



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 142 • NUMBER 028 • 2nd SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, November 30, 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, November 30, 2007

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

• (1005)

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

(Bill C-376. On the Order. Private Members' Bills:)

Second reading of Bill C-376, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (impaired driving) and to make consequential amendments to other Acts—Mr. Ron Cannan.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations with all parties and I believe you will find unanimous consent of the House to propose the following motion. I move:

That the order for second reading of Bill C-376, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (impaired driving) and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, be discharged and the bill be withdrawn.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Order discharged and bill withdrawn)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET AND ECONOMIC STATEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2007

The House resumed from November 29 consideration of the motion that Bill C-28, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2007 and to implement certain provisions of the economic statement tabled in Parliament on October 30, 2007, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert (Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on debate today with regard to the fiscal update.

When the Liberal government came into power in 1993, we had inherited a debt of \$42.5 billion. There was no question that this deficit of \$42.5 billion was given to us by the previous Mulroney government. Under great fiscal management by the Liberals, we

were able to eliminate the national deficit and pay down the national debt. The present government has inherited a very strong fiscal framework, all due to good Liberal management.

The one area that the Conservative government has failed on, and I am glad to see that the minister is here today, is the urban community agenda.

In 1983 the Federation of Canadian Municipalities proposed an infrastructure program to deal with decaying infrastructure in Canada. However, in 1984, the new Conservative government let it lay dormant for 10 years. I know something about this because I was president of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities at one time.

There seems to be a pattern here. When we came into office, we brought in a national infrastructure program. We dealt with cities and provinces. We had a true partnership with them. We were moving the urban agenda forward, particularly the agenda dealing with infrastructure.

Regrettably, the Conservative government does not understand the urban agenda and it does not understand infrastructure. Comments have been made by ministers of the Crown, the Minister of Finance being one, suggesting that they are not in the pot hole business.

This is not about pot holes. This is about being competitive, both at home and abroad. It is about making sure that we have the right infrastructure to deal with it. I would have expected the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities to have been more sensitive to this issue given his previous life. However, maybe he has forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Miramichi and I know that he is sensitive to these particular issues.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities just commissioned a study which found that there is a \$123 billion infrastructure deficit. The government's response is that this is basically not its problem. It was the Liberals who eliminated the GST on goods and services for municipal governments. At the time, we inherited a 57.4% rebate that came in when Mulroney was in power. In 1989 Mulroney quietly brought in this additional charge. We were able to eliminate it and the municipality of Richmond Hill saved \$1 million a year.

The Liberals also came in with a new deal. This new deal was about dealing with this order of government, and that order of government being, of course, the municipal sector.

Government Orders

We know that on Monday mayors from across Canada will be coming here. They are going to make it very clear to the government that it will get an F. It could receive lower than that, but on the scale only an F is allowed. The Conservative government has not addressed the issue. The real sad part is that the Conservatives do not understand the issue, and that is rather disappointing.

We know that if we want to compete in the world, we need to have the kind of infrastructure that can move goods and services. We have to be able to deal with businesses and communities and universities and post-secondary institutions in general. The funding gap is there.

The Conservative government is a failure on the environment. However, it does like to recycle old Liberal programs. It likes to recycle moneys which we had set aside over the past while. We on this side of the House will never take any lectures from the Conservative government on municipal infrastructure or on how to deal with cities and communities because we were the leaders on that and we continue to be the leaders on that.

Our party has formed a cities and communities caucus because we have great bench strength when it comes to that issue. We understand those issues. There is absolutely no question—

An hon. member: That's kind of late don't you think.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: They can talk all they like over there, but again it is the reality. The reality is that the president of the FCM was here last week and said that the government does not understand the issue.

• (1010)

In order to address an issue people have to understand what it is about. The government does not get it. I do not think it will ever get it. The government did not get it when it was in power under Mulroney and under the present government it is not understood either, which is of course a failure. That failure means that we are seeing bridges collapse. We are seeing infrastructure that generally is not keeping up.

That report which was dismissed by many members of that government is an important report. It talks about where we need to be dealing with these issues. Whether these issues be roads, sewers or whether they be dealing with waste treatment plants, these things need to be addressed, not only for the environment but for health and economic competitiveness which is extremely important. It is rather disappointing.

In this budget the government fails to invest. It seems to think that investing is not a good thing. We need to be investing in these issues. The Minister of Transport might think that this funny, but I have to say that the members of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities are rather shocked at the insensitivity of members of the government on this issue.

I certainly remember those very dark days under the Conservatives when we could not get a meeting with the minister. The prime minister would never attend the FCM. Under the Liberals of course we had all of that. Now, of course, it is fashionable for government ministers to come, but again they are short on delivery. They are long on talk, but they do not deliver. Of course that is very unfortunate because again we are not addressing the issues.

I do not hear the government talking about the innovation agenda. I do not hear it talking about the productivity agenda. These are important initiatives. On this side of the House, we support tax cuts. We support the issues dealing with paying down the debt. We support those kinds of issues. At the same time we believe in investment, whether that is in health or in infrastructure there needs to be a balance. Unfortunately, the government does not understand balance. I think that is certainly something that Canadians want and Canadians expect from the government.

On the transit issue the government recycles Liberal initiatives. The GTA transit is a good example where again the previous Liberal government put money forth. The Conservative government cancels it and then it recycles. I do not know how many times the same program can be repackaged and then resold as the same thing, but apparently the government likes to do that.

We know what the government's shameful record is on the environment. We were going to work with the province of Ontario in closing down some coal-fired generating plants. The Conservatives came to power and eliminated that. Now the government is trying to get back and trying to recycle that initiative. That was another Liberal initiative.

The fact is that at the end of the day we on this side of the House understand these issues. It is unfortunate that on the other side the Conservatives have failed to listen and to respond effectively to the mayors and councillors from across this country on this whole range of issues.

Our cities and our communities are critical if in fact we are going to be able to take leadership on the world stage. We need to make sure that we are doing that. It is unfortunate.

At the same time, this budget also fails to address some other fundamental issues. I suggest that when it comes to partnership it is not my way or the highway. We see that in the provinces. The government promised peace in our time with the provinces. We had two angry provinces going in and of course we have had about four or five that are still very unhappy with the government. Again, it is about partners. It is about listening. We have not had a first ministers conference.

The government is now suggesting that it will have a first ministers conference in January, 22 or 23 months after assuming office. Again, this is rather shameful. The fact is that the government needs to talk with its provincial counterparts. The government needs to talk with the FCM. It needs to be able to say what it can do in terms of having effective leadership in this country.

Unfortunately, the mini-budget fails cities. It fails innovation. It fails the productivity agenda. It does not deal with some of the core issues and core values that Canadians have when it comes to these issues.

That is why on this side of the House we are very disappointed and unable to endorse what clearly was a very lacklustre performance by the Government of Canada.

Government Orders

•(1015)

Mr. Ken Epp (Edmonton—Sherwood Park, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was truly amused by this speech. It is a good way to start a Friday morning to have, shall we say, a jokester on the hustings here.

I do not know, but these Liberals keep talking about how they inherited a \$35 billion debt. First of all, it was not a debt. It was a deficit. Every year the government was borrowing more money than it was taking in. It was spending and borrowing money and putting us further and further into debt.

I remember that in 1993 when we were campaigning I had a computer clock set up at some of the trade fairs. It showed how the debt was growing and how we were going to attack the debt.

It is true that the Conservative government under Mulroney for those nine years made only one error, that is, it did not sufficiently address the issue of the debt it had inherited from the Liberals. That debt came totally from the years of rampant spending and overspending by the Liberal government.

I did the math at the time and was able to prove not only to others but also to myself that this was correct. The debt had simply grown, with compound interest, to where it was so huge that it was growing at the rate of \$1,000 per second. It was totally untenable for us to put that kind of debt load onto our young people and our next generation.

We fought against that. I am very proud to be able to say that we were part of changing the culture in this place so that we stopped that interminable borrowing. The member says the Liberals did it. Yes, that is true, in that the Liberal government finally succumbed to the pressure and to the reality that they could not sustain that kind of borrowing, but please, let us remember that the debt was a Liberal debt from 1970 or 1972 onward until it had grown into the hundreds of billions of dollars.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: Mr. Speaker, in 1993 when the Liberal Party came in, 33¢ of every dollar was borrowed money, from the Conservative-Mulroney group. Therefore, it was because of strong fiscal management on our side that we were able to eliminate the deficit and pay down the debt.

No other government in the history of this country has ever inherited such a good fiscal performance as the current government has, because of the work we did. We were determined to work with Canadians, and Canadians understood that we could not continue to borrow money and live beyond our means. By eliminating the deficit by 1996-97, we were able to invest savings. When we pay down the debt, which obviously is still too high, we save about \$3 billion-plus a year in interest alone. That again is due to the work of the previous Liberal government.

I commend my friend on the other side for recognizing the work that was done by previous Liberal governments. I would suggest to him, however, that the present government needs to invest in our cities and communities, because if the government does not do that we will continue to see reports like the one on the \$123 billion situation. It is important. It is vital.

Again, I am very concerned. I do not want this way in which the members on the other side have been spending money in terms of the GST and all of those things, which costs the treasury \$5 billion to \$6 billion a year alone. We do not want to go back into a deficit. What if the economy slows down and we go into a deficit? Deficits are very easy to get into and extremely difficult to get out of. We do not want to see that again. We ask for some prudence on that side.

In terms of the government's little GST announcement, unless one is buying a yacht or some expensive vehicle I suggest that there would not be a lot of money saved. It costs the treasury \$5 billion to \$6 billion per year in order to take 1% off the GST.

Hon. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I certainly listened with interest when the former president of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities was able to bring to the floor this morning some of the concerns that the federation and municipal governments have with this federal government of ours today.

Just over a week ago, the federation had its annual meeting here in Ottawa. I do not think I have ever experienced a meeting with more frustrated people in regard to how they came here to Ottawa to talk about the future needs of their organizations across this country and the response they got from talking with various members of the federal government.

In fact, when we look at their overall concerns in terms of infrastructure, infrastructure today has been put under the Minister of Transport, and I know he has a vital interest in this, but I am not sure he has the backing or the support of his colleagues in the cabinet to make sure that we have a viable and workable infrastructure program, so that not only the large cities but our smaller communities can benefit from the revenues we have here in the federal treasury.

With budgets, visions, directions and responsibilities, and with an attempt to look at the economy so that our people in the future can be prosperous, so that our country can benefit from the wealth of our nation, we have to assess what this present government is doing for our Canadian people.

We have to think about the many students who are attending our universities and who look for some source of relief in terms of the student loans they are accumulating from their years of study.

We have to look at research and development in this country in terms of what attitudes and what directions our government is taking.

We have to think in terms of productivity and how our government is encouraging our various companies in this country to invest in research, to look at forms of development and, above all, to see that we have a productive society from which all Canadians can benefit.

Members may say that our unemployment in this country is at one of its lowest levels. In fact, we are very happy to see that we are almost approaching the concept of a 5% unemployment rate, but we have to look at the types of jobs that we are creating in this country and at whether or not our people can get adequate incomes to support their families.

Government Orders

Too often in this country, we find that workers need to have two jobs, or that they need to have at least two family incomes and maybe three jobs to support a family. With that, we have to look at the transfer of jobs from one sector of the economy to another.

I speak in terms of our agricultural community. While some sectors are prospering, this past week we have had the pork producers and the beef producers here in our city looking for support. They are looking for help in terms of what those sectors are encountering.

We can think in terms of our forestry sector and what is happening there. The province of Quebec recently made some statements on that. We have certainly a lot of people with long term unemployment in our pulp and paper and long lumber industries. Only this morning, while looking in the paper, I noticed that a new company, AbitibiBowater, is closing a number of mills, and in fact one mill just across the way here in Gatineau, and another in my home province, in Dalhousie, New Brunswick.

This is not an easy fact to consider. Many of those people were earning some of the highest wages in this country. With this, the changes that are happening in our forest sector certainly will need to be addressed by the budgets and by the economic icons of the present government.

It is rather disappointing that when I look at the front bench I see a lot of former ministers from the Harris government. With that, I just wonder what happens in that big room upstairs when those people meet and as a cabinet attempt to look at our country and try to see what they can do to improve it and to make our Canadian society more productive.

Mr. Speaker, I know, certainly, that you are a resident of Ontario. You have experienced some of the frustrations of the previous government here in this province and I certainly hope that the decisions being made do not reflect the history of what happened in your own province.

• (1020)

The oil industry and the research and work being done in terms of exploring that oil sector in the west certainly is a very vital part of the Canadian economy. I am happy to say that in terms of even my own province we are seeing the results in the manufacturing sector back home in how it can compete and participate in Alberta and the great activity that is happening in that province.

However, we also have to consider other provinces and other sectors. Hopefully, with the surplus we have today, we can address some of the issues that are affecting people in other sectors.

The hon. member who spoke previously spoke at length in terms of 1993-94 and the difficulties we encountered as a government in the 13 years in which the Liberals governed this country. I think everyone can recognize the tremendous response that the Canadian people offered in terms of the sacrifices they made so that Canada today is the prosperous society that we enjoy.

It was not easy to look at the amount of debt, the annual deficit and the problems related to it. I know that all Canadians participated with our previous government in seeing that we reached a point where we had surpluses and annual balanced budgets and where

Canadians could be proud of the fact that they were not accumulating more debt each year. It is interesting to note in terms of what has happened that we are approaching today the 25% ratio of debt to GDP which was the goal of our previous ministers of finance.

So today I express concerns in terms of what is happening with our surpluses. The previous members talked about how the HST or GST affects the future of our country. It is rather disappointing that we spend so much time trying to look at a 1% saving, which, for the average Canadian, saves a very small amount of money. In fact, the average worker probably would save only \$100 or more per year, but somebody with a lot of wealth would save a great deal more in taxes.

We must salute the fact that personal income taxes have been at an all-time high, that corporations have been contributing to our revenues, and that overall the present government inherited a very sound and very stable fiscal arrangement from the previous Liberal government.

• (1025)

Mr. Bruce Stanton (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the comments of the member for Miramichi, I was quite surprised by the claims made by the member and the previous speaker with regard to a lack of support for municipalities. In the previous government, the support for municipalities was lacklustre at best.

In contrast, we now have a government that has pledged some \$33 billion in support for municipalities and for small communities right across the country. Not only does that include an extension of the gas tax, which, by the way, the previous government back-ended so that under its previous commitments up to 60% of its commitment in gas tax has yet to be realized, but we have continued it for an extra four years, well out to 2014. I think in a lot of cases the municipalities forget to consider that.

This means billions of dollars. The two programs combined, the full GST refund commitment and now the gas tax commitment to municipalities, total some \$18 billion, which is fully three times what the previous government committed in any case to municipalities.

The member's words ring hollow. I would ask the member to consider them and to respond in some way as to how he could make such a claim in light of what he now sees in this commitment by the government.

Hon. Charles Hubbard: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Simcoe North for bringing this to our attention. The federation believes very strongly that there is a situation of smoke and mirrors with the \$33 billion.

As I said in my speech, a government has to plan for the future. My disappointment with the present Conservative government is the fact that not only is it failing to prepare for the future, but it is trying to destroy some of the past programs, which were so effective.

A child care program disappeared. We see little of an excellent program that attempted to help our university students. When the Conservatives talk about the money they are spending, or plan to spend, it is the idea, the vision for which we are looking. It is a vision of what we can offer to our municipalities in an attempt to improve their infrastructure. It is a vision to give them some sense that something is being done and that we are not looking to the past.

Further, I have to be concerned about the fact that we have had a lot of announcements, but only few programs are on the table. Many of our municipalities have said that the program is not ready yet, the announcement has been made but there is no money yet. They want to know we get things going.

• (1030)

Mrs. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am quite taken with all of the discussion about good planning. I saw an example of that good planning in the city in which I live, London. About three weeks ago, the street literally caved in, and the city of London has been desperately trying to address the situation that this huge sinkhole has created downtown, in the busiest part of the city.

Consequently, merchants and people who work and shop downtown are tremendously disadvantaged. Since it is during the Christmas period, this is creating a certain level of shock.

I have no faith in the planning, about which we keep hearing. The problems involving infrastructure just did not happen. The fact that the current government is not interested in helping municipalities does not change the fact that the previous Liberal government had no interest.

My question is about planning. It seems to me that in the last decade or so we have had a lot of news about Liberal surpluses and Conservative surpluses. Why could both governments not anticipate needs well enough to understand that these surpluses would be available? What on earth is wrong with their ability to calculate and tabulate the money coming in?

Hon. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is one of the great problems. In fact, the present government, when it was in opposition, always criticized the Liberal minister of finance, saying he was somehow jiggling the books, that he could not really analyze the state of the economy well enough to have a fairly balanced budget. The same party that criticized us has a more serious problem, if it is a problem, today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy André (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Bill C-28, in which I take a great interest. First of all, I should point out that this bill introduced by the Conservative government was drafted for purely partisan reasons.

By drafting a single bill to implement the provisions of the March 2007 federal budget, the provisions of the October 2007 economic statement and the side deal with Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia on equalization, the government has introduced legislation that may be designed to provoke an early federal election.

The Conservatives could simply have introduced a separate bill for each part of Bill C-28.

But no. It is important to remind this House that even though the Bloc Québécois voted for the March 2007 federal budget, we have always opposed side deals on equalization.

Now, Nova Scotia is getting new benefits under an accord that the Bloc Québécois has always denounced. We also opposed the economic statement because it did not address the Bloc Québécois' five priorities.

Government Orders

For example, the measures in the economic statement do not meet the urgent needs in the manufacturing and forestry sectors and do not include an older worker assistance program, even though the Conservative government could afford one, given the \$11.6 billion surplus it announced in the economic statement.

For all these reasons, the Bloc Québécois, as a responsible party that defends Quebec's interests, will vote against this bill.

As for the economic statement, this government has demonstrated that it is completely indifferent to the problems facing workers in the manufacturing and forestry sectors and the communities that depend on those sectors.

The Conservatives have demonstrated once again their total disdain for the lot of these thousands of workers who have been so greatly affected. This attitude appears all the more disdainful when we realize that the federal government has huge financial means with which to provide them with assistance.

The Conservative government had the means to help the manufacturing sector by providing loans for new production equipment and for massive investments in innovation.

It could have helped older workers as well. We estimate that it would cost \$60 million to set up an income support program for older workers, something that we have been demanding for a very long time and that Quebec has also been calling for since the POWA was terminated.

Despite its vast surpluses, the government could not even come up with a hundred dollars a month to increase the guaranteed income supplement for seniors and ensure that the poorest of them have enough income to keep them above the poverty line.

There is nothing here for our manufacturing and forestry sectors, nothing for older workers who lose their jobs, and nothing to help seniors. Yet the Conservatives did not hesitate to cut taxes. What ridiculous propaganda. Who will benefit from these tax cuts? Rich oil companies in western Canada. The Conservative Party's only goal is to help the oil industry and, of course, scuttle the Kyoto accord.

These tax cuts will not do forestry companies and manufacturers one bit of good because these businesses are in crisis and are not making a profit.

All told, this government has presented measures that are completely out of touch with Quebec's priorities but that are great for their friends, the rich oil companies.

Once again, this proves that Quebec ministers in the current federal government have been sidelined. They have no real power, they cannot defend Quebec's interests, and they are just there to promote Alberta's oil industry.

Government Orders

•(1035)

The Conservative government's shameful indifference to the problems facing the manufacturing sector and the powerlessness of Conservative government members from Quebec are jeopardizing key economic sectors in Quebec.

Take job losses in Quebec's manufacturing sector: 135,000 manufacturing jobs—one in five—have been lost in Quebec since December 31, 2002, and 65,000 of those since the Conservative Party came to power. Nearly half of the 275,000 jobs lost in Canada during that period were lost in Quebec. The Conservative Party says that it is acting in the best interest of all Canadians, but it is certainly not acting in the best interest of Quebecers.

Unfortunately, we have not seen the end of this yet. Yesterday, AbitibiBowater announced the permanent closure of several locations, including the Belgo mill in Shawinigan. Between now and March 2008, over 500 jobs will be lost. This is an economic disaster for Mauricie because closing this mill means losing \$30 million in salaries and \$60 million in economic spinoffs for the Shawinigan region. This is an economic disaster.

What is the government waiting for?

One thousand Quebecers who work for AbitibiBowater will lose their jobs. This is a tragedy for these workers and their families, and it is dreadful news to be receiving just before Christmas.

The Conservative government needs to take a long hard look at how it has managed the forestry and manufacturing crisis. Everyone has been begging for help for years now, but the government just ignores those pleas, or promises measures that, for now, do not amount to anything.

Forestry workers have to know that this government is refusing to help them. That is unacceptable. The government has to help these workers who are going through the worst crisis in their history, a crisis that is made worse by the government's mismanagement.

In my riding of Berthier—Maskinongé, which I have the honour of representing, the furniture sector is quite important. In Berthier—Maskinongé, we have a number of innovative and dynamic companies and skilled and creative workers who, in the past, like everywhere else in Quebec, have shown that they can face the new challenges of international competition.

Now, in light of this new trade reality we are experiencing, this industry needs the government's support to help it adapt.

Let us not forget that this furniture industry has seen a 22% decrease in its labour force. It is currently generating roughly 24,000 jobs, while in 2000 it generated roughly 30,500. Employment is decreasing in the furniture industry and the federal government, with its huge surplus, is not doing anything about it.

In December 2006, I tabled a notice of motion calling on the federal government to implement an aid package to support the furniture industry as it adjusts to the rising Canadian dollar. I also asked for support to help the industry cope with fierce competition from emerging countries. Unfortunately, the federal government chose not to present any aid package or research support program to help this industry adapt.

As I have indicated, the Conservative government had the means to help the manufacturing sector by providing loans for new production equipment and for massive investments in innovation.

What more can I say? The federal government is only working on defending the oil industry and abolishing any form of intervention to decrease greenhouse gas emissions. It is only working for western Canada.

It presented an economic statement that is out of touch and does not meet our needs. In this statement, the government chose to help western Canadian oil companies and left the manufacturing sector to fend for itself at a time when it is experiencing the worst situation in years.

The Bloc Québécois cannot accept that the government is standing idly by as Quebec's manufacturing and forestry sectors crumble and fall.

•(1040)

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the Bloc had a lot to say.

We as parliamentarians and Canadians in general would like some understanding of the framework of the fiscal situation of the Government of Canada.

In Bill C-2, the accountability act, there was the commitment to have what I call truth in advertising. It was in the bill but it has not been brought into force to have a budgetary officer of Parliament to tell Canadians and parliamentarians what the surplus will be.

When the Conservatives were in opposition, the then leader of the official opposition who is now the Prime Minister was very clear that he wanted to have an understanding of what the surpluses would be so we could have a debate in this place and Canadians could have a debate in the country as to where the money should be spent.

Sadly, the government is doing what the previous government was doing, which is to treat the nice big fat surplus as if it were the government's, when in fact we know it is Canadians' surplus. The Conservatives just spirit money over to the debt and bring forth a fiscal update which we cannot debate to the extent that we debate a budget. We cannot invest the surplus in our communities to deal with the crumbling infrastructure, housing, et cetera.

I would like the hon. member's take on why the government has not brought into force the budgetary officer of Parliament. Why does he think the government is hypocritical on the issue of debating the surplus and not having a real debate in this country about the country's finances?

•(1045)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy André: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his excellent question.

Government Orders

At the beginning of the year, the government forecast a \$3 to \$5 billion surplus. According to the Bloc's estimates, the surplus will be \$16 billion, at a time when our companies are shutting down and the forestry sector is in serious trouble. But the government is doing nothing.

Let me say this. We are a sovereignist movement. We want a sovereign Quebec. If we were independent and had access to all the taxes paid by Quebec workers, we could better support our manufacturing and forestry industries as well as the poor. Furthermore, we could develop social housing.

But here in Ottawa, governments seem to get bogged down, Liberals and Conservatives alike. They are doing nothing to help older workers. We are asking for some of the money to be returned to the unemployed. This week, changes to the employment insurance fund were voted down. A total of \$55 billion was taken out of the pockets of workers through the excessive premiums charged to employers and employees. Both of these governments have kept helping themselves to workers' money and blocking improvements to the employment insurance program.

These are all examples of what makes it difficult for Quebec to be part of this big family. My colleague had every reason to mention the \$16 billion surplus, when in Quebec, we have problems providing health and education services for our population. Here, they have a \$16 billion surplus, while our companies are shutting down and cannot get help. That is my answer to his question.

Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this government has missed several opportunities to support the manufacturing and forestry sectors, especially considering the strength of our dollar. Everyone except the government understands that we have already lost so many jobs and many more will be lost in the future. This is one subject on which the Bloc Québécois and my party agree.

My question for the hon. member is as follows. What does he think the government should do to support the manufacturing sector?

Mr. Guy André: Mr. Speaker, the rising Canadian dollar and competition from Asia is having an impact on our manufacturing industry. Next week, we will debate Bill C-411. I therefore invite the Liberals to vote in favour of this bill, so it may reach second reading in the House of Commons.

Bill C-411 would establish new criteria to better protect our businesses from competition from Asia. It defines five criteria that would allow customs officers to better protect Canadian and Quebec businesses from Asian competition. I would be surprised to see the Conservative government vote in favour of this bill, because it prefers completely open markets and it has no concerns. It wants a wide open market.

We find it surprising that supply management is still around under this government. It is not in this government's philosophy. It wants free trade for free trade.

The Standing Committee on International Trade has no statistics that would tell it, for example, if it would be advantageous for Quebec businesses to do business under a free trade agreement between Canada and Korea. What are the advantages of such an agreement for the Government of Quebec and the rest of Canada?

This is the case in all sectors. More in-depth studies really need to be conducted.

Once again, I invite Liberal members to vote in favour of Bill C-411, which will protect—

• (1050)

The Speaker: I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé, but his time has run out.

We are now at the period for 10-minute speeches followed by five minutes of questions and comments for everyone.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre.

[*English*]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the budget bill. Pardon me if I smile a bit, Mr. Speaker, because this is a joke. That is all I can say. The bill itself is a joke. When we look at the budget that was tabled it is like everything that the government does. It is a great marketing strategy, fabulous retail. When we look at the window dressing, it is beautiful. It will sell anything. But when we look for the substantive part, it is not there.

Let us consider some of the words in the budget. Let us look at some of the phrases that were used. First and foremost we have to note regarding this budget, people have said that the current finance minister has been the highest spending finance minister in the history of this country.

The Conservative government inherited from the former Liberal government a strong economy, a strong balanced budget over nine years, huge investments that were made in innovation, in learning, in helping to move forward into a 21st century economy. None of that was followed through on. A lot of money was spent on little baubles that look pretty in the window, but which really have no long term impact, no vision and absolutely no ability to create a future for Canadians. In the 21st century, productivity, competitiveness and the ability to develop human capital are the key things we should be thinking about if we are to hold our heads above water.

Given that we are such a small country with only 32 million people, we have to be smart. We have to be the best and the brightest in terms of our workforce. We have to create a country which is going to be innovative, creative and technologically progressive. There are certain things we need to focus on because we cannot be everything to everyone. None of that was taken into consideration in this budget.

Instead we heard marketing slogans. The budget talked about an infrastructure advantage. That is very interesting because there was a reiteration of many Liberal programs, for instance, the gas tax rebate that went to cities for infrastructure. There was in fact a delay of the Pacific gateway which was a huge infrastructure advantage for Canada, for British Columbia and the west.

Government Orders

We know that if we are to be competitive we must diversify trade. Right now most of our eggs are in one basket, and that is the United States. Eighty per cent of our trade is done with that nation. Anyone, including my mother, and she is not an economist, could tell us because it is just common sense that we do not put all our eggs in one basket, that in a global economy we diversify.

Canada has an enormous advantage. We could go to Asia. We have the people. Multiculturalism has given us a whole generation of people who speak the language, who understand the culture and who understand the marketplace of most of Asia. We could have a distinct advantage there. Was anything done to win the race to get there first? No. In fact the gateway has been delayed by five years. As I said once before, by the time we get there, there will only be crumbs left to pick up off the floor. Canada is a trading nation, but absolutely nothing was done to create an advantage for us in terms of trade.

The Conservatives talked about modernizing the health care system. This was another wonderful little slogan that came about in the budget, modernizing the health care system. The biggest problems with our health care system right now are one, infrastructure, and two, wait times. One does not have to be a rocket scientist to know that one of the key factors in bringing down wait times is increasing the human resource potential of health care professionals. We are short of physicians. We are short of nurses. We are short of technologists and technicians in health care. We now know that there are almost three million Canadians who cannot find a family physician. There was not a single word in this budget about health human resources.

• (1055)

The Liberal government had already spent the first year building a policy to help create a strong health human resource pool. That has disappeared. There is no knowledge about where it went and there is certainly no word about it.

The language, the pretty thing in the window, says that the government is talking about modernizing the health care system. What is it modernizing it with? There is nothing substantive to do that, but still they are nice words.

Then we heard talk about a cleaner, healthier environment. That is wonderful. The first thing the government did was to renege on Kyoto. To show how much it cares about a healthier, cleaner environment, the government went to the CHOGM meeting in Uganda and refused to put its signature on a plan to deal with greenhouse gas emissions and to clean up the environment.

The Conservatives argued that they did not sign on to the plan because China was not involved in it. China is not a member of the Commonwealth. That is like saying we will not do anything in our own backyard to make a difference because the rest of the world has done nothing. It is like the cockeyed plan, which they signed with the United States. Now Congress has to look at that plan again to decide if there is a better plan to deal with the environment. Here we go again. The Conservative speak great words, nice words.

Now we know that no one else will go to the next environmental conference. Not a single member of the opposition will go because we are *persona non grata* with the Conservative government. Parliamentary democracy is taking a beating with the government.

As opposition members, we never get to go. I do not care which party goes, but the opposition is an important part of parliamentary democracy. We should be there to ensure the government represents the best interests of Canadians. I guess if we are not there, then we cannot complain. It is kind of late for us to say anything now as it is after the fact: A cleaner, healthier environment, indeed.

Then we heard talk about entrepreneurial advantage. That was another wonderful statement in the budget. Do members know what gives us an entrepreneurial advantage? Investing in human capital will give us that. Anybody who has studied the economics of a post-industrial era will tell us that the most important of the three capitals that are spent on economic development is human capital. We have to educate people so Canadians can be the best and the brightest in the world.

We cannot compete with China in making cheaper T-shirts, but we can talk about how Canadian citizens can be the best and the brightest. Ireland did it. With only four million people, it is one of the most productive and competitive member states in the world and it became so by investing in people and in learning.

Instead, the Conservative government has cut adult literacy. Instead we find out that the fifty-fifty plan the federal Liberals had to help young people to get a post-secondary education is gone. The \$3.5 billion skills and training agreement that the federal Liberal government made with the provinces disappeared. Instead, with all that money gone, \$800 million has been invested in what?

How did we miss the boat on getting the best and the brightest, on giving every Canadian youngster a chance to go to school early? We have no child care, no early childhood development. That was also felt to be unnecessary. Getting our young people to be the best and the brightest, starting at their earliest years, has disappeared. Getting into post-secondary education has disappeared. Skills and training is gone. There is no word about adult retraining for people who have lost their jobs in the manufacturing sector. Yet we hear this wonderful term entrepreneurial advantage.

When I look at this budget, I have to smile. I have to stop myself from laughing out loud. There is absolutely nothing in the budget that would give Canada an advantage on the world stage. There is nothing to help Canada hold its head above water. There is nothing to help Canada become competitive and productive.

When the government answers questions in the House about jobs, it tells us there are all kinds of jobs out there. There are jobs and then there are jobs. With a \$10 an hour “Mac” job, people cannot bring up a family. We are talking about real jobs, sustainable jobs. We are talking about the ability to invest in Canada and in Canadians. We are talking about moving toward a goal for a future for our country. We are talking about being the most competitive in the world on the global stage. There is nothing about that in the budget.

As I said before, I was pleased to stand and speak to the budget bill, but I can find very little in it that is worth mentioning or worth applauding or that has a vision for our country.

• (1100)

The Speaker: There will be five minutes for questions and comments on the hon. member's speech when debate resumes.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

RETIREMENT WISHES

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to say thanks and good luck to Sister St. Stephen of the Sisters of St. Joseph.

Parliamentarians will miss Sister St. Stephen as she recently retired after 28 years as a pastry chef at the House of Commons. Her real specialty was dinner rolls, at which I can attest, she excelled.

She has tried to retire three times before, most recently to the Sisters of St. Joseph motherhouse in Pembroke, but kept on getting called back.

Throughout her life, Sister St. Stephen has believed that when God closes one door he always opens another. Her faith is sending her to the poorest country in the western hemisphere, Haiti, to put her culinary skills to work preparing bread and baked goods for children in orphanages.

Her excitement and enthusiasm know no bounds as she looks forward to entertaining the children with an armload of mouth organs she has collected to teach them music.

On behalf of her friends at the House of Commons, Godspeed and safe voyage.

* * *

WABANO DRUM GROUP

Hon. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past October 7, in Niagara Falls, New York, the women of Wabano Drum Group, consisting of Allison Fisher, Bev Souliere and Carlie Chase, won in the category Best Debut Group of the Year at the ninth annual Native American Music Awards. The group's entry, titled *Voices*, has been a tremendous success.

“Our songs carry the voice of the land and as we know the honour of one is the honour of all,” said Allison Fisher.

I would also note that Allison and Carlie play an important role in the success of the Wabano Centre for Aboriginal Health. Located in

Statements by Members

Ottawa Vanier and founded in 1988, the centre is a respected organization, which provides health services to aboriginal communities.

On behalf of all members, I congratulate them for their dedication and hard work toward aboriginal communities and for the talent that they have demonstrated with *Voices*.

* * *

[Translation]

HOG INDUSTRY

Mr. Roger Gaudet (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that the rising dollar has aggravated the crisis in the manufacturing sectors, but it is also affecting hog producers and exporters. From the start of 2000, the situation of farmers has been disastrous. Almost half of Quebec's hog producers can no longer make their loan payments.

In Canada, imports of American meat rose from 88 million tonnes in 2001 to 138 million tonnes in 2006, an increase of 36%. In addition, the Conservative government has stricter standards for our producers. At the same time, the Americans are imposing stricter regulations. The government's attitude is hurting hog producers.

The crisis highlights the shortcomings of Canadian assistance programs. It is high time that the Conservative government assume its responsibilities and harmonize standards for hog production. In these times, it cannot look out for the interests of oil companies alone.

* * *

[English]

AUTISM

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we know the government has a habit of ignoring motions passed by the House by the opposition, but it is really incredible when it ignores a motion that it supported.

Earlier this year, the House unanimously passed a motion to deal with the situation of autism in our country. The government sits on billions and billions of dollars of surplus, yet not one additional penny is available to coordinate with the provinces and territories assistance for children with autism and their families.

What is the government waiting for? The governments of Europe and of the United States are moving very quickly with a huge investment to assist these children with autism and their families, yet the Conservative government ignores a motion by the House to have a meeting with the provinces and territories to deal with a national plan and with this crisis.

Given the right opportunity and the right investment, these children could have an opportunity that all children in the country have. Autistic children are living in the most beautiful country in the world. It is time the government stood up and honoured that commitment.

Statements by Members

●(1105)

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to rise today to speak in support of our government's building Canada fund.

The building Canada fund commits the government to an unprecedented \$33 billion in new infrastructure funding to assist the provinces and municipalities in repairing, replacing or upgrading Canada's existing infrastructure.

In my home riding of Peterborough, simply extending the gas tax rebate by five additional years will translate into an additional \$26 million in direct funding to the city alone and more than \$40 million for my riding.

Additionally, our government will be there to support new projects, which will build bridges, roads, highways, sewers and public transit. Municipalities were clear. They need our support to assist them with Canada's infrastructure deficit and the government and the Prime Minister are committed to providing them with historic infrastructure support.

The initiatives of the government have already led to the successful agreement on the FLOW project in Ontario, which will provide new transit lines in the GTA and complete Highway 407 all the way through to Highway 115, but we are just getting started.

Like John A. Macdonald, the government is building Canada, and our nation's future could not be brighter.

* * *

WILLIE O'REE PLACE

Hon. Andy Scott (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Fredericton's new Northside Sports and Leisure Complex will officially be named Willie O'Ree Place on January 16.

Born and raised in Fredericton, Willie O'Ree is remembered as the first black player in the history of the National Hockey League.

Willie broke hockey's colour barrier when he was called up by the Boston Bruins to play against Montreal on January 16, 1958. Willie played pro-hockey for 21 seasons despite losing the sight in his right eye after being hit by a puck when he was 21 years old.

This 50th year anniversary celebration is fitting for a gentleman in the true sense of the word. Willie is the director of youth development for the NHL diversity task force. He has set a wonderful example in promoting tolerance and understanding.

Congratulations to Willie O'Ree. He has made Fredericton proud.

* * *

CANADA-U.S. BORDER

Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today and pay tribute to our local administration at Blue Water Bridge Canada.

I recently met with Congresswoman Candice Miller from Michigan, U.S. border officials, the Michigan Department of Transportation, the Blue Water Bridge Authority, and the local

Canadian border services personnel to address issues that are pertinent to our crossing in Sarnia-Lambton.

One of the many issues that we discussed was the fact that although the crossing is served by both the NEXUS and the FAST programs, the hours of operation were not always convenient.

All attendees determined to address the issues and last week I am pleased to report that the NEXUS hours were increased at the Blue Water Bridge crossing.

As well as increased hours our government has announced that the application fee for NEXUS will be reduced to \$50 on December 1.

Congratulations to all involved for making cross border travel more convenient for our residents.

* * *

[Translation]

VIOLENCE AWARENESS CAMPAIGN

Mr. Raymond Gravel (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. That is the appeal being made by AFEAS. Ms. Mariette Gilbert, president of the organization, launched the 11th annual campaign to raise awareness about violence under the banner *Opération Tendre la main*.

The objective of the campaign is to denounce the murders of spouses, children and parents, which all too often make the headlines. In memory of such tragic events, Ms. Gilbert is asking everyone to wear a white ribbon during *Opération Tendre la main*, being held from November 25 to December 9.

The purpose of this campaign is to promote practices that respect the individual in interpersonal or professional relations and remind us that violence can take many forms, whether committed against young people, women or the elderly. AFEAS wants to make us aware of this daily, and often silent, violence in order to build a violence-free society.

Ms. Gilbert, my colleagues and I share your stand that enough is enough.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over the past 60 years Japan rebuilt itself as a peaceful nation and worked to be a positive presence on the international stage.

Canada is proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with Japan working to make the world a safer and more prosperous place for current and future generations.

Canada is particularly proud of the work that we are doing alongside Japan to help the people of Afghanistan to regain peace and stability in that country.

Both Canada and Japan are among the largest contributors to reconstruction and development in Afghanistan and we are encouraged by our strong people-to-people exchanges, nurtured through academic exchanges, commerce and tourism.

Over nearly 80 years of diplomatic relations are the result of hard work and the ability to resolve our differences. Canada is not one to turn a blind eye to injustices, but it also recognizes the importance of learning from the past and moving forward.

* * *

• (1110)

CANADIAN HEALTH NETWORK

Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recently received a message from Nova Scotia's Cathy Leslie who said this neo-Conservative government's cuts to the Canadian Health Network reveals, "some of the stealth being used to dismantle our national social safety net".

[Translation]

Ms. Leslie said that we must oppose the cuts and shed light on this quiet death.

The health network works with 26 organizations—departments, universities, hospitals, libraries and non-profit health care providers—who rely on 1,600 specialists in the country.

[English]

How can a government sitting on a \$14 billion surplus explain why it will eliminate funding for this program at the end of the fiscal year? Is it oblivious to how destructive its policies are or does it just not care how many Canadians will be hurt by its actions?

* * *

[Translation]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week, the Bloc sent Quebecers a brochure about what we are doing for women, and once again, the Bloc Québécois is making false accusations about our government. In particular, it criticized our actions to fight violence against women. Let me set the record straight.

Every year this government sets aside \$7 million for the family violence initiative.

Furthermore, 34 of the 60 projects approved as part of the women's community fund deal with violence against women, and that is only from the first call for proposals. The total amount approved for these projects is \$4,465,962.

This government announced close to \$56 million in funding over five years for programs and services to prevent violence on first nations reserves.

Our government is taking action and directly helping women. The Bloc has shown its clear contempt for women, since it has not suggested any positive solutions—

The Speaker: The hon. member for London—Fanshawe.

Statements by Members

[English]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this weekend FAFIA, the Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action, will be holding its national symposium in Gatineau, Quebec.

It will be honouring Professor Jody Williams, Nobel peace prize laureate, who has been recognized for her leadership in the international campaign to ban landmines. She will address Canada's current conduct on the international stage, as well as the recent global effort to establish a new UN women's agency.

The symposium will also include discussions on: preparing for Canada's upcoming performance review under CEDAW; an in-depth exploration of gender budgeting and how it can be effectively used in the Canadian context; and exploring how women's groups in Canada can financially sustain their work.

FAFIA's hard work to promote equality for women in Canada is critical. The changes made by the Conservative government to Status of Women Canada have made access to funding more difficult for many equality seeking organizations such as FAFIA.

We need changes made to the funding mandate so that more can access the funds they need to promote women's equality in Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

WORLD AIDS DAY

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as chair of the Canadian Association of Parliamentarians on Population and Development, I rise to draw the attention of the House to the fact that tomorrow is World AIDS Day.

[English]

I am disgusted that this minority Conservative government has taken money out of the hands of Canadians living with HIV-AIDS by redirecting \$15 million in funding to the Gates Foundation.

The Minister of Health must immediately reinstate this money and commit to never again tampering with funding for the Canadian HIV-AIDS community.

Yesterday, the Parliamentary Secretary for Health said in the House, "the government has invested \$84.4 million in HIV-AIDS and that is more than any other government in the history of Canada".

He should apologize for misleading Canadians by claiming the actions of the previous Liberal government as being that of his government and, instead, encourage his government to take meaningful action to fight this disease in Canada.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

2010 QUEBEC SUMMER GAMES IN GATINEAU

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last night we found out that Gatineau will host the 2010 Quebec Summer Games.

I would like to congratulate the City of Gatineau and the members of the organizing committee, capably led by Robert Bob Labine, on the success of their impeccable submission.

The fact that Gatineau has been chosen to host the 2010 Quebec Summer Games is very good news for the whole Outaouais region, which will benefit from increased visibility thanks to such a high-profile event. The region has hosted the Quebec Summer Games just once before, during the summer of 1981.

I would also like to congratulate the cities of Rivière-du-Loup, Charlevoix, Vaudreuil-Dorion and Shawinigan who were also in the running. I am sure that it was not easy to choose just one of these excellent candidates.

Once again, congratulations to Gatineau and the Outaouais region. Three cheers for the 2010 Quebec Summer Games!

* * *

• (1115)

[English]

INTERNATIONAL AID

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, late last month heavy rains and flooding devastated the southeastern Mexican states of Tabasco and Chiapas. Despite rapid Mexican government response, the heavy flood waters destroyed the homes of almost a million people and all of the farm crops, which is their major source of income. This week, more rains and flood waters could further devastate the already battered region.

In the aftermath of hurricane Katrina, Canada's Liberal government was immediately present in a wide range of capabilities, from deploying over 1,000 Canadian forces to air and sea transport of medical and emergency supplies.

As neighbours, Canada should be stepping up to assist the rebuilding and prevention reconstruction of one of the poorest of regions in the Americas. We have the engineering expertise and the money to do so.

Recently, the Prime Minister vowed to focus his foreign policy on the Americas. Yet, an important poorer neighbour and trading partner has received scant attention and a paltry \$500,000 in aid. Even far away Ireland donated one million Euros.

Does the Prime Minister plan to put his money where his mouth is and send further aid to Tabasco or is this the best he can do for a poor neighbour in desperate need?

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Nepean—Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week, I announced a bridge to results. The Strandherd-Armstrong bridge will connect the community of Barrhaven and

Riverside South, while relieving 25% of the traffic in the Village of Manotick.

I did this by unlocking \$35 million, that is a third of the cost of the future bridge, from a \$200 million fund that was sitting in a federal vault.

The Liberal Premier of Ontario and his brother have both said that money should stay in a vault. They agree with a local Liberal councillor, Jan Harder, that the money can stay around for another day for potentially future projects.

But we need this bridge now. My constituents do not give a tinker's damn what fund that money comes out of. They want the bridge. They want the result. I will not stop until they get both.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

WIRELESS INDUSTRY

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we asked whether Brian Mulroney and his spokesperson, Luc Lavoie, lobbied the government on wireless spectrum. The government laughed.

Now the Conservatives understand the trouble they are in. I ask them again: were there any meetings, conversations, communications or contacts of any kind with any ministers or federal officials, arranged or facilitated, directly or indirectly, by Brian Mulroney or his associates?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with the same media reports as the Liberal asking the question. It is of course incumbent upon lobbyists to ensure that they are properly registered under our new tough accountability provisions. The question the member raises is a question that should be raised with the Registrar of Lobbyists.

The fact is that our decision on the wireless industry was based on the best interests of consumers. We expect that it is going to lead to more choice for Canadians, lower prices for cellphone services, better service and more product choice.

Our government is delivering better results for Canadian consumers. Our decision is based on what is in Canadians' best interests, not any representations made by lobbyists.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it looks like Brian Mulroney was lobbying the government on a multi-billion dollar policy decision. It also appears he was lobbying the government illegitimately.

Why did the industry minister or the former industry minister not immediately report Mr. Mulroney's illegitimate lobbying to the registrar? Since the industry minister is responsible for enforcing lobbyist registration, why did he choose not to report Brian Mulroney's potential violation of his own government's Federal Accountability Act?

Oral Questions

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, this government introduced a tough Federal Accountability Act. It includes a lobbyist registrar who is responsible for dealing with lobbyist registration. The responsibility for registration is not the responsibility of the government. It is the responsibility of individual lobbyists.

But the fact is that on the decision in question—and that is the real question, the decision in question—and what we have delivered for Canadians on wireless broadband spectrum, we are delivering more choice, lower prices for cellphone services, more and better choice, more products and more competition.

Canadian consumers will be better off. The member would be better off if he recognized the fact that we have delivered results for Canadians.

• (1120)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the former industry minister was approached by Brian Mulroney. It may be true that the current Minister of Industry did not meet with Mr. Mulroney on this matter, but he did indeed meet with Luc Lavoie.

Does the minister realize that Luc Lavoie is Brian Mulroney's main spokesperson? In a \$2 billion affair, why did they invite the Mulroney gang to be part of the decision-making process?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I said.

It is the responsibility of lobbyists to obtain the proper qualifications. The fact is, we made the decision in question, on the wireless industry, in the best interest of consumers. This decision should provide Canadians with more choice, lower prices for cellphone services, better service and more products. Our government is delivering results for Canadian consumers.

* * *

[*English*]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Omar Alhabra (Mississauga—Erindale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, explain this to consumers. Last July in Chile and again last week in Tanzania, the Prime Minister held private meetings with senior executives from Barrick Gold. Both of these visits helped Barrick do damage control over controversial mining operations that have had devastating impacts on local environments and have led to serious complaints of human rights violations.

Why is the Prime Minister going out of his way to promote this one particular company on the international stage despite these controversies?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as is the case when the Prime Minister or ministers of the government travel abroad, we do meet with Canadians doing business and investing abroad. In the case of the trip in question, I know that the Prime Minister met with a large number of companies in a round table context.

However, I would say that the government has also carried out a process on a corporate social responsibility round table internationally. I know that the mining companies have a large part in that. This government has a strong interest in seeing our Canadian values of human rights advanced abroad and that includes by our corporate citizens.

Mr. Omar Alhabra (Mississauga—Erindale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I guess it had nothing to do with the fact that Brian Mulroney has been a director on Barrick since 1993 and the fact that he is the chair of its international advisory board.

Mr. Mulroney appears to have been acting as an unregistered lobbyist for at least one other company where he serves as a director. Just how many companies has Mr. Mulroney been discussing with the government? Will the government table all records of involvement with Mr. Mulroney or will we just have to wait until each minister is subpoenaed?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for many, many years the practice of lobbying under the Liberal government was something that brought shame to this country and our political system in an actual culture of corruption, a culture that Canadians wanted to see changed. That is why we brought in a tough Federal Accountability Act, and it created onerous obligations for lobbyists to register, but we are not going to stop advancing the interests of Canadians, Canadian business, Canadian jobs and Canadian prosperity abroad.

We are not going to stand in the way of that. We will continue to meet with those Canadian companies that are doing business abroad and help advance Canada's interests around the world for greater jobs and—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Rivière-du-Nord.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Ms. Monique Guay (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for anyone who doubts that the forestry sector is in crisis, yesterday's announcement of the loss of 1,500 jobs, including 700 in Quebec, is a reminder that the forestry sector has a critical, immediate need for help.

The Minister of Finance is on a pre-budget tour in Quebec City today. While the minister is in Quebec, could he take a side trip to Shawinigan to announce to the 500 workers who have just lost their jobs that he is going to stop doing nothing and announce an assistance plan for the forestry sector?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question.

Oral Questions

Clearly, it is always a sad day when workers lose their jobs or leave their jobs involuntarily. However, we must remember that the government has been very active on this issue. The Minister of Natural Resources has announced a program worth over \$400 million to help these forestry workers. I believe that the federal government has not only made a contribution, but is being very active on this issue.

• (1125)

Ms. Monique Guay (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this government has no heart.

The government is not doing anything, not because it cannot, but because it will not. The government is turning a deaf ear to the pressing demands of the industry, which for months has been calling for measures to update its capital assets. The Bloc has proposed real solutions that could be funded with a portion of the \$11.6 billion surplus.

What is the government waiting for to act?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the way I see it, the only people in Parliament who have no heart are the members of the Bloc Québécois, who for years now have accomplished exactly nothing in this House.

Hon. members have to understand that my colleague, the Minister of Finance, proposed measures in his economic statement and in the throne speech. What did the Bloc Québécois do? Once again, it voted against them, in the interests of Quebeckers, as it claims, even though that meant leaving \$12 billion for Quebeckers on the table.

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, more calls for help are heard every day. Following the Bloc Québécois, manufacturing and forestry associations, unions and the Conseil du patronat, Alain Lemaire of Cascades was next in line to declare that Ottawa must do its part. He listed a series of incentives, such as refundable tax credits and assistance for upgrading facilities.

This government appears to lack inspiration, but what it really lacks is will power. Why does it hesitate to adopt measures that will help the communities affected by this crisis?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, we are doing our part. We have made it clear. My colleague's plans, which are intended to help forestry workers, are a perfect example. The only problem in this House is that the members of the Bloc Québécois do not take the time to read, the time to see what is being done, the time to do anything, full stop.

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the president of Cascades pointed out, the environment and the economy can be reconciled. He sees the creation of a carbon exchange as an effective means of fighting climate change, while being financially beneficial for businesses.

Instead of seeing Kyoto as a socialist plot, why is the government not actively working to create a carbon exchange in Montreal?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again—of course—the government has gone above and beyond the expectations of the Bloc Québécois. Indeed, last year, this government worked

closely with the Quebec government and transferred \$350 million to set up its ecotrust program. This is action. They call for action and that is what we deliver. These results allow Quebec in particular to achieve the necessary standards in terms of the environment.

* * *

[English]

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, reluctant as I am to quote the Prime Minister, I have to do so today, because he promised to: “Make Parliament responsible for exercising oversight over the conduct of Canadian foreign policy...”. He has broken that promise. He also promised to put international treaties to a vote in the House, but now we learn that Canada is signing on to this so-called Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

There was no notice to the House. No debate took place in the House. There has been no vote on this matter. Why is the Prime Minister breaking his promise? Why has he not given parliamentarians oversight over this matter?

Hon. Gary Lunn (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership that we are signing on to is a voluntary agreement to actually expand technology, to reduce spent nuclear fuel and to develop technology that is proliferation resistant. This is very important. Canada is a serious player as the largest producer of uranium of any country in the world.

We would welcome the opportunity to address the committee, if I were invited, to discuss these issues at any time. It is great news for Canada to be part of this partnership.

Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the minister will come to speak to a committee about it. That is a start.

My question is whether the government will accept a vote on this matter, because the facts are very clear. Nuclear energy is prohibitively expensive. It takes too long to bring online. It will not stop climate change. It is dangerous because of the waste product. Furthermore, national security should be a key part of the discussion.

After all, India's nuclear weapons program got started with a research reactor from Canada, so there is a great deal that must be debated. My question for the government is this: will there be a vote on Canada's participation in this nuclear energy partnership, yes or no?

Oral Questions

• (1130)

Hon. Gary Lunn (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is about leadership. There are 17 or 18 countries that have now signed on to this partnership to develop technologies, to minimize waste, to recycle spent nuclear fuel and to develop proliferation resistant technology.

This is exactly the type of thing where Canada should be at the table. We are a player. I find it completely ridiculous that the NDP would not want us to be there. Canada can show leadership. We should share these experiences with other countries.

* * *

LOBBYISTS

Hon. Robert Thibault (West Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, both Fred Doucet and Paul Terrien enabled cash transactions and/or meetings between Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Schreiber. Both men still have ties to the government. Fred Doucet is a close adviser to the defence minister and Paul Terrien is the transport minister's chief of staff.

One week before new allegations concerning this affair came to light, the government backpedalled on a \$45 million project in Cape Breton. Is the government's new embarrassment with Fred Doucet the reason for killing this project?

Mr. Rob Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to see that the hon. member, when he is under the protection of the House, feels quite free to say things that he would never say outside the House.

This matter, as all of us in the House know or ought to know, is before the courts, and it would be inappropriate to comment.

[Translation]

Hon. Robert Thibault (West Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week, the Minister of National Defence diverted attention away from the submarines in Victoria by stating that Fred Doucet was no longer a lobbyist on this file. Two weeks ago, Mr. Doucet was very active. He was lobbying Foreign Affairs when Halifax Shipbuilding sued the government.

The minister stated that he has not spoken with Mr. Doucet since taking up his new position. Can he say the same for the period when he was Minister of Foreign Affairs?

Mr. James Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics, CPC): Mr. Speaker, neither the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, nor the Minister of National Defence, nor I have met with Fred Doucet to talk about this matter.

* * *

[English]

ETHICS

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last November the Minister of National Defence made light of the fact that his father, Elmer MacKay, used the minister's fax machine to send a letter concerning his good friend, Karlheinz Schreiber.

What was the subject and content of that faxed letter? Will the minister table that letter and the fax transmission slips here in the House? Does the minister still think this matter is so funny?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think that matter was canvassed some time ago. It obviously has no involvement of the Minister of National Defence. It has no involvement of this government. It is simply not a question of any relevance to this government.

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is not what we heard yesterday. The Minister of National Defence got a job straight out of school working for the very company that Schreiber used to provide cash to Brian Mulroney that very same year. We also know that Elmer MacKay acted as a go-between for Mulroney and Schreiber. The minister's father drafted a letter for Schreiber that Brian Mulroney hand delivered to the Prime Minister.

Would the minister have us believe that at no time did he discuss any of this with his cabinet colleagues or the Prime Minister? Why did he fail to disclose his conflicts?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister has been quite clear on this. He has already answered it. He had no knowledge of that letter. It had nothing to do with him. It had nothing to do with this government.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to a press release, the UN's most senior official on climate issues, Yvo de Boer, has reiterated that the current carbon market owes its existence to the Kyoto protocol. He also mentioned that if we do not reach a new agreement that goes beyond 2012, the carbon market could vanish just as quickly as it appeared.

Does the minister realize that if we do not reach a new firm agreement that goes beyond 2012, we could be contributing to the disappearance of the carbon market, a market that tripled between 2005 and 2006, to the tune of \$30 billion?

Will the minister take action?

Oral Questions

•(1135)

[English]

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the Bloc well knows that without major targets from all major emitters, greenhouse gas emissions will continue to increase. My question is why he would support greenhouse gas emissions increasing, which was the Liberal plan. Under the Liberal government we saw a 33% rise above the Kyoto target and that did not work. We now have a government that takes climate change seriously. That member is wrong.

* * *

*[Translation]***NATURAL RESOURCES**

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we already know that Quebec has made a clean choice by choosing hydroelectric energy over nuclear energy. The government should choose more promising avenues than petroleum or nuclear energy, especially when there is no solution for getting rid of nuclear waste at this time.

By joining the global nuclear energy partnership, the government is making the wrong choice and on the eve of Bali, it is sending the wrong message.

Does the government understand that it has to make a U-turn and make a firm commitment to develop clean and environmentally friendly energy, instead of promoting nuclear energy?

[English]

Hon. Gary Lunn (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. First of all, certain parts of Canada, such as Quebec and British Columbia, are blessed with a lot of hydro and it is up to the provinces to decide on their own energy mix. We do not take any say in that. But where there are provinces that choose nuclear, as does Ontario, it is important that we provide leadership in the safety and security of all Canadians.

With respect to the global nuclear energy partnership, we made it unequivocally clear that we will under no circumstances ever accept any nuclear spent fuel back from any other country. This is a good initiative and Canada should be at the table to ensure that we have a voice.

* * *

*[Translation]***CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION**

Ms. Meili Faille (Vaudreuil-Soulanges, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a Federal Court ruling referring to the Maher Arar case has virtually nullified the safe third country agreement between Canada and the U.S. with respect to the treatment of refugees. According to this ruling, the Americans are contravening international conventions by not ensuring that the refugees they deport do not become victims of torture in their country of origin.

Given that this agreement would contravene the Canadian charter and international conventions that Canada has signed, does the minister intend to renegotiate the terms of the agreement?

[English]

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the member well knows, a decision was rendered yesterday. That decision is being reviewed and after review, appropriate steps will be taken. In the meantime, as I understand it, the safe third agreement continues to remain in effect.

[Translation]

Ms. Meili Faille (Vaudreuil-Soulanges, BQ): Mr. Speaker, to prevent another case like that of Maher Arar from occurring, does the Minister of Foreign Affairs intend to negotiate a new agreement with the Americans in order to ensure that no refugee will be deported to his country of origin if there is a risk of torture?

[English]

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have previously mentioned, the decision has just been rendered. The agreement continues to remain in effect. That decision is being reviewed and after the review, appropriate steps will be taken.

* * *

AIRBUS

Hon. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, somebody over there stopped a justice department review of whether or not Canadians should get their \$2.1 million back from Brian Mulroney.

The current Minister of Justice claims that he had nothing to do with shutting it down, which leaves one obvious candidate. Was the former minister of justice, now the current President of the Treasury Board, the one responsible for protecting Mr. Mulroney?

Mr. Rob Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, on this entire issue, the Ontario Court of Appeal has granted a stay of a surrender order. The issue is before the courts and it would be inappropriate to comment.

•(1140)

Hon. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that was the wrong page on the briefing book. That was not the substance of my question.

Somebody in the current government decided to shut down a justice department investigation into the questionable ethics of Brian Mulroney and it happened on that government's watch. The current Minister of Justice says he did not do it.

My question is really quite simple. Who shut down the investigation? Who is the responsible party? Has this investigation been restarted and if not, why not?

Mr. Rob Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making some really irresponsible accusations in our view. Our government and the Prime Minister have done the responsible thing. There is going to be an inquiry into this issue and we should let that take its course.

*Oral Questions***INFRASTRUCTURE**

Mr. Paul Zed (Saint John, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here is a quote:

We should abandon the infrastructure works program immediately and begin the overdue process of cutting government spending.

Who said that? It was the current Minister of Human Resources and Social Development.

In the face of a report from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities demonstrating that our national urban infrastructure is on the verge of collapse, does that minister still believe in slashing municipal infrastructure?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary. When we came into power in 2006, members will recall that we put an unprecedented amount of money forward to be able to address the infrastructure needs in the country.

We sat down with the provinces and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to design the new building Canada fund, which is the largest infrastructure fund dedicated to municipalities and communities across the country. This is the largest one since the second world war. We are getting the job done.

Mr. Paul Zed (Saint John, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the building Canada fund, everyone knows, is nothing more than re-gifting. It consists of the Liberal gas tax rebate, the Liberal infrastructure program and the Liberal transit funding, all of which were announced by the previous Liberal government. There is nothing new here.

The Conservatives are recycling Liberal programs. While recycling is good for the environment, it should not apply to promises for our cities and communities. This cannot wait until 2050 like the government tried to do with the environment, because our cities need action now.

Why is there so much contempt?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us face the facts. The Liberals have been saying that it is their money.

There is \$1.3 billion for public private partnerships. Is that new money? There is \$2.25 billion for PT base funding for all the provinces for seven years. Is that new money? There is \$8 billion of extension gas tax from 2010 to 2014. Is that new money? There is the new building Canada fund of \$8.8 billion. Is that new money?

* * *

POVERTY

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has been three weeks since the Leader of the Opposition released his uncosted plan to reduce poverty, yet the Liberals have only asked one question on this file, which the Leader of the Opposition said would be his main election platform plank.

It was the Liberal leader who sat around the cabinet table for almost a decade while child poverty increased, access to affordable housing decreased, and no action at all was taken on child care.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources tell this House what we have done to combat poverty in the 22 months we have been serving Canadians?

Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have to know that while the Leader of the Opposition talks about poverty, this government takes action.

Our government has invested billions to strengthen vital social programs like income assistance, the working income tax benefit, disability supports, support for seniors, skills training, post-secondary education, affordable housing, \$5.6 billion per year to support early learning and child care, three times more than the Liberal government ever spent.

It is not easy for the Liberal Party leader to make priorities—

• (1145)

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

* * *

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the total cost of Canada's participation in the war in Afghanistan is mounting. It is now pegged at \$3.1 billion since the war's start in 2001. Yesterday the defence minister admitted that the costs of the war were inevitably going to get higher and higher.

Canadians are paying for an ill-planned, poorly executed and dangerous mission, a mission that has no exit strategy. Commanders admit there is no military win to be had in Afghanistan.

Could the minister tell the House what the total cost for Canada will be by February 2009?

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government has provided the Canadian Forces with the tools and the protection they need to maintain a high level of activity and intensity in a very remote and undeveloped region. They are conducting more joint operations, mentoring more Afghan police and Afghan soldiers and are facilitating long term reconstruction and development in that country.

Unlike the Liberals who starved the armed forces and did not give them the right tools, this government is working to provide the soldiers with what they need for an effective mission in Afghanistan.

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that I asked a very specific question and all I got was jingoistic ballyhoo.

Canadians want to know what the cost of the war is. It is too bad the minister cannot figure it out.

The cost has increased by a half billion dollars in the last six months alone. If Canada continues on this current track, the war could cost \$4.1 billion by 2009 and \$5.2 billion by 2011.

Oral Questions

Last May, Canada was spending \$10 on combat for every dollar it was spending on aid. Five hundred million dollars later, could the minister tell this House what the new ratio will be?

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is important to know that the Canadian Forces do get the resources they need for effective operations in Afghanistan, which requires security and development, as well as international reconstruction. It is all about making Afghanistan a democratic country, and as a world member, it is absolutely important that we provide these resources to our armed forces.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with only days to go before the Bali climate change conference, the government's Republican-style sabotage of a global accord is becoming clearer. The Minister of the Environment is trying to replay President Bush's six-year-old message track that Kyoto is a dud because not all countries had targets. The problem is that the world did not buy the president's arguments and the Republicans were left behind.

When will the minister realize that the world will not buy his sad and pathetic story now?

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, from that member, the Liberal environment critic, after six months of not asking any questions, the first question we heard a week ago was, "Can I please go to Bali?" I would encourage him to stop watching so much of the Travel Channel.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is nothing short of pathetic. Where is Karl Rove when Canada's new republicans need him?

[Translation]

The hole in the ozone layer is no longer a menace to humanity because the industrialized countries were the first to reduce their emissions. But when it comes to climate change, the minister proclaims, "you first".

Why does he not set the bar higher for Canada? Why is Canada not a world leader?

[English]

Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what a pathetic question. We now have a government that has turned the corner of 13 long years of Liberal inaction. We have targets of 20% reduction by 2020. We have 60% to 70% reductions by 2050. These are some of the toughest targets in the world.

We need less Liberal lectures and more action on the environment. That is what we are getting from this government.

•(1150)

[Translation]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bowater announced yesterday the permanent shut down of machine no. 3 at its Gatineau plant. The workers who have been laid off in my region have therefore lost all hope of returning to work.

Bowater is also closing down in Shawinigan, Quebec City and New Brunswick. In Quebec alone, 1,000 jobs will be lost just before Christmas. The president of Bowater is not ruling out other closures in the next six months.

How many jobs must be lost before this government will take action?

[English]

Hon. Gary Lunn (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we understand these are very difficult circumstances for the forestry sector in every part of Canada. We have acted. We invested \$400 million in a number of programs in the first few years of our mandate, and we are looking at other options.

We have rattled off a list before, \$127 million for a competitive strategy and \$72 million to help older workers. It is making a difference.

We recognize some of the challenges. We are working on them. We are working with associations like the Forest Products Association of Canada, which has said that we have invested money intelligently. They are working with us.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the president of another paper company, Cascades, wrote this morning that his business will be forced to direct its investments outside Canada in order to remain profitable if the stakeholders, at all levels, do not come together to help the industry. The manufacturing sector is not asking for handouts, but rather targeted, concerted assistance.

The Government of Quebec has already done its part. Why does the Conservative government refuse to help this industry?

[English]

Hon. Gary Lunn (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I and the Minister of Industry met with CEOs of the forest industry earlier this week. We had a very productive discussion. They have been very supportive of our approach. They are very supportive of the money we have spent to expand market opportunities and to develop strategies and innovation.

We recognize we do need to do more. This sector is in a difficult situation. That is why we are working directly with it to look at options. The sector has been very supportive and pleased with the approach our government has taken to date.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

FIREARMS

Mr. Serge Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a signatory of the Organization of American States Firearms Convention, which requires that imported firearms have appropriate markings. Yet it would seem that the Conservative government is set to push back the effective date of the firearms marking regulation, a measure that even George Bush's United States enforces, and one which makes it easier to trace firearms found at crime scenes.

Can the minister confirm that he plans on deferring the firearms marking regulations by two years?

[English]

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on consultation with stakeholders and requests from Liberal MPs, the government decided to defer the firearms marking regulations until December 1, 2009.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this government prides itself on being tough on crime, but really, it is being inconsistent since it wants to abolish the firearms registry and once again plans on deferring the firearms marking regulations.

Could the parliamentary secretary tell us whether the minister plans on listening to the wishes of Quebeckers and the National Assembly, which, this morning, unanimously called on the federal government to maintain the date the regulations come into effect, or does he plan on listening to the gun lobby?

[English]

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, we have decided to defer the firearms marking regulation until December 1, 2009. Our decision to defer it will allow us to consult with law enforcement agencies and industry in order to look at all the options for marking and to examine similar initiatives in other countries.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Mario Silva (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is known the world over as a nation with profound respect for human rights. We stand on principles worthy of the millions of Canadians who have fought to defend them. Sadly, the government has broken with this noble vision of Canada and refuses to object to the execution of a Canadian citizen in the United States, or by turning a blind eye to torture in Afghanistan.

When will the government honour Canada's noble history and stand up not just when it suits it, but all the time?

Mr. Rob Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has been clear on this issue. I should add that no government, especially the previous government, has stood for international human rights, as well as human rights here in Canada, more than our government.

The minister has said recently that on this specific issue, there has been an appeal filed. Due to that, we cannot have any further comment.

* * *

● (1155)

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Natural Resources announced that Canada has accepted an invitation to join the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. This partnership focuses on enhanced safeguards, cooperative research and developing advanced technologies.

There were some allegations heard in the House here today that joining this partnership would require Canada to import nuclear fuel from other countries. Could the minister once again clarify this issue and further explain what this announcement will mean for Canada?

Hon. Gary Lunn (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership is an international partnership that promotes a safer, more secure, cleaner world.

With respect to the spent nuclear fuel, there is absolutely nothing in the stated principles that requires Canada or any other country to take back spent nuclear fuel. We went even further. We have absolutely, explicitly stated that under no uncertain circumstances will Canada ever take back spent nuclear fuel at any time from any country.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since we are talking about human rights, let us talk about the rights of veterans.

Yet another group of veterans is proposing to take the government to court to fight over fair compensation and reasonableness in its battle with the government. In 1957 a group of Canadians were sent down to Nevada for atomic testing. These Canadians have been waiting and waiting for fair and proper compensation.

I would like the government to stand up in this place, look into the camera and tell Jim Huntley of Alberta this. When they will receive fair and adequate compensation for what happened to them 50 years ago?

Hon. Greg Thompson (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as members well knows, I have met with the atomic veterans. We will deal with that, as we did with the agent orange issue, in a fair and compassionate way.

Oral Questions

However, I want to bring to the attention of the House that the question is coming from a party that never stands in the House to provide anything to our veterans, or our men and women in uniform. Here is the list. It voted against a bill of rights. It voted against an ombudsman for veterans. It consistently stands in the House and denies our men and women in uniform the equipment to do their jobs. Its record on veterans and our men and women in uniform is not good. It never has been.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we cannot even get him to blush anymore.

Let us see what the Conservatives track record is. The government promised that it would do a full public inquiry and compensate all the victims of agent orange, the defoliant spray, from 1956 to 1984, not 1966-67. It also promised Joyce Carter the extension of VIP services immediately to all veterans and all widows. It also promised to fix SISIP for injured soldiers who suffer from their mental and physical disabilities, yet nothing.

If this is the track record that the atomic veterans have to face, I feel very sorry for them. Will the government—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Hon. Greg Thompson (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have done this before. I invite every member of the House to examine the record of the NDP in terms of support for our veterans and our men and women in uniform.

On the other side, at least the Liberal Party knows this. When it was in government, it commissioned Dr. Furlong to do a study on agent orange, and that was done. We honoured the study that the Liberals commissioned. We responded to it fairly and compassionately.

In terms of Mrs. Carter, I suggest the member call Mrs. Carter. Because of the meeting I had with her, she understands what we will do. It is time the member understood what we will do, which is we will honour that commitment as well—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has so bungled the awarding of the Victoria Class submarine repair contract, that it could take years for our subs to be fully functional and it will cost taxpayers millions of dollars in penalties.

This foot dragging negated the winning bid by CSMG and Victoria shipyards in favour of another bidder located where? In the defence minister's riding.

When will the government stop this bungling and award the repair contract based on the original request for proposals.

• (1200)

Mr. James Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca is close to setting the indoor record for missing the point on this file.

Our government is committed to these subs. These four subs are going to continue servicing our country well, two in the west coast and two in the east coast. They are going to continue serving Canada's interest domestically and abroad in terms of our international obligations. We are in the process of negotiating a contract. When it is finalized, my colleague will read it.

Everything in his question is purely speculative. When he gets the facts, he will be able to stand in the House and ask a factual question for the first time in this Parliament.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Bruce Stanton (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the last session the government passed Bill C-59, which makes the unauthorized recording of a motion picture in a movie theatre a criminal offence.

The bill was passed at record speed, just before last summer's blockbusters came out. This was in an effort to protect the Canadian and U.S. motion picture industry from suffering any significant financial losses.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada update us on how these new Criminal Code provisions have been used so far?

Mr. Rob Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we all know in the House, after years of Liberal inaction on tackling crime, on justice and on protecting Canadians, both personally and in property rights, our government has been moving very quickly and very aggressively to fix that.

I am pleased to report that last week in Montreal a charge was laid. As reported in the *Globe and Mail*, Douglas Frith, president of the Canadian Motion Picture Distributors Association, said that the fact that the charges had been laid in this case showed the legislation was working.

* * *

[Translation]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RESEARCH CENTRES

Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while Ottawa has 27 federally funded research centres, Gatineau has none. In 1983, we were promised 25% of federal jobs. Today, Ottawa's 27 research centres provide 6,033 jobs and receive \$910 million. The federal government is not even trying to catch up by opening one single research centre.

Does the government realize that if Gatineau had one-quarter of federal jobs, as promised 23 years ago, there would now be seven research centres—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[English]*

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by joining my colleagues from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel and Hull—Aylmer in congratulating the City of Gatineau on its winning submission to host the Quebec Summer Games.

In response to the member's question, I believe he is mistaken because unlike him, federalists include the entire national capital region in the equation, and that allows for job creation. There has always been a close economic relationship between the two cities that make up the national capital region, and people are being well served.

* * *

*[English]***POINTS OF ORDER**

ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order because it was in one of the questions asked by the member for Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale. He said that child poverty rates increased while our leader was at the cabinet table. I want to make this correction.

In 1996 the poverty rate was 18.6%. In 2005—

The Speaker: Order. The fact that members make misstatements in questions or answers is not normally the subject of points of order in the House. The difficulty is that the member is raising a matter that sounds like there is an objection to facts that were stated or misstated or whatever.

The Speaker cannot make decisions as to what are facts and what are not. That is a matter for debate in the House. It is not something that the Speaker can be involved in and, accordingly, if the member is raising a matter about facts as stated or not stated or as misrepresented, I am afraid it is beyond the scope of the Chair, and is not a valid point of order.

• (1205)

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, during question period the Minister of Natural Resources, in replying to a question, made reference to the global nuclear energy partnership agreement and document, and in fact, referred to a number of specific clauses in that document.

We would ask the minister to table that document and information so that all members of the House could review it since he referred to it.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the minister was not reading from a document. There is nothing to table.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to five petitions.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill S-203, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals).

He said: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, it is my pleasure to reintroduce a bill to the House which recently has been approved in the Senate, entitled Bill S-203.

Pursuant to Standing Order 86(2), I wish to state that Bill S-203 is in the same form as Bill S-213 which was before the House in the first session, and I ask that the bill be now reinstated.

For your information, Mr. Speaker, it is an act to amend the animal cruelty act. I believe it has broad support across the House and for those who have better ideas in terms of what might happen here, I know that it may be a matter of some debate, but we have to do something to amend an old act which has been before our country for so many years.

This certainly would give greater support to those who are concerned about what happens with the many animals that people enjoy and which often are our friends.

(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time)

The Speaker: The Chair is satisfied that this bill is in the same form as Bill S-213 was at the time of prorogation of the first session of the 39th Parliament.

[Translation]

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 86.2, the bill is deemed read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

*[English]***PETITIONS**

AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Nepean—Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present to the House a petition on behalf of many of my constituents who are calling on the Liberal Senate to immediately pass the tackling violent crime act, so that we can raise the sexual consent from 14 to 16 and protect youngsters from adult sexual predators.

Routine Proceedings

As you know, Mr. Speaker, that bill would ban adults from sexual relations with kids under the age of 16. It is the right thing to do for our kids. It is just plain right for all Canadians.

JUSTICE

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, petitioners in my constituency and other petitioners from the area ask, due to an inadequate sentence passed in Shane Rolston's murder and in other crimes, that the sentences for criminals be re-evaluated to ensure that the sentences are adequate and that they match the crime committed. The petitioners are of course delighted with the action our government has taken in this matter.

PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour today to present a petition signed by over 200 petitioners. The petition states that all Canadians deserve the right to own property and that the property be protected from undue seizure.

The petitioners call on parliamentarians to support Motion No. 315 that is before the House and amend section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to extend property rights to Canadians.

* * *

• (1210)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Questions Nos. 15, 32 and 104.

[Text]

Question No. 15—**Ms. Denise Savoie:**

With respect to the National Homeless Initiative (NHI) and the Homelessness Partnering Strategy (NPS): (a) what is the process and protocol for making local or regional announcements regarding funding for specific projects, from the time of approval of application to the time of formal announcement and media releases; (b) what, if any, directives or instructions exist, from cabinet or elsewhere, with respect to MP participation in government announcements; (c) what is the protocol for inviting the local MP to participate in such announcements; (d) for what proportion of NHI / NPS-approved projects are formal announcements and media releases made; (e) what is the date, location, project name and attending MP for each such formal announcement; (f) has any non-cabinet MP participated in a NHI /NPS announcement and media release for a project located outside of her or his riding and, if yes, to which ones and was the local MP in whose riding the project is located invited to participate, and what was the response to the invitation; (g) broken down by each federal party represented in the House, in how many such announcements has a non-Cabinet MP been invited to participate; (h) broken down by each federal party represented in the House, in how many media releases related to the NHI and NPS posted on the government Web site is a non-cabinet MP mentioned; (i) to date, what projects have been funded by the NHI and NPS, with dollar amount, broken down by federal constituency; and (j) what is the total and the average-per-constituency number of projects funded by NHI and NPS and dollar amount for each federal party represented in the House?

Hon. Monte Solberg (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the response is as follows:

a) The National Homelessness Initiative (NHI) and the Homelessness Partnering Strategy (HPS) are programs of the Government of Canada.

The minister responsible for the program and its funding may announce his decisions or ask a delegate to do so on his behalf.

b) The minister responsible for the program and its funding co-ordinates announcements of Government of Canada funding decisions.

c) The minister responsible for the program co-ordinates announcements of Government of Canada funding decisions.

d) & e) The department does not track this information.

f) The department does not track this type of information. The minister responsible for the program co-ordinates announcements of Government of Canada funding decisions. Organizations may invite anyone they choose to an event.

g), h) & j) The department does not track this information.

i) Government information on funds, grants, loans and loan guarantees issued by departments and agencies is based on parliamentary authorities for departmental or agency programs and activities. This information is listed by department and government organization in the public accounts and disclosed on the web sites of government organizations. However, government organizations do not systematically compile or analyze expenditure information by electoral district. Consequently, at present, it would not be possible to provide most of the information in the form requested.

Over the course of the 39th Parliament, a number of government organizations have undertaken efforts to identify federal expenditures by postal codes which could then be summarized by electoral districts using a tool developed by Statistics Canada. While there is some promise in this approach, there remains a significant potential for error since many postal codes straddle two or more electoral districts. Moreover, the government would have significant concerns about the quality of the financial data derived by this approach because there is no way to track the geographic area in which federal funding is actually spent. For example, federal funding could be provided to the head office of a firm situated in one electoral district, while the funding was actually spent by a subsidiary located in another electoral district. This may also be the case for payments to individuals, organizations or foundations.

Statistics Canada has initiated a process to enhance the accuracy of the tool that provides the link between postal codes and electoral districts. The process will allow departments which use the tool to better approximate by electoral district, data gathered on a postal code basis. The improved tool is expected to be available by January 2008, and training for government organizations on the use of this tool is planned for February—March 2008.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 32—Hon. Lucienne Robillard:**

With regard to the Homelessness Partnering Strategy announced on December 19, 2006, and coming into effect on April 1, 2007: (a) what amount is allocated to Quebec; (b) has the government signed an agreement with the Quebec government; (c) when will the transitional measures end; (d) when will the funding be paid; (e) when will organizations be able to submit funding applications; and (f) when will the Strategy be permanently implemented?

Hon. Monte Solberg (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the response is as follows:

a) The Quebec allocation is \$40,108,848 for fiscal years 2007—2008 and 2008-2009. Of that funding, \$36,841,152 is allocated to designated communities; \$1,284,084 to Aboriginal communities; and \$1,983,612 to outreach communities.

b) The current Canada-Quebec agreement has been extended pending the finalization of a new agreement which is expected to be concluded by December 2007.

c) The transitional measures have been effective since April 1, 2007 and will end on December 31, 2007.

d) Through contribution agreements, funds for transitional measures have been flowing to organizations as of April 1, 2007.

e) Organizations will be able to submit funding applications once the Canada-Quebec agreement is renewed and the call for proposals is advertised.

f) The Homelessness Partnering Strategy, a two-year program, came into effect on April 1, 2007.

Question No. 104—Mr. Michael Savage:

What is the position of the government with respect to the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation and will the government renew its funding?

Hon. Monte Solberg (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the future of the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation, CMSF, after January 5, 2010, is understandably a matter of interest to parliamentarians, students, provinces, territories and stakeholders.

A number of reviews have been undertaken to assess the CMSF's performance, effectiveness and success in achieving its mandate.

The results of these reviews are being examined and will have an impact on the government's decision in this regard. That decision will be announced accordingly.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 3, 16, 17, 19, 44, 46, 52, 53 and 75 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 3—Hon. Sue Barnes:

With regard to the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC): (a) how many programs will receive funding from the NCPC in 2007; (b) how many programs will receive funding from the NCPC in 2008; (c) what is the breakdown for crime prevention funding per riding for 2007; and (d) what is the proposed funding allocation per riding for 2008?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 16—Ms. Denise Savoie:

With respect to programs and spending under the auspices of Human Resources and Social Development Canada, within the riding of Victoria: (a) in each year, fiscal or calendar, from 1993-2006 inclusive, what was the total (i) annual dollar amount of funding allocated, in grants, loans or loan guarantees, broken down by program, (ii) number of grants allocated, broken down by program; (b) for each of the two periods between June 28, 2004 and January 22, 2006, and between January 23, 2006 and September 27, 2007 inclusive, (i) what funds, grants, loans and loan guarantees has the government issued, (ii) under which program was each payment made, (iii) to whom and for what dollar amount was each payment, (iv) what percentage of each project's funding did the payment cover; (c) for the Summer Career Placement Program and the Canada Summer Jobs program, (i) what was the total annual expenditure for each year from 2003 to 2007 inclusive, (ii) how many job positions were supported through the programs for each year from 2003 to 2007 inclusive, (iii) for the year 2007, how many applications were received, (iv) for the year 2007, how many applications were accepted in each of the first and second rounds of approval, and for which employers, (v) for the year 2007, how many applications were denied or placed on a waiting list, and for which employers; and (d) for programs and spending administered by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), in each year, from 1993 to 2006 inclusive, (i) what was the total of CMHC spending, (ii) how many CMHC-funded housing units for singles and families existed, (iii) how many new CMHC-funded units were added, (iv) how many CMHC-funded housing units ceased to be available?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 17—Ms. Denise Savoie:

With respect to workplace skills programs as listed in the 2007-2008 Estimates: (a) why did the government cut \$22 million from workplace skills programs; (b) which programs qualify under the government's definition of "workplace skills program" as listed in the line item in the 2007-2008 Estimates; (c) which programs received funding from the government for the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 fiscal years, broken down by province or territory; (d) how much money did each program receive from the government for 2006-2007 and 2007-2008; (e) which programs received funding from the government for 2006-2007, but not for 2007-2008; (f) what are the expiration dates for each specific program that received funding from the government for 2006-2007 and 2007-2008; (g) which programs received funding from the government for 2007-2008 fiscal year, but not for 2006-2007; (h) for those programs that did not receive funding this fiscal year, was there a review process where applications were re-evaluated and, if so, was more funding applied to those programs; (i) with respect to those programs that had decreased amounts of funding or received no funding, what effect did that have on those specific programs; (j) for those programs that lost funding, what methods did those programs use to compensate for the amount of money not provided by Human Resources and Social Development Canada (HRSDC), specifically in regard to private donations, public fundraisers and applications for other grants outside of HRSDC; (k) what specific services had to be cut or eliminated from those programs because of a loss of funding; (l) what impact did the decrease in or elimination of services have on the surrounding community with the specific groups; (m) what specific demographic groups lost the most from the decrease in or elimination of services; and (n) with respect to workplace skills continued on p. 14-11 of the 2007-2008 Estimates, can the government provide a more detailed breakdown of this figure in the same manner as described in (i), (d), (e), (f) and (g)?

(Return tabled)

Government Orders

Question No. 19—Mr. Bill Casey:

With respect to the ongoing rural mail safety review being undertaken by the Canada Post Corporation, to date: (a) how many rural mailbox locations have been reviewed both nationally and within Nova Scotia; (b) how many of these boxes have been reviewed in the riding of Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley; (c) how many of the reviewed mailboxes in Nova Scotia, and in the federal riding of Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley have failed the criteria of the review; (d) how many senior citizens across Canada and in Nova Scotia have been negatively impacted as a result of failing the criteria of the review, and what steps has Canada Post taken to ensure that they can continue to receive their mail; and (e) how many complaints have been received by Canada Post, by province and territory, in regard to the review?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 44—Ms. Tina Keeper:

With regard to First Nations Inuit Health Branch of Health Canada upstream investment funding for suicide prevention in the Churchill electoral district: (a) since the program's inception what has been the rate of suicide in the First Nations population in Canada, in Manitoba and in the Churchill riding in particular, including the rates in the categories for adults, youth, and children; (b) what has been the rate in each province; (c) has the government assessed what reasons exist for different rates among the provinces and territories; (d) has the government undertaken or contracted for any audits, evaluation reports or analysis of its Suicide Prevention Strategy; (e) what is the annual allocation and expenditure by the government for its annual Suicide Prevention Strategy since its inception; (f) what has been the annual expenditure and allocation for suicide prevention strategies in each province and territory; (g) what is the annual allocation and expenditure of the government on First Nations suicide prevention in the government budget tabled in March 2007; (h) as per the joint report completed by the Assembly of First Nations and Health Canada, entitled "Acting on What We Know: Preventing Youth Suicide in First Nations", what steps has the government taken to address the 30 recommendations; (i) if the government has not acted on certain recommendations, what are its reasons; (j) how many suicide prevention crisis lines are presently receiving federal funding in the Churchill riding; (k) how much federal funding has been allocated to suicide prevention crisis lines in the Churchill riding; (l) what is the amount of federal funding in each of the fiscal years from 2003 to 2008, inclusively; and (m) when will the government begin to fund appropriate and adequate funding and provide services to prevent the high incidence of suicide amongst First Nations?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 46—Ms. Tina Keeper:

With respect to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) in the riding of Churchill: (a) how many RCMP detachments are there currently, including the community name and the number of police officers in each individual detachment; (b) how many detachments are on First Nation reserves in the riding; (c) what is the government's policy on how First Nations are policed in communities without RCMP detachments; (d) what is the total annual federal allotment to provide policing on First Nations without a RCMP detachment; (e) what was the total allotment for band constable funding for First Nations in the province of Manitoba in each of the fiscal years from 2004 to 2007 inclusively; (f) in the budget tabled in March 2007, how much funding was provided for the band constable training program; (g) on First Nations without detachments on reserve, (i) how many have holding cells, (ii) which First Nations have holding cells; and (h) what has been the annual funding in each First Nation without holding cells for the fiscal years 2004 to 2007 inclusively?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 52—Ms. Jean Crowder:

With respect to the resolution of Aboriginal specific and comprehensive land claims: (a) how many lawyers, for each year since 2002, have worked on behalf of the federal government on specific and comprehensive land claims issues, counting both federal employees and those in private practice contracted by the government; (b) provide a list of the departmental budgets from which these lawyers were paid, including the line items accounting for these payments; (c) what is the total dollar amount spent on specific and comprehensive land claims lawyers, since 2002, broken down by year; (d) of the total amount spent on lawyers for land claims issues, what portion has been paid to attorneys in private practice working on government contract; (e) in what part of the country do these lawyers work; (f) what studies and evaluations have been requested, undertaken, or commissioned by Indian and

Northern Affairs Canada since 2002 dealing with Aboriginal land claims; (g) what individuals, departments, or organizations undertook these studies; (h) what has been the total cost of these studies; (i) what were the findings and recommendations of these studies; and (j) have any of these findings and recommendations been integrated into government policy on the resolution of specific and comprehensive land claims?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 53—Mr. Richard Nadeau:

With regard to government jobs in the National Capital Region, what is: (a) the number of Public Service employees in the Outaouais region and in the Ottawa region from 2006 to 2007; and (b) the number of employees of government agencies, Crown corporations or any other government bodies in the Outaouais region and in the Ottawa region, from 2006 to 2007?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 75—Mr. Tony Martin:

With respect to funds allocated to the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario (FedNor): (a) what is the global budget of FedNor and its programs from 2003 to the present; (b) how much of FedNor's economic development funding and other funding it administers has gone to projects and initiatives in Northern Ontario from 2003 to the present, and how does FedNor define "Northern Ontario", i.e. its boundaries, and when and how has that definition changed since 1993; (c) what is the number of jobs directly created in Northern Ontario as well as other regions from FedNor programs and other programs it administers from 2003 to the present; (d) listed by location, what is the number of full time employees and equivalents that have worked for the FedNor, on an annual basis since 2003; (e) what are the top ten electoral ridings in terms of receiving the most FedNor funding from 1993 to the present, broken down on an annual basis; and (f) listed by electoral riding, who were the recipients of FedNor funding, broken down on an annual basis from 1993 to the present?

(Return tabled)

[English]

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Mr. Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday in the Thursday question, I would like to designate Thursday, December 6, 2007, as the last allotted day for this supply period.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

**BUDGET AND ECONOMIC STATEMENT
IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2007**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-28, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2007 and to implement certain provisions of the economic statement tabled in Parliament on October 30, 2007, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Government Orders

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to this bill, but it is sad that we are having to debate this bill. I do not think the bill should have been brought forward in the manner it was. I say that because one of the things that we on our side of the House have been very clear on is that Canadians need to have a fulsome debate as to how the surplus of the nation is spent.

I want to begin my comments on that note because of something I call truth in advertising. When the government was in opposition, it was very clear in its position as to how we should be dealing with the finances of the nation. In fact, I recall in 2005 the then leader of the opposition party, now Prime Minister, went as far as saying to have these kinds of surpluses was akin to fiscal mismanagement. He was saying that because of what had been happening with the previous Liberal government's pattern of underestimating the surpluses.

Of course, we agreed with him on that note, the fact that there should be more accuracy and truth in advertising in understanding exactly how much money is projected to be in the surplus. We know over the years the private sector forecasters, the not for profit forecasters, were all accurate in their projections of what the federal surplus would be and the government would always underestimate it.

The surpluses would come forward and the government would say, "oh, look what we have here, a terrific surplus" which was no news to those who had been paying attention and keeping an eye on these things, but apparently it was to the then government.

What happened of course is that the surplus would be spirited away to pay down the debt, which is noble and might be the best thing to do, but in the way it was done there was no debate. There was absolutely no indication to Canadians that the surplus was something that we could actually talk about, that we should decide where the money should be spent and invested in our communities.

It is rather sad now that the Conservatives are in power they have decided to replicate the same behaviour as the previous government when it comes to surpluses. Further to that, which is more egregious, in Bill C-2, the accountability act, there was a provision for a budgetary officer of Parliament. It is in the act. Anyone can go and look at it. That bill was passed.

What has not been acted on, brought into force, is that budgetary officer of Parliament along with the idea that we can actually have people who are appointed to agencies, boards and commissions to have to be appointed according to merit. Those two key foundations that the NDP supported, and in the case of the public appointments commission amended, have not brought into force.

We now have a government that in opposition said that we need to debate the surplus, we need to have accurate forecasting, and we need to make sure that Canadians are aware of the finances of the nation.

However, not only do the Conservatives continue the past poor practice of the previous government of not being upfront about the surpluses, but they do not bring into force and appoint a budgetary officer of Parliament whose job it would be to give unblemished, objective forecasting, so that all members of Parliament, and by extension Canadians, will understand the fiscal framework of this nation.

Add onto that this method of using a fiscal update to bring forward a very substantial change in the fiscal framework. We just have to look at what is being proposed in this: major tax giveaways to corporations and effects that will continue on for many years. This is not a fiscal update.

A colleague said the Conservatives make it sound like it was a mini-bar in a hotel and they were just doing little fiscal updates in those little bottles. He said in his own way that this was more like a 40 pounder. This is a big giveaway. This is a substantial tax giveaway to corporations with no debate that is substantive. We are debating this now, but normally this would come forward in a budget. Instead, we have it as a "fiscal update".

● (1215)

I just want to begin my comments on process, on accountability and on what the government said it would do in opposition vis-à-vis surpluses as well as what it said it would do around the accountability act with a budgetary officer of Parliament to provide objective, unblemished fiscal updates.

It is important that parliamentarians and Canadians in general know exactly how much the surpluses will be so we can have a fulsome debate. The money should not automatically go toward paying off the debt, *holus bolus*. There should not be these fiscal updates without Parliament being provided the information ahead of time.

That said, the fiscal update bill is before us. Essentially it says that the government's role is to shrink the pie on what we invest within our respective communities.

When we look at the amount of tax giveaways to corporations, there will be less in the federal government's revenue stream, at a time when there is up to \$123 billion in infrastructure debt across this land, when we have needs in terms of housing, affordable education, affordable drugs. There is a widening prosperity gap, and the Conservative government has actually shrunk the pie so that in future, there is less ability for the federal government to make a difference in the everyday lives of Canadians.

The \$123 billion infrastructure deficit that exists was recently brought to the attention of Canadians by an excellent study that was done by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. I might add that the government used that group as a validator in previous budgets, but now seems to want to distance itself from that group when the news the FCM provides is not the news the government wants to hear.

Government Orders

The study outlines the infrastructure deficit across the land. People may ask why we should care about that in that we are at the federal level and it is a municipal concern. The Conservative government would tell the municipalities to quit whining, and in fact we have heard the government say that, to make do with what they have and to raise property taxes.

The government has denied the reality of our communities. The FCM study showed that our bridges, sewers, water systems, et cetera are falling apart and need updating. We have heard the horror stories throughout the land of infrastructure falling apart. It is a real cost. It is a real shame that the government did not see the need for investing in our communities.

I implore the government to take a look at the deficit across this land among our partners at the municipal level. The Conservatives should listen to them. The municipalities know what is going on in our communities. The fact that they will be provided with no relief in this fiscal update is not only a shame, it is an abhorrent action by the government. It shows the lack of responsibility of the Conservatives in terms of the infrastructure of this nation.

I implore other parties to join with us and oppose the bill. I ask them not to abstain on the vote. We saw that occur before. It is not a credible position by any member of Parliament to abstain on this issue. It is too important for Canadians. It is too important for the infrastructure of our cities and municipalities.

I look forward to any comments or questions from my colleagues on a debate that is very serious, very important and incredibly sad in terms of the actions of the government vis-à-vis the bill.

• (1220)

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is a staunch defender of his constituency, his city, his province and his country.

He is absolutely correct when he talks about the municipal deficit in terms of infrastructure for water, sewer, transit and so on. The infrastructure in the cities and rural parts of Canada are crumbling.

My question is with respect to the human deficit.

The government is giving over \$7 billion to the most profitable corporations in the country, some of which are foreign owned, all of which are making very good money under the current tax regime, but it cannot help children with autism. The government tells widows of veterans that they have to wait. It tells atomic veterans that it might get around to them. It tells agent orange victims that only some will receive compensation and the rest will not.

What type of government would ignore the plight of so many who are being left behind to enhance the profits of those that are already doing very well in this country?

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Nova Scotia for the hard work he has done for children with autism and for veterans. Before I was elected to Parliament, I was a teacher and I was aware of the work my colleague did in advocating for the rights of autistic children who, sadly, are being ignored by the Conservative government.

My colleague asked what kind of government would decide it is more important to give money to corporations instead of investing in

vulnerable people, children and veterans. I would respectfully suggest that it is a government that seems to be out of touch with communities across this land. It is a government that is out of touch with the people who need help.

Why is government here? Is government here to advocate on behalf of just big business, or is government here to help out communities, to help out the vulnerable, like autistic children?

This is a very important bill. It deals with the finances of the nation. When the Conservative Party was in opposition, it asked the then Liberal government to be upfront and truthful about the surplus and to have a debate in this place about how that surplus should be spent. Now as government, the Conservative Party is not doing that. It is not going to appoint a budgetary officer of Parliament to provide that information. It is irresponsible and hypocritical.

On the point that my colleague made about how we invest in people, I might add there are over 10,000 people right here in Ottawa, in the nation's capital, who are looking for affordable housing. They have been on a waiting list for a very long time. They are being ignored by this legislation. There is no money for them.

The government has said that it has invested in affordable housing. A point that should be made is that money was in Bill C-48, the amendments that the NDP made in 2005. That is the last investment we have seen in affordable housing. It is not good enough for the residents in Ottawa. It is not good enough for the people of Canada.

• (1225)

Mr. Peter Stoffer: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague is absolutely correct about housing. I just did a tour of the far north in the high Arctic and talk about acute housing needs. The people up there desperately need help and they need it now. The Conservative government is completely ignoring them.

The reality is the government has clearly defined that it is only for the individual, where we in the NDP are for the collective. That is a very clear distinction.

I would like my colleague to elaborate on why in a nation that should be a healing nation, in a nation that encourages all people to have the same rights and benefits, the government is leaving so many behind.

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I think the government is just listening to the wrong people. It is not listening to the communities. The Conservatives are out of touch, but the voters will have a chance to put them back on track and maybe put them out of power. Who knows what will happen in the next election. If they stop listening to Canadians in communities, that is exactly what will happen.

Hon. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure and honour to rise in the House today to speak about the economic statement that was tabled in this House earlier in the fall.

Government Orders

I know that members would agree with me, because we all spend a lot of time in our constituencies, but certainly the constituents of Kitchener Centre and in fact Canadians right across this nation have indicated that they do not want tax cuts at the expense and the compromise of the social fabric of the nation. For the majority of Canadians, spending on medicare and education, the elimination of poverty, the creation of a national child care program, as well as the protection of the environment all come before tax cuts as their priorities.

Today Canada's economy is performing extremely well. In fact, the federal treasury is awash in cash. As the government announced in September, it ran a surplus this year of \$14 billion. Certainly a tax break would be in order during times of such prosperity.

However, the government also announced a reduction of the lowest tax bracket to 15% when in reality it was merely reinstating a tax cut that our previous Liberal government had made. The Conservative government in its initial budget had raised the tax rate of the lowest income bracket from 15% to 15.5%. It is hardly a tax cut when it merely returns to the same rate that it was previous to the increase in the budget preceding. Canadians are no further ahead financially than they were before the minority Conservative government took power.

Many in this House will recall the previous Liberal government's \$100 billion tax reduction plan. It was passed in the year 2000. It was the largest tax cut in history, and Canadians continue to benefit from that budget today.

What made the tax relief plan and the subsequent Liberal tax relief so effective was how very broad the application was. Millions of people benefited from those reductions.

We are also in favour of reducing the tax burden on corporations because we recognize this is one way to unleash Canada's productive capacity. Our record speaks to this.

The finance minister and the government make much of the reduction of 1% in the GST. It has gone to 5% from 6%.

What is interesting about this is that the vast majority of economists and as a matter of fact those with any kind of economic sense are quick to acknowledge that trimming taxes on consumption offers very little in terms of economic stimulus. Quite frankly, it advantages the rich. We all know that we would get more GST relief when buying a Mercedes-Benz than when buying a bicycle. It is simple arithmetic.

On this side of the House, we are accustomed to governing with vision and with an eye to the long term economic good of our country.

The quick fix, simplistic initiatives put forward by the Conservative government are designed to pay dividends at the ballot box in the next election. There is no commitment to long term economic vitality, no vision and no attention to growth.

The Conservatives fail to deliver on the long term vision of the investments that need to be made in using the record setting fiscal strength that they inherited from our previous Liberal governments.

We need a system of taxation that would provide an economic stimulus to help mitigate the economic slowdown in the United States. No one can dispute that Canada will face consequences of any economic changes that happen in the United States. With our loonie at par and occasionally above par and worth more than the U. S. dollar, Canadian manufacturers need help from the government.

● (1230)

The Conservative government is failing to create or even protect thousands of manufacturing jobs. In 2006, the House of Commons industry committee made 22 unanimous recommendations to help Canada's manufacturing sector. To date, of the 22 unanimous recommendations, one has partially been implemented. That was the creation of a two year window for writing off capital investments at an accelerated rate as opposed to the committee's recommendation of a five year window.

Meanwhile, other sectors, such as the booming oil sands industry, continue to enjoy a much more generous accelerated capital cost allowance. These are industries that have immense returns on their investments, yet we see the manufacturing sector struggling in Canada and hear silence from the government.

Canadian communities are also feeling the pinch of this Conservative mismanagement. According to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Canada's cities and communities now face an infrastructure deficit of over \$100 billion, yet only \$4 billion of the government's \$30 billion building Canada fund has been earmarked for municipal infrastructure. Clearly, this is simply not enough.

Canadian cities and municipalities need long term sustainable funding for infrastructure programs. This requires partnering at all levels of government, but the Conservatives have failed to come to the table. The Conservative finance minister accused mayors, my own mayor from Kitchener, of being whiners. He dismissed them. He said that the government does not deal in potholes and said to go home. Yet everybody lives in a community, whether it is a village or a city, and recognizes that there needs to be attention to infrastructure. How many bridges need to collapse and injure or kill Canadians before we recognize the screaming deficit that we have in investment in infrastructure?

Similarly, the Conservatives' immigration program shows no real desire to respond either to the needs of our economy or to the needs of new Canadians. Their approach has a narrow regional focus. It lacks long term objectives for our immigration system. It ignores the realities of the Canadian labour market, where there are severe shortages. In addition, the Conservatives' plan is targeted almost exclusively at western Canada and shows no real desire to respond to the needs of employers in other provinces.

Government Orders

In budget 2006, the Conservatives provided \$18 million over two years to create the Canadian agency for assessment and recognition of credentials. This is for foreign-trained professionals who want to immigrate to Canada. This represented a \$145 million reduction—and I underscore that, a \$145 million reduction—in spending on foreign credential recognition and cut the shelf life of the programming in half from what was promised in 2005.

What is worse, budget 2007 continued this backward path by breaking this meagre commitment. Instead of creating a foreign credential agency, the government replaced it with a Foreign Credentials Referral Office that is worth \$13 million over two years. This merely provides referral services for prospective immigrants to connect with appropriate provincial assessment bodies rather than actually helping the foreign-trained workers find jobs quickly.

Statistics show us that within the next 20 years immigration will account for all of Canada's net labour force and population growth. Passing the buck to provinces and territories hardly seems a responsible reaction in addressing this sector of our society and our economy.

Liberal governments implemented numerous infrastructure programs in the 1990s and the early 2000s to support the municipal infrastructure projects, culminating in \$5 billion over five years with the transfer of gas tax funds to municipalities and continuing at \$2 billion annually from 2009.

The Liberals also invested \$263 million in the foreign-trained workers initiative in 2005 and over \$100 million to improve the delivery of immigration services.

As a member of the Liberal Party, I have consistently advocated for the support of Canadian families while promoting fiscal responsibility and building a solid economic foundation for the future.

I find this budget short-sighted and irresponsible. Quite frankly, Canadians deserve better.

• (1235)

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to start by first saying that I have tremendous respect for the hon. member who just spoke, but she talked about the values that Canadians wish to have, such as investments in health, education, infrastructure and so on, yet her own government announced, and she said so in her speech, \$100 billion worth of tax cuts in 2000.

We said the same things in 2000 that she says now. We said that many people were left behind, including autistic children and veterans, as well as the shipbuilding industries and everything else.

Yes, it is indeed important to ensure that taxes are done fairly and equitably right across the board. If reductions need to take place, they need to be done with a proper and thorough debate in the House of Commons.

I would like to give the member an opportunity to elaborate a bit more on this style of government we are seeing, with a government that turns around and gives a massive tax break to very profitable corporations, usually in the financial and the oil and gas sectors,

corporations that are already making record profits under the current tax system.

Yet the government turns around, and except for a penny or two off a cup of coffee or whatever, average Canadians will not realize any major tax reduction at all in their taxes. Yet the very wealthy who run some of these corporations will realize the lion's share of these cuts.

Does the hon. member not think it appropriate that we should be investing in those people who are going to be left behind by the government, including farmers, fishermen, Inuit, first nations people, children with autism—I go back to that again and again—and families who are suffering? What about homelessness? What about infrastructure and so on? There are so many things the government can and should be investing in, but it simply has re-gifted many things that we in the NDP pushed for in Bill C-48 of the previous Parliament.

Why does the member think that the Conservative government and its Conservative members, who individually are really decent people, collectively seem to have lost their minds? They have gone blank. I would like to give the member a chance to elaborate a bit more and enunciate to us why the Conservatives would be so cold-hearted on many of the things I have just mentioned.

Hon. Karen Redman: Mr. Speaker, lest this sound like a mutual admiration society, I would have to say that I have eminent respect for the colleague who just posed the question. I know that, in the main, members in all parties of the House come here to make this a better country for their constituents, their provinces and Canadians across Canada.

In direct response, I would look at the accelerated writedown of capital costs and ask why the government would choose to continue to have a richer writedown of capital costs for people in the oil sands, who have record profits right now, and ignore the plight of manufacturers.

I think there are many things the government has done that really underscore a philosophical bent. There is an expression, and I do not know if people viewing this on TV will understand, known as “retail politics”. It is what will sell at the ballot box. It is the politics of division in choosing winners and creating losers.

The government had a \$14 billion legacy of surplus left over from the hard work not just of the previous Liberal governments but all Canadians, because we recognize that everyone collectively tightened their belts to get rid of the \$42 billion deficit that we as a government inherited.

The government has cancelled the court challenges program. Philosophically, they have taken word “equality” out of the mandate of the Status of Women department. There seems to be an absolute philosophical bent to decide who votes for them and how to reward them.

Communities and cities right across the nation need the kind of partnership that we can create at the federal government. I look at Waterloo region and Kitchener Centre. I look at the homeless issue. I look at the supporting community initiatives of over \$320,000 that went into my riding and at what the local levels of government and non-profits did to make sure that nobody was left behind in my community.

That is the kind of leadership and partnership Canadians deserve and should expect from the federal government. It is not the kind of leadership they are getting from this minority Conservative government.

• (1240)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Gravel (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to speak to Bill C-28, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2007 and to implement certain provisions of the economic statement tabled in Parliament on October 30, 2007

First of all, I would like to reiterate my colleagues' comments that this bill does not address the Bloc's five priorities, which we all know are as follows: complete elimination of the federal spending power, tax measures for regions affected by the forestry crisis, maintaining in full the supply management system for agriculture, withdrawal of Canadian troops from Afghanistan in 2009, and full respect for the Kyoto protocol and Quebec's interests.

In this bill, the rich continue to have the biggest piece of the pie. Oil companies benefit the most from corporate tax reductions. Because Quebec manufacturing companies make no profits, this bill does nothing for them.

The bill does not include any measures to help the manufacturing and forestry sectors, which are in crisis. Yesterday, in response to a question, my colleague from Trois-Rivières said that it would take shock treatment. The Conservatives are not here to provide that sort of treatment.

This bill also has nothing for seniors. Since this is an issue I feel strongly about, I am going to talk about it.

The bill does not provide for indexing the guaranteed income supplement or for fully retroactive benefits for seniors who were cheated for years. It does not include an assistance program for older workers who have lost their jobs and cannot find work. This bill enhances a side deal benefiting Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador, which cuts the heart out of the equalization program, and Quebec is paying the price.

That is why we are opposed to this bill. Whether we are talking about tax credits or the decrease in the GST, the people who are benefiting from these measures are still the richest members of our society, while the others are continuing to sink deeper and deeper into poverty. Yet these are the people who need help.

I have been sitting in this House as a Bloc Québécois member for a year now. When I look at how the government operates, I sometimes get the feeling that we are the only ones who are defending the poor.

Government Orders

With regard to the 1% cut in the GST, which will cost the federal government \$6 billion and the Government of Quebec \$100 million, we wonder who really benefits. I talked to other people about this, and the example I was given is totally absurd. I was told that someone who buys a \$300,000 house will benefit from the 1% decrease in the GST. I wonder who can afford a \$300,000 house. Are most people in Canada and Quebec buying \$300,000 houses? I doubt it very much. Surely not. Who benefits from the decrease in the GST?

I would like to talk further about seniors who are living in dreadful conditions and whose income puts them, in large part, below the poverty line.

I toured Quebec in the spring and I saw to what extent certain seniors live in extreme poverty. In 2004, a study established the low income cutoff at \$14,794. That was in 2004 for a single person. In 2007, even with the \$18 increase from the Conservatives, the maximum income under the guaranteed income supplement was \$13,514. That means that a poor senior who receives the maximum guaranteed income supplement is living below the poverty line. That person is \$1,280 a year, or \$106 a month, shy of reaching the low income cutoff.

There is something scandalous about that. Once we know about it, then we have a moral and human obligation to do something. The government is up to its neck in surpluses: \$11.6 billion this year and \$14.5 billion next year. The government should be doing something for the least fortunate in our society, but it is not.

• (1245)

What is more, we know that in Quebec, and even in Canada, a good number of seniors are not receiving the guaranteed income supplement even though they are entitled to it, quite simply because they are not receiving the necessary information. Seniors are not aware of this program and the government is not doing anything to reach them. In Quebec alone, an estimated 40,000 seniors are poor—and therefore eligible for the guaranteed income supplement—but are not receiving the supplement for lack of information.

A few years ago, an MP from the Bloc Québécois, Mr. Gagnon, did an extraordinary job of finding these seniors. He reached thousands of them, but unfortunately many more remain.

A few weeks ago, we all saw the story on Radio-Canada television of the woman in Toronto, Mrs. Bolduc, 78, who was living on \$7,000 a year. She was entitled to the guaranteed income supplement, but did not know it. A social worker took up her case. Once again, we would have liked Mrs. Bolduc to receive five years of retroactivity after being cheated by the government for years. However, she was granted just 11 months of retroactivity even though five years of retroactivity would have amounted to just \$12,000. The reporter asked her what she would do with \$12,000. She said she would buy winter clothes, because winter was coming.

Government Orders

I called Mrs. Bolduc the day before yesterday, and I spoke to her for an hour. She was just leaving the hospital after breaking her arm last Friday when she fell in a Toronto subway station. I asked her if I could talk about her today, and she gave me her blessing. As I priest, that was all the encouragement I needed. I am usually the one giving people blessings, but in this case she gave me her blessing.

Mrs. Bolduc said something to me that I would like to share with the House. She said that in a country as rich as ours, it is shameful to deprive seniors of a decent income. I think this bears repeating so that the Conservatives will really hear it. The worst of it is that the government knows about the situation but is not doing anything to fix it. The government would rather spend its surplus on the debt than enable our to seniors live with dignity. I find that scandalous and immoral.

It is indecent to be treating our seniors like this. They are the people who built this country. They are not asking for handouts. They are just asking for their due. We know that seniors are getting poorer and poorer. We know that there is not enough housing and that much of it is inadequate. We know that suicide rates among seniors are climbing. It is scandalous that nothing is being done to help them.

Members of the Bloc Québécois cannot support this bill because it perpetuates gross injustices upon older workers, the manufacturing sector and seniors. It is important to speak out against it.

I have two minutes left, so I would like to share some lines that Georges Lalonde, the president of the Quebec seniors council, included in a document that was sent to Quebec seniors. He quoted Victor Hugo to illustrate how important seniors are in a society like ours. Here is what Hugo wrote:

All things found upon this earth
Rich tradition gave them birth
All things blessed by heav'n on high
All thoughts human or divine
These things, if rooted in the past
Bear leaves that will forever last.

I think this means that seniors are important because they represent where we came from and help us to see where we are going.

● (1250)

Mr. Thierry St-Cyr: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Repentigny for his moving remarks about a senior who was short changed with the guaranteed income supplement. He spoke a little about how it was shameful that the government is going to pay down the national debt—which is not a bad thing—when it should start by paying back the money owed to seniors.

The Bloc Québécois is not asking for new subsidies to be created here. They have a right to that money; they simply did not claim it in the past, because the government did not provide enough information.

If, as a country, we are going to pay our debts, we should start by paying back the debt we owe to seniors. It is even more shocking that they cannot get full retroactivity. I think that if the situation were reversed, if the seniors had failed to pay their taxes for five or ten years, they would not be able to tell the tax man that it has been more

than 11 months, and too bad for him, but they are not going to pay their taxes.

Does my colleague not find this double standard absolutely disgraceful? If a senior owes the government money, it will go back 5, 10, 15 years, but when the government owes money to seniors, for some inexplicable and unknown reason, they get only 11 months retroactivity.

Also, does my colleague not find it shameful that during its election campaign, the government promised to fix this problem and it still has not? It is breaking—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The hon. member for Repentigny.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his questions. Indeed, this is scandalous. An older person once said to me that the government has a long arm when the time comes to take money from our pockets, but its arm is not nearly as long when it is time to dig into its own pockets. That is one way of describing the injustice that exists. And it is true.

Considering the surplus accumulated by the government this year, the retroactivity question could easily be resolved. It would cost \$3.1 billion for all of Canada, and there is a surplus of \$11 billion. Thus, this problem could be resolved, especially given the growing numbers of seniors in this country. We have heard that by 2015, 28% of the population will have reached age 60.

It seems to me that we must find a place for them, especially since these people often live in insecurity; they are often disadvantaged, afraid and need help. There are growing numbers of poor seniors. This is important.

The second question had to do with the Conservatives' broken promise. During the election campaign, the Conservatives promised to resolve this problem, but it remains unresolved. An increase of \$18 a month was given, when we know that \$110 is what is needed just to reach the low income cutoff, the poverty line. This is also scandalous and is, in many ways, immoral.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): I invite the hon. member for Jeanne-Le Ber to take his seat for a moment, because I would like to allow the hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé to speak.

Mr. Guy André (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his speech. As we all know, our colleague from Repentigny has a long history of spiritual and social involvement, and I am sure that he finds the government's contempt for seniors and workers scandalous. This week, they voted against the \$55 billion employment insurance fund, thereby depriving seniors and workers of income.

What does the member for Repentigny think of this right-wing government—

● (1255)

Mr. Thierry St-Cyr: Heartless, a heartless government!

Mr. Guy André (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): —that wants to get rid of all social programs and policies for the most needy in our society?

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The member for Repentigny has 20 seconds to reply.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I would like to respond to part of the question. Yes, it is scandalous. Take housing, for instance. As I travelled around Quebec, I went to Rimouski, where seniors in wheelchairs were living on the fourth floor of a building with no elevator.

We know that the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation records a surplus every year, so we are asking the government to increase transfers to Quebec based on the population and—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): We must continue with the debate. The hon. member for Davenport.

[*English*]

Mr. Mario Silva (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to the government's budget and economic statement implementation act.

Although budgets often seem to be about numbers, balance sheets and allocations, the reality is they are truly about people. They are not just dollars and cents.

The decisions that are made here directly affect the lives of millions of Canadians, and this is an important and enduring responsibility. I have always believed that, in this context, budgets must be fair, balanced and responsible, not just responsible in fiscal terms but in how they treat Canadians.

I am always pleased and honoured to have the opportunity to visit with constituents and agencies within my riding of Davenport. Their insights are invaluable to me and they are truly caring and dedicated people.

During the recent break in the parliamentary calendar, I met with many of these wonderful people, who live and provide invaluable service in my riding. I visited with agencies like FoodShare, the Working Women Community Centre, St. Christopher House and Stop Community Food Centre. I also had the opportunity to meet with residents of Terra Nova Apartments, New Horizons, Rankin Apartments and St. Anne's Place.

At each location, I was deeply moved by the concerns expressed by these caring and concerned people. The concerns touched on things we should all see as priorities. They spoke about poverty in our country, the crisis facing our cities and fair taxation policies, to name but a few of the things about which they talked.

I share the concerns of my constituents on the issue of poverty and, in particular, the realities that many of our children and most vulnerable citizens must face each and every day. Only a few days ago a report was issued that indicated one in every eight Canadian children lives in poverty. This is an outrage in a country as blessed and prosperous as Canada. It is amazing when a statistic like this is released and all the government can do is speak of growth statistics and optimistic fiscal forecasts, which fail to take into account the human face of poverty.

In my city of Toronto 93,000 households live in poverty. During my meeting at the Rankin Apartments in my riding, the people spoke of the realities of poverty. In the context of the government's fiscal plan, not one economist of note, anywhere in the country, agrees that

the 1% cut in the GST is a sound fiscal policy. In fact, most agree that the reduction of GST will have such minimal effect for the average family. The supposed gains would be virtually negligible.

As the Leader of the Opposition has suggested repeatedly, the funds from 1% of the GST would have been much better spent to address issues facing Canada's most vulnerable people. Can anyone imagine the investment that could be made in the fight against poverty with the billions of dollars the government is relinquishing on the GST cuts? People in my riding can. Why can the government not?

During my visits to programs like FoodShare and Stop Community Food Centre, the realities of hunger are rarely more apparent. What kind of government adopts policies for political shows while many of its most vulnerable citizens go hungry?

I am proud that the leader of my party has announced a real plan of action on this issue of poverty in Canada. The 30:50 plan would create a "making work pay benefit", improve the child tax benefit, lift seniors out of poverty, assist first nations people and, as per its name, cut the number of people living below the poverty line by 30% within five years and reduce the number of children living below the poverty line by 50% in five years. This is a real plan of action, not just platitudes and political posturing.

The residents of St. Anne's Place, Terra Nova Apartments and New Horizons live in the heart of Toronto. They witness each day the need for investment in our cities, particularly in the areas of infrastructure and public transit.

● (1300)

Cities across the country require a minimum of \$123 billion in infrastructure funding. Like the famous line from the movie once asked: "Where is the money?" Unfortunately, from this government there is very little to be found even in a time of unprecedented prosperity that it inherited as a result of the hard work of the previous Liberal government.

My colleague, the member for Don Valley West, who served as infrastructure minister in the previous Liberal government, welcomed cities to the table and had begun a process of supporting them with real and meaningful funding. We do not see this from the current government.

Yesterday we heard of the government's action with regard to HIV-AIDS funding and its decision to honour commitments made by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation by taking money away from other programs instead of putting forward new money as agreed. This is simply wrong.

In 2005 the former Liberal government put forward a real fiscal plan of action to help seniors, assist students, address poverty, support child care, and improve the lives of millions of Canadians. That is what a budget should really be about. The reality is that the government is like the salesperson who sells a shiny new car with gleaming paint, clean windows, nice upholstery, but the car has no engine. It is all smoke and mirrors.

Government Orders

For Canada's most vulnerable, for those most in need including our seniors, students, the working poor, and the cities in which they live, there is nothing in this budget document that provides any hope for a better future.

I am proud to belong to a party which has a more just, more equitable, and more humane view of Canada. We on this side of the House are heirs to the legacy of Trudeau and Pearson, the party of national health care and the Canada pension plan, and we will always speak up for those who are most vulnerable as I am proud to do today.

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I too want to correct the record. It was actually a Conservative prime minister who brought in the Canada pension plan. As well, it was Prime Minister Diefenbaker who lowered the age to 65.

However, the member was talking about fairness and justice. When the people of Canada elected us, we had a situation where there was an unbalanced marriage penalty in the taxation laws, there was an accelerated capital cost allowance for the oil fields, the majority of families had no benefit at all for child care, the corporate tax rate was such a burden on Canadian companies it was hard for them to compete, and the Liberals had promised to scrap the GST but never did.

We corrected the marriage penalty and now a spouse who stays at home has the same exemption. We cut the GST to 5%. The personal exemption rate went down by \$1,000. The age exemption for seniors also was raised another \$1,000 so they pay less tax. We have also introduced income pension splitting for seniors. Which one of those initiatives would the member like us to remove for the people of Canada? These are all initiatives for people who are in vulnerable situations and who need help.

Mr. Mario Silva: Mr. Speaker, the member speaks of initiatives the government has brought forward, but yet we see our cities crying for infrastructure moneys and a need for more child care spaces without any support from the government.

The member opposite forgets that this is a government for the first time in the history of our country which has no elected members in any of the large major cities in this country: none in Montreal, none in Vancouver, none in Toronto. The reason for that is because Conservatives do not understand the real needs of the major cities and their concerns facing poverty, issues of homelessness, issues affecting seniors, and issues affecting infrastructure.

That is the reason the government has no support within the major cities across this country. If we look at its record, it speaks for itself. It is the record that a majority of our seniors cannot support because of the fact that the Conservative government has a dismal record when it comes to addressing issues of poverty, homelessness, and child care in our cities that is so badly needed.

I would challenge the member to go out and speak to those groups and tell them it has done exactly what he said because most cities, most municipalities, and most mayors would laugh in his face.

• (1305)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Thierry St-Cyr (Jeanne-Le Ber, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I did not have the opportunity before to ask a third question. However, perhaps my Liberal colleague could respond.

A great deal has been said about this heartless government that refuses to pay back money owed to seniors cheated out of the guaranteed income supplement. I realize that our views on state assistance to citizens will vary according to our political philosophies. The belief that solidarity is important or that personal initiative and individualism are more important will depend on whether we are on the left or the right side of the political spectrum. I can understand that. However, I believe that one thing should be clear to all members, whether they are on the left or the right, and that is that we must be concerned with justice. When money is owed to seniors—or to anyone for that matter—it should be given to them even though the debt goes back one, two, three, five or ten years. A debt must always be paid.

Does my Liberal colleague agree that, no matter whether we are on the right or the left, it is reasonable that seniors who failed to claim amounts to which they were entitled, over the years, should receive these amounts?

Mr. Mario Silva: Mr. Speaker, the seniors of our country, the elderly, need our help. That is very obvious. The poverty rate in our country is too high. Poverty among seniors is scandalous. As parliamentarians, we must help all the seniors in our country.

Lowering the GST will not solve the problem. We must find a solution that will help the seniors in our society.

[*English*]

Mrs. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased to have an opportunity to speak to the 2007 economic update.

I must say, though, that it is a woefully inadequate document. It simply does not take Canada in the direction that Parliament and the House of Commons is obligated to take our country. It quite simply sees this government, as with the past government, taking Canada down the wrong path.

It is not a balanced approach and it completely overlooks an unprecedented opportunity to invest in the people and the communities of this nation.

If we think about it, year after year we have seen incredible surpluses, surpluses that could have been invested in a way that is appropriate and helpful.

The point is that we have not had any real investment in this country. We have not had a new social program in the last 30 years. This government and the government before it had all kinds of chances to invest in national housing, child care, students, and in every juncture but both failed and failed quite miserably.

New Democrats are very concerned about the economic statement and we want to make it very clear that we will not be supporting the government's financial statement. We see it has no promise for the people we represent.

Government Orders

What we wanted and did not get was a balanced approach, investment in people and communities, targeted tax relief for those who need it most, and a chance to close that ever increasing prosperity gap.

I would like to speak a little bit about the reality that I see in my constituency and what this budget will not mean for the people of London—Fanshawe.

•(1310)

Mr. Ted Menzies: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

My apologies to the hon. member who is speaking, but I think it is pertinent that this point be raised with you, Mr. Speaker.

During a question and comment period, the member for Jeanne-Le Ber used an unparliamentary term and I would request that you, Mr. Speaker, review the blues and act in accordance with your decision.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): I thank the hon. the parliamentary secretary for his point of order. I will review the blues forthwith and come back to the House if necessary.

The hon. member for London—Fanshawe has the floor.

Mrs. Irene Mathysen: Mr. Speaker, while I certainly would never support unparliamentary behaviour in this place, it would seem to me that we should be a lot more focused on the needs of the people of our community, their economic needs and the security of those communities, than to be dancing on words.

At any rate, I want to speak about the city I live in, the city of London, and I want to tell members what this budget and previous budgets have meant to those who are most vulnerable.

There is a community of women who have been supported by a remarkable place: My Sister's Place. About four years ago, when a review was done of services for women in the city of London, it was discovered that services for women suffering from mental illness or living in abusive situations were woefully inadequate. So, out of the housing budget, out of the SCPI budget, allocations were made to support My Sister's Place and it received about \$150,000 a year.

That might sound like a lot of money, but when we put it into the large picture of things, it is really very little money for what we see in terms of services to the women of my community.

One woman told me, quite frankly, that if it had not been for My Sister's Place she would have died, that she, quite simply, would have perished, that she owed her life to the staff and the sisterhood that she found at My Sister's Place. Because it is not just the staff, although they are absolutely remarkable and do extraordinary work, it is the other women, the 60 or so women who come in every day, who provide that additional love and support that women who are abused, women who are homeless, women who are suffering from addictions and mental illness so desperately need. It is lonely out there.

My great regret is that this government does not understand what it means to be alone, what it means to be afraid, what it means to be homeless, and what it means to do without day after day. I wish that the Conservatives would try to understand.

At any rate, under the SCPI funding, it received \$150,000. It was always from one year to the next. It had to reapply every year. It had

to fill out extensive forms. Nobody was ever sure whether that money was coming through because the Liberal government had nothing in terms of core funding. It was a band-aid approach that left all of us, I would say, wondering, worrying and trying to figure out how we would manage.

This government came through with a new program. They call it HIPPY on the street. It is supposed to take the place of SCPI.

The interesting thing is that the government cut in half the allocation for My Sister's Place and the other agencies that make up the homelessness coalition in London. In September, it was very clear that this very important service was going to, quite simply, disappear and so the folks at My Sister's Place went into fundraising. At this point in time, they have been able to cobble together a plan and find enough community support to manage.

However, that is not good enough. The charity of the community is not infinite and the time will come when the lack of funding is going to cause significant problems for My Sister's Place and for At^Lohsa, which provides services to aboriginal people living in this city, and programs for street youth. In fact, we have lost a great deal of the programming that we had for street youth.

•(1315)

Quite ironically, we have a government standing on its hind legs, carrying on about how it will address crime with boot camps and all kinds of criminal bills to get tough on kids. I would call it a devastation of the youth in our communities. The government has done nothing to prevent children from being involved in crime. There are no preventative measures, and I have seen that first-hand in my city.

Another thing that this so-called budgetary interim statement fails to address is the infrastructure problem. I stood in the House about three weeks ago and talked about the six metre sinkhole, which appeared in the middle of downtown, and the crumbling infrastructure. I found out subsequently that older cities like Montreal, Toronto, London are in desperate need of infrastructure dollars. In fact, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities has indicated that there is a \$123 billion deficit, which is soon to become a \$150 billion deficit.

The end result of this lack of investment in our cities has caused a real problem, not just the mess that a sinkhole and crumbling infrastructure creates, but a problem in regard to clean water. About 40% of the clean water produced in cities is leaking from old infrastructure. It costs a great deal to ensure that water is safe and clean. It is a very expensive proposition. We are losing that because we have inadequate infrastructure.

I had a great deal more to say, but I want to conclude by saying the economic update provides \$1.50 a day to the average Canadian family, but \$14.5 billion to big oil, to big banks, to those who need it least. The end result is the \$190 billion is being taken from the federal government funding capacity, our ability to address the need for housing and need for infrastructure.

The Conservative government has done nothing. The Liberal Party sat on its hands. It is not acceptable.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Guy André (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her speech.

As we know, the Bloc wanted specific measures to help the workers, companies and regions affected by the forestry crisis. But the economic statement in this bill does nothing for the manufacturing sector, nothing in terms of a program to assist older workers, and even less than nothing for seniors who receive the guaranteed income supplement.

By the way, as my colleague said earlier, the guaranteed income supplement is money that the government owes to seniors.

The Bloc Québécois believes that whether a person is on the left or the right, regardless of his political beliefs, the least he can do is keep his word. But the Conservatives did not do that. When they campaigned in Quebec, they said they would solve the problem with the guaranteed income supplement for seniors, but they did not solve it, nor did they announce a new POWA. The independent employment insurance fund now stands at \$55 billion. But this week, they voted against a bill that would do something about it.

How can a government that is forecasting an \$18 billion surplus over the next four years do nothing for the poor and less fortunate in this country?

• (1320)

[English]

Mrs. Irene Mathysen: Mr. Speaker, I guess it is a matter of priority.

I will follow up with a couple of observations. He talked about seniors. The status of women committee looked at the economic security of women primarily, but we also touched on senior women and seniors in general. We discovered that far too many of our seniors were living in poverty.

Again, I come back to that \$14.5 billion. All that money is being given to big oil companies and big banks, but nothing for the people who desperately need it. There is no money for seniors or for women who are living below the poverty line because they cannot access programs. Programs, such as the employment insurance fund, have been plundered not just by the Conservative government but by previous governments.

The government has no real consideration or concern about how to build a community, or what must be done to have strong communities. Investment in communities is essential. Yet \$190 billion has been taken out of the federal government's ability to invest, to fund communities, to create the kind of nation that real leadership would determine. The government should be concerned.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, why does the member say the previous Liberal government did nothing? Does she believe that taking a country that had a \$42 billion annual deficit in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1994, and turning that into eight or nine consecutive surplus budgets, paying down debt by \$135 billion, reducing income taxes and giving Canada the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years is doing nothing?

If those are the facts, which I know they are, why would the member insult everyone's intelligence and suggest that somehow the previous government did nothing, as she said in her speech?

Mrs. Irene Mathysen: Mr. Speaker, that is interesting. I have a little story in regard to those surpluses and that reduction of the deficit.

In 1997, at a luncheon, Jean Chrétien congratulated himself for reducing the deficit and bringing about prosperity. What he did not tell everyone was that he had raided the EI fund and people entitled to employment insurance were receiving none.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a Friday and it is just a few minutes before we move into the last part of the day with private members' business. I would have liked a full time slot to talk about repackaging, and it has nothing to do with industry or business. It has to do with that government over there, which has not come up with anything new that was not already in the works when it became government. Then it reintroduced it.

On the transportation bill, I remember the parliamentary secretary stood and said that the government had held extensive consultation on it and had come with the bill. In fact, there were extensive consultations and they went on for two years, but the Conservatives took credit for it. They took credit for the bill. It was a good bill, and we will support it.

Then there is some more repackaging. The Conservatives came up with 10 or 12 justice bills. They all went through the process and to the justice committee. Then all of a sudden, the justice committee could only deal with one bill at a time. It had been loaded up. It had no chance whatsoever to deal with all the bills because they had to be done in a reasonable order.

Then the Prime Minister got up at a function and said that the other parties had wasted 1,000 days in getting through the government's important legislation on crime. The government has not even been in power a thousand days. That is a long time.

Here is how the Prime Minister thinks. The bill waited for another bill that was before the committee. It waited 200 days. The next bill waited 250. The next bill waited 200 to 300 days. He added them all up and came up with a thousand. This is the new math of the Conservative government. I have a feeling Canadians have to beware of what they have been shown. It is the tip of the iceberg. This is a government that cannot be trusted.

As the transport minister just indicated, the government is very scary. That is the point.

What did the Conservatives do on a scary night like Halloween? They had the biggest broken promise in the history of Canadian government. They had promised during the election—

Hon. Lawrence Cannon: You guys had the biggest scandal in the history of Canadian governments.

Mr. Paul Szabo: The Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities wants to yell me down. Canadians should know that when a member is trying to speak and a minister is trying to yell him down, he must be on the right track. I know I am on the right track. The minister is now very animated. I am glad he is entertained.

The fact is the Conservatives promised, during the election campaign, to never tax income trusts. Then they turned around and levied a 31.5% tax on income trusts. This affected about 2.5 million Canadians, many of whom are seniors, and their retirement nest eggs were attacked. That is shameful of the government. Even the Prime Minister, when he circulated a piece of literature during the last election, said that by far the greatest fraud was a promise not kept.

Halloween was a scary night for seniors who did not know whether they would be able to survive on what was left of their hard-earned retirement savings. It was a scary night for those people who did not have anything but those income trusts and all of a sudden their equity was gone. It was a scary time for people who did not know they could not trust the government. They made decisions based on that trust.

The government interfered with the marketplace. It hurt Canadians, mostly seniors. It touched at the very core of integrity and credibility of government. Those are the things of which Canadians should be scared.

• (1325)

That government has a terrible record, whether it is on basic things like saying it actually reduced taxes when in fact it increased personal income taxes or other things. The Conservatives think that just because it was a budget implementation item or a mini budget that it is not law until that implementation bill actually passes.

I can tell them that if they want to apply those kinds of rules, we are presently talking about the 2007 budget implementation bill, and none of it is law in Canada until it passes. They should not take credit for something that is not law.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Order, please. It being 1:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

When we next return to the study of Bill C-28, there will be four and a half minutes left for the hon. member for Mississauga South.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1330)

[English]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

The House resumed from October 17 consideration of the motion that Bill C-269, An Act to amend the Employment Insurance Act (improvement of the employment insurance system), be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am excited to get up and talk about Bill C-269 today, not so much for what the bill says, but just to talk about some of the

Private Members' Business

things our government is doing and why we believe that Bill C-269 is not required at this time.

I am thankful for the opportunity to speak today at the third reading of Bill C-269, An Act to amend the Employment Insurance Act. I would also like to thank all my hon. colleagues in this House for their contributions on this very important issue.

I want to start by saying that this government is committed to providing opportunities for all Canadians to participate and succeed in Canada's growing economy.

The economy is booming. Canada's new government and the Minister of Finance have created the winning conditions so that more jobs, better wages and a brighter future can be delivered to all Canadians.

I want to point out for the sponsor of this bill, the member for Laurentides—Labelle, who I know feels this is a very important issue for her, her riding and Quebec, that in Quebec alone the employment growth so far this year has been above the national average at 2%, with the unemployment rate at its lowest point in 33 years at 6.9% in Quebec.

The figures for Canada on a whole are equally optimistic. During the first quarter of 2007, employment grew by an estimated 158,000 new jobs, more than 500,000 jobs since this government took power. Canada's unemployment rate fell to only 5.8% in October. The great news is that these new jobs are paying more. The average hourly wage rose by 6% between August 2006 and August 2007.

Despite these record employment statistics, the opposition has proposed fundamental and sweeping changes to the EI program. These changes include lower entrance requirements, large increases in the duration of benefits and increased benefit rates, changes that are simply not justified by these numbers.

It is estimated that these changes would have a combined cost to the EI program of \$3.7 billion annually. The opposition has done this without providing the House or the HUMA committee any evidence to show that these changes are actually required or warranted.

The opposition spent a mere one hour studying this bill, an absolutely shocking amount of time to spend on a bill that proposes this level of spending of taxpayers' dollars. That amounts to more than \$1 million per second of study for this bill. Although shocking, it is not surprising considering the opposition's record of proposing bills with billions of dollars in new spending with little or no study.

In addition, the opposition members on the HUMA committee refused to consult with business leaders and other stakeholders who will be affected most by these changes.

Private Members' Business

Michel Kelly-Gagnon, the president of the Conseil du patronat du Québec, stated that this additional \$3.7 billion expenditure would return the EI system to a deficit and may result in higher premiums for both workers and employers. He further stated in no uncertain terms that these higher premiums are good for neither the working family nor business owners.

Certainly, one of the things I have heard as I have talked to business owners in my riding is that they would like to find a way for us to be able to cut EI premiums, not only for businesses but for individuals as well, so this bill would have us going in the opposite direction.

One would have thought that Mr. Kelly-Gagnon's opinion would have been of interest to the committee. However, the opposition decided that no employers should be consulted in the drafting, the debate or even the study of the bill. In fact, the opposition decided not to hear from any witnesses before committing to billions of dollars in new annual expenditures.

There are currently 19 bills at various stages before this House that propose changes to the EI program. The cost of these bills is expected to be well in excess of \$11 billion annually. I think it is fair to say that some opposition members have proposed bills or advocate for changes to programs for political purposes without examining what the ramifications are for the taxpayer, without thorough study, and without an idea of what the true cost would be.

Another good example of this would be Bill C-257, which was handled in the same sort of fashion when we had the Bloc propose this bill as a private member's bill to issue sweeping changes to federal jurisdiction and federal legislation when it came to anti-replacement workers, when the Bloc suddenly had an interest in federal issues. I found it remarkably interesting that suddenly the Bloc had a new love for federal issues.

• (1335)

Once again, this was another bill that they tried to ram through committee. I can assure the House that if there had not been the time for thoughtful study on the bill and a chance to hear from witnesses, there would have been a problem that would have cost taxpayers millions in time as well as, probably, lost services.

Thankfully, we have a labour market in which more Canadians and certainly more Quebeckers are working than ever before, and the demand for labour is strong. We are at a great place in the economy. Opportunities are certainly abundant. We are currently experiencing labour shortages across the country. Certainly as we look to B.C., Alberta and Ontario, they are having a hard time not only with skilled labour but with unskilled labour as well.

Coupled with this strong labour market is evidence that the EI program is working well. It is meeting its objectives to help Canadian workers adjust to labour market changes.

I stated earlier that the evidence to support the proposed changes that Bill C-269 proposes was not presented at the HUMA committee. It was not presented because, I would have to say, it does not exist.

The evidence that does exist, though, indicates that the current EI program is meeting the needs of the unemployed Canadians for whom the program was intended. Eighty-three per cent of those who

pay into the program and have a qualified job separation are eligible for benefits. This figure increases to over 90% in areas of high unemployment. Let me just repeat that fact again for those who may not be aware. For those who are in qualified job separations who are eligible for benefits, that figure is over 90% in areas of high unemployment. Those people are able to receive their EI benefits.

The evidence also indicates that both the amount and duration of EI benefits is meeting the needs of Canadians. On average, individuals use less than two-thirds of their EI entitlement before finding employment. Even in high unemployment regions, claimants rarely used more than 70% of their entitlement.

If all this evidence suggests that the current EI program is meeting the needs of individuals who use the program, why has the opposition proposed such wide, sweeping changes?

One of the EI program's chief goals is to encourage a return to the labour market. In other words, the program is designed to provide temporary income support while encouraging Canadians to seek and retain employment. We cannot and will not go back to the problems that existed with the EI under previous governments.

Our approach to EI reform will continue to be based on building on the strengths of Canada's economy and the growth in our labour market. That being said, Canada's new government has acted to make changes to the EI program where the evidence supports the need for change.

For example, our government has expanded the eligibility for compassionate care benefits, which is certainly something we heard about during the last campaign. It is something we have been able to put into place.

We have launched a pilot project to examine the effects of providing additional weeks of benefits for those in areas of high unemployment.

Mr. Scott Simms: That was ours.

Mr. Dean Allison: Thank you very much. We listened. We made sure that happened. That has continued.

We have extended the EI transitional measures for two regions in Quebec and New Brunswick until we complete a national review of EI boundaries.

In addition, we have continued with three pilot projects currently under way in regions of high unemployment, those being the best 14 weeks project, the working while on claim pilot project, and the new entrant/re-entrant pilot project.

Our approach is broad based yet targeted. It is aimed at providing opportunities for all Canadians to participate in our healthy and growing economy.

The Advantage Canada plan has outlined the government's approach to moving forward. One key goal of the government is to create the best educated, most skilled and most flexible workforce in the world.

We have already taken action on this plan by creating the apprenticeship incentives grant, by working to improve foreign credential recognition, and by launching the targeted initiative for older workers. These changes provide real value to Canadians and address the labour issues of the 21st century.

Advantage Canada is about giving people the tools to succeed in a knowledge economy. This is what Canadians want from their government. Canadians want to be active participants in the labour market and in their communities. To do this they need the right tools, but they also want to know that EI will be there when they need it. The current system achieves that balance and the proposals in the bill put that system in jeopardy.

There are strong policy and evidence based arguments to suggest that the proposed changes in Bill C-269 are not in line with the needs of today's labour market and the economy as a whole.

We believe that our holistic approach to the labour market and our specific targeting of measures within the existing EI program is the best avenue to follow.

• (1340)

To make the changes that the member for Laurentides—Labelle has put forward in this bill, we would need to conduct an exhaustive study. We would need evidence. We would need to hear from effective witnesses. We would need answers to many other important questions. For these reasons, we are unable to support the proposals in Bill C-269.

Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having some time to talk on behalf of rural Canada and rural Newfoundland and Labrador. Certainly this is of great concern to my riding.

I would like to start by illustrating the theme I will bring forward in this debate. That theme is seasonal employment. We on this side of the House support Bill C-269. We think it will do a substantial amount for people who have invested over the past decades in seasonal work.

In my own riding I would like to talk about seasonal work in the fishery, forestry, construction work and many other areas. I would also like to talk about some of the arguments put forward by the other side. I will go back to when this debate first started and the comments by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, which were echoed by my hon. colleague from Niagara West—Glanbrook. They said that the evidence also shows that claimants in high unemployment regions rarely use more than 70% of the benefits. What they are doing is playing with the averages. There are people who slip through the cracks, especially those in seasonal work, and therein lies the problem.

The Conservatives keep using statistics on a national basis in saying that the job market is extremely hot right now. Yes, it is extremely hot in certain areas. I know that because it is not particularly hot in my area. Therefore, there is a huge amount of migration taking place. We call it outmigration from my riding to places farther west, such as Alberta, British Columbia, the Northwest Territories and so on.

Private Members' Business

In coming up with certain amendments to the EI act illustrated in Bill C-269, we are giving some of the more vulnerable communities a chance to survive, a chance to make the effort to attract more investment, to be more diverse. That is why they look at this as something that is going to downplay the overall job market.

They are also saying that by doing this, they are picking on businesses by keeping rates at what they are, but we believe that this type of policy is a vanguard for local economic development in areas of higher unemployment. This is all about the pilot projects. I am glad my hon. colleague brought up the pilot projects, which the Liberals initiated back in 2003, but the Conservatives have yet to renew. The problem is that the deadline is approaching.

Let me give an example. Five weeks would be added at the end of a benefit period in areas of higher unemployment. Yes, my area is roughly around 20%. It hovers around that mark. In most cases it is a bit higher, depending on the community.

For those engaged in seasonal work, and the vast majority of them do engage in seasonal work, like the fishery, plant workers and people who work with particular crews in the fishery and forestry, this will add the five weeks at the end to allow them the increased benefit period to get them through what we call the black hole between the benefit period and when the season starts again. That program expires on December 9, which is not very far away, and yet we have not heard whether the government is going to renew it or not.

The other pilot program in areas of high unemployment such as my own deals with the best 14 weeks over the last 52. That allows people to claim the best weeks and get a higher benefit as a result.

There are a couple of other issues in this particular bill that interest me quite a bit. It increases the rate of weekly benefits to 60%. It also reduces the qualifying period by 70 hours, which we believe is just a modicum, a slight benefit, that will not really throw this program into disarray, like the government is pretending it will. It will not, but it will go a long way for the smaller communities with higher unemployment.

• (1345)

Interestingly enough, I am glad this debate came up today because tonight the Prime Minister will be in an area of high unemployment. There are beneficiaries of this pilot program in an area that exceeds 20% unemployment in the riding of Avalon. I hope it is put to the Prime Minister why he and his government and the member of Parliament for Avalon do not support Bill C-269 which means so much to the seasonal workers of that particular riding. I wish he were here to debate it; nonetheless, we will move on.

Here is another point about Bill C-269 that I think is a great idea. The bill eliminates the presumption that persons related to each other do not deal with each other at arm's length. This could go a long way toward benefiting smaller businesses in smaller communities. It becomes a family affair, a family endeavour, a family situation where they run the business and it allows them to collect EI at the same time. That helps to sustain communities. It is a good pilot project that allows employment to persevere in the smaller communities. It gives them a fighting chance. That is why I support that particular clause in Bill C-269.

Private Members' Business

Bill C-269 also increases the maximum yearly insurable earnings to \$41,500 and introduces an indexing formula. This is also beneficial given the cost of living. Therefore, we support that as well.

I would encourage my hon. colleagues across the way to support the bill. We have received support from the majority of the members in this House, with the exception of course of the Conservative Party.

The government mentioned earlier about, I think it said, bringing it on the road, asking for consultation, taking it to the country. I would welcome that.

The government keeps talking about all the input it has received about premium rates from businesses across the country. I have no problem with a reduction in premium rates. However, the government never mentioned anything, not one iota, about receiving input or advice from the communities most affected.

What about the areas of higher unemployment? What about the areas that could greatly benefit from such small measures in Bill C-269? Yes, there are currently 19 private members' bills in the hopper. That alone should tell the government about how important it is for the most vulnerable communities.

This is about seasonal employment. This is about areas of high unemployment. It is about economic development. It is about sustaining our communities.

The migration patterns across this country for work are incredibly high. There is more migration now than we have ever seen in central Newfoundland and it is growing. I believe in my heart that if we go forward with only some of the provisions in this bill that allow workers the benefit of staying in their communities to help build their communities, the government could benefit greatly and our communities could benefit greatly.

Yes, there are 19 bills being discussed about EI reforms that provide greater benefits to seasonal workers. There is a reason. The demand is there in the most vulnerable of communities.

I would implore the government to stop abandoning the areas of higher unemployment. There are some key initiatives in Bill C-269 as well as other EI bills that will greatly benefit the country.

Again, I am disappointed the government does not support Bill C-269. I will always be in favour of greater initiatives for our most vulnerable communities in rural Canada, rural Newfoundland and Labrador, and for us as citizens dedicated to seasonal work.

• (1350)

Mrs. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Laurentides—Labelle for bringing forward this very important piece of legislation.

The bill makes a number of important amendments to the Employment Insurance Act. It reduces each qualifying period by 70 hours. It increases the benefit period. It increases the rate of weekly benefits to 60%. It repeals the waiting period. It eliminates the presumption that persons related to each other do not deal with each other at arm's length. It increases the maximum yearly insurable earnings to \$41,500. It also introduces an indexing formula.

We in the New Democratic Party certainly support this bill. Our whip, the member for Acadie—Bathurst, has introduced his own private member's bills along the same lines with the hope that we can bring some fairness to employment insurance and reduce the disparity out there.

I want to talk briefly about the national employment insurance program and provide a little bit of history, a thumbnail sketch. Canada has had a national program to provide financial support for the unemployed for about 70 years. It was seen as a very important step in regard to making sure that Canadians who were temporarily out of work or suffering because of plant closures were supported so that they could look after their families, so that communities could remain strong.

The program has gone through many changes over the years, most notably in 1971, when benefits were actually extended to those who were experiencing sickness and to women who wanted to take maternity leave. Maternity leave became part of the EI program and the ability to collect was put in place at that point.

Unfortunately, there followed a whole series of task forces and commissions which produced recommendations that changed EI not for the good, but actually sought to decrease its benefits. In 1994 the government of the day came up with proposals for a radical overhaul which led to the implementation of what is now known as the Employment Insurance Act of December 1995. Unemployment insurance was no more at that point in time.

These program changes were intended to shift the emphasis from providing income support when workers lost their jobs to making sure that they got back to work as quickly as possible. That is fine, if work exists, if the worker in question has the training and the background in order to find employment, but as has been pointed out in this House, that is not always the case. Very often in the case of plant closures the workers involved, some of whom have been at the plant for many years, are not able to secure employment.

That reality hit home in London this past spring when Beta Brands foods closed its doors. That plant, the former McCormicks plant, had been in London for over 100 years and provided good jobs and secure employment to families. Suddenly, in a matter of a few days, the announcement was made and those jobs were gone. A lot of the workers had been with the company for 30, 40, and 45 years. In some cases both a husband and wife were working in the plant. When those jobs went, those workers were left without a livelihood. Sometimes the entire family income was gone. In many cases those workers had been out of school for 30, 40, 45 years and lacked the skills and training opportunities in order to find other work.

• (1355)

This notion about getting people back to work quickly is very good but not always possible and not always the reality.

While 74% of unemployed workers were entitled to receive unemployment benefits in 1990 the new act that I was just speaking about, the 1995 act, reduced that number to 36% of those who found themselves to be unemployed. Of those workers, women had the greatest decrease in terms of support. They dropped from 69% in 1990 to 32% in 2004.

I want to speak a little about the effect that it has on a community. I am going to quote from a document that I received this week from Kairos which is an ecumenical partnership from the faith community. It is very concerned about the issues facing our communities and our society. It works very hard to try to alleviate suffering and to bring to the attention of government the things that need to happen, the realities that are out in our communities. It found, and I would say many of the members of the House are aware, that a significant contributor to poverty is the inability of insured workers to collect employment benefits.

It gives some statistics and these are shocking statistics: 788,000 children in Canada live in poverty. That is a 2005 number. We reckon that it is closer to about one million, the same percentage, about 12% as in 1989 when in this Parliament there was a resolve to end child poverty by the year 2000. We know that we did not do that. In fact, child poverty continues at an unacceptable level. There is the sense that it is in fact increasing.

Canada's homeless population is somewhere between 200,000 and 300,000. We are not exactly sure because it is very difficult sometimes to determine if someone is indeed homeless. Too many people, particularly young people, spend their time couch surfing. They go from home to home, from situation to situation, because there is no permanent place for them.

A lot of these young people are the victims of abuse, sometimes sexual abuse. They cannot go home and they are far too young to be able to secure their own home. They have been forgotten and unfortunately they are homeless.

About 1.7 million residents are struggling with housing affordability. Among those are aboriginal people in urban situations living in poverty, new immigrants, and single family homes headed by women.

About 750,000 Canadians rely on food banks in Canada. There are 650 food banks in this nation at a time when our economy is apparently booming and at a time when apparently there is a great wealth abroad. It is apparently for some and not others.

I want to speak about a question that I asked in the House last week of the minister responsible. When I told him that two-thirds of the women who pay into the employment insurance fund were unable to receive benefits, the minister's response was that I was wrong, that I was incorrect.

I would like to make reference to some information that I had. The minister said that 82% of women working full time were eligible to qualify. That does not mean that they will qualify. He was playing with words.

• (1400)

Since only 73% of women in the paid workforce are employed full time, 80% of this number would actually be 58% of all employed women who are eligible to qualify. In fact, less, since self-employed women are not eligible. So, I make my point once again that far too many people, particularly women, are unable to collect.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Order. I regret that I must interrupt the hon. member for London—Fanshawe. I had given her the two minute signal and the one minute signal.

Private Members' Business

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Gatineau.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the House is well aware that the Bloc Québécois supports this bill, since we introduced it. I am referring, of course, to Bill C-269, An Act to amend the Employment Insurance Act (improvement of the employment insurance system).

This bill makes the following changes to the Employment Insurance Act. One, it reduces each qualifying period by 70 hours. Two, it increases the benefit period. Three, it increases the rate of weekly benefits to 60%. Four, it repeals the waiting period. Five, it eliminates the presumption that persons related to each other do not deal with other at arm's length. Six, it increases the maximum yearly insurable earnings to \$41,500 and introduces an indexing formula. Lastly, the bill enables self-employed persons to receive employment insurance.

In rejecting Bill C-269, the Conservatives are defying the will of this House, of workers, of Quebecers and of all Canadians.

However, this is typical of how they do things. We are talking about the Conservative government that decided not to include opposition members in the Canadian delegation to the upcoming Bali conference. We are talking about the Conservative government that decided not so long ago to block the work of the Standing Committee on Official Languages, which was working on something the government was not happy with. We are talking about the government that abolished the court challenges program, saying that it will not fund people who challenge its laws. We are talking about the Conservative government that changed the criteria of the women's program to prevent groups that defend women's rights from receiving funding. We are talking about the minority Conservative government—and I stress the word “minority”—that is doing everything it can to silence any form of opposition.

These Conservatives are not concerned about the living conditions of the unemployed, minorities and those who need help the most. They are only interested in the Americans, oil companies and big business. They do not care about the difficulties of older workers in the manufacturing and forestry sectors or the problems of women's groups. This is very sad. The Bloc Québécois will denounce this situation in order to bring this government back in line. This Conservative government lacks humanity. It is cold and heartless and the idea of it becoming a majority government one day is very frightening. We are going to do everything we can to make sure that does not happen.

Before the Conservatives formed the government, they supported the idea of an independent fund and wanted, as we do, to put an end to the plundering of the employment insurance fund. That money belongs to the unemployed and it is not to be used at the discretion of Canada's federal government to do whatever it wants. Those who contribute to it are not able to touch 100% of it, which is outrageous. The Conservatives agreed with us on this issue when they were in the opposition. Now that they are in power, there is no difference between a Conservative government and a Liberal government. It is six of one and a half dozen of the other.

Private Members' Business

Once in power, as I was saying, the Conservatives went back on their word, rejected our Bill C-357 on an independent fund and preferred to let the money that belongs to the unemployed accumulate in the coffers of the big banks. They are taking from the poor and giving to the rich. That is a very familiar story from medieval times: what we have here is the Sheriff of Nottingham's gang.

•(1405)

They are right here. Here they are, doing absolutely nothing to respond to this very scandalous situation.

Employment insurance is no longer an assistance program, but rather a hidden tax.

Under the Liberals, the employment insurance fund was used to balance the budget. Although the Conservatives voted in favour of an independent fund, the surpluses generated remain in the consolidated fund and are used for other purposes besides providing help to those who need it when they find themselves in the vulnerable position of having lost their jobs. They are most definitely entitled, since they paid into it.

The Auditor General's report of November 23, 2004, reported that the government continued to plunder the employment insurance fund, despite the will of parliamentarians—we keep doing the same thing—and that the powers of the Employment Insurance Commission, whose membership includes contributors, would apparently be suspended for yet another year—and that is still the case. How is it that a government, a political party, once in power, could become such a bully towards those who pay into a fund that should be theirs—it should belong to the workers—and that should not be used to serve the ideological ends of the party in power?

The Conservatives voted at second reading against the idea of improving the employment insurance system through Bill C-269 proposed by the Bloc Québécois, and that shows the true colours of this government.

The 2006 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report indicates that 44.8% of the unemployed have access to the system even though 100% of them paid premiums. Not only did they pay into the fund, but so did the employers. The federal government did not contribute a single nickel and it does what it wants with this money. That is outrageous.

The Bloc Québécois tried to have the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities adopt a report in February 2005 on the reform of employment insurance and continues to call for its implementation.

The Bloc Québécois is speaking out again against the looting of the fund and proposes concrete action such as: creating an independent fund and employment insurance commission, making the government repay the misused funds, having the Employment

Insurance Commission set the premiums, and improving the system's coverage for workers in vulnerable situations.

Over the past two years, the Bloc Québécois has worked tirelessly to improve the system.

Employment insurance contributions are currently being used as a tax, not a contribution. That is unacceptable. The Bloc Québécois believes that we must clear up this misunderstanding and return the system to its original purpose, which was to insure workers who lose their jobs, not to tax work.

We have to think of the different kinds of people who collect employment insurance. I am thinking of the workers in my riding, in the Gatineau region, in the greater Outaouais region. Right now, jobs are being lost in paper mills and in forestry. The Minister of Labour, who is from the Pontiac region, should understand these sectors. I understand the paper mill workers who suddenly find themselves jobless because of downsizing.

We do not have adequate programs to help older workers from these mills, especially if they live in the city, as is the case in my riding. We do not have specific programs to help them bridge the gap between their years of seniority and retirement, when retirement is just a few years away.

Right now, the government could not care less about workers in vulnerable sectors, such as manufacturing and forestry, not to mention Ontarians working in the auto sector and the economic slump they are about to face.

•(1410)

The government says that there are more jobs today and less unemployment. But look at how poorly the new jobs are paid compared to those that have been lost.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Resuming debate.

Given that no members have risen to join the debate, pursuant to the Speaker's ruling of October 17, 2007, the Speaker will not put the question on the motion for third reading because the bill requires royal recommendation and royal recommendation has not been granted.

[*English*]

Accordingly, the order for third reading is discharged and the item is dropped from the order paper.

(Order discharged and bill withdrawn)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): It being 2:12 p.m., this House stands adjourned until next Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:12 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. MICHAEL IGNATIEFF

MR. JAMES MOORE

MR. JOE PRESTON

HON. KAREN REDMAN

HON. PETER VAN LOAN

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Thirty Nine Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Hon. Jim, Parliamentary Secretary for Canadian Heritage..	Kootenay—Columbia.....	British Columbia	CPC
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane, Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)	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 of Natural Resources and 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 Foreign Affairs	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 for Status of Women	Beauport—Limoilou	Québec	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	Québec	BQ
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CPC
Brisson, 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	Ind.
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	CPC
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 for 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
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	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Goodyear, Gary	Cambridge	Ontario	CPC
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la- Chaudière	Québec	CPC
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
Guimond, Michel	Montmorency—Charlevoix— Haute-Côte-Nord	Québec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Edmonton Centre	Alberta	CPC
Hearn, Hon. Loyola, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	Newfoundland and Labrador	CPC
Hiebert, Russ, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	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, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	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	Ind.
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, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	Ontario	CPC
Lavallée, Carole	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Québec	BQ
Layton, Hon. Jack	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	NDP
Lebel, Denis	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	Québec	CPC
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	New Brunswick	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lemay, Marc	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	Québec	BQ
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Ontario	CPC
Lessard, Yves	Chambly—Borduas	Québec	BQ
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 National Defence 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 Finance	Macleod	Alberta	CPC
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 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
Mulcair, Thomas	Outremont	Québec	NDP
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 Revenue	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	Ontario	CPC
Obhrai, Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Calgary East	Alberta	CPC
Oda, Hon. Bev, Minister of International Cooperation	Durham	Ontario	CPC
Ouellet, Christian	Brome—Missisquoi	Québec	BQ
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Québec	Lib.
Pallister, Brian, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Minister of International Cooperation	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
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 Industry	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, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board	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
Russell, Todd	Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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	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—Kapusking	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 Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	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.
Thi Lac, Ève-Mary Thai	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Québec	BQ
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, Mervin	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 Canadian Heritage, Status of Women 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	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River.....	Saskatchewan	
VACANCY	Toronto Centre	Ontario	
VACANCY	Willowdale	Ontario	
VACANCY	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Thirty Nine Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (28)		
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane, Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)	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, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	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 Finance	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 Industry	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 (35)		
Abbott, Hon. Jim, Parliamentary Secretary for 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
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Day, Hon. Stockwell, Minister of Public Safety	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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 Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	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 for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Priddy, Penny	Surrey North	NDP
Savoie, Denise	Victoria	NDP
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Strahl, Hon. Chuck, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	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.
VACANCY	Vancouver Quadra	
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 for 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, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Minister of International Cooperation	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, Mervin	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	Ind.
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark.....	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	South Shore—St. Margaret's	CPC
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of National Defence 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 (104)		
Albrecht, Harold.....	Kitchener—Conestoga	CPC
Alghabra, Omar.....	Mississauga—Erindale.....	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	CPC
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	CPC
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
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	Ind.
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	CPC
Lauzon, Guy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Layton, Hon. Jack	Toronto—Danforth	NDP
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages	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 Revenue	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	CPC
Oda, Hon. Bev, Minister of International Cooperation	Durham	CPC
Pearson, Glen	London North Centre	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.
Shipley, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	CPC
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Lib.
St. Amand, Lloyd	Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking	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.
VACANCY.....	Toronto Centre.....	
VACANCY.....	Willowdale.....	

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 (75)

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 Foreign Affairs.....	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 for Status of Women.....	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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Freeman, Carole	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	BQ
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gaudet, Roger	Montcalm	BQ
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	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
Lebel, Denis	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	CPC
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
Mulcair, Thomas	Outremont	NDP
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
Thi Lac, Ève-Mary Thai	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Thibault, Louise	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	Ind.
Verner, Hon. Josée, Minister of Canadian Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages	Louis-Saint-Laurent	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Vincent, Robert	Shefford	BQ
SASKATCHEWAN (13)		
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and 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.....	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
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board.....	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CPC
Scheer, Andrew, The Acting Speaker	Regina—Qu'Appelle	CPC
Skelton, Hon. Carol	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
VACANCY	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River .	
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Hon. Larry	Yukon.....	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of November 30, 2007 — 2nd Session, 39th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Barry Devolin

Vice-Chairs:

Jean Crowder
Nancy Karetak-Lindell

Harold Albrecht
Rod Bruinooge
Tina Keeper

Marc Lemay
Yvon Lévesque

Anita Neville
Todd Russell

Brian Storseth
Chris Warkentin

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Gérard Asselin
Larry Bagnell
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi

Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
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
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy

Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Tony Martin
Colin Mayes
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
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Chair:

Paul Szabo

Vice-Chairs:
Pat Martin
David TilsonG rard Asselin
Dean Del Mastro
Sukh DhaliwalRuss Hiebert
Charles HubbardCarole Lavall e
Glen PearsonDave Van Kesteren
Mike Wallace

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
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
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
Paul Cr teJohn Cummins
Patricia Davidson
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
Monique Guay
Michel Guimond
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy KampGerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel PetitPauline Picard
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Penny Priddy
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Maurice Vellacott
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Gary Schellenberger

Vice-Chairs:

Mauril Bélanger
Maria Mourani

Jim Abbott
Dave Batters
Gord Brown

Ed Fast
Hedy Fry

Luc Malo
Francis Scarpaleggia

Andy Scott
Bill Siksay

(12)

Associate Members

Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Alex Atamanenko
Vivian Barbot
Colleen Beaumier
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Joe Comuzzi
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson

Libby Davies
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Wajid Khan

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Rick Lebel
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
Richard Nadeau
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Glen Pearson
Daniel Petit

Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Pablo Rodriguez
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Norman Doyle

Vice-Chairs: Meili Faille
Andrew Telegdi

Dave Batters
Colleen Beaumier
Maurizio Bevilacqua

Robert Carrier
Olivia Chow

Nina Grewal
Jim Karygiannis

Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Don Bell
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Dawn Black
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson

Libby Davies
Dean Del Mastro
Johanne Deschamps
Barry Devolin
Sukh Dhaliwal
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake

Francine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
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
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Penny Priddy

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Lui Temelkovski
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Blair Wilson
Lynne Yelich

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Bob Mills

Vice-Chairs:
Bernard Bigras
Geoff ReganNathan Cullen
John Godfrey
Luc HarveyMarcel Lussier
David McGuintyFrancis Scarpaleggia
Maurice VellacottMark Warawa
Jeff Watson

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paule Brunelle
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
Jean Crowder
John Cummins

Patricia Davidson
Claude DeBellefeuille
Dean Del Mastro
Barry 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
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Susan Kadis
Randy Kamp
Jim Karygiannis
Gerald Keddy

Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
James Moore
Rob Moore
Thomas Mulcair
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Christian Ouellet
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Anthony Rota
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Lloyd St. Amand
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Chris Warkentin
John Williams
Blair Wilson
Lynne Yelich

FINANCE**Chair:**

Rob Merrifield

Vice-Chairs:Paul Crête
Massimo PacettiDean Del Mastro
Rick Dykstra
John McCallumJohn McKay
Ted MenziesThomas Mulcair
Thierry St-CyrGarth Turner
Mike Wallace

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Navdeep Bains
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Robert Bouchard
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Joe Comuzzi
Jean CrowderJohn Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Barry Devolin
Sukh Dhaliwal
Norman Doyle
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
John Godfrey
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald KeddyWajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Gurbax Malhi
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott ReidLee Richardson
Anthony Rota
Michael Savage
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Lui Temelkovski
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Blair Wilson
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS**Chair:**

Fabian Manning

Vice-Chairs:Raynald Blais
Bill MatthewsMike Allen
Gerry Byrne
Blaine CalkinsRandy Kamp
Gerald KeddyYvon Lévesque
Lawrence MacAulayScott Simms
Peter Stoffer

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Robert Carrier
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi
Paul Crête
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Rodger CuznerPatricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Wayne Easter
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Wajid Khan
Ed KomarnickiDaryl Kramp
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
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 ReidLee Richardson
Todd Russell
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Paul Steckle
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Roger Valley
Dave Van Kesteren
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:
Vivian Barbot
Bryon WilfertRaymond Chan
Paul Dewar
Peter GoldringWajid Khan
Denis LebelKeith Martin
Deepak ObhraiBernard Patry
Caroline St-Hilaire

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Harold Albrecht
 Mike Allen
 Dean Allison
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Claude Bachand
 Larry Bagnell
 Navdeep Bains
 Dave Batters
 Colleen Beaumier
 Leon Benoit
 James Bezan
 Dawn Black
 Steven Blaney
 Sylvie Boucher
 Diane Bourgeois
 Garry Breitzkreuz
 Bonnie Brown
 Gord Brown
 Patrick Brown
 Rod Bruinooge
 Blaine Calkins
 Ron Cannan
 Serge Cardin
 Colin Carrie
 Rick Casson
 Michael Chong
 Joe Comartin
 Joe Comuzzi
 Irwin Cotler
 John Cummins

Patricia Davidson
 Dean Del Mastro
 Johanne Deschamps
 Barry Devolin
 Sukh Dhaliwal
 Norman Doyle
 Rick Dykstra
 Ken Epp
 Mark Eyking
 Ed Fast
 Brian Fitzpatrick
 Steven Fletcher
 Raymonde Folco
 Cheryl Gallant
 John Godfrey
 Gary Goodyear
 Jacques Gourde
 Nina Grewal
 Art Hanger
 Richard Harris
 Luc Harvey
 Laurie Hawn
 Russ Hiebert
 Betty Hinton
 Michael Ignatieff
 Rahim Jaffer
 Brian Jean
 Peter Julian
 Randy Kamp
 Jim Karygiannis
 Gerald Keddy

Ed Komarnicki
 Daryl Kramp
 Mike Lake
 Francine Lalonde
 Guy Lauzon
 Jack Layton
 Pierre Lemieux
 Tom Lukiwski
 James Lunney
 Dave MacKenzie
 Gurbax Malhi
 Fabian Manning
 Inky Mark
 Wayne Marston
 Brian Masse
 Colin Mayes
 Alexa McDonough
 John McKay
 Ted Menzies
 Rob Merrifield
 Larry Miller
 Bob Mills
 Maria Minna
 James Moore
 Rob Moore
 Richard Nadeau
 Anita Neville
 Rick Norlock
 Brian Pallister
 Glen Pearson
 Daniel Petit

Pierre Poilievre
 Joe Preston
 James Rajotte
 Scott Reid
 Lee Richardson
 Anthony Rota
 Michael Savage
 Gary Schellenberger
 Bev Shipley
 Bill Siksay
 Mario Silva
 Raymond Simard
 Carol Skelton
 Joy Smith
 Bruce Stanton
 Brian Storseth
 David Sweet
 Myron Thompson
 David Tilson
 Alan Tonks
 Bradley Trost
 Mervin Tweed
 Dave Van Kesteren
 Maurice Vellacott
 Mike Wallace
 Mark Warawa
 Chris Warkentin
 Jeff Watson
 John Williams
 Borys Wrzesnewskyj
 Lynne Yelich

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:

Diane Marleau

Vice-Chairs:Charlie Angus
Daryl KrampHarold Albrecht
Raymond Bonin
Diane BourgeoisPatrick Brown
Mark HollandJames Moore
Richard NadeauMario Silva
Chris Warkentin

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Joe Comuzzi
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
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Jean-Yves Laforest
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Marcel Lussier
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
Rob Moore
Thomas Mulcair
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Massimo Pacetti
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Geoff Regan
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Judy Wasylycia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HEALTH**Chair:**

Joy Smith

Vice-Chairs:Christiane Gagnon
Lui TemelkovskiCarolyn Bennett
Patrick Brown
Patricia DavidsonSteven Fletcher
Susan KadisLuc Malo
Robert ThibaultDavid Tilson
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Bill Blaikie
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Rodger CuznerDean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Raymond Gravel
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Wajid KhanEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
John Maloney
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Brian Masse
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
Maria Minna
James Moore
Rob Moore
Brian Murphy
Rick Norlock
Deepak ObhraiBrian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Penny Priddy
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HUMAN RESOURCES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:

Dean Allison

Vice-Chairs:
Yves Lessard
Michael SavageFrance Bonsant
Michael Chong
Rodger CuznerRuby Dhalla
Jacques GourdeMike Lake
Tony MartinJudy Sgro
Lynne Yelich

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Olivia Chow
David Christopherson
Joe Comuzzi
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies

Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Raymonde Folco
Hedy Fry
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Raymond Gravel
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Guy Lauzon
Carole Lavallée
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
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
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Todd Russell
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Scott Simms
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Thierry St-Cyr
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylycia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: James Rajotte

Vice-Chairs:

Paule Brunelle
Dan McTeague

André Arthur
Scott Brison
Colin Carrie

Mark Eyking
Peggy Nash

Raymond Simard
Bruce Stanton

Dave Van Kesteren
Robert Vincent

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rona Ambrose
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Gérard Asselin
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
Gerry Byrne
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Serge Cardin
Robert Carrier
Rick Casson
Raymond Chan
Michael Chong
David Christopherson

Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
Jean Crowder
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Claude DeBellefeuille
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Hedy Fry
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Jean-Yves Laforest
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Dominic LeBlanc
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Tony Martin
Brian Masse
Colin Mayes
John McCallum
Joe McGuire
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Brian Murphy
Rick Norlock

Deepak Obhrai
Massimo Pacetti
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Geoff Regan
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Anthony Rota
Jean-Yves Roy
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair: Lee Richardson

Vice-Chairs: Serge Cardin
John Maloney

Dean Allison
Guy André
Navdeep Bains

Ron Cannan
Sukh Dhaliwal

Peter Julian
Larry Miller

Brian Pallister
Lui Temelkovski

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Don Bell
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paule Brunelle
Blaine Calkins
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Raymond Chan
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro

Barry Devolin
Paul Dewar
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Wayne Easter
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
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Francine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Dominic LeBlanc
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
John McCallum
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Thomas Mulcair
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre

Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Geoff Regan
Scott Reid
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Raymond Simard
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
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:	Réal Ménard Brian Murphy	
Larry Bagnell Blaine Calkins Joe Comartin	Rick Dykstra Carole Freeman	Marlene Jennings Derek Lee	Rob Moore Daniel Petit	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Libby Davies	Mike Lake	Penny Priddy
Harold Albrecht	Dean Del Mastro	Guy Lauzon	James Rajotte
Mike Allen	Barry Devolin	Carole Lavallée	Scott Reid
Dean Allison	Sukh Dhaliwal	Denis Lebel	Lee Richardson
Rob Anders	Norman Doyle	Pierre Lemieux	Gary Schellenberger
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Tom Lukiwski	Bev Shipley
Vivian Barbot	Ed Fast	James Lunney	Bill Siksay
Sue Barnes	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dave MacKenzie	Carol Skelton
Dave Batters	Steven Fletcher	John Maloney	Joy Smith
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Fabian Manning	Kevin Sorenson
James Bezan	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Lloyd St. Amand
Bill Blaikie	Gary Goodyear	Wayne Marston	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Jacques Gourde	Colin Mayes	Brian Storseth
Sylvie Boucher	Nina Grewal	John McKay	David Sweet
Garry Breitzkreuz	Richard Harris	Serge Ménard	Myron Thompson
Bonnie Brown	Luc Harvey	Ted Menzies	David Tilson
Gord Brown	Laurie Hawn	Rob Merrifield	Bradley Trost
Patrick Brown	Russ Hiebert	Larry Miller	Mervin Tweed
Rod Bruinooge	Betty Hinton	Bob Mills	Dave Van Kesteren
Ron Cannan	Rahim Jaffer	James Moore	Maurice Vellacott
Colin Carrie	Brian Jean	Anita Neville	Mike Wallace
Rick Casson	Randy Kamp	Rick Norlock	Mark Warawa
Michael Chong	Gerald Keddy	Deepak Obhrai	Chris Warkentin
Joe Comuzzi	Wajid Khan	Brian Pallister	Jeff Watson
Irwin Cotler	Ed Komarnicki	Pierre Poilievre	John Williams
John Cummins	Daryl Kramp	Joe Preston	Lynne Yelich
Patricia Davidson			

LIAISON

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	Yasmin Ratansi	
Rob Anders	Rick Casson	Fabian Manning	Lee Richardson	(26)
Leon Benoit	Barry Devolin	Diane Marleau	Gary Schellenberger	
James Bezan	Norman Doyle	Rob Merrifield	Joy Smith	
Steven Blaney	Gary Goodyear	Bob Mills	Kevin Sorenson	
Garry Breitkreuz	Art Hanger	Shawn Murphy	Paul Szabo	
Blaine Calkins	Derek Lee	James Rajotte	Mervin Tweed	

Associate Members

Charlie Angus	Paul Crête	Yves Lessard	Pablo Rodriguez
Claude Bachand	Jean Crowder	John Maloney	Michael Savage
Vivian Barbot	Roy Cullen	Pat Martin	Lloyd St. Amand
Mauril Bélanger	Patricia Davidson	Irene Mathysen	Brent St. Denis
Catherine Bell	Ken Epp	Bill Matthews	Paul Steckle
André Bellavance	Meili Faille	Dan McTeague	Peter Stoffer
Carolyn Bennett	Christiane Gagnon	Réal Ménard	David Sweet
Bernard Bigras	Yvon Godin	Maria Mourani	Andrew Telegdi
Raynald Blais	Michel Guimond	Brian Murphy	Lui Temelkovski
Paule Brunelle	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Massimo Pacetti	David Tilson
John Cannis	Daryl Kramp	Penny Priddy	Joseph Volpe
Serge Cardin	Jean-Yves Laforest	Marcel Proulx	Bryon Wilfert
David Christopherson	Mario Laframboise	Geoff Regan	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	Yasmin Ratansi	
Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Paul Szabo	Mervin Tweed	(7)
Diane Marleau				

NATIONAL DEFENCE**Chair:**

Rick Casson

Vice-Chairs:Claude Bachand
John CannisDawn Black
Steven Blaney
Robert BouchardDenis Coderre
Cheryl GallantLaurie Hawn
James LunneyJoe McGuire
Anthony Rota

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Larry Bagnell
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Colleen Beaumier
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Bernard Bigras
Bill Blaikie
Sylvie Boucher
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Robert Carrier
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi
John CumminsPatricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Johanne Deschamps
Barry Devolin
Ujjal Dosanjh
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl KrampMario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Francine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Dominic LeBlanc
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Gilles-A. Perron
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James RajotteScott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Scott Simms
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Alan Tonks
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Lynne Yelich

NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:

Leon Benoit

Vice-Chairs:
Catherine Bell
Lloyd St. AmandOmar Alghabra
Mike Allen
David AndersonKen Boshcoff
Claude DeBellefeuilleRichard Harris
Christian OuelletAlan Tonks
Bradley Trost

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Bernard Bigras
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi
Paul Crête
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
John CumminsPatricia 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
Art Hanger
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid KhanEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Marcel Lussier
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe PrestonJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Scott Simms
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Mervin Tweed
Roger Valley
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:	Steven Blaney	Vice-Chairs:	Yvon Godin Pablo Rodriguez	
Mauril Bélanger Michael Chong Jean-Claude D'Amours	Raymonde Folco Raymond Gravel	Luc Harvey Pierre Lemieux	Richard Nadeau Daniel Petit	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Barry Devolin	Daryl Kramp	Geoff Regan
Harold Albrecht	Norman Doyle	Mike Lake	Scott Reid
Mike Allen	Rick Dykstra	Guy Lauzon	Lee Richardson
Dean Allison	Ken Epp	Jack Layton	Denise Savoie
Rob Anders	Ed Fast	Denis Lebel	Gary Schellenberger
David Anderson	Brian Fitzpatrick	Tom Lukiwski	Bev Shipley
Alex Atamanenko	Steven Fletcher	James Lunney	Carol Skelton
Vivian Barbot	Cheryl Gallant	Dave MacKenzie	Joy Smith
Dave Batters	Peter Goldring	Fabian Manning	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Gary Goodyear	Inky Mark	Bruce Stanton
James Bezan	Jacques Gourde	Colin Mayes	Brian Storseth
Sylvie Boucher	Nina Grewal	Alexa McDonough	David Sweet
Garry Breitzkreuz	Art Hanger	Ted Menzies	Myron Thompson
Gord Brown	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	David Tilson
Patrick Brown	Laurie Hawn	Larry Miller	Bradley Trost
Rod Bruinooge	Russ Hiebert	Bob Mills	Mervin Tweed
Blaine Calkins	Betty Hinton	James Moore	Dave Van Kesteren
Ron Cannan	Rahim Jaffer	Rob Moore	Maurice Vellacott
Colin Carrie	Brian Jean	Maria Mourani	Mike Wallace
Rick Casson	Peter Julian	Rick Norlock	Mark Warawa
Joe Comartin	Randy Kamp	Deepak Obhrai	Chris Warkentin
Joe Comuzzi	Gerald Keddy	Brian Pallister	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
John Cummins	Wajid Khan	Pierre Poilievre	Jeff Watson
Patricia Davidson	Ed Komarnicki	Joe Preston	John Williams
Dean Del Mastro	Maka Kotto	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Gary Goodyear	Vice-Chairs:	Michel Guimond Marcel Proulx	
Yvon Godin Dominic LeBlanc Pierre Lemieux	Tom Lukiwski Pauline Picard	Joe Preston Karen Redman	Scott Reid Lucienne Robillard	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Cummins	Wajid Khan	Pierre Poilievre
Harold Albrecht	Patricia Davidson	Ed Komarnicki	James Rajotte
Mike Allen	Libby Davies	Daryl Kramp	Lee Richardson
Dean Allison	Dean Del Mastro	Mike Lake	Gary Schellenberger
Rob Anders	Barry Devolin	Guy Lauzon	Bev Shipley
David Anderson	Norman Doyle	Denis Lebel	Raymond Simard
Charlie Angus	Rick Dykstra	Derek Lee	Carol Skelton
G�rard Asselin	Ken Epp	James Lunney	Joy Smith
Dave Batters	Ed Fast	Dave MacKenzie	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Brian Fitzpatrick	Fabian Manning	Bruce Stanton
James Bezan	Steven Fletcher	Inky Mark	Brian Storseth
Bill Blaikie	Cheryl Gallant	Colin Mayes	David Sweet
Steven Blaney	Peter Goldring	R�al M�nard	Paul Szabo
Sylvie Boucher	Jacques Gourde	Ted Menzies	Myron Thompson
Garry Breitkreuz	Nina Grewal	Rob Merrifield	David Tilson
Gord Brown	Monique Guay	Larry Miller	Bradley Trost
Patrick Brown	Art Hanger	Bob Mills	Mervin Tweed
Rod Bruinooge	Richard Harris	James Moore	Dave Van Kesteren
Blaine Calkins	Luc Harvey	Rob Moore	Maurice Vellacott
Ron Cannan	Laurie Hawn	Brian Murphy	Mike Wallace
Colin Carrie	Russ Hiebert	Shawn Murphy	Mark Warawa
Rick Casson	Betty Hinton	Rick Norlock	Chris Warkentin
Chris Charlton	Rahim Jaffer	Deepak Obhrai	Jeff Watson
Michael Chong	Brian Jean	Brian Pallister	John Williams
Joe Comartin	Randy Kamp	Pierre Paquette	Lynne Yelich
Joe Comuzzi	Gerald Keddy	Daniel Petit	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Chair:	Scott Reid	Vice-Chair:		
Chris Charlton	Gary Goodyear	Dominic LeBlanc	Pauline Picard	(5)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Joe Preston	Vice-Chair:		
Chris Charlton	Derek Lee	Pauline Picard	Scott Reid	(5)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:** Shawn Murphy**Vice-Chairs:**Jean-Yves Laforest
David SweetDavid Christopherson
Brian Fitzpatrick
Mark HollandCharles Hubbard
Mike LakeMarcel Lussier
Pierre PoilievreJohn Williams
Borys Wrzesnewskyj

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Omar Alghabra
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Ken Boshcoff
Sylvie Boucher
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi
John CumminsPatricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid KhanEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Rick Lebel
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
Thomas Mulcair
Richard Nadeau
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian PallisterDaniel Petit
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
Lynne Yelich

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:

Garry Breitkreuz

Vice-Chairs:Roy Cullen
Penny PriddySue Barnes
Bonnie Brown
Gord BrownUjjal Dosanjh
Dave MacKenzieColin Mayes
Serge MénardRick Norlock
Ève-Mary Thaï Thi Lac

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Omar Alghabra
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
Rick Casson
Raymond Chan
Michael Chong
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro

Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Carole Freeman
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Derek Lee
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Alexa McDonough
Réal Ménard
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Bev Oda
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Lynne Yelich

STATUS OF WOMEN**Chair:**

Yasmin Ratansi

Vice-Chairs:Patricia Davidson
Irene MathysenSylvie Boucher
Nicole Demers
Nina GrewalInky Mark
Maria MinnaAnita Neville
Glen PearsonBruce Stanton
Ève-Mary Thaï Thi Lac

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Dawn Black
Steven Blaney
France Bonsant
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Michael Chong
Olivia Chow
Joe Comuzzi
Jean CrowderJohn Cummins
Libby Davies
Dean Del Mastro
Johanne Deschamps
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Nancy Karetak-LindellGerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel PetitPierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Penny Priddy
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

Chair:

Mervin Tweed

Vice-Chairs:Mario Laframboise
Joseph VolpeDon Bell
Robert Carrier
Ed FastBrian Jean
John MaloneyBrian Masse
Bev ShipleyJeff Watson
Paul Zed

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Harold Albrecht
 Mike Allen
 Dean Allison
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Vivian Barbot
 Dave Batters
 Leon Benoit
 Dennis Bevington
 James Bezan
 Steven Blaney
 Sylvie Boucher
 Garry Breitzkreuz
 Gord Brown
 Patrick Brown
 Rod Bruinooge
 Blaine Calkins
 Ron Cannan
 Colin Carrie
 Rick Casson
 Michael Chong
 Olivia Chow
 Joe Comartin
 Joe Comuzzi
 Paul Crête

John Cummins
 Patricia Davidson
 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
 Art Hanger
 Richard Harris
 Luc Harvey
 Laurie Hawn
 Russ Hiebert
 Betty Hinton
 Rahim Jaffer
 Peter Julian
 Randy Kamp
 Gerald Keddy
 Wajid Khan

Ed Komarnicki
 Daryl Kramp
 Mike Lake
 Guy Lauzon
 Denis Lebel
 Pierre Lemieux
 Tom Lukiwski
 James Lunney
 Dave MacKenzie
 Fabian Manning
 Inky Mark
 Colin Mayes
 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

Geoff Regan
 Scott Reid
 Lee Richardson
 Todd Russell
 Denise Savoie
 Gary Schellenberger
 Carol Skelton
 Joy Smith
 Kevin Sorenson
 Bruce Stanton
 Peter Stoffer
 Brian Storseth
 David Sweet
 Myron Thompson
 David Tilson
 Alan Tonks
 Bradley Trost
 Dave Van Kesteren
 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 StofferRon Cannan
Roger Gaudet
Albina GuarnieriBetty Hinton
Gilles-A. PerronTodd Russell
Bev ShipleyDavid Sweet
Roger Valley

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
David Anderson
Claude Bachand
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Dawn Black
Bill Blaikie
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del MastroBarry 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
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid KhanEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Tony Martin
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Glen PearsonDaniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Blaine Calkins
Marilyn Trenholme Counsell

Joint Vice-Chair: Carolyn Bennett

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Jean Lapointe
Lowell Murray

Donald Oliver
William Rompkey

Mike Allen
G rard Asselin
Gerry Byrne
Ken Dryden
Cheryl Gallant

Peter Goldring
Gurbax Malhi
Fabian Manning
Louis Plamondon
Denise Savoie

(17)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle

Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Maka Kotto
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Maria Mourani
Richard Nadeau
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Glen Pearson
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: J. Eyton
Derek Lee

Joint Vice-Chairs: David Christopherson
Ken Epp

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron
John Bryden
Joan Cook
Mac Harb

Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin
Gerry St. Germain

Sue Barnes
Carole Freeman
Monique Guay
Rahim Jaffer
Denis Lebel

Rick Norlock
Pierre Poilievre
Paul Szabo
Tom Wappel

(20)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson

Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
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
Betty Hinton
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Réal Ménard
Serge Ménard
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

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

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 Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Gary Lunn	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Peter MacKay	Minister of National Defence and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Stockwell Day	Minister of Public Safety
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 Revenue
Hon. Bev Oda	Minister of International Cooperation
Hon. Jim Prentice	Minister of Industry
Hon. John Baird	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Maxime Bernier	Minister of Foreign Affairs
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 Canadian Heritage, Status of Women 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. Gerry Ritz	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
Hon. Jay Hill	Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip
Hon. Jason Kenney	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism and Canadian Identity)
Hon. Helena Guergis	Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport)
Hon. Christian Paradis	Secretary of State (Agriculture)
Hon. Diane Ablonczy	Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher	to the Prime Minister and for Status of Women
Mr. Rob Moore	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Mr. Brian Pallister	to the Minister of International Trade and to the Minister of International Cooperation
Mr. James Moore	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Mrs. Betty Hinton	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mrs. Lynne Yelich	to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development
Mr. Rod Bruinoooge	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Mr. David Anderson	to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board
Mr. Laurie Hawn	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Gerald Keddy	to the Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
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. Russ Hiebert	to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
Mr. Ed Komarnicki	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Mark Warawa	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Brian Jean	to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Mr. Steven Fletcher	for Health
Mr. Guy Lauzon	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario
Mr. Ted Menzies	to the Minister of Finance
Hon. Jim Abbott	for Canadian Heritage
Mr. Pierre Lemieux	for Official Languages
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform

CONTENTS

Friday, November 30, 2007

Criminal Code

(Bill C-376. On the Order. Private Members' Bills:)	1569
Mr. Lukiwski	1569
Motion	1569
(Order discharged and bill withdrawn)	1569

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget and Economic Statement Implementation Act, 2007

Bill C-28. Second reading	1569
Mr. Wilfert	1569
Mr. Epp	1571
Mr. Hubbard	1571
Mr. Stanton	1572
Mrs. Mathyssen	1573
Mr. Hubbard	1573
Mr. André	1573
Mr. Dewar	1574
Mr. McCallum (Markham—Unionville)	1575
Ms. Fry	1575

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Retirement Wishes

Mrs. Gallant	1577
--------------	------

Wabano Drum Group

Mr. Bélanger	1577
--------------	------

Hog Industry

Mr. Gaudet	1577
------------	------

Autism

Mr. Stoffer	1577
-------------	------

Infrastructure

Mr. Del Mastro	1578
----------------	------

Willie O'Ree Place

Mr. Scott	1578
-----------	------

Canada-U.S. Border

Mrs. Davidson	1578
---------------	------

Violence Awareness Campaign

Mr. Gravel	1578
------------	------

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Obhrai	1578
------------	------

Canadian Health Network

Mr. Regan	1579
-----------	------

Status of Women

Mrs. Boucher	1579
--------------	------

Status of Women

Mrs. Mathyssen	1579
----------------	------

World AIDS Day

Ms. Folco	1579
-----------	------

2010 Quebec Summer Games in Gatineau

Mr. Laframboise	1580
-----------------	------

International Aid

Ms. Fry	1580
---------	------

Infrastructure

Mr. Poilievre	1580
---------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Wireless Industry

Mr. LeBlanc	1580
Mr. Van Loan	1580
Mr. LeBlanc	1580
Mr. Van Loan	1581
Mr. LeBlanc	1581
Mr. Van Loan	1581

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Alghabra	1581
Mr. Van Loan	1581
Mr. Alghabra	1581
Mr. Van Loan	1581

Forestry Industry

Ms. Guay	1581
Mr. Cannon	1581
Ms. Guay	1582
Mr. Cannon	1582
Ms. Picard	1582
Mr. Cannon	1582
Ms. Picard	1582
Mr. Cannon	1582

Nuclear Energy

Mr. Layton	1582
Mr. Lunn	1582
Mr. Layton	1582
Mr. Lunn	1583

Lobbyists

Mr. Thibault (West Nova)	1583
Mr. Moore (Fundy Royal)	1583
Mr. Thibault (West Nova)	1583
Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	1583

Ethics

Ms. Sgro	1583
Mr. Van Loan	1583
Ms. Sgro	1583
Mr. Van Loan	1583

The Environment

Mr. Bigras	1583
Mr. Warawa	1584

Natural Resources

Mrs. DeBellefeuille	1584
---------------------	------

Mr. Lunn	1584	Justice	
Citizenship and Immigration		Mr. Stanton	1588
Ms. Faille	1584	Mr. Moore (Fundy Royal)	1588
Mr. Komarnicki	1584	Federal Government Research Centres	
Ms. Faille	1584	Mr. Nadeau	1588
Mr. Komarnicki	1584	Mr. Cannon	1589
Airbus		Points of Order	
Mrs. Redman	1584	Oral Questions	
Mr. Moore (Fundy Royal)	1584	Ms. Fry	1589
Mrs. Redman	1584	Ms. Davies	1589
Mr. Moore (Fundy Royal)	1584	Mr. Lukiwski	1589
Infrastructure			
Mr. Zed	1585		
Mr. Cannon	1585		
Mr. Zed	1585		
Mr. Cannon	1585		
Poverty			
Mr. Sweet	1585		
Mrs. Yelich	1585		
Afghanistan			
Mr. Dewar	1585		
Mr. Obhrai	1585		
Mr. Dewar	1585		
Mr. Obhrai	1586		
The Environment			
Mr. McGuinty	1586		
Mr. Warawa	1586		
Mr. McGuinty	1586		
Mr. Warawa	1586		
Forestry Industry			
Mr. Proulx	1586		
Mr. Lunn	1586		
Mr. Proulx	1586		
Mr. Lunn	1586		
Firearms			
Mr. Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)	1587		
Mr. MacKenzie	1587		
Mr. Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin)	1587		
Mr. MacKenzie	1587		
Justice			
Mr. Silva	1587		
Mr. Moore (Fundy Royal)	1587		
Nuclear Energy			
Mr. Kramp	1587		
Mr. Lunn	1587		
Veterans Affairs			
Mr. Stoffer	1587		
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	1587		
Mr. Stoffer	1588		
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	1588		
National Defence			
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	1588		
Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	1588		
		ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
		Government Response to Petitions	
		Mr. Lukiwski	1589
		Criminal Code	
		Mr. Hubbard	1589
		Bill S-203. First reading	1589
		(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time)	1589
		(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)	1589
		Petitions	
		Age of Consent	
		Mr. Poilievre	1589
		Justice	
		Mr. Benoit	1590
		Property Rights	
		Mr. Allison	1590
		Questions on the Order Paper	
		Mr. Lukiwski	1590
		Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
		Mr. Lukiwski	1591
		Business of Supply	
		Mr. Van Loan	1592
		GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
		Budget and Economic Statement Implementation Act, 2007	
		Bill C-28. Second reading	1593
		Mr. Dewar	1593
		Mr. Stoffer	1594
		Mrs. Redman	1594
		Mr. Stoffer	1596
		Mr. Gravel	1597
		Mr. André	1598
		Mr. André	1598
		Mr. Silva	1599
		Mr. Sweet	1600
		Mr. St-Cyr	1600
		Mrs. Mathysse	1600
		Mr. André	1602
		Mr. Szabo	1602
		Mr. Szabo	1602

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Employment Insurance Act

Bill C-269. Third reading	1603
Mr. Allison	1603
Mr. Simms	1605

Mrs. Mathysen	1606
Mr. Nadeau	1607
(Order discharged and bill withdrawn)	1608

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>**