

*Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse Act*

● (1530)

I want to take note of the observation made by the committee that there are a number of agencies in existence in Canada, particularly the Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation in Ontario which, in these times of attempts to form centres of excellence in the scientific area in Canada, has been recognized by the World Health Organization as a centre of excellence.

Similarly, we gave recognition to a National Native Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program, the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Commission, the Nova Scotia Commission on Drug Dependency and other agencies, provincial or otherwise, in Canada, which have made a significant contribution with respect to drug abuse prevention, rehabilitation and treatment. We recognize the view shared by many organizations in this country that there should exist a similar sort of organization at the national level which would co-ordinate these kinds of activities nation-wide and make available information on those subjects to all of Canada in order to facilitate our attack on substance abuse.

With that, it is not my intention to delay but to complete what I initiated on August 19. I express my support and my Party's support for this legislation, and give my assurance that we will do everything to ensure that we can complete Committee of the Whole consideration and third reading this afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed, Bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mrs. Champagne in the chair.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Order. House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-143, an Act to establish the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Shall Clause 7 carry?

On Clause 7—*First Board*

**Ms. Copps:** Madam Chairman, I would like to have some clarification as to whether the board is subject to the usual Order in Council review. I want to know whether it is subject to the usual Order in Council appointments process. Are the appointments by the Minister or by Order in Council?

**Mr. Epp (Provencher):** Madam Chairman, six of the board members are by recommendation from the Minister, GICs, and the remainder are by recommendation from the board.

**Ms. Copps:** They are not reviewable? They are not Order in Council appointments and, therefore, they are not reviewable?

**Mr. Epp (Provencher):** Madam Chairman, if I would be given the liberty by Hon. Members to direct their attention to Clauses 6, 7 and 8 rather than one clause, that would help me in my explanations, if that is acceptable. If Hon. Members look to Clause 6, the six members that are referred to are the chairperson and the five additional board members. Additional board members will be appointed to the board, if one would look at the board of directors. Under Clause 6, the Hon. Member will find that there can be additional ones appointed whose backgrounds or experience would assist the centre with the fulfilment of its purpose, and they would be reviewable, as other review—I will check that.

**Ms. Copps:** I understand that in Clause 8 the chairman and up to five other directors are appointed by Governor in Council, so they are reviewable. The nine directors who are appointed by the board, because they are not Governor in Council appointments, are not reviewable.

**Mr. Boudria:** Otherwise, how could they be referred?

**Mr. Epp (Provencher):** Madam Chairman, they are not reviewable by the Governor in Council. That is correct. It is the arm's-length approach that we are trying to build into the board, having both GICs and the separate board members. It is the second group that would not be reviewable.

**Mr. Boudria:** If I may, Madam Chairman, I just want to clarify this in my own mind. There may be good reason for this, but I am trying to identify how it works. The Governor in Council appointment review process is now called the experimental process, but it will probably become permanent in the future. In any case, a process has existed for a few years whereby the Privy Council Office sends the names of the appointees to a parliamentary committee for it to review and comment on within 30 days. That will apply to the people who are appointed by the Governor in Council. The others, as far as I can see, are not referred to the Privy Council Office at all. The Privy Council Office cannot send them for review because they are not Governor in Council appointments. I want to be clear. Am I interpreting that clause of the Bill correctly?

**Mr. Epp (Provencher):** Madam Chairman, I believe that the Hon. Member is reviewing it correctly. We are in this experimental period. If we also look at the rules of the House covering committees, Standing Order 103(1) and (2), I believe that under those rules any committee of Parliament can also review appointments. If it is only restricted to GICs, then maybe the Hon. Member could indicate to the House what other route they may be considering. It is the arm's length that the Government is trying to build in, according to the recommendations made to the Government, that some of the members of the board would in fact be at arm's length.