

*Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse Act*

creation of a new centre, not the established practice for centres that have existed in the past. The fact is that Parliament has endorsed the principle that Parliament, not the Minister and not an elite group, however competent it may be, but the people of Canada have an opportunity, through their elected representatives, to review all appointments to government boards and agencies. This, unfortunately, is in violation of that principle. We have registered our protest and are willing to pass it on division.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Shall Clause 8 carry?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** On division.

Clause 8 agreed to.

On Clause 1—

**Ms. Copps:** Since we are discussing the over-all intent and spirit of the Bill I would like to ask the Minister a question. First, I think there should be recognition made of the work of David Archibald and those in the field who have been working for a long time for the creation of a centre of this type. This goes back to the days when the former Minister of National Health and Welfare, John Munro, almost achieved the creation of this type of centre.

Why did the Minister leave the false impression with several people in the health community that the Liberal Party was in fact opposed to this Bill when in fact the Liberal Member on the committee which looked into this issue argued most vehemently in favour of the creation of the centre? Why would the Minister leave that false impression?

**Mr. Epp (Provencher):** I do not want to leave any false impression. If I was wrong and the Liberal Party was not opposed to it, I withdraw that. I just regret that the Hon. Member has not been able to fulfil the deals which her Party made. That is the point which must be stressed again.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Madam Chairman, if it is the decision of the spokesperson for the Liberal Party that it was the Liberals on the Committee on National Health and Welfare who initiated or were preponderant in the consideration or recommendation of this or any other matter in committee, let me assert here and now that the deliberations of the committee involved an equal participation of all sides. All sides were unanimous in all recommendations and most of us shared the concern that the Government has failed to address the other recommendations which were made.

Some 29 of 31 recommendations have been substantially ignored or rejected. We are all concerned about that. However, I think the self-serving discussion which is now taking place on a matter which we promised on August 19 and today would be passed to the House in as quick a fashion as possible is just unacceptable.

**Mr. Epp (Provencher):** Madam Speaker, I do not want to prolong this. I will go through this very quickly because that which the Hon. Member has been saying is simply not true. Of the recommendations which were made, recommendations 1, 4, 7, 6, 17, 18, 28 to 31, 26, and 27 have been implemented.

Implemented through a different strategy and a common goal were recommendations 2, 3, 9, 11 to 14, 15, 16, 24, and 25. Under active review are recommendations 5, 8, 10, 22, and 23. Recommendation 23 is covered by the private Members' Bill dealing with head shops. We lack jurisdiction for recommendations 12 and 20. The Government has rejected recommendations 19 and 21. Therefore, what has been said is patently wrong and I think Hon. Members should understand that.

**Ms. Copps:** Madam Chairman, in response to the comments of the Member for Windsor—Walkerville, I am shocked that the representative of the NDP is saying that they are working so hard in the area of drug abuse when that Party supports the legal sale of cocaine spoons and other illegal drug paraphernalia. I am very sorry that the Member has not fought the good fight in his Party and has not let his Party know that the sale of cocaine spoons and other illegal paraphernalia should be outlawed as was recommended in the report to which the Minister just referred. I wish the Member would spend his time talking to his colleagues as opposed to speaking out in the House about all the things his Party is doing when in fact it refused to support a private Member's Bill to make the sale of cocaine spoons and other paraphernalia illegal.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Madam Chairman, the Hon. Member has gone from duplicity to falsehood. The committee, as she very well knows, specifically rejected the proposal to ban the sale of specific utensils. The committee did recommend that consideration be given to the elimination of head shops. That is quite different from the elimination of spoons. Of course, even after lengthy deliberations, the Hon. Liberal Member learned very little and would not know that a cocaine spoon is no different from any other kind of spoon, that a cocaine razor blade is no different from any other kind of razor blade, and that a marijuana paper is no different from a tobacco paper. Of course, that is a complex matter beyond her understanding.

We were able to agree, however, that a place that was predominantly devoted to the sale of a number of items, books or whatever, which would encourage the use of drugs, should in fact be regulated. My Party, every member of my caucus, and I presume every member of the Party across the nation, shares the common sense view that substance abuse in this country needs to be controlled and attacked and agrees that alcohol is the preponderant substance of abuse in this country and that prescription drugs are a significant substance of abuse in this country. Symbolic actions to which we may say we are devoted, which are going to accomplish nothing in the effort to do something about the drug problem, do no good.

I thought all members of the committee agreed upon that. It surprises me that the Hon. Member, whose Party agreed that this Bill would be facilitated in its passage on August 19 yet deliberately delayed passage on that day and continues to do so today, would introduce an argument of this sort at a time when one significant recommendation which we made is about to be dealt with by the passage of this legislation.