information Act. I commend the member for Wentworth—Burlington for his initiative in this file. I am hopeful that his colleague will see the wisdom in allowing the bill to pass this stage.

• (1405)

My party has always favoured increased openness and transparency in government because openness and transparency combine to form one of the fundamental tenets of an effective representative government in Canada. They also serve to encourage faith and trust in government, something that is sorely missing from the Canadian political landscape today.

The Progressive Conservative Party is committed to the principles of openness and transparency and has continued to aggressively pursue all reasonable means by which to increase government accountability to Canadians. It was our current leader's government in 1979 that first introduced freedom of information legislation.

Bill C-206 addresses many of the concerns of the Progressive Conservative Party with regard to government transparency. The bill represents a positive step toward eliminating the kind of abusive government Canadians have witnessed under the present regime.

This government's "business as usual" attitude and "behind closed doors" mentality have proven to be destructive on many counts. First, and most obvious, we saw that under the current Access to Information Act the Liberal government almost got away with what is perhaps the most scandalous abuse of government power recorded in the history of our country.

The Liberal government's billion dollar fiasco in HRDC not only points to the party's misuse and mismanagement of public funds, but it also uncovers innumerable counts of unethical use of taxpayers' dollars to buy electoral support. Were it not for a mistake on the part of HRDC in submitting a report to my

*Private Members' Business*

colleague from Madawaska—Restigouche, a mistake that we are all thankful he was able to catch, Canadians may not ever have learned of this devastating scandal.

Second, this “we know what is best for you” attitude has resulted in a further alienated, disgusted and cynical population at a time when the government should be doing its utmost to encourage interest in governmental affairs and at a time when public discourse is becoming increasingly distant from Canadians. We need to reverse the damage that the Liberal government has done to the morale of all Canadians and to their trust in the federal government and its agencies.

This is what we need to redress and this is precisely what Bill C-206 seeks to do. Bill C-206 aims to ensure that Canadians have access to the activities, decisions and, more importantly, actions of our governments. This is desirable and it is with enthusiasm that I support the principles and the basic tenets of Bill C-206.

I have a number of particular concerns with this bill that I will outline in brief. First, one of the most questionable parts of the bill seeks to prohibit access to information users who make, and I quote from the bill, “frivolous and abusive requests”.

While on the surface this may seem like a good idea, one that would ensure that users cannot take advantage of the information request mechanism, I am concerned because of the lack of definition as to how the acceptability or admissibility of a request for information would be gauged under this provision. This concerns me because of the subjectivity involved in evaluating requests for information.

I believe that I speak unopposed when I say that in the spirit of fairness and equity, objective measures are usually more favourable than subjective measures. Of course, we should strive for fairness and equity in everything we do. Perhaps we can consider this matter further at a later date should this bill reach the next stage of the process. For now, I am satisfied to have recorded this concern.

I realize that my time may be nearing an end, Mr. Speaker, which is why I will mention only one more concern with this bill. While the previous concern I cited was rather minimal, this one is gravely serious in comparison.

As I understand it, the intent of this legislation is to provide Canadians with increased access to the federal government and to its decision-makers. I support this and I cannot agree any more than I already have with this objective. However, I am concerned because in this bill's earlier life the member proposed a provision to include cabinet confidences, for instance, minutes of meetings, under the Access to Information Act. He proposed releasing them after 15 years. Now, in its revised form, Bill C-206 holds true to the position of the government that cabinet confidences may be

excluded from the public domain for 20 years, not 15 as the member had originally intended.

If we are really going to commit to opening the government and to allowing Canadians greater access to decisions of government, then why not release cabinet confidences after 15 years? While I have yet to decide what time period would be most favourable for the release of these and other such documents, I do believe that this matter should be open to discussion and to careful consideration at committee.

• (1410)

Therefore, I will close by offering my support for Bill C-206 at the second reading with the hope that my colleagues will allow the bill the proper scrutiny and discussion it merits in committee. Matters such as the ones I have discussed very briefly, the subjective matter of some of the bill's provisions, along with what I will simply call a question mark on the question of cabinet confidences warrant careful consideration at the committee level.

In principle the bill represents a strong step toward winning back the trust of Canadians. If my colleagues are genuine in claiming to want Canadians to trust the federal government again, if they really want Canadians to rediscover their faith in government, then they will allow the bill to proceed to the committee stage for intense scrutiny and close analysis of both its merits and shortcomings.

I urge the House to vote in favour of Bill C-206 at this stage. I have a supplemental in closing. I think it is important to outline some of the chronology of the Access to Information Act, where exactly it came from and what governments introduced it. It comes as no surprise to anyone in the House that the champion of the public right to access government information was the late Ged Baldwin, a Tory member of parliament from Peace River. The first government to introduce the access to information bill was that of the Right Hon. Joe Clark. The Liberal government is now afraid to strengthen the law or to modernize it.

Therefore, the members of the House must seize any opportunity to open up the law so it can be strengthened and modernized. The HRDC scandal is only one example of why we need to strengthen the law. We need to prevent ministers from manipulating the process. We need to use this bill as a starting point to work with the commissioner to ensure a strong law. The information commissioner stated in his last report and at the HRDC committee that the government's record system is in chaos. That is all the more reason why we need a strong access to information law to protect citizens and certainly to protect their dollars.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to participate in the debate on Bill C-206, an act to amend the Access to Information Act, by the member for Wentworth—Burlington.

*Private Members' Business*

I am very honoured to have seconded the bill as well. I have had the opportunity to work with members on both sides of the House on a variety of legislation. In this particular instance, however, it is indeed a particular honour to associate myself with the bill, Bill C-206, of the member for Wentworth—Burlington. The reason is that I know the member very well.

I came to this place in 1993 with the member. I have watched his work, he has watched my work and we have collaborated on a number of things. I have great admiration for his work. He has been one of the champions of openness, transparency and accountability in this place. He has been a voice in the wilderness at times, calling out and seeking to find ways in which governments can demonstrate more fully that the principles of fairness and equity, of openness, transparency and accountability are hallmarks in all that we do in every aspect of our job.

It is only when Canadians believe that everything that we do in this place, every decision that we make, every action that we take is on behalf of Canadians and that we have nothing to fear and nothing to hide. In fact it is in our best interest that Canadians are better informed about what it costs to run a government, about the kinds of things that we invest and spend in, about the nature of the decisions and the rationale and the things that Canadians need to know so that they can continue to have confidence in their legislators and indeed in their government.

When we get information, I think it is human nature for us all to consider the source of the information. It is that source of the information that we look to for a degree of credibility. I feel so very strongly about this bill because of where it came from. It is a private member's bill. It comes from a member who has spent the better part of six years of his personal time and has even gone to the extent of hiring his own legislative counsel to assist him.

• (1415)

I have seen many private members' bills, many of which are a paragraph long with one or two clauses. This is probably the most comprehensive private member's bill I have seen in over six years. It touches one of the most important pieces of legislation we have in Canada. It boldly goes out and says that we have an act that is outdated, an act that needs to be not only updated but needs to reflect what Canadians have asked us to reflect in our legislation, which is the aspect of openness.

When we consider the very first amendment that the member proposed in this bill, it was to change the name of the bill from the Access to Information Act to the open government act. It is very significant that the member began on the right foot, that the whole intent and theme of this bill, the many pages and clauses, dealt with the openness of government.

It is a day we should celebrate because members of parliament can now stand in this place and say "We value the principles of

openness, transparency and accountability. We know this is what Canadians have wanted. We know it is responding to the fundamental needs and rights of Canadians. This is the right thing to do".

I contemplated making an amendment to this act because I thought that if I were to think of a member in this place who was reflective of the values of openness, transparency, accountability and of serving the people of Canada, it would be the member for Wentworth—Burlington. I would have proposed an amendment to change the name he is proposing, open government act, to the Bryden act. I believe the member has earned the reputation in this place to be recognized as someone who stands for the principles that he is articulating in this bill.

I give him credit and I want his constituents and Canadians to know that there is a member of parliament in this place who has dedicated at least six years of his work, in addition to all his responsibilities as a member of parliament, to an initiative that he feels very strongly about and is dedicated to.

On top of that, I recognize him further for the fact that he has come before us and placed this bill with some humility. We know there has been great difficulty getting this bill shaped and fashioned. I know the consultations he has had right across the House. He has even come here today, given a speech, and said that the bill is not perfect yet but that the bill belongs to the House.

He is asking the House to consider the bill, to consider his hard work and to send it to committee so we can have the very best experts look at each of the clauses and provisions so it can be, as stated in the member's closing remarks, the best Access to Information Act in the world. What a noble objective, to have the best Access to Information Act in the world. It is something to which Canada should aspire. It is something to which the member aspires. I believe there are many members in this place who share his values and his wish that we make this act a better act.

I know there will be some debate on it. I am surprised that some members have already declared that they will not support it. Some of the changes are very complex. It will take legal advice, legislative expertise and broad consultation with Canadians to ensure that we get it right. The member has asked us to please help him get it right, which is why we should send this to committee.

Let me give some examples. He wants to broaden the notion of openness. He states that very clearly in the second amendment. He is bringing in the whole concept of electronic data, which is not covered under the current act. That reason alone is enough for the act to be amended. There is no question in my mind that even if the members of this place decided that all the other changes proposed by the member were not ready for their time, this change is absolutely necessary.

*Private Members' Business*

• (1420)

We cannot deny the fact that we are in a global and electronic world. Information does have many forms now and we have to respond to realities. We cannot be followers. With this bill, we have an opportunity to be leaders.

In looking at these provisions, we should consider that they actually require prompt attention. The bill actually considers that a balance is needed between the need to know and personal information. It looks at so many different aspects that I could not possibly address them all.

While I was in my office last evening I had a conversation with the member because I wanted to inform myself a little more about some of the provisions. I was actually astounded at the number of ways in which we can improve this particular bill. I am sure that it is a bill which, if the member had not come up with it, the government itself would have tabled a bill to amend the Access to Information Act, in some cases to ensure that we would respond to some of the fundamental changes that have occurred in our society.

The Private Members' Business question troubles me from time to time. This bill, if it goes to committee and is enacted, will become a law of Canada, equal in all respects to other laws in terms of its force and its stature within the Statutes of Canada. However, the process that the member has had to go through, the time and the restrictions and the fact that we cannot even ask questions of the member in this place, shows that we have a second class process to deal with a first class bill. It is as valid as any other bill in this place.

I will conclude by again congratulating the member for Wentworth—Burlington for his hard work, his insight and his representation of what many members would like to have brought forward themselves. He has given us a tool, an instrument to work with. I believe it is an excellent starting point. I know the member is anxious to work with all members of the House to make sure that we do have the best Access to Information Act in the world.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Canadian Alliance):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Okanagan—Coquihalla to speak to Bill C-206, an act to amend the Access to Information Act.

I believe strongly that transparency in government is a laudable goal. Unfortunately, I do not think this bill does exactly what the member intended it to do.

A few years ago, in the 35th parliament, I introduced a bill in the House, Bill C-263, which was an act to change the Financial Administration Act that would bring into the Financial Administration Act the seven crown corporations that are exempt from following the rules of the FAA. We saw at that time that the

government was not interested at all in the transparency and openness of that particular bill, as it failed in Private Members' Business as well.

When the Access to Information Act was first implemented 18 years ago, it was an important step toward the development of our democracy. It actually allowed Canadian citizens the opportunity to legally compel the federal government to provide them with information; not that the federal government has ever complied with this. I am sure every member in the House can testify to the fact that trying to obtain information from the government is and extremely difficult and frustrating exercise.

For instance, I recently placed an access to information request before the human resources department for information on grants and contributions in the riding of Okanagan—Coquihalla. I was expecting to receive the information that I had requested through the act, but instead of the information, I received an invoice from human resources. Human resources officials asked me for \$11,713.80 to cover searching fees. That is the kind of freedom of information that we have in this country.

• (1425)

Human resources officials calculated they would need almost 1,200 hours at \$10 an hour to find the files on grants and contributions that I had requested. One would think if the government was in charge of managing grants and contributions, information would be easily accessible and available to a member of parliament, but it was not. This is a strong indication of gross mismanagement by the minister of this department.

When I heard that the member for Wentworth—Burlington had reintroduced his private member's bill amending the information act, I assumed that the member wanted to tackle some serious impediments Canadians have in getting information from the federal government. After reviewing this bill, I must tell the House that I was very surprised and extremely disappointed to see what this bill actually proposes.

To me, this looks like a government bill by stealth because the intent of this bill is to make it actually more difficult for Canadians to get information from the federal government. Bill C-206 proposes 40 substantial amendments that alter the nature of the current bill in a regressive manner. The information commissioner has expressed his concern over the extent of what the member is trying to accomplish. My concerns with the key proposals in this bill are as follows.

Bill C-206 proposes to exclude access to what it calls frivolous and abusive users of ATI. This is an extraordinary amendment to legislation dealing with openness. I think Canadians want to know who is going to decide which frequent user requests are frivolous. Will the government itself do this?

*Private Members' Business*

Many MPs are frequent users because they rely on ATI to acquire real information from the federal government. From what I can see, this bill is the Liberal government's attempt to block information to opposition MPs through proxy. Furthermore, this supposed private member's initiative intends to control users further by charging frequent users higher fees, something I recently experienced. Now the government wants to charge fees higher than \$11,000 to a member of parliament who is doing the work constituents have asked him or her to do. This is absolutely outrageous.

The intent of access to information legislation is to allow Canadians an opportunity to acquire information from an overly secretive federal government. Many individuals are forced to frequently request information because departments attempt to exclude information from their request. The only way they can receive the information is to reframe the wording of the request, then resubmit it.

A further restriction found in this bill is a section that gives the government the ability to deny access to information that could damage national unity. It also includes a section that allows the government to withhold records injurious to the constitutional integrity of Canada for 30 years.

To make matters worse, this bill proposes to include cabinet confidences such as minutes of meetings to be excluded from public access for a time period of 20 years. It also broadens the definition of what constitutes a cabinet confidence, making it more difficult for Canadian citizens, in this case historians and political scientists, from accessing the information they need for their work.

Further, the member for Wentworth—Burlington has reinforced the access to information exemption enjoyed by crown corporations such as the Export Development Corporation, Canada Post and Atomic Energy. Sections like this make it clear that this is a Liberal government bill in disguise. The member for Wentworth—Burlington should be ashamed for acting as a surrogate for a bill that has the Prime Minister and the Privy Council written all over it.

The sole intent of Bill C-206 is to impede the rightful and legal access Canadians have to information from the federal government. Many would argue that the current legislation governing ATI is too restrictive. The Liberal government exploits every roadblock available and even bends the current law to the breaking point to ensure Canadians do not get information they have requested.

We need to look no further than the Somalia inquiry to see how the government manipulates the current law to deny Canadians access to information.

Less than 5% of private members' bills pass the House. Most are rejected by the Liberal government, which takes private members' best points as its own and writes its own bills.

The Liberals want what is in Bill C-206, but do not want to claim ownership because they do not want Canadians to know that they initiated legislation which would deny Canadians the right to federal government information. Canadians should be aware that this is a bill written by the privy council and disguised under the name of the member for Wentworth—Burlington.

It is my prediction that this bill will be one of the few private members' bills that passes this House, simply because of the majority on the Liberal side.

When the effects of this bill are felt, do not thank the member for Wentworth—Burlington, thank our Prime Minister.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence.

[*Translation*]

It being 2.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.30 p.m.)

---



## **APPENDIX**

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

**CHAIR OCCUPANTS**

**The Speaker**

HON. GILBERT PARENT

**The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

**The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

---

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

MR. STÉPHANE BERGERON

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. JAY HILL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MacKAY

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL



## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session — Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member	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.
Alarie, H��l��ne	Louis-H��bert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	CA
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, G��rard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Andr��	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	CA
Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
B��lair, R��ginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
B��langer, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eug��ne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	CA
Bergeron, St��phane	Verch��res — Les-Patriotes	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gasp�� — ��les- de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	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, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	CA
Brien, Pierre	T��miscamingue	Quebec	BQ

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	Quebec	BQ
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	New Brunswick	PC
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CA
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	NDP
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	CA
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	CA
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
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
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	British Columbia	CA
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan	British Columbia	CA
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	CA
Grey, Deborah, Leader of the Opposition	Edmonton North	Alberta	CA
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Gruending, Dennis	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	Saskatchewan	NDP
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Côte-de-Beaupré — Île-d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CA
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
Harris, Richard M.	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	CA

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	British Columbia	CA
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	Quebec	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
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Manitoba	Ind.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	CA
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CA
Jones, Jim	Markham	Ontario	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CA
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CA
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Ontario	Lib.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CA
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	NDP
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	Ind.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Whitby — Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Alberta	CA
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	CA
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	Nova Scotia	NDP
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CA
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	Quebec	BQ
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	CA
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	CA
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	CA
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	CA
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	British Columbia	CA
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	British Columbia	CA
Mifflin, Hon. Fred	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	CA
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	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.
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CA
Muise, Mark	West Nova	Nova Scotia	PC
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Ind.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	CA
Pagtakhan, Rey D.	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	CA
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	CA
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Rivière—des—Mille—Îles	Quebec	BQ
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade	Papineau — Saint—Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	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	PC
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proud, George	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ind. - CA
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	CA
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	British Columbia	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CA
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount — Ville—Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	CA
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	CA
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CA

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik	Quebec	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland	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, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	CA
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	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.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	PC
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CA
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	British Columbia	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CA
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	CA
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
VACANCY	St. John's West	Newfoundland	

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

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

Second Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

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



Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	CA
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	CA
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	CA
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	CA
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	CA
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	CA
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	CA
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	NDP
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	CA
Scott, Mike	Skeena	CA
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	CA
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	CA
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	CA
White, Ted	North Vancouver	CA

#### MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	CA
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Ind.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Provencher	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	CA
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D.	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP

#### NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	PC
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe	Lib.
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	PC

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Lib.
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Trinity — Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	Lib.
Jones, Jim	Markham	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	Lib.
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	Lib.
Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Whitby — Ajax	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches — East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ind.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	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.
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Kitchener — Waterloo	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	Lib.

#### PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George	Hillsborough	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
<b>QUEBEC (75)</b>		
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères — Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac — Mégantic	BQ
Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup — Témiscouata — Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	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, Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel	BQ
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Côte-de-Beaupré — Île-d'Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	PC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Ind.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade	Papineau — Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	PC
Proulx, Marcel	Hull — Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount — Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphane	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	BQ

#### SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	CA
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	CA
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Gruending, Dennis	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	NDP
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	CA
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	CA
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	NDP
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	CA
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	CA
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	CA
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	CA

#### YUKON (1)

Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP
---------------	-------	-----

## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of April 7, 2000 — 2nd Session, 36th Parliament)

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

**Chair:** Sue Barnes

**Vice-Chairs:** John Finlay  
Derrek Konrad

Claude Bachand  
Ray Bonin  
Paul DeVillers  
Ghislain Fournier

Jim Gouk  
Ivan Grose  
Louise Hardy

David Iftody  
Nancy Karetak-Lindell  
Gerald Keddy

John O'Reilly  
Mike Scott  
Guy St-Julien

(16)

#### Associate Members

Carolyn Bennett  
Cliff Bretkreuz  
René Canuel  
Serge Cardin

Bill Casey  
Pierre de Savoye  
Gordon Earle  
Reed Elley

Maurice Godin  
Richard Harris  
Rick Laliberte

Gilles-A. Perron  
Daniel Turp  
Maurice Vellacott

### AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Chair:** John Harvard

**Vice-Chairs:** Murray Calder  
Howard Hilstrom

Hélène Alarie  
Mark Assad  
Rick Borotsik  
Garry Bretkreuz

Odina Desrochers  
Gar Knutson  
Larry McCormick

Joe McGuire  
Ian Murray  
Dick Proctor

Gerry Ritz  
Paul Steckle  
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

#### Associate Members

Peter Adams  
Roy Bailey  
Leon Benoit  
Rick Casson

Michelle Dockrill  
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
John Maloney  
Lee Morrison

Lynn Myers  
Lorne Nystrom  
John Solomon  
Guy St-Julien

Greg Thompson  
Myron Thompson  
Suzanne Tremblay  
Daniel Turp

### CANADIAN HERITAGE

**Chair:** Clifford Lincoln

**Vice-Chairs:** Inky Mark  
Dennis Mills

Mauril Bélanger  
Paul Bonwick  
Cliff Bretkreuz  
Sarmite Bulte

Irwin Cotler  
Pierre de Savoye  
Wendy Lill

Rick Limoges  
Eric Lowther  
Mark Muise

Alex Shepherd  
Caroline St-Hilaire  
Bryon Wilfert

(16)

#### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
André Bachand  
Claude Bachand  
Carolyn Bennett  
Rick Borotsik

Pierre Brien  
Serge Cardin  
Antoine Dubé  
Maurice Dumas  
Gordon Earle

Paul Forseth  
Christiane Gagnon  
Rick Laliberte  
Peter MacKay  
Louis Plamondon

Benoît Sauvageau  
Guy St-Julien  
Suzanne Tremblay  
Daniel Turp  
Elsie Wayne

### THE STUDY OF SPORT IN CANADA

**Chair:** Dennis Mills

**Vice-Chairs:** Steve Mahoney  
Inky Mark

Marlene Jennings  
Raymond Lavigne

Peter MacKay  
Pat O'Brien

Beth Phinney  
George Proud

John Solomon  
Caroline St-Hilaire

(11)

## CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Chair:** Joe Fontana

**Vice-Chairs:** Leon Benoit  
Steve Mahoney

Rob Anders  
Jean Augustine  
Bernard Bigras  
Paul Bonwick

John Bryden  
Sophia Leung  
Rick Limoges

Pat Martin  
John McKay  
Grant McNally

Pauline Picard  
David Price  
Andrew Telegdi

(16)

### Associate Members

Claude Bachand  
Serge Cardin  
Libby Davies

Gordon Earle  
Louise Hardy  
Francine Lalonde

Réal Ménard  
Deepak Obhrai  
Diane St-Jacques

Suzanne Tremblay  
Daniel Turp

## ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Chair:** Charles Caccia

**Vice-Chairs:** Rahim Jaffer  
Karen Kraft Sloan

Marlene Catterall  
David Chatters  
Jean-Guy Chrétien  
Nick Discepola

Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Gurmant Grewal  
Dennis Gruending

John Herron  
Joe Jordan  
Walt Lastewka

David Pratt  
Julian Reed  
Paddy Torsney

(16)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Peter Adams  
Hélène Alarie  
Leon Benoit  
Bernard Bigras  
Pierre Brien

Chuck Cadman  
Serge Cardin  
Aileen Carroll  
John Duncan  
Louise Hardy

Rick Laliberte  
Clifford Lincoln  
Peter Mancini  
David Price  
Nelson Riis

Judy Sgro  
Guy St-Julien  
Peter Stoffer  
Stéphan Tremblay  
Daniel Turp

## FINANCE

**Chair:** Maurizio Bevilacqua

**Vice-Chairs:** Nick Discepola  
Richard Harris

Scott Brison  
Roy Cullen  
Ken Epp  
Roger Gallaway

Albina Guarnieri  
Sophia Leung  
Yvan Loubier

Richard Marceau  
Lorne Nystrom  
Gary Pillitteri

Karen Redman  
Monte Solberg  
Paul Szabo

(16)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Rob Anders  
Carolyn Bennett  
Rick Borotsik  
Pierre Brien  
Serge Cardin  
Joe Comuzzi  
Odina Desrochers  
Norman Doyle  
Antoine Dubé

Joe Fontana  
Paul Forseth  
Christiane Gagnon  
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Monique Guay  
John Herron  
Dale Johnston  
Jim Jones  
Jason Kenney

Rick Limoges  
Gary Lunn  
Peter MacKay  
Alexa McDonough  
Bob Mills  
Lynn Myers  
Gilles-A. Perron  
Pauline Picard  
Charlie Power

Nelson Riis  
Benoît Sauvageau  
Werner Schmidt  
Alex Shepherd  
John Solomon  
Guy St-Julien  
Stéphan Tremblay  
Daniel Turp  
Tony Valeri



## FISHERIES AND OCEANS

**Chair:** Wayne Easter

**Vice-Chairs:** John Duncan  
Carmen Provenzano

Sarkis Assadourian G�rard Asselin Yvan Bernier John Cummins	Bill Gilmour Nancy Karetak-Lindell Gerald Keddy	Bill Matthews Lawrence O'Brien Marcel Proulx	Lou Sekora Paul Steckle Peter Stoffer	(16)
----------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	------

### Associate Members

Gilles Bernier Ren� Canuel Paul Forseth	Ghislain Fournier Yvon Godin Philip Mayfield	Svend Robinson Yves Rocheleau	Mike Scott Suzanne Tremblay
-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON AQUACULTURE AND OCEANS ACT

**Chair:** Carmen Provenzano

**Vice-Chair:**

Yvan Bernier	Bill Gilmour	Peter Stoffer	(4)
--------------	--------------	---------------	-----

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Chair:** Bill Graham

**Vice-Chairs:** Colleen Beaumier  
Deepak Obhrai

Sarkis Assadourian Jean Augustine Andr� Bachand Maud Debien	Francine Lalonde Diane Marleau Keith Martin Ted McWhinney	Fred Mifflin Denis Paradis Bernard Patry Svend Robinson	Yves Rocheleau Bob Speller Darrel Stinson	(18)
----------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------

### Associate Members

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

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Chair:** Colleen Beaumier

**Vice-Chair:**

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

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

**Chair:** Sarmite Bulte

**Vice-Chair:**

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

**HEALTH****Chair:** Lynn Myers**Vice-Chairs:** Reed Elley  
Ovid JacksonYvon Charbonneau  
Christiane Gagnon  
Bill Matthews  
Ted McWhinneyRéal Ménard  
Bob Mills  
Marcel ProulxKaren Redman  
Paul Szabo  
Greg ThompsonRose-Marie Ur  
Maurice Vellacott  
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis

(16)

**Associate Members**Carolyn Bennett  
Bernard Bigras  
Serge Cardin  
Jean-Guy ChrétienLibby Davies  
Pierre de Savoye  
Michelle Dockrill  
Jocelyne Girard-BujoldJohn Herron  
Grant Hill  
Sophia Leung  
John MaloneyPauline Picard  
Guy St-Julien  
Suzanne Tremblay  
Daniel Turp**HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chair:** Peter Adams**Vice-Chairs:** Maurice Vellacott  
Bryon WilfertDiane Ablonczy  
Bonnie Brown  
Paul Crête  
Libby DaviesJean Dubé  
Raymonde Folco  
Christiane Gagnon  
John GodfreyDale Johnston  
Judi Longfield  
Larry McCormick  
Rey PagtakhanAndy Scott  
Judy Sgro  
Stéphan Tremblay

(18)

**Associate Members**Carolyn Bennett  
Yvan Bernier  
Bernard Bigras  
Serge Cardin  
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral  
Bev Desjarlais  
Michelle Dockrill  
Norman DoyleAntoine Dubé  
Maurice Dumas  
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Deborah Grey  
Monique Guay  
Ovid JacksonJoe Jordan  
Nancy Karetak-Lindell  
Wendy Lill  
Eric Lowther  
Diane Marleau  
Pat Martin  
Réal MénardMark Muise  
Lorne Nystrom  
Diane St-Jacques  
Guy St-Julien  
Suzanne Tremblay  
Daniel Turp  
Angela Vautour**SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK****Chair:** John Godfrey**Vice-Chair:**Carolyn Bennett  
Libby DaviesRaymonde Folco  
Christiane GagnonOvid Jackson  
Eric LowtherDiane Marleau  
Diane St-Jacques

(9)

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chair:** Carolyn Bennett**Vice-Chair:**Joe Jordan  
Nancy Karetak-LindellWendy Lill  
Mark MuiseKaren Redman  
Andy ScottSuzanne Tremblay  
Maurice Vellacott

(9)

**INDUSTRY****Chair:** Susan Whelan**Vice-Chairs:** Walt Lastewka  
Charlie PensonPierre Brien  
Gerry Byrne  
John Cannis  
Antoine DubéJim Hart  
Marlene Jennings  
Jim JonesGurbax Malhi  
Dan McTeague  
Ian MurrayJerry Pickard  
Nelson Riis  
Werner Schmidt

(16)

**Associate Members**Peter Adams  
Hélène Alarie  
Gérard Asselin  
Bernard Bigras  
Chuck CadmanSerge Cardin  
Pierre de Savoye  
Odina Desrochers  
Jean Dubé  
Joe FontanaChristiane Gagnon  
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Rahim Jaffer  
Richard Marceau  
Philip MayfieldAlex Shepherd  
John Solomon  
Guy St-Julien  
Peter Stoffer  
Daniel Turp**JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS****Chair:** Andy Scott**Vice-Chairs:** Chuck Cadman  
Ivan GroseJim Abbott  
Reg Alcock  
Michel Bellehumeur  
Carolyn BennettAileen Carroll  
Paul DeVillers  
Peter MacKayJohn Maloney  
Peter Mancini  
John McKayJohn Reynolds  
Jacques Saada  
Pierrette Venne

(16)

**Associate Members**Bernard Bigras  
Irwin Cotler  
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral  
Pierre de Savoye  
Jim Gouk  
Dennis Gruending  
Michel GuimondLouise Hardy  
Richard Harris  
Jay Hill  
Richard Marceau  
Keith Martin  
Réal Ménard  
Lee MorrisonMark Muise  
Lynn Myers  
Jack Ramsay  
Svend Robinson  
Judy Sgro  
Caroline St-Hilaire  
Diane St-JacquesDarrel Stinson  
Myron Thompson  
Suzanne Tremblay  
Daniel Turp  
Tom Wappel  
Randy White**SUB-COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT****Chair:** Paul DeVillers**Vice-Chair:**Jim Gouk  
Ivan GroseRick Laliberte  
Peter MacKayLynn Myers  
Jacques SaadaPierrette Venne  
Tom Wappel

(9)

**NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS****Chair:** Pat O'Brien**Vice-Chairs:** Jim Hart  
David PrattRobert Bertrand  
Hec Clouthier  
Gordon Earle  
Peter GoldringArt Hanger  
René Laurin  
Judi LongfieldPaul Mercier  
John O'Reilly  
Janko PericGeorge Proud  
Elsie Wayne  
Bob Wood

(16)

**Associate Members**Rob Anders  
Leon Benoit  
Pierre BrienSerge Cardin  
John Duncan  
Monique GuayFrancine Lalonde  
Ghislain Lebel  
Peter ManciniPat Martin  
Daniel Turp

## NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

<b>Chair:</b>	Joseph Volpe	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	David Chatters Julian Reed	
Réginald Bélair Gilles Bernier Serge Cardin John Duncan	Yvon Godin Tony Ianno Ghislain Lebel	Carolyn Parrish Carmen Provenzano Werner Schmidt	Guy St-Julien Brent St. Denis Tony Valeri	(16)

### Associate Members

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

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

<b>Chair:</b>	Derek Lee	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Marlene Catterall Chuck Strahl	
Eleni Bakopanos Stéphane Bergeron Ray Bonin Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Yvon Godin André Harvey Jay Hill	Bob Kilger Gar Knutson Grant McNally	Carolyn Parrish Jerry Pickard John Richardson	(16)

### Associate Members

Peter Adams Michel Bellehumeur Bill Blaikie David Chatters Michelle Dockrill	Norman Doyle Deborah Grey Joe Jordan René Laurin	Eric Lowther Larry McCormick Réal Ménard Lorne Nystrom	John Solomon Suzanne Tremblay Randy White Ted White
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Chair:</b>	Larry McCormick	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Bill Blaikie Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Deborah Grey	André Harvey	Joe Jordan	(6)

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE TELEVISIONING OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Chair:</b>	Marlene Catterall	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Peter Adams Stéphane Bergeron	Michelle Dockrill	Grant McNally	Angela Vautour	(6)

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

<b>Chair:</b>	John Williams	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Steve Mahoney John Richardson	
Hec Clouthier Michelle Dockrill John Finlay Paul Forseth	Mac Harb Marlene Jennings Jason Kenney Philip Mayfield	Gilles-A. Perron Beth Phinney Benoît Sauvageau	Judy Sgro Alex Shepherd Elsie Wayne	(17)

### Associate Members

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

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL REPORTING

<b>Chair:</b>	John Williams	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	
Michelle Dockrill Mac Harb	Steve Mahoney Beth Phinney	John Richardson Benoit Sauvageau	Elsie Wayne (8)

---

## TRANSPORT

<b>Chair:</b>	Stan Keyes	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Joe Comuzzi Val Meredith
Gérard Asselin Roy Bailey Murray Calder Bill Casey	Bev Desjarlais Stan Dromisky Claude Drouin	Joe Fontana Michel Guimond Charles Hubbard	Ovid Jackson Dale Johnston Lou Sekora (16)

### Associate Members

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

---

## STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

<b>Joint Chairs:</b>	Raymond Lavigne Louis Robichaud	<b>Joint Vice-Chair:</b>	Deborah Grey
Representing the Senate: The Honourable Senators		Representing the House of Commons:	
Norman Atkins Isobel Finnerty Jerahmiel Grafstein	Normand Grimard Vivienne Poy Calvin Ruck	Mark Assad Roy Bailey Marlene Catterall Hec Clouthier John Finlay Mac Harb Jim Karygiannis	Wendy Lill Rick Limoges Philip Mayfield Paul Mercier Louis Plamondon David Price Karen Redman (23)

### Associate Members

Libby Davies Maurice Dumas	Suzanne Tremblay
-------------------------------	------------------

---

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

<b>Joint Chairs:</b>	Raymonde Folco Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	<b>Joint Vice-Chairs:</b>	Grant Hill Benoit Serré
Representing the Senate: The Honourable Senators		Representing the House of Commons:	
Gérald Beaudoin Joan Fraser Jean-Robert Gauthier Michael Meighen	Lucie Pépin Jean-Claude Rivest Louis Robichaud	Mauril Bélanger Eugène Bellemare Brenda Chamberlain Pierre de Savoye Yvon Godin Bob Kilger	Raymond Lavigne Inky Mark Dan McTeague Ted McWhinney Val Meredith Louis Plamondon (23)

### Associate Members

Jean-Guy Chrétien Maurice Dumas Paul Mercier	Lorne Nystrom Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp
----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------

---

**SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS**

**Joint Chairs:** Gurmant Grewal  
Céline Hervieux-Payette

**Joint Vice-Chair:**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Ethel Cochrane  
Sheila Finestone  
George Furey  
Normand Grimard

Wilfred Moore  
Melvin Perry  
Jean-Claude Rivest

Mark Assad  
Paul Bonwick  
John Bryden  
Bill Casey  
Joe Comuzzi  
Paul DeVillers  
Ken Epp  
Ghislain Lebel

Ian Murray  
Lorne Nystrom  
Jim Pankiw  
Gary Pillitteri  
Jacques Saada  
Pierrette Venne  
Tom Wappel  
Ted White

(25)

**Associate Members**

Michel Bellehumeur  
Michelle Dockrill

Michel Guimond  
Suzanne Tremblay

---

**The Speaker**

HON. GILBERT PARENT

**Panel of Chairmen of Legislative Committees**

**The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

**The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

## THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Don Boudria	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
The Hon. George S. Baker	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Robert D. Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Maria Minna	Minister for International Cooperation
The Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
The Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Jim Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)
The Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
The Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
The Hon. Denis Coderre	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)



**PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

Gar Knutson	to Prime Minister
Denis Paradis	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Dromisky	to Minister of Transport
Paddy Torsney	to Minister of the Environment
Brent St. Denis	to Minister of Natural Resources
Mauril Bélanger	to Minister of Canadian Heritage
John Cannis	to Minister of Industry
Roy Cullen	to Minister of Finance
Robert Bertrand	to Minister of National Defence
John Maloney	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Yvon Charbonneau	to Minister of Health
Jacques Saada	to Solicitor General of Canada
Carolyn Parrish	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Tony Ianno	to President of the Treasury Board
Beth Phinney	to Minister of National Revenue
Bonnie Brown	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Reg Alcock	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Bob Speller	to Minister for International Trade
Derek Lee	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Joe McGuire	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Lawrence O'Brien	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Judi Longfield	to Minister of Labour
Bob Wood	to Minister of Veterans Affairs
David Iftody	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Eugène Bellemare	to Minister for International Cooperation
Andrew Telegdi	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration



# CONTENTS

Friday, April 7, 2000

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Income Tax Amendments Act, 1999

Bill C-25. Second reading .....	5819
Mr. Hart .....	5819
Mr. Nystrom .....	5822
Mr. Hart .....	5822
Mr. Nystrom .....	5823
Mr. Hart .....	5823
Mr. Lowther .....	5823
Mr. Hart .....	5823
Mr. Nystrom .....	5823
Mr. Nystrom .....	5824

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Air India

Mr. Grewal .....	5826
------------------	------

### Cancer Awareness Month

Mr. Malhi .....	5826
-----------------	------

### Health Care

Mr. Pagtakhan .....	5827
---------------------	------

### Blood Supply

Mr. Dromisky .....	5827
--------------------	------

### Battle of Vimy Ridge

Mr. Alcock .....	5827
------------------	------

### David Suzuki Foundation

Mr. Morrison .....	5827
--------------------	------

### Employment

Mr. O'Reilly .....	5827
--------------------	------

### Lévis Shipyard

Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière) .....	5828
--------------------------------------------------	------

### Group of Twenty

Mr. Paradis .....	5828
-------------------	------

### Immigration

Mr. Benoit .....	5828
------------------	------

### Young at Heart

Mr. Bertrand .....	5828
--------------------	------

### Bill C-20

Mr. Blaikie .....	5828
-------------------	------

### Victoria Harbour Student Parliament

Mr. Pratt .....	5829
-----------------	------

### The Late Victor Tremblay

Mr. Canuel .....	5829
------------------	------

### Tall Ships 2000

Mr. Keddy .....	5829
-----------------	------

### Environment

Mr. Harb .....	5829
----------------	------

### Human Resources Development

Mr. Vellacott .....	5830
---------------------	------

## Budget 2000

Mr. Mancini .....	5830
-------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Public Works and Government Services

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	5830
Mr. Gagliano .....	5830
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	5830
Mr. Gagliano .....	5830
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	5830
Mr. Gagliano .....	5831
Mr. McNally .....	5831
Mr. Gray .....	5831
Mr. McNally .....	5831
Mr. Manley .....	5831

### Human Resources Development

Mrs. Tremblay .....	5831
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	5831
Mrs. Tremblay .....	5831
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	5831
Mr. Crête .....	5832
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	5832
Mr. Crête .....	5832
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	5832

### Health

Mr. Blaikie .....	5832
Mr. Rock .....	5832
Mr. Blaikie .....	5832
Mr. Rock .....	5832

### Public Works and Government Services

Mr. MacKay .....	5832
Mr. Gagliano .....	5833
Mr. MacKay .....	5833
Mr. Gray .....	5833

### CINAR

Mr. Penson .....	5833
Mr. Boudria .....	5833
Mr. Jaffer .....	5833
Mr. Boudria .....	5833

### Health

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	5833
Mr. Peterson .....	5833
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	5834
Mr. Peterson .....	5834

### CINAR

Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	5834
Mr. Boudria .....	5834
Mr. Hart .....	5834
Mr. Boudria .....	5834
Mr. Bergeron .....	5834
Mr. Boudria .....	5834
Mr. Bergeron .....	5834
Mr. Boudria .....	5834

### Canada Development Corporation

Mr. Lowther .....	5835
-------------------	------

Mr. Peterson .....	5835
Mr. Obhrai .....	5835
Mr. Peterson .....	5835
<b>CINAR</b>	
Mr. Bergeron .....	5835
Mr. Boudria .....	5835
<b>Immigration</b>	
Mr. Szabo .....	5835
Ms. Caplan .....	5835
<b>Millennium Bureau of Canada</b>	
Mr. Gilmour .....	5836
Mr. Gray .....	5836
Mr. Ritz .....	5836
Mr. Gray .....	5836
<b>Official Languages</b>	
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst) .....	5836
Mr. Saada .....	5836
<b>Health</b>	
Ms. Desjarlais .....	5836
Mr. Rock .....	5836
<b>Human Resources Development</b>	
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) .....	5837
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	5837
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) .....	5837
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	5837
<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Proulx .....	5837
Mr. Rock .....	5837
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose) .....	5837
Mr. Nault .....	5837
<b>Export Development Corporation</b>	
Mrs. Lalonde .....	5838
Mr. Manley .....	5838
<b>Natural Resources</b>	
Mr. Mancini .....	5838
Mr. St. Denis .....	5838
<b>RCMP Investigations</b>	
Mr. Harvey .....	5838
Mr. Saada .....	5838
<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Murray .....	5838
Mr. Manley .....	5838
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose) .....	5838
Mr. Nault .....	5839
<b>Genetically Modified Foods</b>	
Mr. Cardin .....	5839
Mr. Vanclief .....	5839
<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	5839
Mr. Rock .....	5839
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Tabling of a Document</b>	
Mr. McNally .....	5839
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	5839

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Regional Development Banks</b>	
Mr. Bellemare .....	5839
<b>Government response to petitions</b>	
Mr. Lee .....	5839
<b>Interparliamentary Delegations</b>	
Mr. Malhi .....	5839
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Procedure and House Affairs</b>	
Mr. Lee .....	5840
<b>Budget Implementation Act, 2000</b>	
Bill C-32. Introduction and first reading .....	5840
Mr. Peterson .....	5840
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	5840
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Procedure and House Affairs</b>	
Motion for concurrence .....	5840
Mr. Lee .....	5840
(Motion agreed to) .....	5840
Motion .....	5840
Mr. Lee .....	5840
(Motion agreed to) .....	5840
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Mammography</b>	
Mr. Szabo .....	5840
<b>Human Resources Development</b>	
Mr. Penson .....	5840
<b>Marriage</b>	
Mr. Penson .....	5840
<b>Mammography</b>	
Mr. Maloney .....	5840
<b>The Senate</b>	
Mr. Nystrom .....	5840
<b>National Tartan Day</b>	
Mr. Malhi .....	5841
<b>Marriage</b>	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose) .....	5841
<b>Abortion</b>	
Mr. O'Reilly .....	5841
<b>Marriage</b>	
Mr. Vellacott .....	5841
<b>Euthanasia</b>	
Mr. Vellacott .....	5841
<b>Marriage</b>	
Mr. Morrison .....	5841
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Lee .....	5841
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Mr. Kilger .....	5841
Motion .....	5841
(Motion agreed to, and bill deemed read the second time and referred to a committee) .....	5842
Mr. Kilger .....	5842
Motion .....	5842
(Motion agreed to) .....	5842
<b>Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act</b>	
Bill C-473. Introduction and first reading .....	5842
Mr. Kilger .....	5842

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	5842
Bill C-473. Second reading .....	5842
Mr. Kilger .....	5842
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair) ..	5842
(Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to) .....	5842
(On clause 4) .....	5842
Mr. Bergeron .....	5842
Amendment .....	5842
(Amendment agreed to) .....	5842
(Clause 4, as amended, agreed to) .....	5842
(Clauses 5 to 10 inclusive agreed to) .....	5842
(On clause 11) .....	5842
(Clause 11 negatived) .....	5842
(Clauses 12 and 13 agreed to) .....	5842
(Title agreed to) .....	5842
(Bill reported) .....	5842
Motion for concurrence .....	5842
Mr. Kilger .....	5842
(Motion agreed to) .....	5842
Bill C-473. Third reading .....	5842
Mr. Kilger .....	5842
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed) ....	5842

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Income Tax Amendments Act, 1999**

Bill C-25. Second reading .....	5842
Mr. Nystrom .....	5843
Mr. Lowther .....	5843
Mr. Nystrom .....	5843

Ms. Desjarlais .....	5844
Mr. Nystrom .....	5844
Mr. Harvey .....	5844
Ms. Fry .....	5847
Mr. Harvey .....	5847
Mr. Perron .....	5848
Mr. Harvey .....	5848
Mr. Lowther .....	5848
Mr. Obhrai .....	5851
Mr. Lowther .....	5851
Mr. Szabo .....	5851
Mr. Lowther .....	5851
Mr. Szabo .....	5851
Mr. Lowther .....	5852
Mr. Nystrom .....	5852
Mr. Lowther .....	5852

**Modernization of Benefits and Obligations Act**

<b>Bill C-23—Time Allocation Motion</b>	
Ms. Robillard .....	5852

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Access to Information Act**

Bill C-206. Second reading .....	5852
Mr. Bryden .....	5852
Mr. Grewal .....	5856
Mr. Keddy .....	5857
Mr. Szabo .....	5858
Mr. Hart .....	5860

**Appendix**

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**03159442**

**Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:**

**Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :**

**<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**

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

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

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