



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 141 • NUMBER 142 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, April 27, 2007

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 27, 2007

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*English*]

SENATE APPOINTMENT CONSULTATIONS ACT

The House resumed from April 20 consideration of the motion that Bill C-43, An Act to provide for consultations with electors on their preferences for appointments to the Senate, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill C-43, An Act to provide for consultations with electors on their preferences for appointments to the Senate.

I want to begin my comments with a historical perspective. It is interesting to go back to the beginning of our country and the constitutional debates in Quebec at the Quebec conference and the debates around the Senate. In fact, those debates were some of the longest debates, and some would say they were controversial, about what should be done in terms of that new idea, the new formation called Canada.

There had been a consensus about reforming and having responsible government. Indeed, after the rebellions in 1837, we saw it in 1841. The concept and the idea of responsible government had been born. The rebellions built on Upper and Lower Canada had taken place. In 1841 we saw the idea of responsible government after the Durham report, with all its ills, but there were some good things in it, and then in the Quebec conference in the discussion around what should be done in terms of a new country and the formation of a confederation.

In those debates, there were discussions among the reformers at the time, who were very different from the reformers of more recent times. The Browns, for instance, actually believed that an elected Senate at the time would be problematic. That is interesting to note because at the time Brown and his movement, the reformers of the time, were laying down the markers for what they believed would be more responsible and more representative government.

Yet there was a consensus at the time, after much debate, as I have said, to have an appointed Senate. The reason people gave was

that they believed the two houses had to be given certain jurisdictions and responsibilities. There was a concern at the time that one house should not have dominance over the other house, notwithstanding the obvious submission of people who saw a democratically elected house as better than an appointed one.

These people shared some concerns. Many of the reformers at the time trumpeted the comments of John Stuart Mill, who said in 1861:

An assembly which does not rest on the basis of some great power in the country is ineffectual against one which does.

People consciously knew that by way of agreeing to an appointed Senate the upper house would not trump the House of Commons. They were very deliberate, because they did not want to see the quagmire. They saw the upper house as a check.

They were concerned about the experience in the United States at the time. We have to recall our history. The American civil war had just happened. People were very conscious of it. One of the reasons Confederation came together, notwithstanding the Fenian raids, was due to the concern about the Americans' creep north, so to speak.

They wanted to get it right. They wanted to make sure it was different. They wanted to make sure there were proper checks and balances. They subscribed to the idea of an appointed house.

I will go back in history to re-Confederation in terms of what the debates were at the Quebec conference, because it is very important to understand our history in order to understand where we are now and to understand this bill.

In essence what the reformers of the time were saying, Macdonald and others, was that we needed a balance. They wanted to make sure that the upper house was not going to trump the lower house, so that, as John Stuart Mill said, we would not have one "assembly which rests on the basis of some great power in the country", i.e. the people, and one that would cause a disproportionate balance.

• (1010)

Because, if we look at the structure of the Senate, we see that there were senators appointed. We have to recall that it was the east and west, and the Maritimes were still discussing whether there would be a maritime union. Senators would not be appointed based on representation of exact population. It was very important that it was going to be an appointed Senate.

Government Orders

Delegates at the Quebec conference believed that to have responsible government, the principle that was fought for in the rebellions of 1837 and the act in 1841, there had to be responsible representation by population government in the House of Commons and oversight from the Senate.

If we fast forward to where we are now, this bill is not proposing an overview of what the Senate's roles and responsibilities are. It does not take into consideration, in my opinion, what the initial debate was in this place with the former Reform Party about the so-called triple E Senate. It is not a discussion that really deals with what the Senate's role and responsibilities are. It is simply a way to get around the obvious problem of having an appointed body in 2007. We have not evolved to having a body that is actually democratically respected and responsible.

The fundamental problem with this bill is that it is a half measure. It says that we can have a plebiscite. We have not quite decided yet how that is to be done, but let us say it is in a federal election. The plebiscite goes forward and the person who is nominated goes to the Prime Minister, who makes the appointment.

What it does not do is deal with the whole quagmire of the role of the upper house. That is fundamentally what should be dealt with. That is really what Canadians want. It is what many people believe the former Reform Party really wanted to deal with.

This bill skirts the Constitution because it does not open the Constitution to deal with the problem. It is simply a plebiscite of sorts to find out who is the most popular person to be appointed by the Prime Minister. That might sound good to some people. I am sure the governing party will say that it is a great thing, that it would be a step in the right direction and an incremental and positive step. We may see that as being the case, except when we look at what the government has done in the area of democratic reform and judge it on its record to date.

One bill that the NDP subscribed to and supported was Bill C-16, a bill that would fix election dates and will hopefully be enacted very soon. It was an idea that our party came up with. My predecessor, Mr. Broadbent, put it forward in his ethics package before the last election. The government then took it off the NDP shelf, put it into its platform, brought it before the House and everyone agreed to it. It made sense.

We agreed that we should not open the Constitution for that particular bill. We did that because it was something that could be done without affecting the structure and functions of our Parliament. It was a process in terms of how election dates are set and it did not deal with undermining the whole idea of a minority Parliament and confidence. It was fine.

This bill is a sidestep on the Constitution. For that reason alone, personally I cannot support it. If we continue to skirt the Constitution, I think we are going down a dangerous road. I submit that the government has to understand that the Constitution is not a suggestion list. It is not something for which we say, "Maybe we would like to do this". It is a fundamental foundation of our country and of the structure of this place and obviously of the other place.

If we are going to talk about substantive change and real democratic reform, then what we need to do is have an honest debate

in this country. To be fair, the former Reform Party tried to do that. It attempted to have a so-called triple E Senate.

● (1015)

However, the Conservative government simply wants to do an end run around the Constitution and say, "Here, we have a plebiscite, we will rubber stamp the plebiscite choice, and the Prime Minister will appoint the person". It does absolutely nothing to the roles and responsibilities of the upper house.

In fact, we will have a house that will have some people who are deemed to have been chosen by the people and some who are appointed, those who are flying, so to speak, on different octane, and people will ask who legitimately speaks for the other place. Is it the person who is there by way of plebiscite or the person who is appointed? It creates a quagmire for the upper house and therefore for this place.

On those points alone, I believe we cannot support the bill.

I want to now turn to where the government is on democratic reform. It is very sad to see that the government has decided not to embrace what the previous Parliament put forward through the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, which was to go out to citizens and have a citizens' engagement on democratic reform and also have a House of Commons committee going out to Canadians to speak on democratic reform and find out what Canadians' ideas are.

Sadly, what the government came up with has been a disaster. The government will not admit that, but I know it has been a disaster. The government has had to backtrack and reassign contracts. It has gone to so-called "non-special interests", which is laughable, and I will tell the House who it is, to go to Canadians and have a focus group on what they believe democratic reform should look like.

The paper that has been put out is called "Public Consultations on Canada's Democratic Institutions and Practices". I have the participants' workbook here. I did not get it from the government website but actually from a participant who recently went through the process and procedure.

Mr. Speaker, you will know the group because it is out of Winnipeg. It is the Frontier Centre for Public Policy. I will not say anything too negative about the Frontier group, but what I can say genuinely is that it is not an objective think tank. Some have said that it makes the Fraser Institute look left wing, but I will not subscribe to what those others have said.

On its website, the Frontier group says it fundamentally does not believe in ideas like proportional representation. This is the group that the government has hired, with taxpayers' money, to talk to Canadians about democratic reform. So when the government presents a bill, Bill C-43 on Senate reform and change—

● (1020)

Mr. Scott Reid: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which is perhaps irrelevant now, but I was going to ask the hon. member to refer to Bill C-43 as opposed to electoral reform and the process for looking at the lower house.

Government Orders

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the hon. member brings it up because in the contract the government assigned to the Frontier Centre, it is actually talking about democratic reform, so I might table this later so the hon. member can have a look at it. It actually questions later on table 5, about how to reform the Upper House. So, I think it is entirely relevant and I will provide a copy to the hon. member.

I brought this up because it is related to Bill C-43. The government has introduced a bill to deal with the Senate. On the other hand, it is out there hiring friends of the government to talk to Canadians about democratic reform.

I want to explain that initially Conservatives hired a group that went out to find participants for this consultation and sadly, the group they had subcontracted to did not really know what they were doing. They phoned Democracy Watch and asked if it could provide participants for their consultation. Duff Conacher was none too pleased when he found out that Democracy Watch was being asked to provide participants for everyday Canadians to speak on democratic reform. So Democracy Watch was fired and another group was hired and now we have this flawed process in front of us.

We see in chapter 4 of this public consultation, which is again a bit of an oxymoron because no one can actually get the document, where it talks about Canada's Senate today, and it talks about what this group believes should be done and asks what Canadians, through its hand-picked group, what they think about it.

I bring that up because it is very important that Canadians know the agenda of the government. The agenda of the government is to pretend to be doing democratic reform. If it honestly wanted to engage in democratic reform, it would support the motion the NDP is going to put forward to do what the previous Parliament, through the procedure and House affairs committee, had committed to do. That was to have a parallel process of a parliamentary committee speaking to Canadians about democratic reform. It could engage this place and the other place, and leave it up to Canadians to decide. It could have a citizens' consultation that would be a little less biased than the Frontier Centre.

If we look at Bill C-43, it actually tells Canadians already what they should be doing. They should be supporting the government's idea of a plebiscite with the Prime Minister appointing.

Just to recap, constitutionally going back to the Quebec conference and looking at what exactly the Fathers of Confederation envisioned, because it was all men at the time, and what they thought the upper house should be doing, they said it should not be elected at the time. Even the reformers at the time agreed to that.

We are now in 2007. Most people would believe that the process, and we see it with the House of Lords in England which is being challenged right now to reform itself, needs to be more than just a half measure, more than just a plebiscite so the Prime Minister can appoint. What we need to have is real reform.

I want to emphatically underline the fact that the government is on the wrong path for democratic reform and remind Conservatives that it was one of the predecessors of the now Conservative Party who talked about a triple E Senate. Two Es have fallen off the table with their intent now.

They think that they can fool Canadians by telling them they have had real Senate reform by having a popularity contest and a rubber stamp from the Prime Minister. Canadians will not be fooled. Our party will not be fooled. This place, I am sure, will not be fooled when we hear from the other parties.

However, the issue of democratic reform should be put in front of Canadians genuinely. Our party has said we believe that the mixed member system is a good idea and we have done that deliberately because we need to have a debate in this country about democratic reform.

The Reform Party, to give it credit, believed in a triple E Senate and put an idea forward. We are not sure where the Liberal Party stands on it and I am not sure the Bloc really has an idea on the issue because it is an issue for all of Canada.

• (1025)

What we need is to have ideas put forward in front of Canadians, so that we can have a genuine debate. Bill C-43 does not do that. It is simply saying to let us have an end run around the Constitution, let us have a half measure and say that we have done something.

I think that would be a disservice to Canadians and even to the Fathers of Confederation, the founders of the country, because they would have wanted, and I cite George Brown from the debates during the Quebec conference, genuine reform, not this tinkering and saying that by way of a plebiscite with the Prime Minister having the ultimate power, that this would be real reform. He would be flipping in his grave right now if he say the government putting this forward and calling it real reform.

I will sum up by essentially giving our party's position. We will not be supporting the bill. It is a half measure. It does not deal with real democratic reform and does absolutely nothing to deal with the issue of the roles and responsibilities of the other place.

Hon. Jay Hill (Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I really do not know where to begin after that presentation by my colleague from the New Democratic Party, but I must say at the outset that it certainly does not surprise me.

All too often we see when parties and governments endeavour to make some substantive reform, some change, they run into this type of nonsense. Certainly, in the nearly 14 years that I have been here, I have confronted this at every turn. I remember the former Prime Minister, Mr. Chrétien. I remember the immediate past Prime Minister, the member for LaSalle—Émard, spouting the same kind of nonsense, that if we cannot have this all encompassing dramatic reform, then nothing is worthwhile.

The member used the terms “tinkering” and “half measures”, and that is why he is not going to support it. Even a cursory examination of reforms that have taken place in other countries would show that all too often this is how we have to begin. We have to start somewhere to make some change and get the ball rolling.

Our Parliament is well over 130 years old and that archaic other place, the Senate, still has vacancies filled by appointment. The current Prime Minister is the first Prime Minister who has decided to take definitive action by taking some steps to change that after all that time.

Government Orders

I am the first one to admit that this is not a triple E. We are not trying to fool Canadians into believing that somehow the bill is going to bring about an instantaneous triple E Senate. I still believe in the principle of a triple E Senate. I got involved in that. I used to proudly wear the three E lapel pin. I still have it at home.

I have not lost my desire to see that type of dramatic and substantive reform to the upper chamber in this country, but the reality is that we have to start somewhere.

I would suggest that this is a start. If we look at what happened in the United States when the Americans eventually arrived at a triple E senate, their senate was filled by appointments as well. But a few states started the process, just as Alberta has started the process in Canada, and it grew from there. This legislation will accomplish that.

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where to start as well. Let us start off with the tradition of the Westminster model. I was sad to hear the member refer to a political structure that is highly irrelevant to ours.

I encourage him to read the debates of the Quebec conference, read the debates about what the House was supposed to do. He is suggesting that we can do a little end run around the Constitution. That is not good enough for Canadians. It does not respect the history of this country. Responsible government is about being just that.

The bill says that we do not have to worry about the Constitution. We can do a little end run around it and the Prime Minister can rubber stamp it. That is not good enough.

I am sorry, but for that member to call this substantive change in that incrementally that is the way it is done, he should look at the Westminster model. No one has done this. It requires a constitutional change. If the member does not like the other place, then it should be abolished and the government could then bring forward real reform.

• (1030)

Hon. Jay Hill: Which is your position?

Mr. Paul Dewar: Absolutely, that is our position. We have been consistent on it.

Then we have to take a look at how to represent people. I am absolutely shocked that a member from British Columbia would not address the fact that there is disproportionate representation in the other place to his region and he thinks it is okay. I am gobsmacked.

Mr. Ken Epp (Edmonton—Sherwood Park, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I remember when I was first elected in 1993 and we had a very strong issue with respect to an elected Senate. I remember standing over there and asking the then Prime Minister Jean Chrétien why the list of his party hacks was a better source of choices for a Senate appointment than the list provided by the people in an election. I would like the member to answer that. In both cases the prime minister would appoint the senator, but which list would he use? In this legislation the list would be from the people.

An hon. member: Selected by the people.

Mr. Ken Epp: Selected by the people or selected from among party hacks, which would the member prefer? I would like him to be very specific and answer this question, and not go on a big rant on another topic.

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, surely the member is not asking the New Democratic Party to support party hacks being appointed to the other place. We are the only party that has been consistent with respect to this issue. When the Conservative Party was putting its bagmen into the upper house, we were the only party before the Reform Party came around to criticize that. There is no argument here. I am not sure if the member has convenient amnesia about our party's position.

My mentor, as a kid and a hero to this day, Tommy Douglas, used to say Tweedledum and Tweedledee. That is what we have here with the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. The government is just deciding what way it can get its friends into the other place.

This is not going to work. It is not going to work because it is really not democratic. Do we need change? Absolutely. Is this the right kind of change? Absolutely not.

In the end, it does not deal with the fundamental issue of the role of the Senate. Certain senators, and I mentioned this in my comments, will be deemed as representing the people and others not. It will be utter confusion.

One day in the green and pleasant land for the Conservatives, all senators will be elected. I am sure they will have to deal with the issue of proportionality, as I mentioned to my friend from B.C., in terms of dealing with who is represented. Is the representation for P.E.I. versus B.C. acceptable right now? Absolutely not. Is that more important right now? Absolutely. It is part of the equation. That needs to be dealt with. We need real democratic change and not tinkering, and that is the problem with this bill.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Ottawa Centre for bringing a lot of substance to this debate by giving a historical view of how the Senate came about and what the real issues are before us.

I also thank him for the work he has been doing on this file in terms of bringing forward the substantive issues on democratic reform, as did the previous member for Ottawa Centre, Ed Broadbent. It was Ed Broadbent who really picked this up and set before Parliament the real qualitative changes that need to be made. The current member for Ottawa Centre is continuing that work.

The problem with this bill, like so many other bills that come forward, is that it is just window dressing. When we think of organizations like Fair Vote Canada or the Citizens' Assembly that took place in British Columbia, these are substantive processes that show there is a hunger out in the communities to address democratic reform.

I find it interesting that both the present government and the previous government had ministers responsible for democratic reform and yet we saw nothing happen. I think part of the question here is the process for arriving at democratic reform. I would like the member for Ottawa Centre to comment on that in terms of the kind of process we need to see, rather than this phony one that is set up for these focus groups, to actually engage people in the question of democratic reform.

Government Orders

• (1035)

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I laid that out. We have a motion in front of this House of what we think is the model. The Conservatives need to go to Canadians, not to their friends in the Frontier group or to paid consultants. Canadians are thirsting to contribute but the government puts up barriers every time Canadians want to be heard.

What we need is a process that all parliamentarians agreed to in the last Parliament, which is a Citizens' Assembly engagement and a parliamentary committee. We need to do our work. We should not pay consultants to do it. Canadians sent us here to listen to their good ideas.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I had actually hoped to ask the hon. member for Ottawa Centre a question but maybe after my speech he will want to intervene during the long period for questions and comments.

I had wanted to ask the member if he remembers his predecessor, Ed Broadbent, a man I liked and admired and still do. I wonder if he remembers that Ed Broadbent and I had a difference of opinion in the procedure and House affairs committee concerning a report, to which he is referring, about changes to the electoral system and that the process for searching out this change existed. Mr. Broadbent advocated a system very similar to the one the government has actually implemented. Conservative members actually advocated a much broader consultation but, when we pushed hard on it, Mr. Broadbent organized a walk out from the committee to deny us a quorum and then raised the matter in the House.

What I am getting at is that there has been a reversal of position here and I think everyone should be aware of that. I would like the member to comment on why the New Democrats, or at least he, have now switched to a position of favouring narrowing consultations, although he says that he is now in favour of a citizens' assembly as well, which they opposed at the time. I am actually a little unsure of which particular iteration of the changing position he is on at the moment. I will leave that thought with him. This is not strictly relevant to Bill C-43 and the Senate, which is the subject to which I will now turn.

When the end of the government comes, be it soon, be it off in the distant future, the bill and the work we have done on democratizing our Canadian institutions, this bill and other bills along the same lines, will be regarded as the greatest accomplishment of the government unless they are totally blocked by the other parties, in which case they will be regarded as the greatest missed opportunity that this Parliament had.

I just want to go through and mention some of the legislation we have put forward, of which Bill C-43 forms a package. We have Bill S-4, which would create fixed terms for senators, and it is in the upper House. That bill has been executed, not as part of a grandiose single package but as a separate piecemeal, to use the word that the member for LaSalle—Émard, the former prime minister, used to use, or incremental reform. The adoption of that bill is very important if we are to move to electing senators so that we are electing people for fixed terms.

The advisory consultations or informal elections that would take place for senators is another step in that package, and that is what Bill C-43 is all about.

We also have Bill C-31, which is designed to reduce to the extent possible electoral fraud throughout the country. We have also moved to change electoral financing rules. This would be very significant in reducing the influence of corporations, unions and non-voters in the financing of our elections and, therefore, the manner in which our decisions take place.

Those are all substantial moves forward. However, what is of particular importance is the work we are doing on the Senate. I am surprised at the way this gets belittled by some members of the House. This is an extraordinary measure. Canada has had an unelected chamber as its upper House for over 100 years. We are not quite unique in the world but we are getting closer and closer to being unique in the world in having an unelected upper House with full powers. It is an equal House to this one, with the exception of its inability to create money bills, and yet it is completely unelected.

This was a model that was considered by the Australians when they were designing their Senate over 100 years ago and rejected as being antiquated. They opted for an elected Senate.

We are looking at the replacement, in the member's words, incremental replacement, but we are looking at the replacement of an antiquated way of doing things with the modern and democratic way of doing things.

I want to talk a little bit about some of the things I think are important. Let me begin with a really basic one, which is the need for bicameralism and the need for a federation like Canada to have a bicameral system as opposed to a unicameral system where there is one chamber. This is a matter where I respectfully disagree with the position of the hon. member's party.

• (1040)

I would just point to the examples of federations in the world. Many countries claim to be federations but many of them are not real federations. For example, the Comoros Islands claim to be a federation but it is not a real federation. However, there are several long lived and successful examples of federal systems. Canada, of course, is one and Switzerland, the United States and Australia are others. We can also look at Germany and Austria. What we see in all of these cases is that they have, through one means or another, an elected upper chamber. In particular, the examples that are closest to Canada would be Australia and the United States but they have elected upper houses.

There are a number of purposes for having two chambers. One is to allow, and this is using the language of the Fathers of Confederation, a chamber of sober second thought, a place where decisions that may be taken in haste in this House can be examined, perhaps improved and sent back to us. As we know, the Senate is not shy even now about sending back measures that have been passed in this House for reconsideration.

Government Orders

Unfortunately, sometimes I think the Senate does so excessively on the basis of the interests of the partisanship of the party that put the senators there. That is a long term history. If we go back and look at the appointed Senate, it has either acquiesced completely to the government in power when the majority in the Senate reflects the majority in the lower house, or it has been unnecessarily obstructionist. That is a fundamental flaw with an appointed Senate, appointed effectively by the prime minister because the Governor General always takes the prime minister's advice on Senate appointments.

A significant change and improvement would be to move away from a Senate that is, depending on the moment, either a lapdog or excessively aggressive to one that gives considered sober second thought. That can be accomplished by an elected upper house. All we need to do is look at the examples that I have cited of other mature, responsible federations to see how this can work.

The other thing about an elected upper house is that it will tend to be elected on a separate mandate, both geographically and in terms of the electoral system we propose and also, to some degree, in terms of timing from the lower house that provides a different cross-section of Canadian public opinion and public sentiment over a broad period of time. The classic federalism theory is that we ought to have counterbalancing mandates for the upper and lower houses.

I want to turn now to the question of incremental reform, that which the former prime minister and now the hon. member for Ottawa Centre have derided as piecemeal reform versus wholesale reform. We have an unhappy series of experiments in our recent history with attempts at mega-constitutional reform. They have not been successful. I am thinking here of the Meech Lake accord and the Charlottetown accord. We are trying to move away from that.

The simple, practical reason for moving away from that to incremental reform is that it works. Incremental reform, making changes that are possible, does not involve hanging us up the way the country got hung up on the Meech Lake accord in which the part of the accord that had the highest threshold for approval became the standard by which everything had to be dealt with, which effectively guaranteed that it would be impossible to get it through.

The problem with wholesale reform is that in order to change the terms of senators and the way in which senators are selected, and to move from an appointed to an elected or an advisory elected system, and the changing of the regions and the representation by regions would involve, by necessity, moving to the seven-fifty amendment formula, which means having the approval of seven provincial legislatures representing 50% of the population on the very sticky issue of who should get how many senators.

While I would certainly agree that British Columbia is very underrepresented, which I think we can all agree on, we may discover, as we try to put in more seats for British Columbia and other provinces, that we may not get a national consensus on that. It is easy to say that we should get a consensus, but I would encourage the hon. member, if he gets a chance to stand up, to perhaps provide the percentage, the number of seats he would offer for each province and see whether he would get the support of all provinces or even of his party in all provinces on this subject. There is not a national consensus on this point. We can throw the baby out with the

bathwater, which was the approach of the former prime minister, and say that since we cannot get to perfection from here we cannot go anywhere.

However, I still advocate perfection, an unspecified kind of perfection, but I advocate it, or we can work on practical piecemeal incremental reform. This is the route to success. I invite all hon. members to look at the history of elected upper houses in the federations that most closely resemble our own, the Australians, the Swiss and the Americans. What everyone will notice is that in each case they went from much less democratic institutions to much more democratic institutions: to equal, elected, effective senates by means of incremental reform.

• (1045)

For example, 101 years ago was the anniversary of the election of the first American senator. It was an informal election held in the state of Oregon in 1906. Prior to that date, state legislatures had appointed senators. The famous Lincoln-Douglas debates in the 1850s were not debates between two men seeking direct office. They were seeking to cause people to influence their votes for the state House of Representatives, which would then choose which of those two people would go on to the senate.

That changed through the action of one state. Once that state acted, other states began to act the same way. There was a popular groundswell in support of elections and by 1913 the constitution was amended. In short, piecemeal reform produced a breaking of an impasse that would have continued to exist had there been an attempt of wholesale reform.

Australia moved from a first past the post system for its upper house, which was its initial system, to a proportional system. Again, that was done incrementally through piecemeal constitutional reform.

If I have time I will return to this. I note the system we have proposed in the upper house does involve a system of proportional representation known as a single transferrable vote. It is the same system, with some improvements, that exists in the Australian upper house and a number of other countries, including Ireland and Malta. It is a great success in producing more proportional representation.

I mention this simply because part of the critique raised by my predecessor, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre, was that the government was doing nothing on electoral reform. I suggest that moving from completely unelected partisan appointments by the prime minister to a system of proportional representation in the upper house is the greatest move toward any kind of proportional representation we have seen anywhere in this country's history. It is a great accomplishment.

I have mentioned how we are moving in this direction incrementally.

I point out that not only do we require the 7/50 amendment formula, which I would suggest is practically impossible, to move to a different representation province relative to other provinces in the upper house, we require the same thing to abolish the Senate.

Government Orders

While there are people who support abolition of the Senate, in fact the hon. member's whole party would support that, it requires the support of seven provinces with half the population. I think we will find that is just as difficult to attain as a process for changing the proportional representation of the provinces in the upper house. In practice, it is as Utopian as the other suggestion and leads to the fundamental problem of essentially leaving us with the status quo.

The Prime Minister is faced with a choice of attempting to act incrementally, as he is doing, or simply going to direct appointments based upon his own preferences, which might be wise or might be entirely partisan, who is to say, but they would not be democratic by definition.

The problem here, constitutionally, is that there is a section of the Constitution, specifically section 42(1) of the Constitution Act, which deals with and explains our amending formula as it relates to, among other things, the amendment of the Senate. The following categories of rules regarding the Senate are constitutionally protected and cannot be changed without the 7/50 formula.

The Governor General's power to appoint senators cannot be changed without the 7/50 formula. That is why the law is structured as it is. It is a Senate consultations act. It is not a Senate elections act because these are formally consultations. In Canada it is the convention. We have come to understand that the Governor General's power to appoint means in practice a prime minister's unfettered right to advise the Governor General and to expect his advice to be taken without question.

That cannot be changed except, as we are doing, through a law that effectively creates a convention. To those who object to the idea that we should move incrementally and use conventions for our Constitution, I point out that so much of our Constitution is conventional, such as the notion of a prime minister at all. The prime minister is not mentioned in the Constitution. He is purely a convention. This is a very honoured place in our system. In fact, I do not think our Constitution could function without conventions having a central role.

● (1050)

The constitutional qualification for Senators is one cannot become a Senator in Canada unless one is 35 years old. I do not think that is terribly fair, although I feel it is a bit fairer than I did when I was under 35. However, we do not have the power to change that provision, without the 7/50 formula, much as I would like to see that change. Perhaps that can be a non-controversial amendment in the future that all members could support.

I note that constitutional scholars over the years have been clear that the government's approach would not constitute a breach of the relevant sections of the Constitution. It can be done through non-constitutional means.

What we see here is the way mature federal systems act. If we take a look at other federations, one of the things that distinguishes their constitutional history from Canada's recent constitutional history, not Canada's entire constitutional history, for the last say 40 years is this.

In countries like Switzerland, Australia and the United States we see small incremental constitutional amendments discussed, sometimes accepted and often rejected, but never by means of attempts to

create vast new edifices, dramatic changes. We see reasonably regular changes to their constitutions. Whereas in Canada we have developed this idea that we must always act as we did in 1982, with the constitutional package that changed our amending formula and introduced the Charter of Rights and so on, but also caused some other problems. As we know there are many Quebeckers who feel greatly dissatisfied with this arrangement and with the fact that their province and their legislature did not sign on to it.

As we did in the Meech Lake accord in 1987 through 1990 and as we did in the Charlottetown accord, attempts were made to create vast new changes, to essentially pull the system up by the roots to examine it and see if it is still growing. These other countries have acted in piecemeal manners and the result is they have gone further in changing and modernizing their constitutions than we have done.

Therefore, it is precedented. It speaks well that we are acting this way through our maturity as a country. It also reflects a part of our constitutional history that gets forgotten, and that is the fact that we actually have had successful piecemeal changes to our Constitution in recent years in areas that were for some mystical reason not seen as being part of a vast edifice.

I think of things like the Prince Edward Island bridge amendment. We had to amend the Constitution to allow a bridge to be constructed to Prince Edward Island. We had an amendment dealing with Newfoundland schools. We had an amendment to change the name of the province of Newfoundland to the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We also had an amendment on the Quebec schools system that moved to a non-confessional system.

All these amendments have been done successfully, as were some others as well. They were all piecemeal and they all dealt with specific problems.

The attempt here, because we cannot deal through the Constitution, is to step aside, deal through a convention effectively with this law and thereby deal in the same spirit in the same way, which has brought success to our country and other countries, in order to achieve a mature bicameral democratic and, to a greater degree than ever before, a proportional system of democracy in the country.

I am excited by this. I think when the time comes in the future, all Canadians will look back at this move forward as one of the keystones in our country's democratic development.

● (1055)

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to address the question the member had for me in his preamble.

Statements by Members

I recall speaking to Mr. Broadbent about the same committee meeting to which the member was referring. In fact, he remembers it quite differently. I guess I trust Mr. Broadbent's version of events and the fact that the member was filibustering because he did not want to engage in the question of citizen consultation. I will leave it to them to settle who walked out on whom and why.

The bottom line is we had an all party committee agree, and Parliament therefore adopted it, to a consultation. Sadly, the Liberal Party decided not to engage in it. It let the date of October come and go and that was the date the committee had set to have the citizen's consultation process engaged.

I have to ask the member this. I find it strange that he would want to have citizen's consultation and support this flim-flam sham of a consultation through the Frontier Institute, which calls people like Democracy Watch to get a couple of people to participate because it does not know how to do it.

Would the member not believe that Canadians, along with Parliament, are the ones who should be the ones to decide how this is done? Why is he so afraid of the Constitution? There is an amending formula simply because the Constitution is set up so parties like his cannot come up with what they decide is best and not go to Canadians. Does the member not understand the importance of the Constitution and that he should not treat it as a suggestion list? It is the rules and the foundation of any mature country.

Mr. Scott Reid: Mr. Speaker, I am at a bit of a disadvantage in responding to what he says about my discussions with Mr. Broadbent because they have been in the context of an in camera committee, so I cannot provide any details. This also means that the hon. member could not have been there, notwithstanding his, I think, honestly mistaken assertion. He may have spoken to Mr. Broadbent, but that would mean that Mr. Broadbent broke the in camera convention in telling him what went on in committee.

If I could, Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member to maybe be quiet during my speech, just the way I was during his comments? That would be a real treat.

I cannot respond to that, other than to say I am trying to respect the in camera convention. However, I can say that my position, which was reflected in the dissenting Conservative Party report at the time, was that there should be wider consultations, and Mr. Broadbent objected to it. That is very easy to look up in the relevant report, although we did support it.

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I have to rise on a point of order. The member is insinuating that there was some trust broken in an in camera meeting, when he was the one who brought it up. I plead to the member to apologize to Mr. Broadbent, through me. He brought up the whole subject. He is the one who is—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member has made his point and unfortunately no one will have a chance to make any further points at this point, but we can resume the question and answer period after question period. Statements by members will now begin.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

JACK LAPIN

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today Barriere, B.C. bids a fond farewell to Regional District Director, Jack Lapin.

“Poppa Jack” and I first met in 1986 when we served together on the Thompson-Nicola Regional District board.

Jack was NDP to the core. I am Conservative. In the minds of many that would mean there could be no common ground. Two decades of friendship between us serve as an example of how politics can work when elected representatives hold office to serve their constituents and not themselves.

Whether he was gardening, plumbing or standing up for constituents, he always gave 100 per cent of himself. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Yvonne and his daughters Marlene, Theresa, Corinne and Cathy today as we remember this wonderful man and the many wonderful contributions he made to his community.

* * *

• (1100)

SOL KANEE

Hon. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a distinguished citizen of Manitoba and of Canada.

Sol Kanee, Officer of the Order of Canada, died April 21, 2007 at the age of 97. Born in Saskatchewan in 1909, he was educated in both Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

After practising law, he joined his family business, Soo Line Mills, and became one of the foremost leaders of the milling industry in western Canada. A member of the board of the Bank of Canada for 17 years, he was also chairman of the Federal Business Development Bank and he served on the boards of Transair and MONY Life Assurance.

His record of service in the Jewish community of Canada was outstanding, including as president of the Canadian Jewish Congress and in leadership positions in the World Jewish Congress. The Jewish community of Winnipeg annually awards its highest recognition for leadership and volunteerism in his name.

In Winnipeg the United Way, the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, the University of Manitoba and the Canadian National Millers Association, among others, benefited from his leadership.

His recognitions included a doctoral law degree from the University of Manitoba, the Order of Manitoba, and as I mentioned, Officer of the Order of Canada.

Sol Kanee was a commanding presence in our community. He was smart and he was wise. He was tough and he was caring. He was a practical man and he was a visionary. His legacy will live on for many generations and Winnipeg will be the richer for it.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

TOURISM AWARDS

Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on March 21, Tourisme Laurentides recognized its regional winners at the Grands Prix du tourisme Desjardins Laurentides 2007 gala.

In the category of tourism restoration-development, Sainte-Anne-des-Plaines' country-style restaurant La Conclusion won the gold.

Its owners, Chantal and Gilles Fournier, are very deserving of this honour, since they are members of Agricotours, and especially since their restaurant is certified country-style dining. With their hard work, their passion, their hospitality and the quality of their service, they have given our region a place to feature local products from my riding.

La Conclusion was also awarded the Coup de coeur du public award for agri-tourism, and on May 4 we will hear whether La Conclusion will win the Grand Prix du tourisme québécois. We wish them the very best of luck.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN CREDENTIAL RECOGNITION

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for the past several years Canadians have been concerned about the issue of foreign credential recognition. The process for newcomers to Canada to receive recognition for their skills lacks coordination among different levels of government and is often unfair and fragmented.

This leads to trained professionals in professions where we have serious labour shortages not being able to work in their field of expertise. They become underemployed and struggle to achieve their earning potential, which in turn leads to unacceptable levels of child poverty.

Recently I held several forums with foreign trained professionals and local immigrant settlement workers in my riding of Ottawa Centre to engage in discussions and develop pragmatic solutions to identify the barriers faced by new Canadians.

We all must work to ensure that the credential recognition process is transparent, objective and impartial. We also should support community based organizations that help newcomers become more quickly established in their new communities.

According to Statistics Canada, new immigrants will account for 100% of Canada's new net labour growth by 2011. Yet less than 20% will find work in their profession.

* * *

SPELLING BEE

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young constituent from my riding, Dakota Thiel, of Weyburn, Saskatchewan, who earned top honours winning the 2007 CanWest CanSpell Leader-Post Southern Saskatchewan Spelling Bee in Regina last month.

Dakota, who has become the community's newest celebrity, is a grade 7 student from St. Michael Junior High School in Weyburn.

This month Dakota paid a visit to Ottawa where 40 other national finalists gathered to participate in the 2007 CanWest National Spelling Bee championship. He made a valiant showing despite all the attention and pressure that accompanies a national competition. I know that making new friends and meeting the Prime Minister had to be highlights for him.

The journey does not end here, however, as Dakota will compete once again as he travels to Washington, D.C. next month for the Scripps National Spelling Bee championship.

I wish to commend Dakota for his hard work and the countless hours he has spent. My constituents, especially the city of Weyburn, are all very proud of his achievements.

On behalf of myself and the Government of Canada, I congratulate Dakota on a job well done.

* * *

● (1105)

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Roger Valley (Kenora, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last year, 2006, should have been a year worth celebrating. It was the 25th anniversary of Canada's ratification of the only UN convention on women's human rights, yet there was no celebration.

The new federal government has made some very disturbing changes to Status of Women. It has removed the word "equality" and changed the rules regarding funding for women's groups to ban all domestic advocacy and lobbying with federal funds. It has closed 12 of the 16 Status of Women Canada offices, one of them being the only northern office, in Thunder Bay, which was important to the women in the Kenora riding.

Many women's groups, especially aboriginal women's groups, will not have the necessary access to funding initiatives. Women in the Kenora riding and throughout Canada will be impacted negatively by these changes. Women's voices will be weakened.

The Prime Minister has said that he would respect and uphold women's human rights—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when I studied the environmental plan tabled by the Minister of the Environment this week, I saw that it will not only get the job done for the environment but it will do so by involving all sectors of our economy.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

We have a concrete and achievable plan that will stop the rise in greenhouse gases and then begin to reduce them. However, the opposition members are saying that they must be reduced immediately.

We have a comprehensive plan, one of the most stringent ever seen, but the Liberals are saying that we are headed for disaster because the objectives are below those set in a protocol that they signed, but that they never even tried to respect.

[English]

What we have had from the Liberals are words, arm waving, broken promises and inaction. What we have from our Conservative government is a concrete plan and action. We are getting the job done where the Liberals did nothing.

* * *

[Translation]

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AWARD

Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Laval's Chamber of Commerce and Industry held its 26th Dunamis gala on March 22. During the awards ceremony, Jean-Guy Girard, the founding president of Fondation La Belle-Aide, received the community involvement award.

This organization, which he has been leading for 14 years, improves quality of life for people in assisted living environments. Mr. Girard has done outstanding work through fundraising campaigns to offer special activities, such as concerts, lectures, summer camps and cultural outings, and purchase special equipment for people who are ill.

Initially, the foundation worked mostly with the Chomedey residence. Since then, it has worked with the Idola St-Jean and Ste-Dorothée CHSLDs. It looks as though all Laval area CHSLDs will be able to take advantage of the foundation's programs within a few years.

Congratulations to Mr. Girard, who is a philanthropic role model for the entire community. Thanks to his involvement, many seniors now enjoy a better quality of life.

* * *

[English]

WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY

Hon. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, April 28 is the National Day of Mourning. It is a day during which Canadians and people from 80 other countries take time to remember those who have been injured or who have lost their lives in the workplace.

[Translation]

The statistics are worrisome. In Canada, three people die in workplace accidents every day and even more workers die of work-related illnesses. We must lower the incidence of illness and death and protect our fellow citizens' health and lives. We must make an effort every day to make our workplaces safer.

[English]

The National Day of Mourning recognizes the urgent need to improve health and safety standards in the workplace.

On this day, I ask all members of Parliament to join me in calling on the government to take workplace safety more seriously and see to a better enforcement of the Canada Labour Code.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in a disgraceful display of partisan arrogance, the Liberal defence critic is at an international gathering in Brussels today, not to promote Canada as the greatest country in the world, but rather to soil our nation's reputation.

Liberals are using baseless allegations to smear not only the great name of Canada, but the integrity of the men and women in the Canadian Forces.

The member, along with the entire Liberal Party, should apologize to all Canadians for attempting to diminish our country's standing among the international community.

Unfortunately the Liberals are not above smearing our nation's reputation in an attempt to gain a political advantage. We all remember the derogatory remarks made by Carolyn Parrish about our neighbours to the south.

Simply put, Liberal MPs have a history of undermining the Canadian identity for partisan gains. Unlike the reckless Liberal defence critic and his opposition cohorts, we believe in defending our country.

Stand up for Canada was not just a campaign slogan. It is what this Conservative government does every day both at home and abroad for our citizens and soldiers.

On this side of the House, we are proud to be—

● (1110)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Victoria.

* * *

FETAL ALCOHOL SPECTRUM DISORDER

Ms. Denise Savoie (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a Health Canada report estimates the incidence of FASD to be approximately one in 100 births. In May 2004 an American research paper estimated the lifetime financial cost of caring for and supporting a person with FASD to be \$2.9 million U.S..

On financial grounds alone, Canadian taxpayers cannot afford to ignore this highly prevalent and invisible health and social issue that is having a profound effect on our communities and nation.

My NDP colleagues and I call upon the government to allocate the necessary resources to implement a national strategic FASD plan, including labelling. This plan must address the substantial lifetime needs of people with FASD together with their families and caregivers.

SASKATCHEWAN FLOOD

Mr. Gary Merasty (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during the past two weeks many communities in northeast Saskatchewan have declared a state of emergency due to rising flood waters in our lakes and rivers. In some places the water is at its highest level in decades.

On Wednesday morning, most of the 700 people from the Red Earth Cree Nation began to return to their homes after being evacuated six days prior. Last year, evacuees from this community had to endure a 12 day absence from their homes. This year's improvement is a direct result of the preparation, determination and hard work of a dedicated group of officials and volunteers.

I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the men and women of the Saskatchewan Public Safety Department, the Prince Albert Grand Council, the Saskatchewan Watershed Authority, and especially the Red Earth Cree Nation people themselves, and all the other volunteers, emergency workers and businesses in Prince Albert and Saskatoon who helped make this ordeal a little more manageable for the people affected.

I invite all my colleagues in the House to join me in praising these organizations and individuals for their efforts.

* * *

[Translation]

MAUDE BRIAND-LEMAY AND PÉNÉLOPE ROBINSON

Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate two outstanding young scientists, Maude Briand-Lemay and Pénélope Robinson, of the École Polyvalente Nicolas-Gatineau. Since September, they have won awards at a number of science fairs for their project called “one mirror, two suns”. They first won at their own school, then within the Des Draveurs school board, and went on to win first prize at the Expo-sciences Bell in the Outaouais, and the Hydro-Québec award at the Université de Sherbrooke. Maude and Pénélope will represent Quebec at the Canada-Wide Science Fair to be held in Nova Scotia in May.

The genius of their original invention doubles energy production by maximizing available space. “One mirror, two suns” causes solar radiation to reflect onto a surface that does not directly benefit from this energy. The radiation is captured by solar panels and produces enough heat and electricity for a home.

The Bloc Québécois would like to congratulate Maude and Pénélope, each a modern day Marie Curie. Long live science and way to go, girls!

* * *

[English]

VOLUNTEERISM

Hon. Raymond Simard (Saint Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on April 18 the volunteers of a group in my riding, Bishop Grandin Greenway Inc., were recognized for their incredible contribution and relentless work by being awarded the Mayor's Volunteer Service Award for Environment by Volunteer Manitoba. The award was presented at the 24th annual volunteer awards dinner and coincided with National Volunteer Week.

Statements by Members

These volunteers were recognized for “transforming the barren scar of land along Bishop Grandin Boulevard between the Seine and Red rivers into a network of accessible nature areas and public pathways linking and supporting both human and wildlife communities”.

This group of dedicated people, led by their president, Mike Balshaw, have raised an impressive amount of money, created partnerships with both the public and private sectors, and spent countless personal hours to get the job done.

The Bishop Grandin Greenway will provide a safe, healthy transportation corridor and green space for all Winnipeggers.

I offer these volunteers my sincerest congratulations. I ask members of the House to join me in acknowledging the amazing work of these outstanding citizens.

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY CANDIDATE

Mr. Gary Goodyear (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have had a hard time finding candidates, but it is really slim pickings in Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont where the Liberals have nominated the opposition leader's Edmonton campaign manager, Farhan Mujahid Chak.

For those who do not know Chak, today's *National Post* is pretty interesting. He accuses Israel of rape and murder. He has outlandish conspiracy theories about terrorist attacks in France. He says Canada's new government is trying to destabilize Poland.

He will not say if he is the same Farhan Mujahid Chak who the *National Post* reports was charged in 1993 with the use of a firearm during the commission of an offence, and possession of an illegal weapon.

Canadians deserve the truth. Will the Liberal leader ask Chak if he was in fact charged with weapons offences? Does the Leader of the Opposition think, as his campaign manager does, that we should be more sympathetic toward suicide bombers?

* * *

• (1115)

JUSTICE

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for York West rose in this House yesterday and accused the Government of Canada of being soft on criminals and not caring for the victims of crime.

Let me set the record straight.

We recently established the Office of the Federal Ombudsman for Victims of Crime.

We have dedicated \$52 million to give victims of crime greater support and a more effective voice in the federal corrections and justice system.

We have hired a victim services officer to respond to the needs of victims.

Oral Questions

The National Parole Board will strengthen communication with victims and ensure better quality in service delivery and parole hearings.

The government supports victims of crime. We have acted to toughen the Criminal Code by tackling everything from reverse onus at bail hearings to mandatory minimum sentences.

I know the member for York West will be eager to convince her leader to support these measures because they do what she says she wants. In 2005 she said:

What's wrong is there's too much plea-bargaining with the Crown and judges are not passing down tougher sentences like they could.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Michael Ignatieff (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister demonstrated yet again his contempt for this House. He repeatedly rose to say that access to prisons in Afghanistan has not been denied. This bluster was contradicted right away by the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission, which confirmed yet again that access has been denied for some time.

When the Prime Minister got it so wrong, was he relying on the Minister of Public Safety's false information about the activities of Correctional Service Canada? Was he relying on advice from his incompetent Minister of National Defence? Or was he making it up as he went along?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the confusion and disappointment on the opposition benches is desperation at the loss of their issue. They were wrong. They said that the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission did not have access to detention facilities. It does. They said that Canada did not have access to detention facilities. We do.

The fact is they keep restating false accusations again and again, and they are doing it today, after they have been proven wrong again and again. Would they please apologize to Canadians, to the troops, and stop repeating falsehoods?

Mr. Michael Ignatieff (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Public Safety added a new chapter to this evolving tale of incompetence, disinformation and cover-up. He said that two Correctional Service Canada officers have had access all along to monitor the condition of detainees in Kandahar prison. Then the minister's own spokesperson contradicted him, and the ambassador of Afghanistan contradicted him, making it clear that before yesterday Canadians did not have the right to visit Afghan detainees.

Is there anyone in the Conservative government prepared to stand up and tell the truth about this matter?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr.

Speaker, the opposition continues to restate falsehoods, although the record has been made clear.

The reality is that the previous Liberal government, which had sent our troops into Afghanistan, had for almost the entire period it was in government no policy whatsoever on detainees. Only at the eleventh hour did it enter into an arrangement which allowed the International Committee of the Red Cross access, an arrangement that the Liberals later attacked as inadequate, their own arrangement that they entered into.

We have since made arrangements with the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission to have access to detention facilities and now we are confirming the arrangement that we have with—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore.

[Translation]

Mr. Michael Ignatieff (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, these answers are disappointing.

The top Correctional Service Canada officer on the ground in Afghanistan said that she “was not naive enough to believe” that there is no torture in Afghan prisons. It seems that the only people naive enough to believe this are the members of the Conservative government.

For the sake of the mission, for the sake of our brave soldiers and for the sake of Canada's reputation, will the Prime Minister put an end to this circus and immediately dismiss this incompetent Minister of National Defence?

• (1120)

[English]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the opposition members should really stop inventing stories to help the Taliban. If they have any proof, they should put it on the table, and they should put it on the table now instead of repeating falsehoods.

I will quote this authority:

Therefore, it was not imprudent on the part of the government, in the context of our fight against terrorism, to side with a nation that was attacked and not become the defenders of terrorists, as the [opposition] has.

Do they know who said that? It was Jean Chrétien.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla (Brampton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this has been a week of chaos, confusion and cover-up for the Conservatives, a political gong show at the expense of our international reputation and the Canadian military.

The Prime Minister and his ministers have all stated that Afghan detainees were not abused. The international community has stated otherwise. Evidence of torture is undeniable.

The government is in utter disarray. When will the Prime Minister stop misleading Canadians, tell the truth, do the right thing, and fire his Minister of National Defence?

Oral Questions

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am stunned that the opposition continues to repeat false accusations and undermine our troops.

I reference the following CBC report. Responding to news that Canadians have a new arrangement to inspect detention facilities, Dutch Major General Ton van Loon said he has not heard of any specific cases of abuse in the six months he has been in charge of NATO troops. "I have not been given any reason to think that they would take place," van Loon said. He and his officials talk regularly with Afghan police and the country's intelligence service, and with a name like van Loon, I have to respect him.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla (Brampton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government must realize that it is in complete chaos. It is a disgrace.

The Conservatives do not know how many detainees have been turned over to the Afghans. They do not know where they are. They do not know who is holding them. They do not even know what prisons they are in. How can they claim that these detainees were not abused?

When will the Prime Minister show some leadership, take some action, and fire Canada's version of Donald Rumsfeld?

Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the Sarpoza prison facility just west of Kandahar city there are 838 detainees, alleged terrorists, and 138 of them are kept in what is called the national security component of that particular facility.

There are 40 alleged terrorists and other suspects in the national directory security facility, which is a separate one, and in the third facility, which is run by the Afghan police, there are 35. We have had access to those three facilities.

The opposition should cease making these false allegations and should cease carrying these allegations that are brought forward by Taliban suspects because they are hurting our troops.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Monique Guay (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment would have us believe Canada is turning the corner, in fact his plan does not respect the Kyoto targets because instead of achieving these targets between 2008 and 2012, it will reach the target 15 years later, in 2025.

The minister knows perfectly well that we can still achieve the Kyoto targets on time. What is he waiting for to change course?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada has to make a U-turn because it is going in the wrong direction. Since the Liberals promised to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in 1997, emissions have not stopped increasing. We are going to change that.

Ms. Monique Guay (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister did not understand my question. I will try again.

This government did not keep its word on the environment. On Tuesday it voted in favour of the Bloc Québécois motion to set absolute targets for reducing greenhouse gases, but today it is sticking to the ridiculous idea of intensity targets, which is not a real constraint, because with technological innovations they are being achieved anyway.

Does the minister realize that he is thereby giving the oil industry an advantage by choosing the polluter pay principle to the detriment of Quebec, which will be achieving its targets on time?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our policy is clear. For the very first time, Canada is forcing industry to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions and atmospheric pollutants. We will impose mandatory ceilings on industry in order to cut industrial atmospheric pollution in half by 2015.

• (1125)

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, not only does the minister's plan not fully recognize past efforts, but it also mortgages the future. Quebec's new environment minister, Line Beauchamp, said the greenhouse gas reduction plan was disappointing, and she is worried that Quebec companies will pay the price because they will not have access to the international credit trading system.

Does the government realize that its plan goes not only against environmental interests, but also against the interests of Quebec?

[English]

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his question, but unfortunately, he is wrong.

Our plan is a realistic plan. It is a balanced plan. It reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 20%. That is a real reduction. Under the Liberals, for 13 years, the greenhouse gas emissions continued to climb and went up, up, up. Ours are going down, down, down.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, because of the minister's ideological stubbornness, Canada will not meet the Kyoto objectives, and Quebec, which is well on its way to meeting them, will be penalized in 2012 because the Kyoto protocol provides for penalties for those, like Canada, who are dragging their feet.

Can the government guarantee that Quebec will not have to pay a single cent for the inaction of the government and of Canada?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am really surprised that the member did not notice that after 13 years of Liberal inaction, greenhouse gas emissions had risen 35% above the Kyoto target.

We will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Liberals caused them to go up. Our plan is that they will go down by 20%. That is dramatic. That is 150 megatonnes of reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

* * *

AFGHANISTAN

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has refused to admit that his Minister of National Defence has become a liability to soldiers on the ground in Afghanistan. The daily changing story and the chaos that the minister has created are surely grounds for dismissal.

However, it gets worse. For over a year, the NDP has been asking Correctional Service Canada for information on the officers who supposedly report on Afghan prisons and prisoners but DFAIT and DND claim no knowledge of this and have produced no documents.

How is it possible that three government ministers have three stories and none of them match?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the opposition continues to make false allegations and repeat false allegations there is no wonder the story keeps changing. Every day we get a false allegation and then we must chase it down and put the facts on the table.

When we keep answering false allegations with facts there is obviously a change in the story.

If the Liberals and the other opposition parties would stop repeating and misstating falsehoods, we would no longer have this issue of changing stories because the straight truth would be coming from one source, this government.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is the government's story and information that keeps changing every day in question period.

Correctional Service Canada has told us that it will release the documents requested today or Monday but it will not matter because the access coordinator has told us that the whole document will be blank.

This is outrageous. The story would not keep changing had the government simply told Canadians everything. The truth will set them free.

Why does the government continue to confuse Canadians? Why does it not simply tell us what is really going on in Afghanistan?

Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is fascinating to hear a member of the NDP say that there was no document about our officers going over there.

When we sent out the press release about our officers going over there, I thought the NDP members would be so proud of our

corrections officers putting themselves in harm's way to go into these facilities that they would be asking for more detail. I also thought they would want to know more after I talked to the media in Afghanistan. It has been published in newspapers in Canada but I thought they would want to know even more. However, they did not ask one question about what our officers were doing over there. They believe allegations promulgated by people—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Saint Boniface.

Hon. Raymond Simard (Saint Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first we were told that the Red Cross would ensure that detainees were not tortured, but the Red Cross said that was not true. Then the minister told us that the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission would do the job, but again not true. Then the minister suddenly announced, out of thin air, that he has a new deal, but again not true. Then the Minister of Public Safety stands up and says that now Correctional Service Canada is doing the job, but again that is not true.

When will the government tell the truth, stop changing its story and fire its incompetent Minister of National Defence?

• (1130)

Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we saw yesterday, when the Liberal accusations were proven absolutely false and we asked for an apology, we received nothing.

Now the member stands and says that it is not true that corrections officers are in those facilities. That is true. I said yesterday that they had made 15 visits. They have now made 17 visits.

I would like him to stand and take responsibility for false allegations and say that he is sorry. Those officers are there. I want him to stop maligning our corrections officers and our troops. Will he please do that?

Hon. Raymond Simard (Saint Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the apology should come from the minister.

[Translation]

On Monday, the Prime Minister said that detainees were not being tortured. Tuesday, he said that a new agreement to ensure their protection was unnecessary. Wednesday, however, the Minister of National Defence concluded an agreement, first with the Kandahar government, and then with the national directorate of security. Thursday, the Prime Minister said that he was still working on that agreement and that our Correctional Service officers had been able to see prisoners from the beginning. We all know that this is not the case.

What is going on? What stories will they make up for us today?

Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he is again repeating things that are simply not true.

It is the responsibility of all members, whenever they say something, especially something as important as the name of our soldiers and our federal corrections officers, to not continually repeat false statements.

Oral Questions

I would like the member to rise and apologize, and to say that he supports our soldiers, the very brave men and women who are on this mission.

[*English*]

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada-Afghan agreement on the transfer of detainees prohibited Canada from transferring detainees into a condition of torture and inhumane treatment.

Why did the multiple reports of such treatment not immediately set off alarm bells in the government? Why did the government ignore those reports, deny those reports, censor those reports or falsely characterize them as Taliban reports when these reports were coming also from the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission?

The facts were clear. Our responsibilities were clear. Why did the government dissemble rather than implement our responsibilities?

Hon. Helena Guergis (Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about reports. In fact, there were five reports and four out of five reports were given to the previous Liberal government. What did the Liberals do with those reports? They did absolutely nothing. They implemented a policy one month before Canadians fired them.

When we became the new government, we took hold of that policy, implemented it and enhanced it.

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government's entire conduct this week has been a pattern of contradiction, misrepresentation, misinformation and disinformation, and it is still continuing, and, at its core, undermining the very integrity of the Afghan mission and our responsibility to protect our own soldiers.

Why is the government seeking to blame everybody else but refuses to accept responsibility for its own action or inaction? Why does the new government not finally act as a responsible government and implement our responsibilities under the Canada-Afghan agreement and under international law? Why does the government not act responsibly?

Hon. Helena Guergis (Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is Canada's new government that has acted responsibly with respect to Afghanistan.

What Canadians deserve to know is why it is the Liberals in the opposition continually take what the Taliban, the alleged terrorists, have to say to be the gospel truth but when Canadians, brave Canadian men and women, say something they ignore it.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Vivian Barbot (Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, over the past few days we have been treated to a real festival of contradictions. First, the Minister of National Defence called in the Red Cross and then the chair of the Afghan human rights commission. Then there was a new agreement; then there was no agreement. The latest is that Correctional Service Canada is there. However, they do not have the mandate to monitor the prisoners.

If the government were truly dedicated to the troops and the Canadian mission in Afghanistan, then would the suitable story of the day not be the resignation of the Minister of National Defence?

• (1135)

Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Correctional Service Canada officers are there to help improve the conditions in the prisons and in other institutions, to help train the Afghan officers to work in the prisons and also to verify and ensure that there is no torture. They are there. They have made a lot of visits and they will continue to do so.

Mrs. Vivian Barbot (Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while the story keeps changing to suit the Minister of National Defence, the abuses continue.

If, as the Prime Minister claims, the government has the interests of the troops at heart, what is he waiting for to stop transferring prisoners and dismiss the minister?

[*English*]

Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are two things that have not changed. First, our commitment to see conditions improve has not changed, and we are seeing improvements. These are slow improvements. It is a third world system over there but we are seeing improvements.

The other thing that has not changed is the continued flow of false allegations, where members opposite prefer to take testimony from those who are suspected terrorists, some of whom have been instructed and trained to lie, and they run with that. They will insult our military. They will automatically say that the suspected terrorists must be telling truth. They should start believing our troops.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the level of disinformation that this government has reached this week on the issue of Afghan prisoners is quite unacceptable. We have heard a myriad of unlikely stories. This government, which campaigned on openness and transparency, has used every form of manipulation.

What is the government waiting for to pull itself together and put an end to this culture of secrecy that seems to be its trademark?

[*English*]

Hon. Helena Guergis (Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, how many times must we ask the opposition why it listens to the Taliban and chooses to believe that what it says is the absolute truth? The Taliban, the alleged terrorists, are the people who are there to kill our brave men and women.

Opposition members might just want to think about that and might just want to give our Canadian brave men and women the benefit of the doubt.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that same culture of secrecy was evident earlier this week when the Minister of the Environment chose to announce his plan without inviting the opposition parties so that he could more easily control his message and discourage public debate.

How can a government that takes pride in its transparency justify restricting parliamentarians' access when it comes to an issue like the environment, which is critical to the future?

[English]

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question because we finally have a government that is taking serious the importance of the environment.

For 13 years, we had a Liberal government where emissions continued to rise. The Liberals promised but obviously they were not concerned.

We now have a government that has made firm commitments: a 20% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and a 50% reduction in air pollutants. We are getting it done.

[Translation]

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we learned that the government has abandoned Kyoto.

Its plan is an illusion that will destroy Canada's potential to become a green energy superpower.

Quebec's environment minister said that this plan is too little, too late. The Pembina Institute said that the plan will do nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. David Suzuki said it is embarrassing.

Why will this government not take the future health of our planet seriously?

[English]

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that it was the Liberals who abandoned Kyoto when we saw greenhouse emissions go 35% above the target. They owe this Parliament an apology.

During the committee, it was Dr. David Keith, from the University of Calgary, who told that member, "This is the kind of grandstanding that is the reason we're not having policy in Canada".

They did not get it done. We are getting it done.

• (1140)

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has officially announced that it will ignore the Kyoto targets, it will ignore the Kyoto timelines, it will ignore the science of Kyoto, it will ignore environmentalists like David Suzuki and it will ignore the recommendations of the parliamentary committee.

It is a sham that prevents Canadians from using most of Kyoto's tools and that delays action for more than a decade. It is pure political hyped theatre of the absurd.

Will the Conservatives stop the doublespeak and deceit and bring their own bill, Bill C-30, back to this House so Canadians can get a real plan for our environment?

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, his own leader said, "I will be part of Kyoto, but I will say to the world I don't think I will make it". It is that party that abandoned Kyoto. It is that party that created the environmental mess. It is that party's deputy leader who said, "We didn't get it done".

Today in *The Globe and Mail*, Jeffrey Simpson said that this plan was better than anything the previous Liberal government advanced.

Our plan will be effective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. We are turning the corner and we are doing it.

Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary should start answering questions and stop playing opposition.

Yesterday, the minister laid out a road map that takes a wrong turn and drives Canada into a climate change ditch. The minister's intensity based targets give up meaningful reductions of greenhouse gases and represent a complete abandonment of our Kyoto commitments.

It fails to set any industrial targets for smog. It gives the cold shoulder to early movers and uses the least cost-effective means to ensure that consumers, not polluters, pick up the tab.

What a scam.

Why should Canadians pay more for a plan that does so little?

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, well-known Liberal supporter, Mr. Buzz Hargrove, has also been quoted today. He says that he thinks the minister has taken a major step forward that will deal with some of the environmental concerns but will not throw tens of thousands of workers out of work.

The Liberal plan was to destroy the economy. All they know is how to mismanage.

We have a tough, realistic plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is balanced. Canadians support it. We are getting it done.

Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only thing the Conservatives know how to do is to fearmonger.

The Conservatives abandoned Kyoto, abandoned project green and yesterday they tossed out the work of Parliament and abandoned the clean air act.

What little they did offer yesterday thumbs its nose at the international community: cheating by using 2006 as a base year and using meaningless intensity based targets.

Why does the government not just give up the hoax and admit that when it comes to the environment it just does not care?

Oral Questions

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals had taken action on the environment when they were in government, we would have met the Kyoto target, but the reality is that they did not get it done. We have heard that they did not even plan to get it done. They made a lot of promises but they did not get it done.

Our plan is realistic. We have heard that it is the toughest plan in the world. It is true. Yesterday was a historic day because the 20% reduction by 2020 is a tough target. It is a realistic target. It is a balanced target. We are getting it done.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP has been making baseless accusations against the government without any regard for the facts. It is trying to create an issue that just does not exist by alleging that the government is participating in the North American future 2025 project round table, which involves a discussion on bulk water exports.

Can the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and International Trade confirm whether government officials are participating in this round table and if the government intends to enter into negotiations on bulk water exports?

Hon. Helena Guergis (Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the great concern of the member for Selkirk—Interlake on the issue of bulk water.

Our new government is not participating in or financing this meeting in any way. On the issue of bulk water exports, we have said many times very clearly that our government has no intention of entering into negotiations, behind closed doors or otherwise, regarding the issue of bulk water exports.

Canada's new government is committed to protecting water in its natural state and to preserving the integrity of ecosystems and we will continue to do so.

I would really appreciate it—

• (1145)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying in politics, never interrupt your opponents when they are screwing up, but when it comes to the environment we will have to fight along with Canadians to stop the government from its reckless policies to fight climate change.

Every Canadian knows that the Liberal Party screwed up and put Canada in a deep hole when it came to our own climate change targets, but that is no excuse for the Conservative government to continue with the delay. Will it bring back the clean air and climate change act for a free and fair vote in this Parliament now?

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that if the plan we introduced yesterday had been introduced in 1997, we would have met the Kyoto targets. I ask members to listen to this quote:

—my initial reaction is that this is a strong step in the right direction. The federal government seems to finally have its priorities straight on climate change...

Do you know who said that, Mr. Speaker? The leader of the Liberal Party in Alberta.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government is in an obvious and huge mess when the only group truly praising this plan is the oil and gas sector. This is meant to be a plan for our environment, not for the oil patch.

It is understood that the 13 years of Liberal inaction on this file do not permit the government any more excuses for not getting the job done and bringing in the clean air and climate change plan. It is no longer excusable for the government to rely on the excuses of failed past governments.

Will the government bring the clean air and climate change act back to Parliament for a free and democratic vote today?

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only people who are opposing this plan, which is a good realistic plan, are the radical environmentalists and the opposition.

I have a quote from the FCM president, who said:

We applaud the Minister for recognizing the important role municipal governments can play in the national fight against climate change.

The plan is real. It reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 20% by 2020. That is huge. We will cut pollution levels by 50% in the next eight years. We are getting it done.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Gary Merasty (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate released a report entitled “Children: The Silenced Citizens”. Highlighted within it is how Canada has failed aboriginal children.

The government continues to re-victimize these silent victims living in third world conditions. It refuses to rebuild schools that have burned. It cut funding to child welfare programs. It betrayed children by killing the Kelowna accord. It ignored aboriginal children through two federal budgets. It even refused to apologize to residential school students and survivors.

The government must stop playing political games with children's lives. When will it make aboriginal children a priority?

Oral Questions

Mr. Rod Bruinooge (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, CPC): Mr. Speaker, of course our government is very concerned about the state of aboriginal children in Canada. That is why we continue to make very large investments, both in the previous budget and in the current one.

I would like to point out the fact that unfortunately the Liberal Party of Canada is slowing down the process on an important bill that we have brought forward, Bill C-44, which actually brings human rights to people on reserve. This is something that has been neglected for so many years.

We want the Liberals to pass this bill. We would very much like to see this happen. Hopefully the member opposite can speak to the Liberal position on that bill.

Hon. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): That is another piece of misinformation, Mr. Speaker, from that group across the floor.

Recent press reports indicate that the federal government had been warned of the inhumane living conditions at residential schools that led to the spread of tuberculosis. That disease caused the death of almost half of the children at those schools.

Today, the survivors and the families of these victims live with the realities of this neglect.

Again, what could possibly be preventing this meanspirited government from apologizing for the legacy of residential schools?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, CPC): Mr. Speaker, of course our government was very interested in making sure that this sad chapter of Canadian history was rectified. We signed the residential schools agreement just last year.

Not only did we do that, but we have moved forward with a reconciliation process that we believe will bring to bear the facts that have occurred over that period of history. We will continue to make sure that this happens.

* * *

● (1150)

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, almost one year ago in this House I asked this question. When will the Prime Minister honour his written promise to my constituent Joyce Carter to immediately extend VIP benefits to all veterans and widows of the second world war and the Korean war?

The minister's excuse at the time was that he was waiting for the department to complete a full study on health services. Expert witnesses at the veterans affairs committee have stated there is nothing stopping the government from moving right now.

I will ask again, why does the Prime Minister continue to ignore the promise he made to Joyce Carter?

Hon. Greg Thompson (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think everyone will acknowledge that we have done

more for veterans in our first 13 months in office than the Liberals did in 13 years. The Liberals, the government the member was part of, cut VIP services to allied veterans. They cut burial programs for veterans. They cut travel rates and treatment benefits for veterans.

We are committed to improving the VIP, but we are not going to do it in the ad hoc, make it up as we go along approach the Liberals always took and always will take.

Mr. Roger Valley (Kenora, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in November of last year the Gerontological Advisory Council at Veterans Affairs Canada released a report calling for an integrated health system for our veterans, with statements such as these:

There is no time for extensive debate; there is only time to act. It is time to keep the promise.

Five months later we have heard nothing from the minister on his plans to implement this program. Worse, the Conservatives have presented two budgets to the House without improving the quality of health care for veterans. When will the government stop stalling? When will it honour its commitments to our veterans and implement this program?

Hon. Greg Thompson (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to make the member aware of what we have done for veterans in the last budget.

In fact, since taking office, we have increased benefits to veterans to the tune of half a billion dollars. We have brought in more front line workers. Those are things that the Liberals actually rejected in our budget. We have already brought in an ombudsman and the bill of rights. We are committed to improving those benefits.

Again, we are not going to do it in the ad hoc, make it up as we go along approach that the Liberals always take. We are doing it in a way that is—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Laval.

* * *

[Translation]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, until 1992, thousands of women used to come to Canada from the Philippines to work as nurses. In 1993, the government changed the criteria, forcing such women to come and work as live-in caregivers to seniors, children and people with disabilities. They have become low-cost housekeepers, forced to live in their employer's home, regardless of the abuse they endure.

If women are so important to the Minister for the Status of Women, how can she allow her government to condone this injustice?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while the Liberals cut the budget of women's programs by three times, our government provided an additional \$20 million for women's programming.

Under our government, women's programs have the highest budget ever in the history of the Status of Women. This means we are giving money directly to initiatives that help these women. We are getting the job done.

* * *

*[Translation]***WORLD BANK**

Mr. Thierry St-Cyr (Jeanne-Le Ber, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the president of the World Bank, Paul Wolfowitz, is being accused of using his position to approve a salary increase for a bank employee, who happened to be his girlfriend. The pay raise meant that she was earning more than the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice.

As Canada's governor of the World Bank, does the Minister of Finance intend to demand the resignation of Paul Wolfowitz?

[English]

Ms. Diane Ablonczy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member will know that the World Bank has a process in place to deal with these types of allegations. In fact, the process is being followed.

We are assured that the World Bank's board of directors is seeking and collating all relevant documentation. Once it is released we will have a clear picture of what is happening. We will be able to make a finding at that time.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, increasingly the new government is breaking trust with Canadians, but the Minister of Agriculture has found a new low in taking money out of farmers' pockets.

Last year the minister announced a two year options program to provide low income farmers with financial assistance. Last week the minister changed the rules after the fact, destroying farmers' financial planning as of December 31 so that farmers do not now qualify.

Eliminating planned critical financing is outrageous. Will the minister reinstate the original rules so that farmers still qualify as they were intended to?

● (1155)

[Translation]

Hon. Christian Paradis (Secretary of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question.

It must be understood that the options program mentioned by the member is a pilot project that has provided \$141 million to 15,000 farm families. We are listening to farmers to determine how best to support them. And what is the result? We want to replace the CAIS with a savings account program with increased assistance for rising

production costs, a disaster relief program, improved production insurance and an improved margin based program. This all comes as a result of listening to farmers—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River.

* * *

*[English]***THE BUDGET**

Mr. Chris Warkentin (Peace River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week in the House the member for Markham—Unionville, the Liberal finance critic, incorrectly stated that budget 2007 did not address the needs of Canadians with disabilities. In particular, he alleged that the new green levy on gas guzzling vehicles would make wheelchair accessible vans more expensive.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance set the record straight?

Ms. Diane Ablonczy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is another problem with the Liberals making things up. In fact, the Liberal leader told his party to go out and trash the budget. I guess for Liberals that means fearmongering with some of the most vulnerable in our society.

However, since the Liberals cannot do their own homework, I will point them to the budget bill, at page 46, subclause 68.02(1), which makes it very clear that anyone using wheelchair accessible vans will not be out of pocket for the green levy. This is on top of the landmark registered disability savings plan, the \$45 million enabling accessibility fund, and the working income tax benefit and disability supplement.

* * *

COMMUNITY ACCESS PROGRAM

Ms. Denise Savoie (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, community access to the Internet helps low income Canadians develop essential skills and participate in the economy.

Last year the community access program was cut by almost 25%, and now 4,000 community groups have been left hanging for four weeks with no information about funding renewal.

Why is the Conservative government stalling to fund a program that assists ordinary Canadians in developing job skills? Will the minister publicly today confirm the status and budget for this important job skills program?

Oral Questions

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that this government has ensured that the community access program will be funded for 2007-08. Once the details are finalized we will provide information to the CAP recipients about CAP operations for 2007-08.

* * *

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Ms. Denise Savoie (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the government is going to finalize it some time this year. The groups will be interested.

I would like to mention another subject of delay. It is the end of exam month and thousands of students are graduating with crippling levels of debt.

Unfair sky-high interest rates force students to pay more than 33% on top of their loans and the repayment regime is very rigid. The last time the government consulted on post-secondary it waited until mid-August and forgot students in the process.

The minister promised to review the loan system, but students need fixes now. When will they get them?

Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I remind the member that stakeholders have praised the investments made by the government to post-secondary education in the last budget.

In fact, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada stated that the investments showed the government's recognition of the importance of research to increasing Canada's productivity and Canadian standard of living.

The Council of Ontario Universities welcomed the \$1 billion post-secondary education infrastructure trust fund.

We believe in knowledge advantage in Canada. We are getting things done.

* * *

[Translation]

PASSPORT CANADA

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because of the incompetence of the Conservatives, Canadians have to wait up to three months to get a passport. The government knew for months that this would happen, but it did absolutely nothing about it.

On February 13, the Minister of Foreign Affairs said he had recruited more than 500 new employees at Passport Canada. However, on Monday he said, "We hope to have them all on stream very soon to address this bottleneck in the process".

What are we to believe? When will the minister admit that this problem is the direct result of his own incompetence?

● (1200)

[English]

Hon. Helena Guergis (Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member that the Liberals can run from their past, but they cannot hide. It is a fact.

Canadians are having problems with passports and it stems back to the previous Liberal government's inability to deal with the issue then. In fact, it was the Conservatives in opposition who called an emergency debate to get the Liberals to get their act together and to discuss this with the United States, and they failed to do so.

That being said, we have taken this responsibility very seriously. Not only do we have people working 24/7, we are receiving applications—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the environment minister announced Canada's new Conservative government was turning the corner with a plan to reduce greenhouse gases and air pollution. What a great announcement that was.

Could the Secretary of State for Agriculture tell the House how Canada's new government is helping our farmers seize the opportunities of the new eco-economy and contribute to Canada's efforts to improve our environment?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Secretary of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I remind the member that on Monday we announced the \$200 million ecoABC to help farmers participate and invest in new biofuel plants. That is just a fraction of what we are doing to help farmers and to help our environment.

Budget 2007 included \$2 billion in new measures for biofuels. This is great for farmers, it is great for rural Canada and it is great for the environment.

* * *

[Translation]

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Raymond Gravel (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Safety stated yesterday that the correctional service officers have access to the prisoners in Afghanistan.

Can the minister tell us how many officers are there to conduct these visits and how long they have been there?

Privilege

[English]

Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, we have two corrections officers over there and they have been into three facilities presently. One is just west of Kandahar city, which is the prison facility. There are 838 prisoners there, many of them suspected terrorists. There are 138 in a separate national security section. The NDS site, the national director of security site, has another 40 people there.

The Afghan police are being trained by our RCMP. We have never heard a word of congratulations from opposition members about the good work the RCMP is doing over there, training Afghan police. They have 35 in—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

* * *

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we were told by the heritage minister last December that a decision was coming on where the national portrait gallery was to be housed. Would it be another gift to the Conservatives' corporate friends in big oil, or would it be invested with Canadians?

Could the minister please tell Canadians what the government's plans are for the portrait gallery? Has it abandoned its plans to hand it over to its corporate friends or will it do what is right and keep it where it belongs?

What is it hiding? Will it let us know today?

Mr. Jim Abbott (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is a very interesting question from the NDP. I rather suspect he does not like the idea of public-private partnerships.

I point him to what has happened with respect to the museum in Winnipeg, where the Prime Minister very proudly joined together public-private partnerships to expand the capacity of our government to honour the people who should be honoured through our museums policies.

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order arising out of question period. I wonder if the Minister of Public Safety can say whether anyone from Correctional Service Canada has actually seen the detainees for whom Canada is responsible, not just a registry. Have his officials—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. that sounds more like a supplementary question than a point of order, but nice try.

Hon. Stockwell Day: Mr. Speaker, I want to be careful not to bump up against that last point of order, but in a situation where somebody uses a point of order to cause question and doubt on the good work of—

The Deputy Speaker: It is not a point of order to call other points of order into question.

At this time, we have a point of privilege from the hon. member for Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington.

● (1205)

PRIVILEGE

PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am rising today on a matter of privilege and contempt that I had raised on March 29 and again on April 17.

I do so today because—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt, but I want to remind the hon. member that I believe this is the third time he has intervened on this question of privilege. Therefore, the Chair will not be anxious to hear a long question of privilege. If he has some new information or something, then we look forward to hearing it.

Mr. Scott Reid: Mr. Speaker, when you stood up, I was about to say that I do so today because new information has become available today, further confirming my assertion that the office of the Leader of the Opposition and also the hon. member for Ajax—Pickering were acting in contempt of Parliament when they retained and selectively leaked correspondence to the media, claiming it was new information proving that in 2000 illegal inducements had been provided to cause a Reform MP to resign his seat.

On March 22, the member for Ajax—Pickering issued a press release announcing that he had handed the documents over to the RCMP and that these documents constituted new evidence of illegal acts. He said:

The atrocious activity brought to light by these documents represents possible Criminal Code violations, but also a gross betrayal of the public trust. [The Minister of Public Safety] must step aside while the matter is being investigated.

An article in today's *Ottawa Citizen* confirms that the RCMP has had possession of copies of these documents for six years, that they do not represent new evidence of anything and that this was never a case of unlawful activity or breach of the public trust.

Thus, a false allegation, which was made a double wrong by the fact that the hon. member's press release falsely stated that the documents "came anonymously into his possession" when in fact they had been handed to him by staff at the opposition leader's office, has been allowed to stand for a month. It is worth noting that the untrue allegation was made at a moment when an election seemed to be in the offing and that it has taken 35 days, or about the length of a writ period, for the truth to be finally reported, correcting these allegations.

The fact that this has been allowed to stand for a month and the fact that the press release containing the false allegations remains on the hon. member's website, as we speak, demonstrates that if allowed to stand unchallenged, his manner of behaviour would place extraordinary novel constraints on the ability of all members to carry out their business, by the need to take extraordinary security measures to ensure that no documents could ever, even when presented to the public under false pretenses, be used in such a manner.

Routine Proceedings

This represents a novel impediment to the ability of the House to do its business and therefore is a contempt of Parliament.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair will take the member's new information and most recent intervention into account and at some point the Speaker will give a ruling on the member's question of privilege.

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In the debate before question period, when the member for Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington was speaking, he suggested I had information or had been privy to information that should not have been disclosed because the committee discussions had been in camera.

I want an apology from the member. He was the one to broach the topic and did not mention the fact that it was in camera. In fact, what I was referring to was not an in camera discussion. It was a discussion that I had with the previous member for Ottawa Centre, Mr. Broadbent, about how the whole arrangement of going to the people to talk about democratic reform had happened. I had heard from the member for Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington previously that he had been in the way of it. Paraphrasing the previous member for Ottawa Centre, he had told me—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the member for Ottawa Centre is eager to give his account of things and his account of how things transpired this morning. I really do not think this is the sort of thing that can be sorted out in the context of a point of order or on the floor of the House in this way. The member has gotten what he has gotten on the record. We will leave it at that.

We will now proceed to the daily routine of business.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1210)

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Gary Goodyear (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 46th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of committees of the House, and I should like to move concurrence at this time.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-433, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (consecutive sentences).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce Bill C-433, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

Eight years ago the House passed the bill I am introducing today by an overwhelming margin because members then saw the need to give judges the discretion to set fair and proportional sentences for multiple murderers and rapists, finally putting an end to Canada's automatic bulk rate for murder and sexual assault.

However, the bill was not passed by the Senate before the general election 16 months later. A Pollara poll at that time found that 90% of Canadians supported consecutive sentencing for murder and rape.

I urge members of the House to also support this bill because justice has to be measured and because every victim deserves a measure of justice.

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

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE—BILL C-376

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations and I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That, notwithstanding the Standing Orders or usual practices of the House, on Tuesday, May 1, 2007, private members' business shall be suspended and Bill C-376, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (impaired driving) and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, shall be dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence; and at the time for the beginning of private members' business the House proceeds to the adjournment proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 38(1).

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to move a motion for concurrence in the 13th report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

The committee's report contains a protocol that lays the ground rules for the appearance of deputy ministers and agency heads before the public accounts committee to defend the management of public money and their departments and agencies.

This is a complicated issue, so let me give the House some background on how this protocol came to play and why it is so important that we get concurrence in this report.

Deputy ministers and agency heads are now considered accounting officers under the government's new legislation. Accounting officers are accountable in their own right before Parliament for the financial administration of their departments.

Routine Proceedings

At the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Accounts we are responsible for holding the government to account for the way it spends taxpayers' dollars. For members of the public accounts committee the accounting officer provision is very useful because it clarifies the question of just who is accountable when there is misspending found within a department or an agency. However, the accounting officer provision is only as good as the way it is implemented.

Unfortunately, Canadians are faced with a minority Conservative government that is quite happy to trumpet the rhetoric of accountability, but when the time comes to take real action, the Conservatives have shown themselves to be completely opposed to implementing the principles that would allow for a transparent and accountable government. That is why we are here today seeking concurrence in this report.

After the passage of the accounting officer provision last year, the committee undertook to study the provision and how it would work in reality when public servants are called before Parliament to account for their actions.

With the assistance of a widely respected academic, Dr. Franks of Queen's University, the public accounts committee drafted a protocol that sets the ground rules for the appearance of accounting officers before the committee to account for the financial administration of their departments, a very important role.

Throughout the process of writing this protocol, we have repeatedly reached out to the government to work with us to develop a document that would work for both Parliament and the government. The Treasury Board Secretariat was also invited to participate in the writing of a joint protocol.

However, the Treasury Board Secretariat was unwilling to cooperate with the committee. In fact, the government went as far as to bypass Parliament in an attempt to tell the committee how the accounting officer provision would work, not ask but tell the committee.

Shortly before the protocol was to be debated by the committee, the Privy Council Office released a separate document outlining its interpretation of the responsibilities of accounting officers appearing before parliamentary committees.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, it is absolutely inappropriate for the government to dictate to Parliament the terms on which it will hold the government to account.

Moreover, the Privy Council Office document interprets the roles and responsibilities of accounting officers in such a narrow way that the legislation might well not even exist. For example, the public accounts committee protocol insists that accounting officers are personally and permanently accountable for the decisions made while in office, whereas the Privy Council Office document suggests that only the current accounting officer can be called before Parliament.

In the current environment of public administration in which deputy ministers are shuffled on a regular basis, it is the opinion of the opposition members of the committee that this is a wholly unsatisfactory framework in which to exact accountability from

anyone. In short, the Privy Council Office document is intended to shield the government from increased accountability.

This debate is occurring in the context of an ongoing struggle between the executive and Parliament. Parliament is ultimately responsible for approving government spending and holding the government to account for the way it spends. When it comes to accountability, it is ultimately for Parliament, not the executive of government, to decide how it will hold the government to account for its spending of taxpayers dollars.

• (1215)

Given the discord between these two interpretations, the opposition members of the committee wish to debate and pass a motion for concurrence with its protocol in the House of Commons. This would give the protocol the weight of a Standing Order of the House and would empower the committee to compel the government to conform to Parliament's interpretation of the terms of accountability.

It is quite unacceptable that the government is not more willing to cooperate with the committee on this extremely important issue, but I believe that we owe it to Canadians to make sure that we as parliamentarians are able to work on their behalf to ensure that their government remains open, transparent and accountable.

In conclusion, I believe that it is extremely important that the House of Commons vote to concur with this protocol of the public accounts committee. Doing so will send a strong message to the government that the Parliament of Canada is a strong, effective body that is working hard to hold it to account by the way it spends taxpayers' dollars.

I would ask all members of Parliament to support this concurrence motion in favour of real accountability.

• (1220)

Hon. Shawn Murphy (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member for York West pointed out, this is a tremendously important issue and it really goes to the fundamental role of Parliament: why we are here and why we were elected.

The member gave a brief history of this issue and it has been before us for about 30 years. It was raised first by the Lambert Commission 30 year ago and then by the McGrath Commission about 20 years ago. The Auditor General brought it out in some of her reports, indicating that Parliament ought to look at this issue.

The public accounts committee recommended the accounting officer provision. The Gomery Commission, in recommendation five, stated that and it was codified in article 16 of the Federal Accountability Act, which was enacted in December last year.

The public accounts committee, which I am honoured to chair, developed a protocol and we spent a considerable amount of time, energy and effort in developing this protocol. We tried to get some cooperation from the Treasury Board Secretariat. Unfortunately, we did not get that. A day or two before the final matter was to come to the public accounts committee, the Privy Council Office published its own protocol on its website.

Routine Proceedings

The issue becomes, which leads to my question, is it Parliament's job to determine the roles, procedures and duties of parliamentary committees, or does that job fall on the officials across the street at the Privy Council Office? This is just a continuation of the battle between Parliament, the people and the executive that has been going on for centuries now.

My question to the hon. member is this. Whose job is it to determine the roles, procedures and duties of parliamentary committees?

Hon. Judy Sgro: Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague who does a fine job of chairing the public accounts committee and has actually put an enormous amount of time and effort into working with all of the committee members, frankly. It is not just the opposition that has worked on this whole issue of establishing a protocol.

We are the ones who get elected, not the people in the executive across the street, in the PMO in the Langevin Building or anywhere else. Parliamentarians such as yourself, Mr. Speaker, with your past history and knowledge could probably write a protocol on this very important issue. We are elected parliamentarians and we are the ones who are ultimately responsible.

That is the reason we worked so hard as a committee on this very protocol. We were very disappointed when Treasury Board refused to work with us on the issue. In fact, it produced its own protocol just before ours was issued. That is totally contrary to how the government is supposed to be working, especially given the fact that the Conservatives had campaigned on good government, accountability, transparency and so on.

It is nothing short of a farce that they are now not supporting us as we move forward as a committee to ensure that we have good transparency, accountability and honesty in government.

We need to know who is accountable. That is one of the frustrating things for all of us who sit on the committee, but even as parliamentarians. Who is accountable? That is the issue. We are currently dealing with additional issues. Who is accountable at the end of the day?

Parliamentarians are accountable to the taxpayers and to the general public. We have to ensure that we are doing our job. That is the reason why a good strong protocol is required.

• (1225)

Hon. Shawn Murphy (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the background of this whole discussion is that there has been a fundamental misunderstanding over the last number of years here in Canada with regard to the responsibility of ministers and deputy ministers to and before Parliament for financial administration.

Let me state initially that I accept fully the constitutional convention and practice of ministerial responsibility individually for ministers in the administration of a minister's particular department and collectively for their operations of departments.

Ministers are accountable to Parliament for the authority assigned to them by Parliament. Ministers are supported by deputy ministers. Deputy ministers have always had, or have had for quite some time now, certain statutory responsibilities delegated to them. Certain

legislative statutes passed by Parliament delegate certain jobs, duties and functions to deputy ministers. These are included in the Financial Administration Act, in the Public Service Employment Act and in the Official Languages Act.

I should point out that these authorities were not delegated to them by ministers. They were delegated to them by Parliament. As such, ministers cannot give specific direction to deputy ministers on issues of financial management, pursuant to the Financial Administration Act, or staffing, pursuant to the Public Service Employment Act. Those roles belong to the deputy ministers.

However, it has been the position of successive governments that a deputy minister, in appearing before the public accounts committee, does so on behalf of a minister, which is a very confusing anomaly. This anomaly was described accurately by C.E. S. Franks, Professor Emeritus, Department of Political Studies, Queen's University, when he concluded that the current approach creates an absurd position in which a deputy minister before the public accounts committee responds to questions solely on behalf of his or her minister, while if the minister were there, the minister would only be able to respond on behalf of the deputy, the actual holder of the statutory powers.

This has led to what I consider to be a considerable amount of confusion over the last 30 years and has been challenged by a number of commissions, bodies and others during that period of time.

The first major challenge occurred approximately 30 years ago in the Lambert commission. That commission recommended that deputy ministers become accounting officers similar to the system used in Great Britain and which has been used for approximately 130 years. The document states:

It is essential that the authority of deputies with respect to administration be clearly prescribed, and that they be held accountable for that administration.

That particular recommendation was not followed by the government of the day.

This recommendation was again repeated in the McGrath commission report that was tabled in this House in 1985. It called for deputy ministers to be accountable before parliamentary committees for the administration of their particular departments.

That has come before the different issues arising before the public accounts committee. The Auditor General has raised this in at least two of her reports. She has indicated that this issue ought to be explored by Parliament. She correctly concluded that parliamentarians have an essential role to play in the process of clarifying roles and responsibilities.

In May 2005 the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Accounts, of which at that time I was a member, filed a comprehensive report on this issue. I should point out that there was a considerable amount of time, effort and energy put into the report and it was a unanimous report. The committee recommended:

That deputy ministers be designated as accounting officers with responsibilities similar to those held by accounting officers in the United Kingdom.

That recommendation, unfortunately, was not adopted by the previous government.

Routine Proceedings

• (1230)

In the Gomery commission report tabled on February 1, 2006, Mr. Justice Gomery dealt squarely with this issue in the fourth recommendation which states:

In order to clear up the confusion over the respective responsibilities and accountabilities of Ministers and public servants, the Government should modify its policies and publications to explicitly acknowledge and declare that Deputy Ministers and senior public servants who have statutory responsibility are accountable in their own right for their statutory and delegated responsibilities before the Public Accounts Committee.

It can be seen that a number of recommendations have been made over the years. The present government, to its great credit, accepted these recommendations and included them in the Federal Accountability Act, section 16 of which states:

Within the framework of the appropriate minister's responsibilities and his or her accountability to Parliament, and subject to the appropriate minister's management and direction of his or her department, the accounting officer of the department...is accountable before the appropriate committee of Parliament for—

And there are four points:

- (a) the measures taken to organize the resources of the department to deliver departmental programs in compliance with government policies and procedures;
- (b) the measures taken to maintain effective systems of internal control in the department;
- (c) the signing of the accounts—

—I will repeat that, the signing of the accounts—

- that are required to be kept for the preparation of the Public Accounts pursuant to section 64; and
- (d) the performance of other specific duties assigned to him or her by or under this or any other Act in relation to the administration of the department.

The obligation of the accounting officer under this section is to appear before the appropriate committee of Parliament and answer questions put to him or her by members of the committee in respect of the carrying out of the responsibilities and performance of duties.

Upon enactment of this legislation, which was in December last year, the public accounts committee, as has already been indicated by the previous speaker, commenced work on the development of a protocol for the appearance of accounting officers as witnesses before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

I should point out that I spoke on the Federal Accountability Act on many occasions, and on every occasion I was given that opportunity, I certainly stated that this was the most important provision in the Federal Accountability Act as far as I was concerned.

To assist us in the development of this protocol we did seek outside assistance. We sought and received assistance from Dr. Franks. He of course engaged others. The committee, to its credit, spent a lot of time and effort on this particular issue. It appeared that the protocol would certainly receive the approval of all members of the committee.

I should point out also that we very much wanted to make it a joint protocol, as between ourselves and Treasury Board Secretariat because we do have similar duties and responsibilities. The public accounts committee is that committee of Parliament responsible for financial administration and Treasury Board Secretariat is that particular department representing the executive that is responsible for prudent, proper and compliant financial administration.

For reasons unbeknown to me, Treasury Board Secretariat opted not to cooperate. Unfortunately, as the previous speaker has pointed out, after four or five months had elapsed and a day or two before the protocol was to come before the committee for a final discussion, it decided to post on the Privy Council website its own protocol.

Let us think about this for a second. Government receives its authority from Parliament and is accountable to Parliament. Privy Council and Treasury Board Secretariat have taken the position, the erroneous constitutional position I submit, that it is their job, their duty to determine the roles and procedures of parliamentary committees.

• (1235)

I believe that everyone in this House has an obligation to think about that particular statement, because if we are going to accept that for one second, we will be abdicating our role as parliamentarians and we will not be serving the people who sent us here to represent them.

I am troubled and disturbed by this behaviour. This is a classic fight between the executive, the government, and the people represented by the members of the House of Commons. This fight started close to 800 years ago and it is continuing in this chamber today.

There are a few other points on the protocol. It is clarifying the roles; it is not a wholesale change. It certainly does not, nor does it intend to in any way alter the fundamental and essential importance of ministerial responsibility. Accounting officers are accountable before the public accounts committee. It does not give deputy heads or agency heads new powers and authority. Everything in the protocol is in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Accountability Act. It is, I submit, a balanced approach after a lot of discussion and deliberation on our part.

If we accepted the government protocol, nothing would change. In fact, it has been argued quite correctly, I would submit, that accountability is worse off before the accountability act if we accepted this. We went forward with these particular provisions of the accountability act based upon the understanding that what the act stated was going to be the actual way it was interpreted, but that is not the way the government wants to do it.

Despite what I just read from the act, the government does not want to give the accounting officers any sphere of accountability that is independent of ministers. It is stating that the accountability belongs to the office, not the person, although the act states that the accounting officer signs the accounts. The Conservatives are asserting that the accounting officer is not accountable for his or her performance and they are stating that the signing of the accounts simply means the accounting officer is expected to answer questions, nothing more than that.

Routine Proceedings

If we accepted the protocol as posted by the government, which was wrong in the first place, the provisions of the Federal Accountability Act would be meaningless and the whole act would be thrown into question. There has been very little of the act proclaimed. All the accounting of these officers of Parliament does not exist. There was a lot of bluster at the time. I certainly supported this provision, but if we adopted this interpretation, the whole thing as far as I am concerned would be a meaningless piece of legislation.

When we talk about accountability and the public accounts act, I want to remind members that inappropriate financial management is extremely rare given the volume of transactions that the government does on a daily basis. Of course when incidents do happen and do come before the committee, it does trouble citizens, but the overwhelming number of public servants continue to display an extremely high degree of integrity and objective professionalism in carrying out the tasks required of them.

● (1240)

I believe I have accurately summarized the background leading up to the adoption of this protocol, which was adopted by the committee. I urge all members of the House to stand up for Parliament and pass this particular motion for concurrence.

Hon. Jay Hill (Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague from across the way and his intervention on this particular concurrence motion. While I would agree with him that the subject matter is one of great concern, the whole business about accountability as it pertains to the public accounts act, the whole issue of accountability is one that we on this side of the House take very seriously.

My question for my colleague is relatively simple. It seems like every time we start to debate Bill C-43, the legislation that we were debating today dealing with Senate selections, in other words, to reform the other place, that one of the opposition parties, in this case the Liberal Party, takes it upon itself to get us off the agenda. I wonder why it is that those members do not want to discuss the reform of the upper chamber.

Hon. Shawn Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I will give a very brief and simple answer.

I chair the public accounts committee and yesterday I heard that this motion would be moved by another member of the committee. I had planned to go back to my riding last night but I postponed that because I thought it was important that I speak to this extremely important concurrence motion, which goes right to the very heart of why we are here.

I really did not know it would be debated this afternoon. I take the hon. member's assertion that it was to be Bill C-43. However, I am not in a position to answer about the agenda of the House or why certain things are debated or why certain things are not debated. However, I do submit this is an extremely important matter for the House.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my well-respected colleague from Charlottetown, who chairs the public accounts committee and who sat on that committee in the last Parliament, certainly holds the respect of all members of the House when it comes to the workings of that committee.

I appreciate the fact that anybody watching this at home would see this as a fairly dry issue but, for all intents and purposes, it is the essence of what we do here in Parliament. We look after the accountability of government.

My colleague from Random—Burin—St. George's, my seatmate, once said, "letting government look after government is like leaving the dogs in charge of the meat".

As this protocol was being developed by the public accounts committee, and with the PCO coming forward with its own position on it and, as I understand it, the Treasury Board Secretariat also came forward with its position on it, I believe it gives the wrong perception. It looks as if the government is setting the ground rules as opposed to Parliament. Is that the wrong perception or is there a fear of it being perceived as that if this is not an act of Parliament?

I would ask my colleague for his comments on that.

Hon. Shawn Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this is a relatively non-partisan issue. I want to clearly say for the record that the public accounts committee made the recommendation back in 2005 and the previous government did not accept it. However, it was included in the Federal Accountability Act, which I certainly support, but now we have a situation, despite what the legislation states, where we have groups in Ottawa that are going to fight this to their dying breath.

To follow up on the member's question, if we agree to allow the Privy Council to determine the roles and procedures of parliamentary committees, we may as well all just go home right now because there will be nothing further for us to do. We have abandoned our accountability role.

It will be interesting to see how this unfolds but I feel confident that every member in the House will support the motion moved by the member for York West.

● (1245)

Hon. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, earlier I posed the question to the member for Charlottetown, that despite the importance of this particular issue that has been moved by his colleague, whether this is a delaying tactic yet again on the part of the opposition to prevent the House from dealing with and debating Bill C-43, a very important piece of legislation that, I would argue, is long overdue to make some incremental changes to the other place.

Mr. Speaker, through you, with the greatest of respect, if I heard the member for Charlottetown correctly, and I want to give him the opportunity to correct the record if I misheard him, he stated that despite being in the House today and prepared to debate this particular concurrence motion, that he had no idea what the House would be debating today. Did I hear him correctly?

Hon. Shawn Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I can repeat what I said. I was planning to return to my constituency last night but yesterday afternoon I was informed by the member for York West that she would be moving this concurrence motion. I was not prepared to debate Bill C-43. The member is quite right, I did not know that Bill C-43 would be debated today but I certainly wanted to be here when this concurrence motion was debated.

Routine Proceedings

I could spin this all day but I cannot answer the question as to the agenda of the House. I was informed that this concurrence motion would be moved and, as chair of the public accounts committee, I felt that I had to speak to it, which is why I am here to speak today.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can see why the chief government whip wants to debate Bill C-43. The Conservatives are trying to go beyond democratic means and change the Senate without really doing it constitutionally but through the House.

One of the things the member for Charlottetown said really worries me. He said that there was concern that if the report of the committee were not passed it would mean that the Privy Council Office takes more control, and that worries me.

Could the member elaborate a little further on the Privy Council Office taking more control so that members of Parliament do not really matter? We know with the current Prime Minister that it is absolute dictatorial control. Government members never speak out and cabinet members never speak out. Would we end up with a PMO and a PCO running things? Is that what the member's concern is all about?

Hon. Shawn Murphy: Mr. Speaker, the executive control of Parliament is a long-standing issue. I do not want to disappoint the member but it did not start with the present government. It is something that we as parliamentarians had to deal with for probably centuries.

However, this goes beyond that. This is a situation where the people in the Privy Council feel that they can now take it upon themselves to tell Parliament the roles, procedures and duties to be followed in parliamentary committees.

To repeat what I said before, if people in the House allow that to happen, then we may as well all pack our bags and go home because there will be nothing further for us to do.

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see that people are talking about government accountability today, because we just learned that today, one of the major players in the sponsorship scandal has decided to plead guilty to 28 counts of fraud.

[*English*]

That was part of the Liberal ad scam. Jean Lafleur announced today that he will plead guilty to 28 counts of fraud. I find it interesting that under these conditions we are getting lectures from the Liberal Party, which oversaw and carried out that fraud to its own benefit, on how we ought to restore accountability in this House.

I note that the chair of the public accounts committee was part of the previous Liberal government that was responsible for that corruption and fraud. It is with a great deal of respect that I stand in this House today and honour the Federal Accountability Act and its main components by clarifying what the act was meant to accomplish and how it is meant to be implemented.

The accounting officer model was meant to clarify the roles and responsibilities of those in the senior bureaucracy, to recognize that the deputy heads in departments and throughout government have a responsibility to explain the public administration that occurs within their departments. Those individuals are answerable to Parliament. They are not accountable to Parliament. Never in the history of our parliamentary system has a deputy head ever been directly accountable to Parliament. It is not how the system works.

The minister is accountable, which is where we have a disagreement with our Liberal colleagues. The Liberal Party does not believe in ministerial responsibility. The Liberals do not want to come before the House of Commons and defend their own behaviour—

Hon. Wayne Easter: What about the Minister of Defence?

Mr. Pierre Poilievre:—so they are trying to structure the rules in a way that will allow them always to blame public servants for their own corruption. With the record of corruption that we witnessed and is bearing itself out today—

Hon. Wayne Easter: Oh, that's right, he is controlled by the Prime Minister.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): I would like to ask for order in the House and I would like to advise all members that there will be a 10 minute period for questions and comments, and I will try to recognize as many members as possible, so meanwhile, I would like to pay attention to the hon. the parliamentary secretary. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you be patient and understanding with members of the Liberal side because today has been a very difficult day for them. There has been this guilty plea today and a lot of them are in very rough spirits as a result. We should not be too hard on them because it has been a very difficult day for all of them. One of their very close friends has come forward and admitted what the Liberal government had done. In fairness to them, we should recognize that might explain some of their comportment in the House of Commons.

Now on the issue of the accounting officer—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, point of order.

I was having a hard enough time listening to the accusations made by my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, but now he is accusing me of being friends with Mr. Lafleur. I demand that he withdraw his statements. I am not friends with Mr. Lafleur. I do not know Mr. Lafleur, nor does he know me. If the member wants to spew that kind of nonsense, he should go do it somewhere else.

• (1255)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The hon. member's point is well taken, but I think this is a point of debate.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders say that no member may falsely accuse another member. I would like him to withdraw his comments. If he refuses to do so, then I invite him to say the same thing outside so I can take him to court.

Routine Proceedings

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The member for Hull—Aylmer should know that when the Speaker rises, the members must sit down.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: That is what I am doing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Thank you.

I heard what the parliamentary secretary said, and I find that his comments were not directed at any particular member. He was speaking generally. Your argument is therefore not valid. Mine, however, is. I would like to have order in the House when a member is speaking. Earlier, we heard from a number of members, and we paid attention while they were talking.

I gave the floor to the honourable parliamentary secretary, and I would like everyone to show him the same courtesy. Thank you.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the person occupying the Speaker's chair. Are you standing or sitting?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): I am standing. Order, please. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board has the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I of course would like to continue with my remarks. I know some members in the House have identified themselves as being very hurt by today's events, but I would like to continue with my speech. I see that again we have members interrupting.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The hon. member for Hull—Aylmer on a point of order. He has the floor and I hope he will not come back to the questions on which I have already made a ruling.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for your word and judgment. I have a great deal of respect for the person in the Speaker's chair. However, you are an expert in the French language and you know full well that when someone criticizes a group, it is a general statement, but in fact, it affects the individuals in the group.

When the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board accuses the Liberals of being friends of an individual, I feel as though that includes me and I do not accept that. Our rules are such that he cannot insult me with falsehoods, with false accusations.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): I listened to the comments of the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer with great respect and attention. I have the impression that this is degenerating into a debate. I would like to give the floor to the hon. member during questions and comments, but for now, the hon. parliamentary secretary has the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I will note, as well, that none of us will be silenced in speaking out against what happened under the direction of the previous Liberal government. The sponsorship scandal was created by the Liberals for the Liberals. Today we see a very prominent participant in that Liberal scandal come forward and confess his guilt.

Today I would like to further clarify the legislated intent behind the accounting officer provisions as set out in the Federal Accountability Act's amendment to the Financial Administration Act.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts has been considering the meaning of this new designation, and we appreciate its careful consideration of these provisions in ensuring good management in the Government of Canada. However, we must insist on defending the principles of ministerial responsibility and the political neutrality of the public service, two key principles undermined by the Liberal Party during the sponsorship scandal and during other corrupt episodes in the history of that government.

The Liberals interpretation of the role of the accounting officer differs from what the government codified in legislation. Some have compared our differences as akin to the epic struggle between Parliament and the executive back in the misty beginnings of British history.

I do not really know that much about the Magna Carta, but I do know one thing about Canada. Ministers have always been responsible for the conduct and decisions they have made. It has never been the duty of the deputy minister to rise in the House and explain the behaviour of the minister.

What the public accounts committee is attempting to do is to transfer the responsibility of minister, the politician, and put it on the backs of the public servant. We do not believe this is healthy evolution in the history of our democracy.

I know that ministerial responsibility and political neutrality of the public service are cornerstones of Canadian constitutional law, Canadian values and the Canadian system of democracy. I ask the hon. members to forget King John and to look at the facts of our history, after all we are Canadians. The accounting officer protocol adopted by the committee runs counter to the Federal Accountability Act and chips away at the underpinning principle of our democratic system of government.

According to the act, approved by the House, deputy ministers and deputy heads are designated as accounting officers for their organizations within the framework of ministerial accountability and accountability to Parliament. The accounting officer is legally obligated to appear before committees, but the legislation does not make him or her accountable in political arenas for management in the specific areas set out for in the act.

Ministers are still politically accountable to Parliament for the actions of the executive, including management. This is where we differ. Recently we had Anne McLellan, the previous public security minister before the public accounts committee. We asked her, as a former minister, why she publicly exonerated the commissioner of the RCMP before a criminal investigation was allowed to go ahead into the scandal unfolding at the highest levels of that organization.

Routine Proceedings

I note the public accounts chair became very emotional and he shut down questions against the minister because he did not believe that she should be held accountable for her own behaviour. Therein lies the difference between our vision and the Liberal vision. We believe ministers ought to be held to account. The Liberals believe in transferring responsibility and blame onto the bureaucrats.

● (1300)

This does not mean that accounting officers have no accountability for management. They do. They are accountable to their minister, who in turn is accountable to Parliament.

The Federal Accountability Act has clarified accountabilities and recognizes that officers may have more information on the day to day management of the department than their ministers. Therefore, the accounting officer appears before committees in support of the minister's overall accountability.

What we have not done through the act is to undermine the long-standing principles of ministerial responsibility and the core relationship between ministers and their deputies. For example, we have not altered the obligation of the public servant to protect confidential information. Nor does the act contemplate parliamentary committees subjecting accounting officers to censure, engaging them in policy discussions or asking them to disclose personal opinions or advice to ministers.

These accounting officers are non-partisan public servants. It is not their role to take a position on political issues. It is not their duty to explain the political rationale behind the behaviour of the minister. That is the minister's job. That is why we have question period. That is why we have confidence votes in Houses of Commons across the world. The ministers, and therefore the government, are responsible here before the House of Commons rather than the bureaucrats. The bureaucrats are accountable through those ministers.

Parliamentary committees do not have the authority to direct public servants. It does not matter if the chair of the public accounts committee wants to beat his chest and pronounce that he now wants new authorities on how the government operates. He cannot take that authority away from the executive branch of government. Try though he might, he does not have the authority. That might bother him. He might not be satisfied with his role in the democratic process. Perhaps he wants to augment his powers. However, he cannot do so because our system forbids him from accumulating power that was not handed to him in an election.

In short, the accounting officer model underlines the critical importance of sound departmental management. At the same time, it underlines the role played by deputy ministers in achieving and supporting their ministers' accountability for it.

To help deputy ministers understand their new responsibilities as accounting officers, the government has developed a new document entitled "Accounting Officers: Guidance on Roles, Responsibilities and Appearances Before Parliamentary Committees". It provides guidance on such matters as preparing for committee appearances and the principles governing conduct during appearances. In places, it refers to certain recognized principles of conduct during the appearances of public servants. It endorses professionalism and mutual respect.

However, the document does not purport to govern parliamentarians. Parliamentarians can behave as they wish before parliamentary committees. Our government will never put out a document demanding that they behave in one way or another. That compartment is governed by the Standing Orders of the House of Commons and we do not propose to intervene in it.

We propose, rather, to define the roles of accounting officers. Accounting officers work for the government. They are hired by the government. They are fired by the government. They are remunerated by the government. They are not paid directly by Parliament. Their authority flows through the ministers to Parliament and not directly. That will not change, thump his chest though the public accounts chair might.

This document is intended as guidance for officials. It is not direction to committees.

We understand the importance of Parliament having access to non-confidential information about the operations of government and we want Parliament to have the information it needs to hold the government to account for management issues.

● (1305)

However, it is equally important that public servants not be drawn into the political and partisan arenas by replacing the rightful roles of elected officials. That is why we must never compromise political neutrality of the public service.

We want to work with the public accounts committee to ensure that the accounting officer functions effectively. I know we share a common goal in wanting to ensure good government management for Canadians, but there are areas of disagreement between oppositions. These areas are limited, but they are important and they need to be resolved.

In particular, the government does not agree that accounting officers have a personal accountability relationship with Parliament and committees. This seems to reflect the idea that the accounting officer appears in defence of his or her performance, but in fact the accounting officer appears before the committee to support the minister's accountability and ultimately the government's accountability for the way departments, agencies and other government organizations are managed.

Ministers and not public servants are accountable directly to Parliament. Closely related to this point, committees' protocol could be interpreted to support the earlier mentioned principle.

It speaks, for example, of accounting officers being held accountable before the committee and also of the deterrent force of bad publicity. We disagree with shifting political blame to bureaucrats. This would undermine the principle, once again, of ministerial responsibility and public service neutrality.

That is to say, if a government fails to manage its operations effectively, we will not transfer blame from where it should be to where it cannot be. We will accept responsibility, something to which the previous Liberal government had a violent allergy. We, in this government, believe in ministerial responsibility and that is what distinguishes us from the members across.

Routine Proceedings

The protocol also calls for the disclosure of certain decisions of the Treasury Board, which is a committee of cabinet, under the mechanism for resolving disagreements between accounting officers and their ministers. The legislation, however, does not contemplate disclosure of cabinet decisions. It never has. No government in the country's history has ever believed that cabinet confidences should be made public before parliamentary committees.

Frankly, the Liberals were in power for 13 years. If they wanted to put an end to cabinet confidences, make all cabinet activity public, they could have done so. Strangely enough, they did not do it and they have not done it, and no government has done it in the past 130 years in our country. We do not believe that cabinets can function properly if they cannot operate in carrying out their duties and carrying out their work in that way.

It now turns on to us to recognize that decisions will be shared with the office of the Auditor General as confidants of the Queen's privy council, which is consistent with the general treatment of Treasury Board decisions. Cabinet decisions will be available to the Auditor General, who is independent from the government and who can scrutinize those decisions.

We look forward to meeting with the committee to discuss the effectiveness of this accounting officer model in helping Parliament to hold government to account, but in the Canadian tradition of evolution, not revolution, our goal is to implement a model that balances accountability with the important constitutional principle of ministerial responsibility.

The Federal Accountability Act is our made in Canada solution. The protocol should be returned to the public accounts committee for proper review and consideration.

I hope that next time the chair of the public accounts committee will recognize his duty to allow debate before the public accounts committee, that he will stop shutting down questioning of former Liberal ministers and that he will learn to curtail his outbursts in defending previous Liberal corruption and incompetence. I will join with him and I will be happy to offer him my help as he makes that transformation in his conduct.

•(1310)

Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for this opportunity. I thank you for allowing the government to stand before the Canadian people and uphold the principles of accountability upon which we were elected and for which we are deeply proud.

•(1315)

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to get into the questions and comments. I believe you said the truest words when you said things were degenerating. I agree because it seems to me that when the parliamentary secretary who just addressed the House walks into the House, the behaviour usually degenerates, not into a schoolyard, not into a pep rally, but more like a playpen. The member's own record of being chastised by the Chair will bear me out.

I wanted to say—

Mr. Richard Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With all due respect to the member for Oakville, her comment toward the member for Nepean—Carleton was in fact a personal comment

when she said that when he walked into the House of Commons the behaviour deteriorated. He is an hon. member.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): I appreciate the point made by the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George, but it is a point of debate. I will give him a chance later on. Right now I am recognizing the hon. member for Oakville.

Ms. Bonnie Brown: Mr. Speaker, despite what I said, I want to reassure the parliamentary secretary and all his colleagues on the other side of the House that it is not a difficult day for Liberals. It is a happy day for Liberals, as it is a happy day for all Canadians when anyone who committed a crime pleads guilty. We are happy about that.

I am not happy that the parliamentary secretary is getting away with fraud and he is not admitting guilt.

An hon. member: That's a point of order.

Ms. Bonnie Brown: Members have not listened to my explanation of what—

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member across the way said and her words were “the parliamentary secretary is getting away with fraud” when he speaks in the House.

As an elected member of the House, I have the privilege to speak in the House. That is not a fraud. It was a privilege conferred upon me by over 39,000 electors who chose me as their representative in the last election. She is violating that privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Order, please. I know this is Friday afternoon, but I would like to point out to all hon. members that *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* by Marleau and Montpetit, at page 522, says:

Remarks directed specifically at another Member which question that Member's integrity, honesty or character are not in order.

I think in this case the hon. member for Oakville did identify a specific member and so her words are not in order. Before we go on, withdrawal would be in order.

Ms. Bonnie Brown: I will withdraw that, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry about that.

What I am trying to get to is not the person across the way. What I am trying to get to is the accusation he made in his initial comments that the corruption—

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, she hasn't apologized.

Ms. Bonnie Brown: Mr. Speaker, I did. I withdrew.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The Chair has asked the hon. member to withdraw. That is the only thing that the Chair has asked for and the Chair is satisfied that she has withdrawn.

The hon. parliamentary secretary may respond, but the Chair's patience is getting a little short, so I would hope so would be the reply.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for having withdrawn her remarks. I know sometimes members across the way do cross the line and are forced to withdraw their remarks. I will accept her apology as well.

I note that she made an implicit reference to my age in her remarks and used that as a means to attack my character. There are young people across the country who deserve a voice in this country, young people, millions of them who pay taxes, who work hard and make a contribution to our country. They ought never to be pushed aside simply because of their age. In fact, it is their constitutional right not to experience discrimination. I will be proud to stand up for that.

● (1320)

Hon. Jay Hill (Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the issue I raised earlier with the member for Charlottetown.

We are left to guess why the member for York West would move this concurrence motion on a Friday afternoon if it were not the case that the Liberals do not want to discuss and debate the legislation we are here to debate, which is Bill C-43, the reform of the Senate, long overdue reform I might add.

I would like to pose a question to my colleague. This report was tabled on March 27 and the Liberals, as other did, had 12 sitting days when they could have called concurrence on this issue and discussed the report. I am left to ponder.

I take the member for York West at her word. When she made her remarks earlier today, she said how important this issue was, how critical and crucial it was that we have a good, fulsome debate about the committee report. I do not disagree with that, but I am left wondering.

Given that the Liberals had 12 days and if it were that critical, why would they not have brought it forward?

If they are really serious about this issue, why would they have only notified their own colleagues? The member for Charlottetown said that he cancelled his flight home for the weekend so he could stay here to debate this issue. We are fortunate that my colleague, who just spoke, happens to sit on that committee. We had no prior knowledge of this so we could ensure that the government members, who sit on the public accounts committee, would be here to participate in the debate.

We are left to really question, along with the viewers watching this at home I am sure, how serious the Liberals happen to be about this debate.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I think it might have been an emotional outburst that caused them to bring the motion before the House of Commons. I know the chair of the public accounts committee has been prone to such outbursts. Today, with the very troubling news that is coming out, I think all of that might have led to this very sudden decision to raise this debate.

The Liberals do not want an elected Senate, so they are blocking our democratic Senate bill. They do not want accountability, so they are trying to shift debate away from a very prominent Liberal who has pled guilty today to 28 counts of fraud in conjunction with the Liberal sponsorship scandal.

They want to avoid any form of accountability. That is why they are trying to push a protocol that will transfer responsibility away from politicians and on to public servants. We will not support them in their efforts.

Mr. Richard Harris (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I had been so preoccupied with some other constituency issues that I did not hear the revelation today about the case about which the member for Nepean—Carleton just talked. Could he possibly enlighten me and the House on it again?

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I generally do not like to speak about it, but today a very prominent Liberal has pled guilty to 28 counts of fraud. Mr. Jean Lafleur was—

An hon. member: How many?

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: That was 28 counts of fraud. This very prominent Liberal has admitted to what happened under the previous —

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I ask what the relevance is of this blow by blow account of what a criminal has agreed to plead guilty to? The hon. member—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): I thank the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer.

The hon. member for Malpeque.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the secretary of state is trying to determine why we would debate this issue on a Friday afternoon. It is quite simple. It is an important issue.

This is usually what the government tries to do on a Friday afternoon. You know how Friday afternoons operate, Mr. Speaker. Some members are not here and the government is trying to slip through senatorial change on a Friday afternoon when the public really should know what the debate is all about. That is what those members over there are trying to do.

My question is for the parliamentary secretary, who stood in his place and claimed that the new government is being accountable. Has anyone in the House read the papers saying that in the House this week the Minister of National Defence, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Safety had contradicting stories?

If there were any accountability on that side, the Minister of National Defence would be long gone, but I can understand why they do not allow him to go, because the Prime Minister is calling the shots—

● (1325)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): It is a good thing that another member is not raising relevance at this point.

I recognize the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board.

Private Members' Business

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that due to events today must be very difficult for all the members of the Liberal Party. Today, with so many dark facts haunting that party, we see the strain and the stress on the face of every single Liberal member. In fact, all Canadians are concerned about the corruption that has been uncovered in the previous Liberal government.

Now we have the opportunity to reverse that trend of corruption, that failure in accountability, by moving forward with democratic reforms. That is what we wanted to do today. We have waited 140 years for Senate reform. Why do the opposition members want us to wait longer? Why can they not attempt to redeem themselves by joining with us in making the Senate more democratic? Why not?

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The hon. member for Brossard—La Prairie should know he has 20 minutes for his speech. However, since we have to move on to private members' business at 1:30 p.m., he will be given three minutes to speak today.

Mr. Marcel Lussier (Brossard—La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the Liberal Party motion on the protocol.

Today's debate is between a minority government and a majority opposition and is on the accountability and responsibility of deputy ministers.

We have before us a report that was tabled in the Standing Committee on Public Accounts in March 2007 on a study that was conducted by an honourable university professor, Mr. Franks. He had a very specific and unanimous mandate to examine the issue of accountability of deputy ministers.

Let us now look at the Gomery report, which heavily influenced the new accountability legislation. The Gomery report, at recommendation four of chapter five, says:

In order to clear up the confusion over the respective responsibilities and accountabilities of Ministers and public servants, the Government should modify its policies and publications to explicitly acknowledge and declare that Deputy Ministers and senior public servants who have statutory responsibility are accountable in their own right for their statutory and delegated responsibilities before the Public Accounts Committee.

This recommendation from Mr. Gomery should be integrated. In my opinion, Professor Franks has integrated it into his protocol. He is clear that this protocol signifies for Parliament, the public service, the government and the general public that no new statutory powers or authority are given by the accounting officer approach to deputy ministers, agency heads or any other senior public servants.

This protocol codifies and clarifies practices for accountability for the existing statutory and delegated powers of accounting officers. Furthermore, this protocol states that for members of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, as far as parliamentary privilege is concerned, questions should pertain to responsibilities and accountabilities.

Since my time is almost up and we want to move on to private members' business, I would just like to say that the Bloc Québécois will support this motion.

• (1330)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings on the motion at this time. One hour and

45 minutes of the three hours allotted by Standing Order 66 for debate on the motion remains. Next time, the hon. member for Brossard—La Prairie will have 17 minutes, and, of course, 10 minutes for questions and comments. Accordingly, debate on the motion is deferred until a future sitting.

[*English*]

It being 1:31 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from February 27 consideration of the motion that Bill C-343, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (motor vehicle theft), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mrs. Joy Smith (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to express my support for Bill C-343, introduced by the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle.

The government agrees that there is a pressing need to reduce the high rate of vehicles stolen every day in this country. This bill, by creating a distinct offence for motor vehicle theft, aims to do just that.

It is true that there are many offences in the Criminal Code that already address motor vehicle theft, such as theft, fraud, joyriding, possession of property obtained by crime, and flight from a peace officer. However, this bill will create a distinct offence, with penalties in the form of mandatory minimum sentences.

The sentence for a first offence will be a minimum fine of \$1,000 or a minimum term of imprisonment of three months, or both. A second offence would result in a mandatory minimum fine of \$5,000 or a minimum prison term of six months, or both. A third and subsequent offence would result in a minimum fine of \$10,000 and a minimum term of imprisonment of two years, up to a maximum term of 10 years.

I am aware that not all members will agree on the penalty that a distinct Criminal Code offence for motor vehicle theft should have. However, I am certain that most members can agree on the utility of creating such an offence. Accordingly, the bill should be sent to the appropriate committee for review on its merits, including the proposed penalties.

Private Members' Business

I would like to note that the idea of a distinct offence for motor vehicle theft was supported by the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre on March 20, 2007, when he introduced Motion No. 295 calling for, among other things, an amendment to the Criminal Code to include auto theft as a distinct, stand-alone offence. Clearly this is an issue that cuts across party lines and is one that most members of the House can support.

Winnipeg holds the dubious distinction of being the car theft capital of Canada. For example, in Winnipeg, the auto theft rate in 2005 was 1,712 thefts per 100,000 population, whereas in Toronto there were 306 thefts reported per 100,000 population.

It is clear that the rate of auto theft in Canada is simply unacceptable. In 2001, the per capita rate of auto theft was 26% higher in Canada than it was in the United States. In the 1999 international crime victimization survey, Canada ranked fifth highest for a risk of car theft, with 1.6% of the population being a victim of car theft. Overall since 2001, the auto theft rate has remained roughly the same.

While in recent years auto theft rates have held steady at unacceptably high rates, the number of stolen vehicles that are recovered has been on the decline. It used to be that over 90% of stolen cars were recovered. Today, that rate has fallen to 70% nationwide, with recovery rates varying by city. In large cities in Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia, organized crime groups are believed to be more active in thefts, thanks in part to readily accessible ports that allow cars to be shipped out of the country quickly and with relative ease.

Out of the approximately 170,000 automobiles stolen every year, police and insurance experts estimate that about 20,000 of these cars are shipped abroad to destinations such as Eastern Europe, West Africa, the Middle East and Latin America.

Stealing and reselling a vehicle is an extremely lucrative way for organized criminals to make money.

Let us take, for example, the scenario when a new luxury SUV is stolen. It is valued at \$65,000 on the lot. It would cost an organized criminal around \$1,000 to pay a youth to steal the car and approximately \$1,500 to have the car "re-VINned" if it is being sold in Canada, or if it is exported to another jurisdiction, around \$3,000 for shipping and handling. The automobile would likely be sold for around \$45,000, resulting in a profit of nearly \$40,000 per car.

Clearly the rewards for motor vehicle theft are enormous. There is a great incentive for young future career criminals to get involved in motor vehicle theft rings.

• (1335)

The involvement of youth in motor vehicle theft is a serious problem. Almost 40% of those charged with stealing motor vehicles are between the ages of 12 and 17 years. While vehicles are often stolen by youth for joyriding, it is also frequently the case that youth are enticed by organized criminals to steal an automobile and deliver it to a predetermined location all for a set fee. This involvement in organized crime unfortunately often has the effect of cementing criminal behaviour in young offenders. This influence on Canada's at risk youth is another tragic aspect of motor vehicle theft.

Not all of the news is bad though. Advances in technology, such as alarm systems, steering wheel locks, and GPS tracking units are making it harder to steal motor vehicles. However, as technology advances so do the skills that professional car thieves use to defeat these technologies.

So while the smash and grab method employed by most joy riders will no longer work on newer cars outfitted with sophisticated anti-theft devices, the new career car thief will ultimately find ways to outfox these devices.

It has already been mentioned that auto theft costs Canadians more than a billion dollars a year in insurance costs, medical costs, legal costs, police costs, and costs to the victims, such as insurance deductibles.

However, what about the costs that are impossible to calculate? I am referring to the human toll that motor vehicle theft has on our society. All too often when a car is stolen, the offender will drive erratically or at a high speed and not always because of police pursuit. Each year motor vehicle theft results in over 30 deaths and over 50 people being seriously injured a year in Canada.

Recently, a 10 year old girl in Regina was killed after a driver of a stolen pickup truck smashed into the minivan she was travelling in while he was attempting to escape the police.

As a society we do not tolerate impaired driving and our laws should treat this type of dangerous driving with the same seriousness. It is time that we reaffirm our commitment to making Canada's roads and highways safer.

I am proud that the government is taking a number of measures to tackle crime in Canada. We have introduced a number of pieces of legislation that deal with serious criminal offences.

Bill C-10 was introduced to ensure that criminals who use guns in the commission of an offence or if an offence is gang related receive a very serious sentence with escalating mandatory minimum penalties for first and subsequent offences.

As well, the government also introduced Bill C-35 which seeks to protect the public from gun crime by amending the bail provisions in the Criminal Code. The proposed amendments would reverse the onus to the accused to prove why he or she should not be denied bail when the accused is charged with a serious offence committed with a firearm or charged with smuggling or trafficking firearms.

The government is serious about making our roads and highways safer. We introduced Bill C-19 which created five new offences to combat street racing. It also gets these dangerous drivers off the road by providing mandatory minimum periods of driving prohibition. I am pleased that this bill received royal assent on December 14, 2006.

Private Members' Business

Another step the government has taken to make our roads and highways safe is with Bill C-32 which aims to significantly increase fines and minimum jail terms for driving while impaired. This bill tackles driving while under the influence of both alcohol and drugs. Although it is already a crime to drive while impaired by drugs, currently police officers have to rely on symptoms of impairment to driving behaviour for an impaired driving investigation. There is no authority in the Criminal Code to demand physical sobriety tests or bodily fluid samples.

Bill C-32 would authorize the police to demand roadside testing and a drug recognition expert evaluation at the police station, and if this evaluation shows impairment, the police will be authorized to demand a sample of bodily fluid to identify that the impairment was caused by an illegal drug. Refusal to comply with these demands would be a criminal offence punishable by the same penalties for refusing to submit to an alcohol breath test.

The government is also committed to crime prevention. The 2007 budget allocates \$64 million over two years to establish a national anti-drug strategy to crack down on gangs, grow ops and meth labs, prevent illicit drug use and illicit drug dependency. As well, the government has set aside \$14 million over two years to combat the criminal use of firearms.

The hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle has brought forward a very important issue for the House to consider. I urge all hon. members to vote to send this bill to committee for further review.

• (1340)

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-343, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (motor vehicle theft). It was introduced by the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, who is also deputy chair of the committee of the whole.

The bill is meant to address the serious issue of automobile theft. While I appreciate my colleague's efforts in this area, I regret to say that the bill is a very imperfect way of trying to solve this problem. I want to raise a number of concerns that I think, should the bill reach committee, need to be considered as well.

As things stand now, the Criminal Code does have specific provisions to deal with the theft of motor vehicles. These offences would be covered by the general offence of theft as set out in section 322 of the Criminal Code. Punishments are laid out in section 334.

If the value of the stolen goods exceeds \$5,000, the theft is an indictable offence punishable by a maximum of 10 years in prison. If the value of the goods is \$5,000 or less, the offence may be prosecuted by way of a summary conviction or an indictable offence. In the first case, it is punishable with a maximum jail term of six months or a fine of \$2,000 or both. In the latter case, the maximum penalty is two years of incarceration. In addition, if the circumstances surrounding the theft result in criminal negligence causing death, those convicted are subject to a penalty of life in prison, the most serious sentence in the Criminal Code.

There are also a series of offences in the Criminal Code that deal with related car theft offences. For instance, some offenders may at times decide to flee from law enforcement personnel in stolen vehicles, the member just gave an example, and drive perhaps recklessly to do so. If this occurs and there are no injuries as a result,

the offender may be charged with the offence of flight from a peace officer and this offence carries a maximum term of five years of imprisonment. Should flight lead to death, as was the case just given, then the offender is criminally liable to a term of life imprisonment for this terrible crime.

Obviously, society does not accept this type of behaviour and available sentences for this crime reflect that strong message. Also related is Bill C-19 which was passed by Parliament some months ago. It received royal assent on December 14. It dealt with the issue of street racing, one with which our previous Liberal government had been dealing. In any case, Bill C-19 defined street racing and created a set of five specific offences to deal with this issue.

I will recognize that the theft of automobiles may sometimes be undertaken systematically by organized criminal organizations and I might say that in my time as solicitor general, I saw that issue up pretty close.

In this regard the Criminal Code holds a number of additional and useful tools that can apply when auto theft is committed for the benefit of, at the direction of, or in association with a criminal organization. These additional tools provide for the possibility of consecutive sentencing and reduced parole eligibility.

My point in referring to various sections of the Criminal Code is to show all Canadians that there are already existing and efficient mechanisms to deal with the issue of motor vehicle theft.

Let us now consider the effects of Bill C-343, were it to receive royal assent one day. The bill would add a new section to the Criminal Code, section 334.

• (1345)

On a general level, the bill affects the current motor vehicle theft regime in the following ways.

One, the bill brings in mandatory minimum sentences, be they fines or incarceration.

Two, the bill sets out what are referred to as escalator mandatory minimum penalties which establish increasingly harsher penalties for people who commit the crime time and time again.

Three, more specifically, an offender who was found guilty a third time of motor vehicle theft would automatically be incarcerated for a time period of 2 to 10 years.

Four, the bill erases the distinction given to the value of a vehicle that is stolen as an aggravating factor that would be taken into consideration in sentencing determination upon conviction.

Let us consider the specific sentencing provisions outlined in Bill C-343. Let us first examine the punishments established for summary convictions.

Private Members' Business

For a first offence prosecuted summarily, the minimum mandatory penalty is three months of incarceration and/or a fine of \$1,000. The maximum penalty is a two year prison sentence. Should a second offence later take place and also be prosecuted summarily, the punishment is that of a six month jail term and/or a \$5,000 fine. The maximum is also a two year sentence. As I stated previously, the value of the vehicle is of no consequence in these sentencing arrangements.

Should the criminal act be prosecuted by means of indictable offence, the minimum penalty upon conviction would be a three month jail term and/or a \$1,000 fine. The maximum sentence would be a five year stay in prison. For a second offence prosecuted by way of an indictment, the penalty would be a six month incarceration and/or a \$5,000 fine. The maximum sentence is a five year jail term. Here too, the value of the stolen vehicle has no effect on the sentence.

Finally, in the case of a third offence, the individual may only be prosecuted via indictment and cannot be prosecuted through a summary conviction. Its penalty is a minimum of two years in jail along with a \$10,000 fine. Its maximum sentence is 10 years of jail time.

We do have to consider the issue of mandatory minimum penalties and their use.

The minority Conservative government seems to believe that mandatory minimum sentences and mandatory minimum penalties are the ultimate panacea to all crime committed in Canada. However, when they are used as a sweeping blunt instrument like in Bill C-343, they could lead to an immense increase in prison populations and a series of unintended consequences. For instance, the presence of mandatory minimum sentences often affect how a Crown attorney lays charges and conducts plea bargains. Has this been considered by the mover of the bill? I suspect not. It would no doubt have dire consequences for Canada's justice system.

As we on this side of the House know and appreciate, Canada uses mandatory minimum sentences with restraint, preferring an individualized sentencing approach that gives the court the discretion to fashion a sentence that is proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the conduct of the offender, considering also any aggravating or mitigating circumstances.

Given this, the broad and generalized use of mandatory minimum sentences in Bill C-343 would be contrary to the established Canadian sentencing principles such as proportionality and restraint in their use. The flexible approach, I believe, delivers quality justice and has the support of many Canadians. We should not disregard these facts.

It would seem that the bill's mover believes that any potential thief would be deterred from a criminal act when he or she realizes that a second or third offence, in this case of auto theft, would yield a certain prescribed penalty. That is not necessarily the case. I realize I am not—

• (1350)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Resuming debate. The hon. member for Jeanne—Le Ber.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Thierry St-Cyr (Jeanne-Le Ber, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in today's debate on Bill C-343. This bill seeks to amend the Criminal Code to increase minimum penalties for motor vehicle theft.

A similar bill, Bill C-293, was defeated at second reading during the last Parliament. At the time, the Bloc Québécois voted against it, and today, we will vote against it again. The only difference between the two bills is that Bill C-343 establishes a two-year minimum sentence for a third car theft offence instead of a one-year sentence.

Currently, the Criminal Code treats car theft like any other theft, that is, as a crime against property punishable by different penalties according to the value of the stolen goods. When an individual steals a motor vehicle whose value exceeds \$5,000, the offence is punishable by a maximum prison term of 10 years. If the value of the vehicle is less than \$5,000, the offence is punishable by up to two years in prison. As we are all aware, most of the time, shorter sentences are given. I would note that a vehicle worth less than \$5,000 is becoming a rare thing these days. At any rate, thieves generally steal vehicles that they think have a certain cash value.

The bill before us seeks to amend the Criminal Code to impose minimum prison sentences for motor vehicle theft. It sets out different sentences for first offences and repeat offences. As I said, we are against this bill. We believe its purpose is not really to solve this problem but to create the illusion of doing so. I mentioned earlier that we voted against a nearly identical bill on September 28, 2005.

Minimum penalties are at the heart of this bill. We know that, in the vast majority of cases, the concept of minimum penalties is an ineffective deterrent to crime. In our society, most people readily obey the law. Any reasonable person obeys the law and they do so not because they worry about the repercussions, but because they are reasonable and they simply respect society. Those who do not obey the law do not have that good sense. In the majority of cases, in almost all cases, these people think they will not be caught. So the severity of the punishment is not much of a deterrent to criminals. When the legislator determines the length of a maximum term of imprisonment, they are far more concerned with establishing the relative seriousness of a crime in relation to others than with the deterrent it would provide.

So, to think that because a thief is familiar with the Criminal Code and knows that there is a minimum penalty, he will be deterred from stealing a car is wrong in most cases.

Private Members' Business

I would like to provide some international statistics that prove that imprisonment is not an effective measure for crime prevention. Canada imprisons 101 persons out of every 100,000 inhabitants. In the European Community, it is 87 out of every 100,000. In France, the number is 77. I do not think anyone believes that countries in the European Community or that France are less safe than our country. In Japan, one of the countries which has the lowest number of cars stolen, 50 out of every 100,000 inhabitants are imprisoned. In fact, the places in the western world where crime rates are the highest include the United States, where 689 out of every 100,000 inhabitants are imprisoned. The United States even surpasses Russia, where that number is 673.

● (1355)

Contrary to the Conservatives' worn-out rhetoric about law and order and getting tough on crime, the numbers show that this does not work. Putting people in jail does not prevent crime. We put people in jail to punish them once they have already committed crimes. We have to get to the root of the problem and work on preventing crime.

The members of the Bloc Québécois do not like the idea of minimum penalties because we do not want judges' hands to be tied unnecessarily. In some cases, this can produce undesirable results because judges may be inclined to acquit a person rather than impose a penalty they consider unreasonable. If the application of this legislation results in people who would otherwise have been given less severe penalties being acquitted because judges cannot bring themselves to apply such draconian penalties, we will be no further ahead. How paradoxical that this bill should have come from the Conservative Party, because in the past, the Conservatives criticized political activism on the part of judges and accused them of making or amending legislation. They said this was the prerogative of elected representatives, that it was up to the House to vote on legislation, and that the judges had no business getting involved.

It is rather ironic to see the Conservatives denounce a so-called intrusion by judges in our work while, at the same time, they are proposing a bill that interferes in the work of judges. Personally, I believe it would be best to maintain the traditional division of power. We are here, as legislators, to enact legislation and determine the relative seriousness of offences. We must leave it up to the judges to impose the most appropriate penalties after taking into account any aggravating or mitigating factors that may come up in a given case. As legislators, we will never be able to incorporate that into a bill.

It is even more ironic that this bill would lower the maximum penalty for a first offence. As I was saying earlier, the current sentence is 10 years, but that would be decreased to five years in the case of a first offence. If, as legislators, we pass this legislation, it could be construed as belittling the seriousness of the offence, which seems rather illogical. That was probably not the intention of the sponsor of the bill, but there is a clear incongruity here.

Another problem arises from the fact that the \$10,000 fine provided for in the bill would not have the same impact on everyone, depending on the offender's financial situation. Motor vehicle theft is often the work of organized groups. These groups are often very wealthy, and a \$10,000 fine would not be a much of a problem, given the profits earned from the sale of stolen cars. However, for

certain isolated young people who spontaneously commit a one-time indiscretion, this would be a very serious penalty. For these reasons, it seems to me that this bill completely misses the mark. The Conservative government and the Conservatives would be much wiser to leave the firearms registry alone, which would help prevent crime.

As we all know, throughout Quebec and Canada, crime prevention programs and subsidies are being cut by the government. That is where we must act, to prevent crime before it happens.

● (1400)

[*English*]

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I stand today to speak in support of Bill C-343, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (motor vehicle theft), and I thank the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle for bringing this important bill forward.

It is clear from reading Bill C-343 that this proposed legislation is directed at combating the high rate of auto theft in Canada. Reducing the rate of auto theft would make Canadian streets safer and would target a major source of profits for criminal organizations.

The bill would amend the Criminal Code to create a distinct offence with enhanced penalties for the theft of a motor vehicle. The bill provides that the sentence for a first offence would be a minimum punishment of a fine of \$1,000 or a minimum prison term of three months, or both. A second offence would result in a mandatory minimum fine of \$5,000 or a minimum prison term of six months, or both. A third and subsequent offence would result in a minimum fine of \$10,000 and a minimum term of two years imprisonment with a maximum of ten years.

The auto theft rate in Canada must be reduced. Statistics Canada reports that more than 160,000 cars were stolen in 2005, which is up from 130,000 in 2003. The Insurance Bureau of Canada estimates that motor vehicle theft costs Canadians over \$1 billion a year in insurance costs, health care, court, policing and out of pocket expenses such as deductibles.

While the financial cost of auto theft is a serious concern, an even greater concern is the dangerous driving that often results from the commission of the offence of stealing a car. Dangerous driving can and does result in serious injury and death to innocent Canadians. Such was the case of the tragic death of Theresa McEvoy, a Nova Scotian educator and mother of three children. She was killed on October 14, 2004 when her car was struck by a youth driving a stolen vehicle. Just recently in Regina a young girl was killed when the minivan in which she was driving was struck by a stolen car whose driver was evading the police.

Private Members' Business

In my own province of Manitoba, the city of Winnipeg has become the auto theft capital of Canada. Manitoba's auto theft rate jumped over 10% in the last two years, despite a \$22 million program to put in ignition immobilizers in as many vehicles as possible. In 2006, Manitoba recorded 9,449 vehicle thefts, up from 8,957 in 2005, but still down from the record 10,638 in 2004, one of the worst years ever for car theft, which placed Manitoba on top among provinces for auto theft.

This epidemic often leads to the destruction of vehicles and serious injuries to law-abiding motorists and pedestrians when the stolen vehicles are used as weapons or taken for dangerous joyrides.

Just last month a group of kids in Winnipeg stole vehicles and then targeted joggers, clipping them with their car mirrors. It is these kind of criminals that we need to get off our streets.

There is also a trend in Canada where auto theft is shifting away from random acts of crime toward organized criminal activity. Experts link the recovery rate of stolen cars to the degree of organized crime involvement. The recovery rate for stolen cars is on the decline. For example, in Toronto, over 90% of stolen cars used to be found and returned. Now that rate is less than 70%. In Quebec, less than 50% of stolen cars are recovered.

Out of close to the 170,000 automobiles stolen every year, police and insurance experts estimate that about 20,000 of these cars are shipped abroad to destinations such as eastern Europe, West Africa, the Middle East and Latin America.

Vehicle theft rings are insidious organizations that the government is determined to fight. They tend to be complex organizations made up of brokers who hire middlemen who, in turn, hire thieves to steal the cars. Typically, the thieves are young people who are instructed to steal the vehicle and deliver it to a set location. At this point, the vehicle is normally chopped and dismantled for parts or re-VINed, where the vehicle identification number is altered, or the car is exported.

Another serious issue is the role of young offenders in motor vehicle theft. Almost 40% of those charged for stealing a motor vehicle are between the ages of 12 and 17. Oftentimes cars are stolen for joyriding but, increasingly, organized crime is recruiting youth to their operations. Youths are required to steal the cars and deliver them to a middleman, while the criminals at the upper levels of the organization are protected from the risk of getting caught by the law.

Canadians know that our government is committed to getting tough on crime. We have introduced a number of pieces of legislation that aim to crack down on serious criminal offences.

Bill C-10 was introduced to increase the mandatory minimum penalty for serious offences involving firearms for gang related offences. For offences committed with a restricted or prohibited firearm, such as a handgun, there are mandatory minimum penalties of five years on a first offence and seven years for a second or subsequent offence.

•(1405)

The government has proven its commitment to combat dangerous driving through Bill C-19, which created five new offences to combat street racing and also provided for mandatory minimum

periods of driving prohibitions. I am pleased that the House supported the bill and, indeed, that it received royal assent on December 14, 2006.

Another step that the government has taken to make our roads and highways safer is with Bill C-32. In 2003, alcohol and/or drugs were involved in 1,257 fatalities, 47,181 injuries and 161,299 property-damage-only crashes involving 245,174 vehicles. The total financial and social costs of these losses are estimated to be as high as \$10.95 billion.

The bill would significantly increase fines and minimum jail terms for driving while impaired. It also would make it easier to investigate and prosecute impaired driving cases. The bill also deals with those who drive while on drugs, authorizing police to demand roadside physical sobriety tests and bodily substance samples at the police station.

The government has shown its commitment to crime prevention in the 2007 budget in which \$64 million over two years were set aside to establish a new national anti-drug strategy to crack down on gangs, grow ops and crystal meth labs, prevent illicit drug use and treat illicit drug dependency. In addition, \$14 million over two years have been set aside to combat the criminal use of firearms.

Under the current law, a person who steals a motor vehicle is normally charged with theft over \$5,000. Bill C-343 would create a separate, distinct offence for motor vehicle theft.

Another compelling reason for the creation of a distinct offence is that it would make the criminal justice system more efficient. Currently, a prosecutor is often unaware of whether an offender is a career car thief. Normally the offender is simply charged with theft over \$5,000 and there is no indication on the record as to the type of property that was stolen. The creation of a distinct offence would help to give the courts a clearer picture of the nature of the offender for bail hearings or when it comes time to handing down a sentence.

I support Bill C-343 and urge hon. members to send the bill to committee so it can be reviewed in greater detail.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Private Members' Business

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

May 2, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

[*Translation*]

And five or more members having risen:
[*English*]

It being 2:11 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Pursuant to Standing Order 93 the division stands deferred until Wednesday,

(The House adjourned at 2:11 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

HON. BILL BLAIKIE

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ROYAL GALIPEAU

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

MS. LIBBY DAVIES

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

HON. JAY HILL

MR. JAMES MOORE

MR. JOE PRESTON

HON. KAREN REDMAN

HON. LUCIENNE ROBILLARD

HON. PETER VAN LOAN

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Thirty Nine Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Kootenay—Columbia	British Columbia	CPC
Ablonczy, Diane, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Calgary—Nose Hill	Alberta	CPC
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	Ontario	CPC
Alghabra, Omar	Mississauga—Erindale	Ontario	Lib.
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	New Brunswick	CPC
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	Ontario	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	Alberta	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	CPC
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CPC
André, Guy	Berthier—Maskinongé	Québec	BQ
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	Ontario	NDP
Arthur, André	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier	Québec	Ind.
Asselin, Gérard	Manicouagan	Québec	BQ
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	British Columbia	NDP
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Québec	BQ
Bagnell, Hon. Larry	Yukon	Yukon	Lib.
Bains, Hon. Navdeep	Mississauga—Brampton South	Ontario	Lib.
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of the Environment	Ottawa West—Nepean	Ontario	CPC
Barbot, Vivian	Papineau	Québec	BQ
Barnes, Hon. Sue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Batters, Dave	Palliser	Saskatchewan	CPC
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West	Ontario	Lib.
Bélangier, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bell, Catherine	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	NDP
Bell, Don	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Lib.
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Québec	BQ
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	Alberta	CPC
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of Industry	Beauce	Québec	CPC
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio	Vaughan	Ontario	Lib.
Bevington, Dennis	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	NDP
Bezan, James	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CPC
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	Québec	BQ
Black, Dawn	New Westminster—Coquitlam	British Columbia	NDP
Blackburn, Hon. Jean-Pierre, Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Jonquière—Alma	Québec	CPC
Blaikie, Hon. Bill, The Deputy Speaker	Elmwood—Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blais, Raynald	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Québec	BQ
Blaney, Steven	Lévis—Bellechasse	Québec	CPC
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonsant, France	Compton—Stanstead	Québec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Boshcoff, Ken	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Bouchard, Robert	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Québec	BQ
Boucher, Sylvie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages	Beauport—Limoilou	Québec	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	Québec	BQ
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CPC
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Brown, Gord	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	Ontario	CPC
Bruinooog, Rod, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	CPC
Brunelle, Paule	Trois-Rivières	Québec	BQ
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CPC
Cannan, Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	British Columbia	CPC
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Pontiac	Québec	CPC
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Québec	BQ
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Carrier, Robert	Alfred-Pellan	Québec	BQ
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester— Musquodoboit Valley	Nova Scotia	CPC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	CPC
Chamberlain, Hon. Brenda	Guelph	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	NDP
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	Ontario	CPC
Chow, Olivia	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	NDP
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	Ontario	NDP
Clement, Hon. Tony, Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	CPC
Coderre, Hon. Denis	Bourassa	Québec	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—Tecumseh	Ontario	NDP
Comuzzi, Hon. Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ontario	Ind.
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Québec	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Montmagny—L'Islet— Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	Québec	BQ
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	NDP
Cullen, Hon. Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta—Richmond East	British Columbia	CPC
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
D'Amours, Jean-Claude	Madawaska—Restigouche	New Brunswick	Lib.
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	CPC
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
Day, Hon. Stockwell, Minister of Public Safety	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CPC
DeBellefeuille, Claude	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Québec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Del Mastro, Dean	Peterborough	Ontario	CPC
Demers, Nicole	Laval	Québec	BQ
Deschamps, Johanne	Laurentides—Labelle	Québec	BQ
Devolin, Barry	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes— Brock	Ontario	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	NDP
Dhaliwal, Sukh	Newton—North Delta	British Columbia	Lib.
Dhalla, Ruby	Brampton—Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Leader of the Opposition	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Québec	Lib.
Dosanjh, Hon. Ujjal	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland and Labrador	CPC
Dryden, Hon. Ken	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Québec	BQ
Dykstra, Rick	St. Catharines	Ontario	CPC
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Emerson, Hon. David, Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	CPC
Epp, Ken	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	Alberta	CPC
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Faille, Meili	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Québec	BQ
Fast, Ed	Abbotsford	British Columbia	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Haldimand—Norfolk	Ontario	CPC
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Fletcher, Steven, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Charleswood—St. James— Assiniboia	Manitoba	CPC
Folco, Raymonde	Laval—Les Îles	Québec	Lib.
Freeman, Carole	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	Québec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Québec	BQ
Galipeau, Royal, The Acting Speaker	Ottawa—Orléans	Ontario	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing— Pembroke	Ontario	CPC
Gaudet, Roger	Montcalm	Québec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	Québec	BQ
Godfrey, Hon. John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Goodyear, Gary	Cambridge	Ontario	CPC
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la- Chaudière	Québec	CPC
Graham, Hon. Bill	Toronto Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Gravel, Raymond	Repentigny	Québec	BQ
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	British Columbia	CPC
Guarnieri, Hon. Albina	Mississauga East—Cooksville	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Rivière-du-Nord	Québec	BQ
Guergis, Hon. Helena, Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport)	Simcoe—Grey	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Guimond, Michel	Montmorency—Charlevoix— Haute-Côte-Nord	Québec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CPC
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CPC
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	British Columbia	CPC
Harvey, Luc	Louis-Hébert	Québec	CPC
Hawn, Laurie	Edmonton Centre	Alberta	CPC
Hearn, Hon. Loyola, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	St. John's South—Mount Pearl Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador	CPC
Hiebert, Russ, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	South Surrey—White Rock— Cloverdale	British Columbia	CPC
Hill, Hon. Jay, Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	CPC
Hinton, Betty, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Kamloops—Thompson— Cariboo	British Columbia	CPC
Holland, Mark	Ajax—Pickering	Ontario	Lib.
Hubbard, Hon. Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ignatieff, Michael	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	CPC
Jean, Brian, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	Alberta	CPC
Jennings, Hon. Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce— Lachine	Québec	Lib.
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	British Columbia	NDP
Kadis, Susan	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge— Mission	British Columbia	CPC
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore—St. Margaret's	Nova Scotia	CPC
Keeper, Tina	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism and Canadian Identity)	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CPC
Khan, Wajid	Mississauga—Streetsville	Ontario	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Souris—Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	CPC
Kotto, Maka	Saint-Lambert	Québec	BQ
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	Ontario	CPC
Laforest, Jean-Yves	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	Québec	BQ
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau— Mirabel	Québec	BQ
Lake, Mike	Edmonton—Mill Woods— Beaumont	Alberta	CPC
Lalonde, Francine	La Pointe-de-l'Île	Québec	BQ
Lauzon, Guy	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	Ontario	CPC
Lavallée, Carole	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Québec	BQ
Layton, Hon. Jack	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	NDP
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	New Brunswick	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lemay, Marc	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	Québec	BQ
Lemieux, Pierre	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Ontario	CPC
Lessard, Yves	Chambly—Borduas	Québec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lévesque, Yvon	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	Québec	BQ
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	CPC
Lunn, Hon. Gary, Minister of Natural Resources	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CPC
Lussier, Marcel	Brossard—La Prairie	Québec	BQ
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety	Oxford	Ontario	CPC
Malhi, Hon. Gurbax	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Malo, Luc	Verchères—Les Patriotes	Québec	BQ
Maloney, John	Welland	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Fabian	Avalon	Newfoundland and Labrador	CPC
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	Manitoba	CPC
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	Ontario	NDP
Martin, Hon. Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Lib.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Right Hon. Paul	LaSalle—Émard	Québec	Lib.
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	NDP
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	Ontario	NDP
Mathysen, Irene	London—Fanshawe	Ontario	NDP
Matthews, Bill	Random—Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	British Columbia	CPC
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuinty, David	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
McGuire, Hon. Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood	Ontario	Lib.
McTeague, Hon. Dan	Pickering—Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga	Québec	BQ
Ménard, Serge	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	Québec	BQ
Menzies, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and Minister of International Cooperation	Macleod	Alberta	CPC
Merasty, Gary	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	Alberta	CPC
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Ontario	CPC
Milliken, Hon. Peter, Speaker	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	CPC
Minna, Hon. Maria	Beaches—East York	Ontario	Lib.
Moore, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Moore, Rob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Fundy Royal	New Brunswick	CPC
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	Québec	BQ
Murphy, Brian	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	New Brunswick	Lib.
Murphy, Hon. Shawn	Charlottetown	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Nadeau, Richard	Gatineau	Québec	BQ
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	Ontario	NDP
Neville, Hon. Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Niagara Falls	Ontario	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	Ontario	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon, Minister of National Defence	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	Ontario	CPC
Obhrai, Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Calgary East	Alberta	CPC
Oda, Hon. Bev, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Status of Women	Durham	Ontario	CPC
Ouellet, Christian	Brome—Missisquoi	Québec	BQ
Owen, Hon. Stephen	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Québec	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	Manitoba	CPC
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	Québec	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Secretary of State (Agriculture)	Mégantic—L'Érable	Québec	CPC
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Québec	Lib.
Pearson, Glen	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	Québec	BQ
Peterson, Hon. Jim	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Petit, Daniel	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	Québec	CPC
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Québec	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	Québec	BQ
Poilievre, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Nepean—Carleton	Ontario	CPC
Prentice, Hon. Jim, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Calgary Centre-North	Alberta	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Ontario	CPC
Priddy, Penny	Surrey North	British Columbia	NDP
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Québec	Lib.
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	Alberta	CPC
Ratansi, Yasmin	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Redman, Hon. Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	CPC
Richardson, Lee	Calgary Centre	Alberta	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CPC
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Québec	Lib.
Rodriguez, Pablo	Honoré-Mercier	Québec	Lib.
Rota, Anthony	Nipissing—Timiskaming	Ontario	Lib.
Roy, Jean-Yves	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	Québec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Russell, Todd	Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Savage, Michael	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Savoie, Denise	Victoria	British Columbia	NDP
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Québec	Lib.
Scheer, Andrew, The Acting Speaker	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	Ontario	CPC
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
ShIPLEY, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	CPC
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Simard, Hon. Raymond	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Skelton, Hon. Carol, Minister of National Revenue	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CPC
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	Manitoba	CPC
Solberg, Hon. Monte, Minister of Human Resources and Social Development	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CPC
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	Alberta	CPC
St-Cyr, Thierry	Jeanne-Le Ber	Québec	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	Québec	BQ
St. Amand, Lloyd	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin—KapusKasing	Ontario	Lib.
Stanton, Bruce	Simcoe North	Ontario	CPC
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	Alberta	CPC
Strahl, Hon. Chuck, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	British Columbia	CPC
Stronach, Hon. Belinda	Newmarket—Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	Ontario	CPC
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Hon. Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Temelkovski, Lui	Oak Ridges—Markham	Ontario	Lib.
Thibault, Louise	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	Québec	Ind.
Thibault, Hon. Robert	West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Thompson, Hon. Greg, Minister of Veterans Affairs	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	CPC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	CPC
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	Ontario	CPC
Toews, Hon. Vic, President of the Treasury Board	Provencher	Manitoba	CPC
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Ontario	Lib.
Trost, Bradley	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	CPC
Turner, Hon. Garth	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Tweed, Merv	Brandon—Souris	Manitoba	CPC
Valley, Roger	Kenora	Ontario	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform	York—Simcoe.....	Ontario	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin.....	Saskatchewan	CPC
Verner, Hon. Josée, Minister of International Cooperation and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages	Louis-Saint-Laurent.....	Québec	CPC
Vincent, Robert.....	Shefford	Québec	BQ
Volpe, Hon. Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	Ontario	CPC
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest.....	Ontario	Lib.
Warawa, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Langley	British Columbia	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River.....	Alberta	CPC
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	NDP
Watson, Jeff	Essex.....	Ontario	CPC
Wilfert, Hon. Bryon.....	Richmond Hill	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John.....	Edmonton—St. Albert.....	Alberta	CPC
Wilson, Blair	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country....	British Columbia	Lib.
Wrzesnewskyj, Borys	Etobicoke Centre.....	Ontario	Lib.
Yelich, Lynne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development.....	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CPC
Zed, Paul.....	Saint John	New Brunswick.....	Lib.
VACANCY	Outremont	Québec	
VACANCY	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot.....	Québec	

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session—Thirty Nine Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (28)		
Ablonczy, Diane, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Calgary—Nose Hill	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CPC
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	CPC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	CPC
Epp, Ken	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	CPC
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	CPC
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	CPC
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	CPC
Hawn, Laurie	Edmonton Centre	CPC
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	CPC
Jean, Brian, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	CPC
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism and Canadian Identity) ...	Calgary Southeast	CPC
Lake, Mike	Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont	CPC
Menzies, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and Minister of International Cooperation	Macleod	CPC
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	CPC
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	CPC
Obhrai, Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Calgary East	CPC
Prentice, Hon. Jim, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Calgary Centre-North	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	CPC
Richardson, Lee	Calgary Centre	CPC
Solberg, Hon. Monte, Minister of Human Resources and Social Development	Medicine Hat	CPC
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	CPC
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	CPC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	CPC
Williams, John	Edmonton—St. Albert	CPC
BRITISH COLUMBIA (36)		
Abbott, Jim, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Kootenay—Columbia	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	NDP
Bell, Catherine	Vancouver Island North	NDP
Bell, Don	North Vancouver	Lib.
Black, Dawn	New Westminster—Coquitlam	NDP
Cannan, Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	CPC
Chan, Hon. Raymond	Richmond	Lib.
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	NDP
Cummins, John	Delta—Richmond East	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Day, Hon. Stockwell, Minister of Public Safety	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CPC
Dhaliwal, Sukh	Newton—North Delta	Lib.
Dosanjh, Hon. Ujjal	Vancouver South	Lib.
Emerson, Hon. David, Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Vancouver Kingsway	CPC
Fast, Ed.	Abbotsford	CPC
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	CPC
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	CPC
Hiebert, Russ, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	CPC
Hill, Hon. Jay, Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip	Prince George—Peace River	CPC
Hinton, Betty, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo	CPC
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission	CPC
Lunn, Hon. Gary, Minister of Natural Resources	Saanich—Gulf Islands	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CPC
Martin, Hon. Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Lib.
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
Moore, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Owen, Hon. Stephen	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Priddy, Penny	Surrey North	NDP
Savoie, Denise	Victoria	NDP
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Strahl, Hon. Chuck, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	CPC
Warawa, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Langley	CPC
Wilson, Blair	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	Lib.
MANITOBA (14)		
Bezan, James	Selkirk—Interlake	CPC
Blaikie, Hon. Bill, The Deputy Speaker	Elmwood—Transcona	NDP
Bruinooge, Rod, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Winnipeg South	CPC
Fletcher, Steven, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	CPC
Keeper, Tina	Churchill	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	CPC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Hon. Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	CPC
Simard, Hon. Raymond	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	CPC
Toews, Hon. Vic, President of the Treasury Board	Provencher	CPC
Tweed, Merv	Brandon—Souris	CPC
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	CPC
D'Amours, Jean-Claude	Madawaska—Restigouche.....	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Hubbard, Hon. Charles.....	Miramichi.....	Lib.
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic.....	Beauséjour.....	Lib.
Moore, Rob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Fundy Royal	CPC
Murphy, Brian	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Hon. Greg, Minister of Veterans Affairs	New Brunswick Southwest.....	CPC
Zed, Paul	Saint John	Lib.
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)		
Byrne, Hon. Gerry.....	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East.....	CPC
Hearn, Hon. Loyola, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.....	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	CPC
Manning, Fabian.....	Avalon	CPC
Matthews, Bill	Random—Burin—St. George's	Lib.
Russell, Todd	Labrador	Lib.
Simms, Scott.....	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor.....	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Bevington, Dennis.....	Western Arctic	NDP
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Hon. Scott.....	Kings—Hants	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	CPC
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark.....	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald.....	South Shore—St. Margaret's	CPC
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	Central Nova	CPC
McDonough, Alexa.....	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West.....	Lib.
Savage, Michael	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore.....	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert.....	West Nova	Lib.
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut.....	Lib.
ONTARIO (106)		
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	CPC
Alghabra, Omar.....	Mississauga—Erindale.....	Lib.
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook.....	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	NDP
Bains, Hon. Navdeep	Mississauga—Brampton South	Lib.
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of the Environment	Ottawa West—Nepean	CPC
Barnes, Hon. Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West	Lib.
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio	Vaughan	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Boshcoff, Ken	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
Brown, Gord	Leeds—Grenville	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	CPC
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Oshawa	CPC
Chamberlain, Hon. Brenda	Guelph	Lib.
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	NDP
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	CPC
Chow, Olivia	Trinity—Spadina	NDP
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP
Clement, Hon. Tony, Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Parry Sound—Muskoka	CPC
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—Tecumseh	NDP
Comuzzi, Hon. Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ind.
Cullen, Hon. Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	CPC
Del Mastro, Dean	Peterborough	CPC
Devolin, Barry	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Dhalla, Ruby	Brampton—Springdale	Lib.
Dryden, Hon. Ken	York Centre	Lib.
Dykstra, Rick	St. Catharines	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Haldimand—Norfolk	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	CPC
Galipeau, Royal, The Acting Speaker	Ottawa—Orléans	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CPC
Godfrey, Hon. John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Goodyear, Gary	Cambridge	CPC
Graham, Hon. Bill	Toronto Centre	Lib.
Guarnieri, Hon. Albina	Mississauga East—Cooksville	Lib.
Guergis, Hon. Helena, Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport)	Simcoe—Grey	CPC
Holland, Mark	Ajax—Pickering	Lib.
Ignatieff, Michael	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Kadis, Susan	Thornhill	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Khan, Wajid	Mississauga—Streetsville	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	CPC
Lauzon, Guy	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	CPC
Layton, Hon. Jack	Toronto—Danforth	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Lemieux, Pierre	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety	Oxford	CPC
Malhi, Hon. Gurbax	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Welland	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	NDP
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste. Marie	NDP
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	NDP
Mathysen, Irene	London—Fanshawe	NDP
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville	Lib.
McGuinty, David	Ottawa South	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood	Lib.
McTeague, Hon. Dan	Pickering—Scarborough East	Lib.
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	CPC
Milliken, Hon. Peter, Speaker	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	NDP
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Niagara Falls	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon, Minister of National Defence	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	CPC
Oda, Hon. Bev, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Status of Women	Durham	CPC
Pearson, Glen	London North Centre	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim	Willowdale	Lib.
Poillievre, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Nepean—Carleton	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	CPC
Ratansi, Yasmin	Don Valley East	Lib.
Redman, Hon. Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	CPC
Rota, Anthony	Nipissing—Timiskaming	Lib.
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	CPC
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Lib.
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	CPC
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Lib.
St. Amand, Lloyd	Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing	Lib.
Stanton, Bruce	Simcoe North	CPC
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stronach, Hon. Belinda	Newmarket—Aurora	Lib.
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	CPC
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Hon. Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Lib.
Temelkovski, Lui	Oak Ridges—Markham	Lib.
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	CPC
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Lib.
Turner, Hon. Garth	Halton	Lib.
Valley, Roger	Kenora	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform.....	York—Simcoe.....	CPC
Volpe, Hon. Joseph.....	Eglinton—Lawrence.....	Lib.
Wallace, Mike.....	Burlington.....	CPC
Wappel, Tom.....	Scarborough Southwest.....	Lib.
Watson, Jeff.....	Essex.....	CPC
Wilfert, Hon. Bryon.....	Richmond Hill.....	Lib.
Wrzesnewskyj, Borys.....	Etobicoke Centre.....	Lib.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Hon. Wayne.....	Malpeque.....	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence.....	Cardigan.....	Lib.
McGuire, Hon. Joe.....	Egmont.....	Lib.
Murphy, Hon. Shawn.....	Charlottetown.....	Lib.

QUÉBEC (73)

André, Guy.....	Berthier—Maskinongé.....	BQ
Arthur, André.....	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.....	Ind.
Asselin, Gérard.....	Manicouagan.....	BQ
Bachand, Claude.....	Saint-Jean.....	BQ
Barbot, Vivian.....	Papineau.....	BQ
Bellavance, André.....	Richmond—Arthabaska.....	BQ
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of Industry.....	Beauce.....	CPC
Bigras, Bernard.....	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.....	BQ
Blackburn, Hon. Jean-Pierre, Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec.....	Jonquière—Alma.....	CPC
Blais, Raynald.....	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine.....	BQ
Blaney, Steven.....	Lévis—Bellechasse.....	CPC
Bonsant, France.....	Compton—Stanstead.....	BQ
Bouchard, Robert.....	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord.....	BQ
Boucher, Sylvie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages.....	Beauport—Limoilou.....	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane.....	Terrebonne—Blainville.....	BQ
Brunelle, Paule.....	Trois-Rivières.....	BQ
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities....	Pontiac.....	CPC
Cardin, Serge.....	Sherbrooke.....	BQ
Carrier, Robert.....	Alfred-Pellan.....	BQ
Coderre, Hon. Denis.....	Bourassa.....	Lib.
Cotler, Hon. Irwin.....	Mount Royal.....	Lib.
Crête, Paul.....	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska— Rivière-du-Loup.....	BQ
DeBellefeuille, Claude.....	Beauharnois—Salaberry.....	BQ
Demers, Nicole.....	Laval.....	BQ
Deschamps, Johanne.....	Laurentides—Labelle.....	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Leader of the Opposition.....	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville.....	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles.....	Laurier—Sainte-Marie.....	BQ
Faille, Meili.....	Vaudreuil—Soulanges.....	BQ
Folco, Raymonde.....	Laval—Les Îles.....	Lib.
Freeman, Carole.....	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant.....	BQ
Gagnon, Christiane.....	Québec.....	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Gaudet, Roger	Montcalm	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	CPC
Gravel, Raymond	Repentigny	BQ
Guay, Monique	Rivière-du-Nord	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord	BQ
Harvey, Luc	Louis-Hébert	CPC
Jennings, Hon. Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Kotto, Maka	Saint-Lambert	BQ
Laforest, Jean-Yves	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	BQ
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	La Pointe-de-l'Île	BQ
Lavallée, Carole	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ
Lemay, Marc	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	BQ
Lessard, Yves	Chambly—Borduas	BQ
Lévesque, Yvon	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	BQ
Lussier, Marcel	Brossard—La Prairie	BQ
Malo, Luc	Verchères—Les Patriotes	BQ
Martin, Right Hon. Paul	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga	BQ
Ménard, Serge	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	BQ
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	BQ
Nadeau, Richard	Gatineau	BQ
Ouellet, Christian	Brome—Missisquoi	BQ
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Secretary of State (Agriculture)	Mégantic—L'Érable	CPC
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Petit, Daniel	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	CPC
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rodriguez, Pablo	Honoré-Mercier	Lib.
Roy, Jean-Yves	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	BQ
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
St-Cyr, Thierry	Jeanne-Le Ber	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	BQ
Thibault, Louise	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	Ind.
Verner, Hon. Josée, Minister of International Cooperation and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages	Louis-Saint-Laurent	CPC
Vincent, Robert	Shefford	BQ
VACANCY	Outremont	
VACANCY	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CPC
Batters, Dave.....	Palliser	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CPC
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph.....	Wascana	Lib.
Komarnicki, Ed, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Souris—Moose Mountain	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.....	CPC
Merasty, Gary.....	Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River .	Lib.
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism).....	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CPC
Scheer, Andrew, The Acting Speaker	Regina—Qu'Appelle	CPC
Skelton, Hon. Carol, Minister of National Revenue	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar.....	CPC
Trost, Bradley.....	Saskatoon—Humboldt.....	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin.....	CPC
Yelich, Lynne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development	Blackstrap	CPC
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Hon. Larry	Yukon.....	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of April 27, 2007 — 1st Session, 39th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Colin Mayes	Vice-Chairs:	Jean Crowder Nancy Karetak-Lindell	
Harold Albrecht Larry Bagnell Steven Blaney	Rod Bruinooge Marc Lemay	Yvon Lévesque Anita Neville	Todd Russell Brian Storseth	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Mike Allen Dean Allison Rob Anders David Anderson Charlie Angus Gérard Asselin Vivian Barbot Dave Batters Leon Benoit Dennis Bevington James Bezan Sylvie Boucher Garry Breitkreuz Gord Brown Patrick Brown Blaine Calkins Ron Cannan Colin Carrie Bill Casey Rick Casson Nathan Cullen John Cummins Patricia Davidson Dean Del Mastro	Barry Devolin Norman Doyle Rick Dykstra Ken Epp Ed Fast Brian Fitzpatrick Steven Fletcher Cheryl Gallant Yvon Godin Peter Goldring Gary Goodyear Jacques Gourde Nina Grewal Helena Guergis Art Hanger Richard Harris Luc Harvey Laurie Hawn Russ Hiebert Jay Hill Betty Hinton Rahim Jaffer Brian Jean Randy Kamp Gerald Keddy Tina Keeper	Jason Kenney Ed Komarnicki Daryl Kramp Mike Lake Guy Lauzon Pierre Lemieux Tom Lukiwski James Lunney Dave MacKenzie Fabian Manning Pat Martin Tony Martin Irene Mathysen Ted Menzies Rob Merrifield Larry Miller Bob Mills James Moore Rob Moore Rick Norlock Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Christian Paradis Daniel Petit Pierre Poilievre Joe Preston	James Rajotte Scott Reid Lee Richardson Gerry Ritz Gary Schellenberger Bev Shipley Joy Smith Kevin Sorenson Lloyd St. Amand Brent St. Denis Bruce Stanton David Sweet Myron Thompson David Tilson Bradley Trost Garth Turner Merv Tweed Roger Valley Dave Van Kesteren Peter Van Loan Mike Wallace Mark Warawa Chris Warkentin Jeff Watson John Williams Lynne Yelich
---	---	--	--

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Chair:

Tom Wappel

Vice-Chairs:Pat Martin
David TilsonSukh Dhaliwal
Carole Lavallée
Glen PearsonJim Peterson
Scott ReidBruce Stanton
Dave Van KesterenRobert Vincent
Mike Wallace

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
Maurizio Bevilacqua
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Joe Comartin
Paul Crête
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson

Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Paul Dewar
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Michel Gauthier
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Monique Guay
Helena Guergis
Michel Guimond
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Michael Ignatieff

Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Derek Lee
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai

Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pauline Picard
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair: James Bezan

Vice-Chairs: André Bellavance
Paul Steckle

David Anderson
Alex Atamanenko
Ken Boshcoff

Barry Devolin
Wayne Easter

Roger Gaudet
Jacques Gourde

Charles Hubbard
Larry Miller

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
Guy André
Charlie Angus
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Serge Cardin
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Joe Comartin
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins

Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Mark Eyking
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Tony Martin
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Gary Merasty
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre

Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Gary Schellenberger

Vice-Chairs: Maka Kotto
Andy Scott

Jim Abbott
Charlie Angus
Diane Bourgeois

Gord Brown
Ed Fast

Hedy Fry
Tina Keeper

Francis Scarpaleggia
Chris Warkentin

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Alex Atamanenko
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Colleen Beaumier
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Garry Breitzkreuz
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Rodger Cuzner
Jean-Claude D'Amours
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Dean Del Mastro

Barry Devolin
Ruby Dhalla
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Luc Malo
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Colin Mayes
Dan McTeague
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
Maria Minna
James Moore
Rob Moore
Richard Nadeau
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre

Joe Preston
Marcel Proulx
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Mario Silva
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair:

Norman Doyle

Vice-Chairs:
Meili Faille
Andrew TelegdiOmar Alghabra
Dave Batters
Barry DevolinRaymond Gravel
Nina GrewalJim Karygiannis
Ed KomarnickiBill Siksay
Blair Wilson

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Diane Ablonczy
 Harold Albrecht
 Mike Allen
 Dean Allison
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Vivian Barbot
 Leon Benoit
 James Bezan
 Dawn Black
 Steven Blaney
 Sylvie Boucher
 Diane Bourgeois
 Garry Breitzkreuz
 Gord Brown
 Patrick Brown
 Rod Bruinooge
 Blaine Calkins
 Ron Cannan
 Colin Carrie
 Bill Casey
 Rick Casson
 Olivia Chow
 David Christopherson
 Joe Comartin
 John Cummins
 Patricia Davidson

Libby Davies
 Dean Del Mastro
 Johanne Deschamps
 Rick Dykstra
 Ken Epp
 Ed Fast
 Brian Fitzpatrick
 Steven Fletcher
 Cheryl Gallant
 Peter Goldring
 Gary Goodyear
 Jacques Gourde
 Helena Guergis
 Art Hanger
 Richard Harris
 Luc Harvey
 Laurie Hawn
 Russ Hiebert
 Jay Hill
 Betty Hinton
 Brian Jean
 Peter Julian
 Randy Kamp
 Gerald Keddy
 Jason Kenney
 Daryl Kramp
 Mike Lake
 Francine Lalonde

Guy Lauzon
 Jack Layton
 Pierre Lemieux
 Tom Lukiwski
 James Lunney
 Dave MacKenzie
 Fabian Manning
 Inky Mark
 Pat Martin
 Brian Masse
 Irene Mathysen
 Colin Mayes
 Ted Menzies
 Rob Merrifield
 Larry Miller
 Bob Mills
 James Moore
 Rob Moore
 Peggy Nash
 Rick Norlock
 Deepak Obhrai
 Brian Pallister
 Christian Paradis
 Daniel Petit
 Pierre Poilievre
 Joe Preston
 Penny Priddy

James Rajotte
 Scott Reid
 Lee Richardson
 Gerry Ritz
 Gary Schellenberger
 Andy Scott
 Bev Shipley
 Joy Smith
 Kevin Sorenson
 Bruce Stanton
 Brian Storseth
 David Sweet
 Myron Thompson
 David Tilson
 Bradley Trost
 Garth Turner
 Merv Tweed
 Dave Van Kesteren
 Peter Van Loan
 Maurice Vellacott
 Mike Wallace
 Mark Warawa
 Chris Warkentin
 Judy Wasylcia-Leis
 Jeff Watson
 John Williams
 Lynne Yelich

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Bob Mills

Vice-Chairs:Bernard Bigras
Geoff ReganMike Allen
Nathan Cullen
Luc HarveyMarcel Lussier
David McGuintyAnthony Rota
Francis ScarpaleggiaMaurice Vellacott
Mark Warawa

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Omar Alghabra
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Don Bell
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Scott Brison
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paule Brunelle
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Joe Comartin
Jean Crowder
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Claude DeBellefeuille
Barry Devolin

Stéphane Dion
Norman Doyle
Ken Dryden
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Mark Eyking
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
John Godfrey
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Bill Graham
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Mark Holland
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Susan Kadis
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Christian Ouellet
Stephen Owen
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Todd Russell
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Lloyd St. Amand
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
Belinda Stronach
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Alan Tonks
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Chris Warkentin
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FINANCE**Chair:**

Brian Pallister

Vice-Chairs:Paul Crête
Massimo PacettiDiane Ablonczy
Dean Del Mastro
Rick DykstraJohn McCallum
John McKayThierry St-Cyr
Robert ThibaultMike Wallace
Judy Wasylcia-Leis

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
Maurizio Bevilacqua
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Robert Bouchard
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
David Christopherson
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
Roy Cullen
John CumminsPatricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Barry Devolin
Ruby Dhalla
Norman Doyle
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Ed KomarnickiDaryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Yasmin Ratansi
Scott Reid
Lee RichardsonGerry Ritz
Anthony Rota
Gary Schellenberger
Judy Sgro
Bev Shipley
Mario Silva
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Brent St. Denis
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
Belinda Stronach
David Sweet
Paul Szabo
Lui Temelkovski
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Joseph Volpe
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair:

Gerald Keddy

Vice-Chairs:
Raynald Blais
Bill MatthewsGérard Asselin
Blaine Calkins
Rodger CuznerRandy Kamp
James LunneyLawrence MacAulay
Fabian ManningScott Simms
Peter Stoffer

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Raymond Bonin
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Robert Carrier
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Paul Crête
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
Patricia Davidson

Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Wayne Easter
Ken Epp
Mark Eyking
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean

Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Dominic LeBlanc
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Todd Russell
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Kevin Sorenson	Vice-Chairs:	Francine Lalonde Bernard Patry	
Vivian Barbot Bill Casey Ujjal Dosanjh	Mark Eyking Peter Goldring	Wajid Khan Alexa McDonough	Deepak Obhrai Bryon Wilfert	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Ruby Dhalla	Guy Lauzon	Scott Reid
Diane Ablonczy	Stéphane Dion	Jack Layton	Lee Richardson
Harold Albrecht	Norman Doyle	Dominic LeBlanc	Gerry Ritz
Mike Allen	Ken Dryden	Pierre Lemieux	Pablo Rodriguez
Dean Allison	Rick Dykstra	Tom Lukiwski	Anthony Rota
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	James Lunney	Michael Savage
David Anderson	Ed Fast	Lawrence MacAulay	Gary Schellenberger
Claude Bachand	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dave MacKenzie	Bev Shipley
Larry Bagnell	Steven Fletcher	John Maloney	Bill Siksay
Navdeep Bains	Raymonde Folco	Fabian Manning	Mario Silva
Dave Batters	Hedy Fry	Inky Mark	Raymond Simard
Don Bell	Cheryl Gallant	Wayne Marston	Scott Simms
Leon Benoit	John Godfrey	Keith Martin	Joy Smith
James Bezan	Gary Goodyear	Pat Martin	Caroline St-Hilaire
Dawn Black	Jacques Gourde	Brian Masse	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Bill Graham	Colin Mayes	Paul Steckle
Raymond Bonin	Nina Grewal	John McKay	Brian Storseth
Sylvie Boucher	Helena Guergis	Dan McTeague	David Sweet
Diane Bourgeois	Art Hanger	Ted Menzies	Lui Temelkovski
Garry Breitkreuz	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Myron Thompson
Gord Brown	Luc Harvey	Larry Miller	David Tilson
Patrick Brown	Laurie Hawn	Bob Mills	Alan Tonks
Rod Bruinooge	Russ Hiebert	Maria Minna	Bradley Trost
Blaine Calkins	Jay Hill	James Moore	Garth Turner
Ron Cannan	Betty Hinton	Rob Moore	Merv Tweed
Serge Cardin	Mark Holland	Brian Murphy	Dave Van Kesteren
Colin Carrie	Michael Ignatieff	Richard Nadeau	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Rahim Jaffer	Anita Neville	Joseph Volpe
Denis Coderre	Brian Jean	Rick Norlock	Mike Wallace
Joe Comartin	Peter Julian	Stephen Owen	Mark Warawa
Irwin Cotler	Randy Kamp	Brian Pallister	Chris Warkentin
John Cummins	Jim Karygiannis	Christian Paradis	Jeff Watson
Patricia Davidson	Gerald Keddy	Daniel Petit	John Williams
Dean Del Mastro	Jason Kenney	Pierre Poilievre	Blair Wilson
Johanne Deschamps	Ed Komarnicki	Joe Preston	Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Barry Devolin	Daryl Kramp	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Sukh Dhaliwal	Mike Lake	Yasmin Ratansi	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Jason Kenney	Vice-Chairs:	Mario Silva Caroline St-Hilaire	
Irwin Cotler	Wajid Khan	Wayne Marston	Kevin Sorenson	(7)

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:

Diane Marleau

Vice-Chairs:Daryl Kramp
Peggy NashHarold Albrecht
Raymond Bonin
Diane BourgeoisJames Moore
Richard NadeauPierre Poilievre
Raymond SimardGarth Turner
Chris Warkentin

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
David Christopherson
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry DevolinPaul Dewar
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Charles Hubbard
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy KampGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Jean-Yves Laforest
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Massimo Pacetti
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Joe PrestonJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Paul Szabo
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Joseph Volpe
Mark Warawa
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HEALTH

Chair:	Rob Merrifield	Vice-Chairs:	Christiane Gagnon Susan Kadis	
Colleen Beaumier Carolyn Bennett Bonnie Brown	Patrick Brown Patricia Davidson	Steven Fletcher Rahim Jaffer	Luc Malo Penny Priddy	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Harold Albrecht Mike Allen Dean Allison Rob Anders David Anderson Vivian Barbot Leon Benoit James Bezan Steven Blaney Sylvie Boucher Garry Breitzkreuz Gord Brown Rod Bruinooge Blaine Calkins Ron Cannan Colin Carrie Bill Casey Rick Casson Chris Charlton Nathan Cullen John Cummins Dean Del Mastro Barry Devolin Norman Doyle Ken Dryden	Ken Epp Ed Fast Brian Fitzpatrick Hedy Fry Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Gary Goodyear Jacques Gourde Raymond Gravel Nina Grewal Helena Guergis Art Hanger Richard Harris Luc Harvey Laurie Hawn Russ Hiebert Jay Hill Betty Hinton Michael Ignatieff Brian Jean Peter Julian Randy Kamp Gerald Keddy Jason Kenney Ed Komarnicki Daryl Kramp Mike Lake	Guy Lauzon Jack Layton Pierre Lemieux Tom Lukiwski James Lunney Dave MacKenzie John Maloney Fabian Manning Inky Mark Keith Martin Brian Masse Irene Mathysen Colin Mayes Ted Menzies Gary Merasty Larry Miller Bob Mills James Moore Rob Moore Rick Norlock Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Christian Paradis Daniel Petit Pierre Poilievre Joe Preston James Rajotte	Scott Reid Lee Richardson Gerry Ritz Gary Schellenberger Bev Shipley Joy Smith Kevin Sorenson Lloyd St. Amand Bruce Stanton Brian Storseth David Sweet Lui Temelkovski Myron Thompson David Tilson Bradley Trost Garth Turner Merv Tweed Dave Van Kesteren Peter Van Loan Maurice Vellacott Mike Wallace Mark Warawa Chris Warkentin Judy Wasylycia-Leis Jeff Watson John Williams Lynne Yelich
---	--	---	---

HUMAN RESOURCES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:

Dean Allison

Vice-Chairs:
Ruby Dhalla
Yves LessardFrance Bonsant
Patrick Brown
Michael ChongMike Lake
Tony MartinGary Merasty
Michael SavageMario Silva
Lynne Yelich

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
Maurizio Bevilacqua
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Raymond Chan
Chris Charlton
Olivia Chow
David Christopherson
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Rodger Cuzner
Jean-Claude D'Amours
Patricia Davidson

Libby Davies
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Sukh Dhaliwal
Norman Doyle
Ken Dryden
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Raymonde Folco
Cheryl Gallant
John Godfrey
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Raymond Gravel
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Mark Holland
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian

Randy Kamp
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Guy Lauzon
Carole Lavallée
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
Maria Minna
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Christian Ouellet
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis

Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Andy Scott
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Thierry St-Cyr
Bruce Stanton
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: James Rajotte

Vice-Chairs:

Paule Brunelle
Dan McTeague

André Arthur
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Scott Brison

Gerry Byrne
Colin Carrie

Brian Masse
Bev Shipley

Dave Van Kesteren
Robert Vincent

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Gérard Asselin
Larry Bagnell
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Don Bell
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Ken Boshcoff
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Serge Cardin
Robert Carrier
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Raymond Chan
Chris Charlton
David Christopherson
Joe Comartin
Jean Crowder
Roy Cullen
John Cummins

Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Claude DeBellefeuille
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Stéphane Dion
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Mark Holland
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Marlene Jennings
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Jason Kenney
Wajid Khan

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Jean-Yves Laforest
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Pat Martin
Tony Martin
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
David McGuinty
Joe McGuire
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Massimo Pacetti
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

Yasmin Ratansi
Geoff Regan
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Anthony Rota
Jean-Yves Roy
Michael Savage
Gary Schellenberger
Andy Scott
Bill Siksay
Raymond Simard
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Brent St. Denis
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Robert Thibault
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Roger Valley
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Blair Wilson
Lynne Yelich
Paul Zed

INTERNATIONAL TRADE**Chair:** Leon Benoit**Vice-Chairs:**Serge Cardin
Lui TemelkovskiDean Allison
Guy André
Navdeep BainsRon Cannan
Peter JulianDominic LeBlanc
Pierre LemieuxJohn Maloney
Ted Menzies

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Alex Atamanenko
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paule Brunelle
Blaine Calkins
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del MastroBarry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Ed KomarnickiDaryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Francine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James RajotteScott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Art Hanger	Vice-Chairs:	Derek Lee Réal Ménard	
Larry Bagnell Joe Comartin Rick Dykstra	Carole Freeman Marlene Jennings	Rob Moore Brian Murphy	Daniel Petit Myron Thompson	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Diane Ablonczy Harold Albrecht Omar Alghabra Mike Allen Dean Allison Rob Anders David Anderson Vivian Barbot Dave Batters Leon Benoit James Bezan Steven Blaney Sylvie Boucher Garry Breitreuz Gord Brown Rod Bruinooge Blaine Calkins Ron Cannan Colin Carrie Bill Casey Rick Casson Raymond Chan Irwin Cotler John Cummins Patricia Davidson Libby Davies Dean Del Mastro Barry Devolin Norman Doyle	Wayne Easter Ken Epp Ed Fast Brian Fitzpatrick Steven Fletcher Hedy Fry Cheryl Gallant Yvon Godin Peter Goldring Gary Goodyear Jacques Gourde Nina Grewal Helena Guergis Richard Harris Luc Harvey Laurie Hawn Russ Hiebert Jay Hill Betty Hinton Michael Ignatieff Rahim Jaffer Brian Jean Randy Kamp Gerald Keddy Tina Keeper Jason Kenney Ed Komarnicki Daryl Kramp Mike Lake	Guy Lauzon Carole Lavallée Jack Layton Pierre Lemieux Tom Lukiwski James Lunney Dave MacKenzie John Maloney Fabian Manning Inky Mark Wayne Marston Pat Martin Irene Mathysen Colin Mayes John McKay Serge Ménard Ted Menzies Rob Merrifield Larry Miller Bob Mills James Moore Anita Neville Rick Norlock Deepak Obhrai Stephen Owen Brian Pallister Christian Paradis Pierre Poilievre Joe Preston	James Rajotte Scott Reid Lee Richardson Gerry Ritz Gary Schellenberger Judy Sgro Bev Shipley Bill Siksay Joy Smith Kevin Sorenson Bruce Stanton Brian Storseth David Sweet David Tilson Bradley Trost Garth Turner Merv Tweed Dave Van Kesteren Peter Van Loan Maurice Vellacott Joseph Volpe Mike Wallace Tom Wappel Mark Warawa Chris Warkentin Jeff Watson John Williams Borys Wrzesnewskyj Lynne Yelich
--	--	---	---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOLICITATION LAWS

Chair:	John Maloney	Vice-Chair:		
Patricia Davidson Libby Davies	Hedy Fry	Art Hanger	Réal Ménard	(6)

LIAISON

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:		
Rob Anders	Gary Goodyear	Rob Merrifield	Lee Richardson	(26)
Leon Benoit	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Gary Schellenberger	
James Bezan	Gerald Keddy	Shawn Murphy	Kevin Sorenson	
Garry Breitzkreuz	Guy Lauzon	Brian Pallister	Paul Szabo	
Rick Casson	Diane Marleau	James Rajotte	Merv Tweed	
Norman Doyle	Colin Mayes	Yasmin Ratansi	Tom Wappel	
Peter Goldring				

Associate Members

Claude Bachand	Roy Cullen	Mario Laframboise	Pauline Picard
Catherine Bell	Paul Dewar	Francine Lalonde	Marcel Proulx
Don Bell	Ruby Dhalla	Derek Lee	Geoff Regan
André Bellavance	Ken Epp	Yves Lessard	Pablo Rodriguez
Carolyn Bennett	Meili Faille	Gurbax Malhi	Joy Smith
Bernard Bigras	Brian Fitzpatrick	Pat Martin	Brent St. Denis
Raynald Blais	Christiane Gagnon	Irene Mathysen	Paul Steckle
Paule Brunelle	Yvon Godin	Bill Matthews	Peter Stoffer
John Cannis	Michel Guimond	Dan McTeague	Andrew Telegdi
Serge Cardin	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Réal Ménard	Lui Temelkovski
Joe Comartin	Maka Kotto	Peggy Nash	David Tilson
Paul Crête	Daryl Kramp	Massimo Pacetti	Alan Tonks
Jean Crowder	Jean-Yves Laforest	Bernard Patry	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	Yasmin Ratansi	
Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Paul Szabo	Tom Wappel	(7)
Guy Lauzon				

NATIONAL DEFENCE**Chair:**

Rick Casson

Vice-Chairs:Claude Bachand
John CannisDawn Black
Steven Blaney
Robert BouchardDenis Coderre
Cheryl GallantLaurie Hawn
Russ HiebertKeith Martin
Joe McGuire

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Larry Bagnell
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Bernard Bigras
Raymond Bonin
Sylvie Boucher
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Robert Carrier
Bill Casey
Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Johanne Deschamps
Barry DevolinNorman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Bill Graham
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mario Laframboise
Mike LakeFrancine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
John McCallum
Dan McTeague
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Anita Neville
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Gilles-A. Perron
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Geoff Regan
Scott ReidLee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Anthony Rota
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Brent St. Denis
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Robert Thibault
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Alan Tonks
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Roger Valley
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair: Lee Richardson

Vice-Chairs: Catherine Bell
Alan Tonks

Mike Allen
Claude DeBellefeuille
Jacques Gourde

Richard Harris
Mark Holland

Christian Ouellet
Todd Russell

Lloyd St. Amand
Bradley Trost

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Alex Atamanenko
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Bernard Bigras
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Paul Crête
Jean Crowder

Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean

Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Marcel Lussier
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
David McGuinty
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit

Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:	Guy Lauzon	Vice-Chairs:	Yvon Godin Pablo Rodriguez	
Sylvie Boucher Michael Chong Jean-Claude D'Amours	Raymonde Folco Luc Harvey	Pierre Lemieux Luc Malo	Brian Murphy Richard Nadeau	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Barry Devolin	Ed Komarnicki	Lee Richardson
Diane Ablonczy	Norman Doyle	Maka Kotto	Gerry Ritz
Harold Albrecht	Rick Dykstra	Daryl Kramp	Denise Savoie
Mike Allen	Ken Epp	Mike Lake	Gary Schellenberger
Dean Allison	Ed Fast	Jack Layton	Bev Shipley
Rob Anders	Brian Fitzpatrick	Tom Lukiwski	Joy Smith
David Anderson	Steven Fletcher	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Alex Atamanenko	Cheryl Gallant	Dave MacKenzie	Bruce Stanton
Vivian Barbot	Peter Goldring	Fabian Manning	Brian Storseth
Dave Batters	Gary Goodyear	Inky Mark	David Sweet
Leon Benoit	Jacques Gourde	Colin Mayes	Myron Thompson
James Bezan	Nina Grewal	Alexa McDonough	David Tilson
Steven Blaney	Helena Guergis	Ted Menzies	Bradley Trost
Garry Breitzkreuz	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Garth Turner
Gord Brown	Richard Harris	Larry Miller	Merv Tweed
Patrick Brown	Laurie Hawn	Bob Mills	Dave Van Kesteren
Rod Bruinooge	Russ Hiebert	James Moore	Peter Van Loan
Blaine Calkins	Jay Hill	Rob Moore	Maurice Vellacott
Ron Cannan	Betty Hinton	Rick Norlock	Mike Wallace
Colin Carrie	Rahim Jaffer	Deepak Obhrai	Mark Warawa
Bill Casey	Brian Jean	Brian Pallister	Chris Warkentin
Rick Casson	Marlene Jennings	Christian Paradis	Judy Wasylycia-Leis
Joe Comartin	Peter Julian	Pierre Poilievre	Jeff Watson
John Cummins	Randy Kamp	Joe Preston	John Williams
Patricia Davidson	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Dean Del Mastro	Jason Kenney	Scott Reid	

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Gary Goodyear	Vice-Chairs:	Michel Guimond Marcel Proulx	
Yvon Godin Jay Hill Tom Lukiwski	Stephen Owen Pauline Picard	Joe Preston Karen Redman	Scott Reid Lucienne Robillard	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Patricia Davidson	Gerald Keddy	Lee Richardson
Diane Ablonczy	Libby Davies	Jason Kenney	Gerry Ritz
Harold Albrecht	Dean Del Mastro	Ed Komarnicki	Gary Schellenberger
Mike Allen	Barry Devolin	Daryl Kramp	Bev Shipley
Dean Allison	Norman Doyle	Mike Lake	Mario Silva
Rob Anders	Rick Dykstra	Guy Lauzon	Raymond Simard
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Pierre Lemieux	Joy Smith
G�rard Asselin	Ed Fast	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Dave Batters	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dave MacKenzie	Bruce Stanton
Leon Benoit	Steven Fletcher	Fabian Manning	Brian Storseth
James Bezan	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	David Sweet
Steven Blaney	Michel Gauthier	Colin Mayes	Myron Thompson
Ken Boshcoff	Peter Goldring	R�al M�nard	David Tilson
Sylvie Boucher	Jacques Gourde	Ted Menzies	Bradley Trost
Garry Breitzkreuz	Nina Grewal	Rob Merrifield	Garth Turner
Gord Brown	Monique Guay	Larry Miller	Merv Tweed
Patrick Brown	Helena Guergis	Bob Mills	Dave Van Kesteren
Rod Bruinooge	Art Hanger	James Moore	Peter Van Loan
Blaine Calkins	Richard Harris	Rob Moore	Maurice Vellacott
Ron Cannan	Luc Harvey	Rick Norlock	Mike Wallace
Colin Carrie	Laurie Hawn	Deepak Obhrai	Mark Warawa
Bill Casey	Russ Hiebert	Brian Pallister	Chris Warkentin
Rick Casson	Betty Hinton	Christian Paradis	Jeff Watson
Joe Comartin	Rahim Jaffer	Daniel Petit	John Williams
Jean Crowder	Brian Jean	Pierre Poilievre	Lynne Yelich
John Cummins	Randy Kamp	James Rajotte	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Joe Preston	Vice-Chair:		
Jean Crowder	Derek Lee	Pauline Picard	Scott Reid	(5)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISCLOSURE FORMS UNDER THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE

Chair:	Scott Reid	Vice-Chair:		
Yvon Godin	Gary Goodyear	Stephen Owen	Pauline Picard	(5)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:** Shawn Murphy**Vice-Chairs:**Brian Fitzpatrick
Jean-Yves LaforestDavid Christopherson
Mike Lake
Pierre PoilievrePablo Rodriguez
Jean-Yves RoyJudy Sgro
David SweetJohn Williams
Borys Wrzesnewskyj

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Navdeep Bains
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Denis Coderre
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry DevolinSukh Dhaliwal
Ujjal Dosanjh
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Mark Holland
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Marlene Jennings
Peter Julian
Randy KampGerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Richard Nadeau
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Joe PrestonMarcel Proulx
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
Paul Szabo
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Joseph Volpe
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylycia-Leis
Jeff Watson
Lynne Yelich

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:

Garry Breitkreuz

Vice-Chairs:Joe Comartin
Roy CullenSue Barnes
Gord Brown
Raymond ChanIrwin Cotler
Laurie HawnDave MacKenzie
Serge MénardMaria Mourani
Rick Norlock

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
France Bonsant
Sylvie Boucher
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick DykstraKen Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Carole Freeman
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike LakeGuy Lauzon
Derek Lee
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Pat Martin
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Réal Ménard
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott ReidLee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Tom Wappel
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

STATUS OF WOMEN**Chair:** Yasmin Ratansi**Vice-Chairs:**Irene Mathysen
Joy SmithPatricia Davidson
Nicole Demers
Johanne DeschampsNina Grewal
Helena GuergisMaria Minna
Anita NevilleBruce Stanton
Belinda Stronach

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Dawn Black
Steven Blaney
France Bonsant
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Olivia Chow
Irwin CotlerJean Crowder
John Cummins
Libby Davies
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Hedy Fry
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald KeddyTina Keeper
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel PetitPierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Penny Priddy
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Kevin Sorenson
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

Chair: Merv Tweed

Vice-Chairs:

Don Bell
Mario Laframboise

Mauril Bélanger
Robert Carrier
Ed Fast

Brian Jean
Peter Julian

Brian Storseth
Joseph Volpe

Jeff Watson
Paul Zed

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Olivia Chow
David Christopherson
Joe Comartin
Paul Crête
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies

Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Roger Gaudet
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Randy Kamp
Jim Karygiannis
Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Jason Kenney

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Dominic LeBlanc
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Brian Masse
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

Marcel Proulx
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Denise Savoie
Francis Scarpaleggia
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Belinda Stronach
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair: Rob Anders

Vice-Chairs:

Brent St. Denis
Peter Stoffer

John Cummins
Rodger Cuzner
Roger Gaudet

Albina Guarnieri
Betty Hinton

Gilles-A. Perron
Bev Shipley

David Sweet
Roger Valley

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
David Anderson
Claude Bachand
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Dawn Black
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin

Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Christiane Gagnon
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Raymond Gravel
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Michael Ignatieff
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre

Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
Robert Thibault
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Peter Goldring
Marilyn Trenholme Counsell

Joint Vice-Chair: Gurbax Malhi

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Janis Johnson
Jean Lapointe

Donald Oliver
Vivienne Poy

Mike Allen
G rard Asselin
Gerry Byrne
Blaine Calkins
Joe Comuzzi

Cheryl Gallant
Fabian Manning
Jim Peterson
Louis Plamondon
Denise Savoie

(17)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Diane Ablonczy
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Bill Casey
Rick Casson
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Paul Dewar

Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Helena Guergis
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jay Hill
Betty Hinton
Charles Hubbard
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Jason Kenney
Ed Komarnicki
Maka Kotto

Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Lawrence MacAulay
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Richard Nadeau
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Christian Paradis
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gerry Ritz
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Garth Turner
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Van Loan
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: John Eyton
Paul Szabo

Joint Vice-Chairs: Paul Dewar
Ken Epp

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron	Wilfred Moore	France Bonsant	John Maloney	(20)
John Bryden	Pierre Claude Nolin	Ron Cannan	Inky Mark	
Pierre De Bané	Gerry St. Germain	Dean Del Mastro	Rick Norlock	
Mac Harb		Monique Guay	Tom Wappel	
		Derek Lee		

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Ed Fast	Guy Lauzon	Lee Richardson
Diane Ablonczy	Brian Fitzpatrick	Pierre Lemieux	Gerry Ritz
Harold Albrecht	Steven Fletcher	Tom Lukiwski	Gary Schellenberger
Mike Allen	Cheryl Gallant	James Lunney	Judy Sgro
Dean Allison	Peter Goldring	Dave MacKenzie	Bev Shipley
Rob Anders	Gary Goodyear	Fabian Manning	Joy Smith
David Anderson	Jacques Gourde	Pat Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Dave Batters	Nina Grewal	Colin Mayes	Bruce Stanton
Leon Benoit	Helena Guergis	Réal Ménard	Brian Storseth
James Bezan	Art Hanger	Serge Ménard	David Sweet
Steven Blaney	Richard Harris	Ted Menzies	Myron Thompson
Sylvie Boucher	Luc Harvey	Rob Merrifield	David Tilson
Garry Breitkreuz	Laurie Hawn	Larry Miller	Bradley Trost
Gord Brown	Russ Hiebert	Bob Mills	Merv Tweed
Patrick Brown	Jay Hill	James Moore	Dave Van Kesteren
Rod Bruinooge	Betty Hinton	Rob Moore	Peter Van Loan
Blaine Calkins	Rahim Jaffer	Deepak Obhrai	Maurice Vellacott
Colin Carrie	Brian Jean	Brian Pallister	Mike Wallace
Bill Casey	Randy Kamp	Christian Paradis	Mark Warawa
Rick Casson	Gerald Keddy	Daniel Petit	Chris Warkentin
John Cummins	Jason Kenney	Pierre Poilievre	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Patricia Davidson	Ed Komarnicki	Joe Preston	Jeff Watson
Barry Devolin	Daryl Kramp	James Rajotte	John Williams
Norman Doyle	Mario Laframboise	Scott Reid	Lynne Yelich
Rick Dykstra	Mike Lake		

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

BILL C-27

Chair:	Bernard Patry	Vice-Chair:		(13)
Sue Barnes	Joe Comartin	Ed Fast	Rob Moore	
Mauril Bélanger	Patricia Davidson	Marc Lemay	Brian Murphy	
Bill Casey	Wayne Easter	Réal Ménard	Rick Norlock	

BILL C-35**Chair:**

Bernard Patry

Vice-Chair:Larry Bagnell
Joe Comartin
Rick DykstraCarole Freeman
Art Hanger
Marlene JenningsDerek Lee
Réal Ménard
Rob MooreBrian Murphy
Daniel Petit
Myron Thompson(13)

Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

HON. BILL BLAIKIE

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ROYAL GALIPEAU

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

MS. DAWN BLACK

MR. BILL CASEY

MR. JOHN CUMMINS

MR. KEN EPP

MR. LAURIE HAWN

HON. DIANE MARLEAU

MR. DAVID MCGUINTY

MR. BERNARD PATRY

MR. MARCEL PROULX

MR. DAVID TILSON

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Stephen Harper	Prime Minister
Hon. Rob Nicholson	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. David Emerson	Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics
Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn	Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Hon. Greg Thompson	Minister of Veterans Affairs
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Secretary of State (Seniors)
Hon. Monte Solberg	Minister of Human Resources and Social Development
Hon. Chuck Strahl	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
Hon. Gary Lunn	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Peter MacKay	Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Stockwell Day	Minister of Public Safety
Hon. Carol Skelton	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Vic Toews	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Rona Ambrose	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Gordon O'Connor	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Bev Oda	Minister of Canadian Heritage and Status of Women
Hon. Jim Prentice	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. John Baird	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Maxime Bernier	Minister of Industry
Hon. Lawrence Cannon	Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Hon. Tony Clement	Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario
Hon. Jim Flaherty	Minister of Finance
Hon. Josée Verner	Minister of International Cooperation and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages
Hon. Michael Fortier	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. Peter Van Loan	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform
Hon. Jay Hill	Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip
Hon. Jason Kenney	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism and Canadian Identity)
Hon. Gerry Ritz	Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)
Hon. Helena Guergis	Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport)
Hon. Christian Paradis	Secretary of State (Agriculture)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher	to the Prime Minister and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages
Mr. Rob Moore	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Mr. Ted Menzies	to the Minister of International Trade and Minister of International Cooperation
Mrs. Betty Hinton	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mrs. Lynne Yelich	to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development
Mr. David Anderson	to the Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Randy Kamp	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Dave MacKenzie	to the Minister of Public Safety
Mr. Pierre Poilievre	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Ed Komarnicki	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Russ Hiebert	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Jim Abbott	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Rod Bruinooge	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Mr. Mark Warawa	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Brian Jean	to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Mr. Steven Fletcher	to the Minister of Health
Ms. Diane Ablonczy	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. James Moore	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform

CONTENTS

Friday, April 27, 2007

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Senate Appointment Consultations Act

Bill C-43. Second reading	8785
Mr. Dewar	8785
Mr. Hill	8787
Mr. Epp	8788
Ms. Davies	8788
Mr. Reid	8789
Mr. Dewar	8791

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Jack Lapin

Mrs. Hinton	8792
-------------------	------

Sol Kanee

Ms. Neville	8792
-------------------	------

Tourism Awards

Ms. Bourgeois	8793
---------------------	------

Foreign Credential Recognition

Mr. Dewar	8793
-----------------	------

Spelling Bee

Mr. Komarnicki	8793
----------------------	------

Status of Women

Mr. Valley	8793
------------------	------

The Environment

Mr. Lemieux	8793
-------------------	------

Community Involvement Award

Ms. Demers	8794
------------------	------

Workplace Health and Safety

Mr. Bélanger	8794
--------------------	------

National Defence

Mr. Lukiwski	8794
--------------------	------

Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder

Ms. Savoie	8794
------------------	------

Saskatchewan Flood

Mr. Merasty	8795
-------------------	------

Maude Briand-Lemay and Pénélope Robinson

Mr. Nadeau	8795
------------------	------

Volunteerism

Mr. Simard	8795
------------------	------

Liberal Party Candidate

Mr. Goodyear	8795
--------------------	------

Justice

Mr. Norlock	8795
-------------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Afghanistan

Mr. Ignatieff	8796
Mr. Van Loan	8796
Mr. Ignatieff	8796
Mr. Van Loan	8796
Mr. Ignatieff	8796
Mr. Van Loan	8796
Ms. Dhalla	8796
Mr. Van Loan	8797
Ms. Dhalla	8797
Mr. Day	8797

The Environment

Ms. Guay	8797
Mr. Van Loan	8797
Ms. Guay	8797
Mr. Van Loan	8797
Mr. Bigras	8797
Mr. Warawa	8797
Mr. Bigras	8797
Mr. Warawa	8798

Afghanistan

Ms. Davies	8798
Mr. Van Loan	8798
Ms. Davies	8798
Mr. Day	8798
Mr. Simard	8798
Mr. Day	8798
Mr. Simard	8798
Mr. Day	8798
Mr. Cotler	8799
Ms. Guergis	8799
Mr. Cotler	8799
Ms. Guergis	8799
Mrs. Barbot	8799
Mr. Day	8799
Mrs. Barbot	8799
Mr. Day	8799
Ms. Picard	8799
Ms. Guergis	8799

The Environment

Ms. Picard	8800
Mr. Warawa	8800
Mr. McGuinty	8800
Mr. Warawa	8800
Mr. McGuinty	8800
Mr. Warawa	8800
Mr. Holland	8800
Mr. Warawa	8800
Mr. Holland	8800
Mr. Warawa	8801

Trade	
Mr. Bezan	8801
Ms. Guergis	8801
The Environment	
Mr. Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)	8801
Mr. Warawa	8801
Mr. Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley)	8801
Mr. Warawa	8801
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Merasty	8801
Mr. Bruinooge	8802
Ms. Neville	8802
Mr. Bruinooge	8802
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Cuzner	8802
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	8802
Mr. Valley	8802
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	8802
Status of Women	
Ms. Demers	8802
Mrs. Yelich	8803
World Bank	
Mr. St-Cyr	8803
Ms. Ablonczy	8803
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Easter	8803
Mr. Paradis	8803
The Budget	
Mr. Warkentin	8803
Ms. Ablonczy	8803
Community Access Program	
Ms. Savoie	8803
Mr. Carrie	8804
Post-Secondary Education	
Ms. Savoie	8804
Mrs. Yelich	8804
Passport Canada	
Mr. D'Amours	8804
Ms. Guergis	8804
Agriculture	
Mr. Shipley	8804
Mr. Paradis	8804
Afghanistan	
Mr. Gravel	8804
Mr. Day	8805

Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Dewar	8805
Mr. Abbott	8805
Privilege	
Parliamentary Precinct	
Mr. Reid	8805
Mr. Dewar	8806

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Goodyear	8806
(Motion agreed to)	8806
Criminal Code	
Ms. Guarnieri	8806
Bill C-433. Introduction and first reading	8806
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	8806
Criminal Code—Bill C-376	
Mr. Van Loan	8806
Motion	8806
(Motion agreed to)	8806
Committees of the House	
Public Accounts	
Ms. Sgro	8806
Motion for concurrence	8806
Mr. Murphy (Charlottetown)	8807
Mr. Murphy (Charlottetown)	8808
Mr. Hill	8810
Mr. Cuzner	8810
Mr. Easter	8811
Mr. Poilievre	8811
Mr. Proulx	8811
Ms. Brown (Oakville)	8814
Mr. Hill	8815
Mr. Harris	8815
Mr. Easter	8815
Mr. Lussier	8816

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code	
Bill C-343. Second reading	8816
Mrs. Smith	8816
Mr. Easter	8818
Mr. St-Cyr	8819
Mr. Bezan	8820
Division on motion deferred	8822

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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 Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :**
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

**Additional copies may be obtained from Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: (613) 941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: (613) 954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>**

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 ou la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : (613) 941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : (613) 954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>**