



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 145 • NUMBER 018 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, March 26, 2010**

—  
**Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken**

## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 26, 2010

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

•(1005)

[*English*]

### GENDER EQUITY IN INDIAN REGISTRATION ACT

**Hon. Stockwell Day (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development)** moved that Bill C-3, An Act to promote gender equity in Indian registration by responding to the Court of Appeal for British Columbia decision in *McIvor v. Canada* (Registrar of Indian and Northern Affairs), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. John Duncan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak to Bill C-3, Gender Equity in Indian Registration Act and explain why I encourage all members of the House to join me in supporting it.

Bill C-3 proposes to accomplish two objectives. First, this legislation would remove a cause of gender discrimination in the Indian Act. Second, it would meet the deadline imposed upon Parliament in a ruling of the Court of Appeal for British Columbia.

My remarks today will describe not only how Bill C-3 achieves these objectives, but also how it would serve the larger national interest.

In last year's decision by the Court of Appeal for B.C. in *McIvor v. Canada*, the court ruled that the two paragraphs in section 6 of the Indian Act discriminate between men and women with respect to registration as an Indian and therefore violate the equality provision of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Rather than have the decision take effect right away, the court suspended the effects of the decision until April 6, 2010, and explicitly called on Parliament to enact an effective legislative solution.

What this means is we have until April 6 to implement a solution and if we fail to meet this deadline a key section of the Indian Act, one that spells out rules related to entitlement to registration also

known as Indian status, will cease to have legal effect in the province of British Columbia.

This will have some significant consequences. As the members of the House will recognize, Indian status is a legal concept that confers a particular set of rights and entitlements. Should the two paragraphs of section 6 cease to have legal effect, it would lead to uncertainty and confusion about entitlements to registration in British Columbia.

The legislation now before us proposes to avert these consequences by amending certain registration provisions of the Indian Act. The bill addresses the root of the problem by removing the language that the court ruled unconstitutional.

I have no doubt that every member of the House stands opposed to discrimination based on gender. Despite this conviction, I expect that all members appreciate that equality between men and women is difficult to achieve at times.

Bill C-3 would take Canada one significant step closer to this important goal and this is what this debate is all about, the ongoing effort to eliminate gender discrimination.

Parliament, of course, has played an important role in taking corrective actions to address this issue. For example, the House endorsed the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which is recognized internationally as a milestone in the fight against discrimination. To understand the origins of the *McIvor* decision we must go back to the 1980s when the charter was first enacted.

The charter required the Government of Canada to amend or rescind federal legislation that caused, aided or abetted discrimination based on gender. A significant effort was undertaken to amend the Indian Act, which clearly discriminated against women.

Perhaps the most egregious example of this discrimination was the Indian Act's treatment of a status Indian who married someone without status. If the status Indian were a woman, she would immediately lose her status. If the status Indian were a man, he would retain his status and furthermore his wife would become entitled to registration.

So these effects were dramatically different of course on their children. Children of a woman who lost status and her non-Indian husband were not entitled to registration, while children of a status man and his non-Indian wife were entitled to registration.

*Government Orders*

A provision in the former Indian Act, which was commonly referred to as the “double mother clause”, discriminated against children whose mother and paternal grandmother gained status upon marriage. These children, born after September 4, 1951, would lose their Indian status at age 21.

In an effort to eliminate these types of discrimination, Parliament endorsed a series of amendments to the Indian Act in 1985. These amendments are still known, colloquially, as Bill C-31 changes, and they remain controversial and lie at the heart of the McIvor ruling at the Court of Appeal for British Columbia.

The problem lies with the mechanisms that Bill C-31 used to rectify gender discrimination related to status entitlement and registration. I will do my best to simplify two of the key amendments from 1985.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** Good luck.

**Mr. John Duncan:** Yes. “Good luck”, somebody just said.

Subsection 6.(1) provided a way for Indian women who had lost status through marriage to regain it and subsection 6.(2) made it possible for the children of these women to be registered.

Although this approach earned the approval of Parliament, and many other groups, subsequent generations were still subject to residual gender discrimination, and that is what was ruled on by the Court of Appeal for British Columbia.

Now, let me provide members with a little history to the court's decision.

Sharon McIvor is an Indian woman who married a non-Indian man before 1985. They had children together. According to the Indian Act, at that time, Ms. McIvor would have lost her status and her children would not be eligible for registration.

Through the amendments to the Indian Act, in 1985, Ms. McIvor was registered in accordance with subsection 6.(1) and her son was registered under subsection 6.(2). When this son had a child with a non-Indian woman, their children were not eligible for registration. This fact formed the basis for Sharon McIvor's arguments in *McIvor v. Canada*: that her descendants were not in the same position to transmit registration to their children as they would be if she were male.

To determine if this constituted bona fide discrimination, the Court of Appeal for British Columbia reviewed the Indian Act's provisions for registration following the Bill C-31 amendments to the Indian Act in 1985. The court specifically examined Ms. McIvor's situation in comparison to that of a brother. It found that the consequences of two successive generations of parenting with non-Indians actually significantly differed in the male and female lines.

While the 1985 amendments in Bill C-31 succeeded in eliminating gender discrimination in the first generation, it failed to eliminate it in subsequent generations. This is the core, essentially, of the court's ruling.

It is important to note that Bill C-3 responds directly to the court's decision by amending certain provisions of section 6 of the Indian

Act. By any measure, this is a progressive and desirable step because it removes an identified cause of gender discrimination.

As a modern nation, Canada champions justice and equality for all. Canadians recognize that discrimination does weaken the fabric of our society and erodes public faith in our justice system. That is why I am pleased to bring forward this legislation identified in the court's decision.

Members of this House have demonstrated over and over again that willingness to address issues related to individual rights. It is something they wish to do. In 2008 Parliament supported the repeal of section 67 of the Canadian Human Rights Act, for example. Section 67 of this act had created an exception so that complaints for people subject to the provisions of the Indian Act could not seek redress under the Canadian Human Rights Act, which was the only exception for Canadians in the act. To rectify this situation, members of the House supported legislation to repeal this section.

● (1010)

Bill C-3 has much in common with the legislation that repealed this section of the Canadian Human Rights Act. Both strive to protect individual rights and promote equality. Putting an end to discrimination against first nations women is advantageous for all Canadians, which is why I am asking members to support this bill.

When speaking about protecting human rights, I would also like to take this opportunity to remind members of the House that this government has been actively seeking to address a legislative gap that undermines our justice system. I am talking about matrimonial real property legislation. I am talking about eliminating the gap that leaves first nations people, most often women and children, vulnerable and without legal protection.

Addressing issues such as gender discrimination in certain registration provisions in the Indian Act, repealing section 67, and filling a legislative gap respecting matrimonial real property will have positive and lasting impacts. For too long aboriginal people have struggled to participate fully in the prosperity of the nation due to a series of obstacles. By removing these obstacles, Canada enables aboriginal people to contribute socially, economically and culturally to this country. Parliament must play its key role in this process.

We should consider the Specific Claims Tribunal Act. The legislation was a crucial component in a larger action plan to resolve another major obstacle to good relations between first nations and the federal government, and that was a backlog of unresolved specific claims. Thanks in part to the House's endorsement of the Specific Claims Tribunal Act, every claim settled brings a first nation one step closer to realizing its full potential.

*Government Orders*

To help achieve similar progress, the government has taken action on a number of issues, from human rights to other basics, such as drinking water, education and housing. A multifaceted and collaborative action plan continues to increase the number of first nation communities with access to safe and reliable supplies of drinking water.

A series of tripartite partnerships with individual provinces and first nation groups continues to generate improvements in on-reserve educational outcomes and the quality of child and family services. The government is acting in collaboration with the people directly affected by the issues at play and Bill C-3 is no exception.

Last year, following a thorough review and analysis of the court's decision, department officials had technical briefings with representatives of five national aboriginal organizations to discuss the decision and Canada's proposed response. Following those briefings, 15 engagement sessions were held throughout the country to present Canada's proposed response to the McIvor decision and solicit feedback.

To help focus the sessions, the Government of Canada researched, published and distributed copies of a discussion paper. Hundreds of participants came to the engagement sessions and many written submissions were received.

We had several common themes emerge during the sessions and in the written submissions. Many people were expressing concerns about the broader issues of registration, membership and citizenship.

Based on the views expressed during this engagement process, we announced broader measures that extend beyond the scope of the bill before us and will be discussed in a separate forum. This will be done in partnership with national aboriginal organizations and will involve the participation of first nations and other aboriginal groups, organizations and individuals at all levels.

The findings of the exploratory process will form the federal government's next steps regarding further initiatives on these issues. As important as all of this work might be, it cannot take precedence over the importance of passing Bill C-3.

•(1015)

We must not lose sight of the fact that the legislation now before us responds to a specific court ruling and prescribed deadline. The ruling and deadline inform the design of Bill C-3. The proposed legislation is a precise, compact and focused response.

As Bill C-3 proceeds through the parliamentary process, the plan is to work in partnership with first nations and other aboriginal groups and organizations to identify and discuss the critical issues surrounding registration, membership and citizenship. This process will be separate from Bill C-3 in recognition of the court's deadline and the importance of acting quickly to address the situation of gender discrimination in the Indian Act.

Bill C-3 is progressive, responsive and measured. It is rooted in the principle that all citizens should be equal before the law.

Bill C-3 represents a timely and appropriate response to the Court of Appeal for British Columbia's ruling. It proposes to eliminate a

cause of unjust discrimination and ensure that Canada's legal system continues to evolve alongside the needs of aboriginal peoples.

I urge all members of the House to join me in supporting Bill C-3.

•(1020)

**Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for his words and for helping to clarify what is a very complex issue.

He did mention in his remarks the timeline that we are facing of April 6, which is only days away and we are only at second reading of this particular bill.

The government had intended to table this bill last fall or when the House came back in late January or early February. How does the member feel prorogation affected the timing?

It is my understanding that the minister or the government has asked the B.C. Court of Appeal for an extension. I may be correct or incorrect on that particular assumption, but has the government asked for extension and, if so, what was the reply?

**Mr. John Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, in terms of the request for an extension from the courts, we did ask for an extension but we have not heard a response.

I did make a commitment in the aboriginal affairs committee that as soon as we received a response I would certainly let the other parties know, although I think it would generally be a matter of public knowledge at that time in any case.

In terms of the timing of getting this bill before Parliament, we are doing quite well. This is our second week here and I have been pressing to get this bill before the House, which I have, and I think we will give it quick passage through second reading and then into committee where we can deal with it.

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, would the parliamentary secretary agree with me that perhaps he should have prefaced his comments with the statement that this House of Commons, this Parliament believes that the Indian Act is a paternalistic, obnoxious instrument of oppression that is unworthy of any western democracy and, in fact, is unworthy of any civilized free society?

I believe that the parliamentary secretary could have prefaced his remarks by recognizing that the social condition and the status of aboriginal people in our culture is perhaps Canada's greatest shame, and that there is and should be a sense of urgency to remedy some of the historic atrocities contained within the Indian Act.

Perhaps he should have acknowledged that the Indian Act was really designed as an instrument, not only of oppression but of extinction. In fact, it had recipes for extinction built into it. For instance, when a 6(1)(a) Indian, they categorized rights as 6, chapter (1) section (a), and a 6, chapter (1), section (c), marry. the results shall have a 6(1)(c) that forfeits their rights. It is not called disenfranchised. It is called enfranchising because they then become full status human beings as non-Indians.

*Government Orders*

I would just like my colleague to acknowledge and perhaps explain the position of his government. Does he acknowledge that Bill C-3 does not confer rights on aboriginal women, that this bill recognizes and finally acknowledges the inherent rights of those people who gained those rights by their birthright not bestowed upon by the government?

• (1025)

**Mr. John Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, the Indian Act is very controversial of course and we do have some first nations in Canada who have negotiated their way out of the Indian Act for all provisions of the Indian Act with the singular exception of the registration provision very often because this whole determination of who is and who is not a registered Indian or a status Indian is a very complex and debatable issue.

Even after Bill C-3, we have bands that operate under custom code that will determine who their members are without reference to Bill C-3. We also have bands that have chosen to remain strictly under the Indian Act provisions that will have members added to their roles through the bill.

Therefore, there is no single response or catch-all phrase, but this is a narrow targeted and focused bill.

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on the excellent questions from the member for Labrador and the member for Winnipeg Centre this morning.

I thank the government for introducing Bill C-3. The fact is that Sharon McIvor should never have had to launch a court case in the first place. It took 21 years for this process to take place and it should never have taken that long in the first place.

We will be supporting the bill. We feel that it is long overdue to rectify this situation.

However, I do not understand why this was left until the last possible minute. The parliamentary secretary indicated that April 26 is our date. The question really is, as the member for Labrador suggested, whether the government could have acted earlier and given us more time to deal with the issue.

Having said that, we will be supporting the bill to get it to committee and then if there are any amendments we can deal with them at that time.

**Mr. John Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, I would remind members that the engagement process was an ongoing process that continued right through into the new year. Therefore, we have not lost any time over this.

Beyond the engagement process, an exploratory process will carry on subsequent to the passage of the bill at second reading. I do not see us as being tardy in any way.

**Mr. Richard Harris (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the comments of the member for Winnipeg Centre and he is quite correct. Why has this taken so long? I am not talking about the most recent period because, as the parliamentary secretary said, there is a process to go through.

The Liberal government was in power from 1993 to late 2005, a total of 13 years. It had ample time within that vast period of government to deal with this issue and yet the Liberals treated that

issue as if it were so far below the importance in their minds that it was never even contemplated.

I congratulate our minister for having the mind to realize the importance of this issue and bring it to our government's attention, and we have dealt with it.

Could the parliamentary secretary tell the House whether there was any justification for a 13 year hands off approach to this most important issue that the Liberal government displayed?

• (1030)

**Mr. John Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the specifics on what we are now calling Bill C-3 in terms of that comment or question, but there has been a whole host of areas, whether it has to do with drinking water, housing or child and welfare services, where I believe we have had a sense of urgency and we have improved the circumstances very significantly in our time in office.

I would like to think that we will continue in a dramatic way in that same direction.

**Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand in the House today and speak to Bill C-3, An Act to promote gender equity in Indian registration by responding to the Court of Appeal for British Columbia decision in *McIvor v. Canada* (Registrar of Indian and Northern Affairs).

The bill is in response to a long-running battle in the courts spearheaded by Sharon McIvor. This action is being taken because the courts have said that the government must take action on this particular case. I congratulate Sharon McIvor and the others who have walked with her on the journey to heal the wounds of inequality and injustice.

It is pertinent for the House to know that it has taken 20 years. The court case was launched in 1989 and it took 17 years, until 2006, for it to be heard. Every obstacle was thrown in the way. I will not get into a debate about what government was in power when. The case was launched under the Mulroney government, carried on under the Chrétien and Martin governments, and continued on under the present Prime Minister's government.

However, there is something wrong with the system when it takes 20 years in the courts to resolve an issue of inequity. It takes time and resources and eats up people's lives, and we are talking about people's lives. I really do not care what government was in power. There must be a better way. There are smart lawyers in the Department of Justice. Someone must have sat back and thought that this really was an issue of inequity. They must have wondered if there was a better way to deal with it, such as through discussion or negotiation.

I note as well that, when it comes to resources, Sharon McIvor used the court challenges program, as have many other women, to try to advance their particular cause of equity. It was in 2006 that the current government killed the court challenges program that promoted the cause of equity. That added further to Sharon's struggle for money to see this case through to its successful conclusion, at least in some people's minds.

Does the title of this bill accurately reflect the intent of the bill, which is to provide equity? Many would argue that it tries to achieve that particular objective but it would be wrong for the House to think that this legislation would resolve all of the issues of inequity based on sex or on one's maternal line. Many other issues have not been addressed.

Let us take a quick look at what Bill C-3 is about and put it into context.

The McIvor case was the first of many cases to reach a decision under section 6 of the Indian Act. The case is about Indian status. It does not talk about band membership, citizenship or section 35 rights.

Sharon McIvor challenged the constitutionality of the Indian Act under section 6 as a violation of section 15 of the charter. The argument was that there was preferential treatment for descendants who traced their Indian ancestry along the paternal line over those who traced their ancestry along the maternal line, and that there was preferential treatment for male Indians who married non-Indians and their descendants over female Indians who married non-Indians and their descendants.

The B.C. Supreme Court ruled in favour of Sharon McIvor. It said that there was discrimination on the basis of sex and matrimonial descent and ordered that section 6 was of no force and effect only with respect to the conferral of Indian status. The order resulted in inequality, the B.C. Supreme Court ruled, regarding the passage of status.

However, even though Sharon McIvor had won, Canada appealed the decision to the B.C. Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal found discrimination in section 6 as well but on a much narrower basis. The court said that Bill C-31 created a new inequality because it enhanced the position of those affected by the double mother rule. Children of non-Indian mothers and non-Indian paternal grandmothers lost status at age 21 but restoring their status in section 6(1) meant that they could pass status regardless of the status of one parent.

● (1035)

The court only struck down sections that gave this enhanced status, and that is sections 6(1)(a) and 6(1)(c), so the ruling was in relation to a more limited category of people affected, which is why the government did not appeal because there were protected vested rights. The court gave the federal government one year to amend this provision.

Sharon McIvor in fact felt that even though she had won, the ruling was not what she wanted or felt she needed to resolve the issue of inequity. She filed for a leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. The appeal was denied on November 5, 2009.

The B.C. Court of Appeal's decision does not result in those who are already registered under the impugned provisions being struck off the registry, which basically means nobody will lose the rights they now have under the Indian Act, as this would result in a charter challenge itself.

What was the government's response? The government had a deadline to meet of April 6 of this year. The court said that it would

### *Government Orders*

give the government one year to bring in the legislation to deal with the inequity under section 6 of the Indian Act. The government released a discussion paper outlining what some of the options might be, some of the processes that it would go through. It then went through an engagement process. Engagement is an important word. It is not a consultation process because the government felt it had no legal requirement to consult, but only to engage the opinions of people to listen.

People had problems with that. People felt the engagement process was limited. Only about 150 individual submissions were made to the department. There were some regional and national meetings, but people, as a whole, felt it was very limited, that they did not get the full range of views they should have on this important legislation.

After the engagement process, the government gave notice that it would table a bill back in December. We were informed that the bill would be narrowly scoped to only deal with the equality as set out by the B.C. Court of Appeal. The government did admit that it would only deal with the B.C. Court of Appeal decision, that it would not deal with other issues arising out of the Indian Act, other issues of inequality or discrimination that exist.

Up against this April 6 timeline set by the Court of Appeal, the government has now brought forth legislation at the eleventh hour. The timing constraint is certainly compounded, and was compounded, by the prorogation of Parliament, which removed many days from the parliamentary calendar. I know the government says it is serious, but if it is serious about getting the legislation through, then annual prorogations are not the way to do it.

In examining this bill, we want to be diligent, we want to be expeditious, but we should not be rushed.

When we look at some of the content of the bill, people have written to me and to the department. They have indicated there are certain provisions of the proposed legislation that are still very problematic, and that they may raise other potentially new cases of discrimination.

I refer to a briefing note, a submission that was made by Dr. Pamela Palmater, who did her doctoral thesis on the Indian Act and the whole issue of status and the conferral of status. I will only refer to one section, just to give members and those who are listening a sense of where some other issues of discrimination may arise.

She says that section 6(c.1)(iv) of the proposed Bill C-3 provides that a person:

—had or adopted a child, on or after September 4, 1951, with a person who was not entitled to be registered on the day on which the child was born or adopted;

● (1040)

She says:

This section has the effect of creating a new way to determine entitlement to registration and, as a result, creates a new form of discrimination as between the siblings of the Indian women who married out. What this additional criterion does is determine entitlement to registration based on the status or lack thereof of the applicant's children. Status has always been determined based on the entitlement of one's parents, i.e. parents transmit their status to their children - not vice versa.

*Government Orders*

I mention this because the committee will have to take the time to understand what the implications are of this legislation. We do not want to make the situation worse. We want to improve the situation. We want to respond effectively and efficiently to the B.C. Court of Appeal's decision.

Neither does the legislation address the second generation product rule or situations of undeclared or unknown paternity. Again, these are matters that the committee will seriously have to consider.

The case is also shrouded in other fundamental rights issues, which the Government of Canada says this bill does not raise. I tend to agree that the bill does not raise these issues, the issues of jurisdiction, who determines citizenship, who determines membership. Why do we have a very paternalistic piece of legislation, one of the greatest examples of colonial infrastructure left in the western world that determines who is Indian and who is not. It is not determined by birth, by culture or by descendance. It is determined by a statute in the House. There is definitely something wrong with the legislation, for which there are many descriptions. We are only dealing with one part of it now, but this whole bill raises other fundamental issues.

People ask this question. Why should Canada interfere in the determination of who can be registered as an Indian under the Indian Act? They say that it contravenes international conventions like the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, which states that indigenous people have the right to determine their own identity or membership in accordance with their customs and traditions. This does not impair the right of indigenous individuals to obtain citizenship of the state in which they live.

Indigenous peoples have the right to determine their own identity or their own membership. I believe all members of the House would agree. Hopefully in the future we will be able to deal with these matters. The government acknowledged that by announcing an exploratory process to deal with these more substantive and fundamental questions.

The government should not delay or prolong that process. National aboriginal groups, regional aboriginal groups and individuals want to see this go forward in an expeditious manner. We want to ensure that it is done in a proper way and properly resourced, and let us call it a consultation process as opposed to an exploratory process.

We also have to be cognizant of questions around implementation. Is the department ready? Is the Office of the Indian Registrar ready? Are people being notified of possible changes that are coming? It will not be automatic that one gets status. The fact is people will have to apply and provide documentation, so there will be an onus on individuals to provide, in some cases, some very personal information. That in itself can be problematic, but is the system ready to take on new registrants?

Also, what are the impacts? There is a possibility that there could be up to 45,000 new registrants. That is what a noted demographer, Mr. Clatworthy, has indicated in his study commissioned for the department. He also gives a breakdown of how many people would likely register on reserve as opposed to off reserve, and what the implications would be then in terms of program and service

implications and cost. We have asked the government this question. The government says that while it is looking at it, it does not know what the impact will be on programs such as non-insured health benefits, post-secondary education and if there is an influx of people on a reserve and what happens to the existing housing prices and the need for other services, other types of infrastructure.

• (1045)

While we ask all these questions, we believe the intent of the bill is to try to meet the test or dictates of the B.C. Court of Appeal. We believe it is worthy of support at second reading. We hope it will close one gap in the law, even if it does not address others that remain. It definitely requires full examination in committee.

Despite the shortened time frame due to the court decision and the government's prorogation, we hope there will be a full and fair hearing with a broad cross-section of witnesses. I look forward to hearing those witnesses and, if possible, to making the bill a better one.

**Mr. Alan Tonks (York South—Weston, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, those of us who are dedicated to understanding the issues facing our first nations are very concerned with respect to the issues that the bill raises and the issues on which my colleague has given us an overview. From what the member has said, my observation is that section 6(c.1)(iv) is very pertinent and of concern to the first nations community. It has introduced a new form of discrimination based on the status of children.

This seems to be the nature of the appeal stemming from the McIvor initiative that attempted to focus on the whole issue of inequity between paternal and maternal rights. The inference I draw from the member's overview is that this added form of discrimination is contrary to the very intent that Sharon McIvor had. In fact, it will contribute to the saying that justice delayed is justice denied.

Is it within the purview of the committee, given that the Court of Appeal really established the parameters of the B.C. decision within which the inequity could be legally addressed, to address that new form of discrimination, or is this a case where we are trying to catch up on bad legislation?

**Mr. Todd Russell:** Mr. Speaker, it seems there can be, and many times is, some very confusing wording and approaches to status. I have talked to experts and asked them a question on this bill or on the Indian Act as it now exists. There are many confusing circumstances.

We have to ensure the bill does not create other cases of discrimination. That is our fundamental role. We have to ensure we respond appropriately to the B.C. Court of Appeal to ensure we resolve the issue of inequity on which it had passed judgment. That is what we have to do and that is what the committee's work will be.

There are many who will pass opinions. As I mentioned, Dr. Pamela Palmater has gone through the bill and found some areas where she feels that discrimination may arise from what we study in Bill C-3. Whether that is the case or not, the committee will have to judge this. If it is possible to make amendments to deal with any further cases of discrimination that may arise, I think we will do everything in our power to make those amendments so other cases of discrimination do not arise.



We know one thing for sure. Many times, when the government responds to this, it creates other possibilities of inequity. We have to look forward and not deal only with the present situation.

• (1055)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-3, An Act to promote gender equity in Indian registration by responding to the Court of Appeal for British Columbia decision in *McIvor v. Canada* (Registrar of Indian and Northern Affairs).

The Bloc Québécois supports the principle of this bill designed to allow those who suffered discrimination because of Bill C-31 passed in 1985 to reconnect with their origins.

Indian registration is indeed the first step in gaining not only Indian status, but also peer recognition in the community.

Membership is a very important concept, as it entitles individuals to live on reserve, participate in political processes such as the election of band chiefs, own property on reserve and share band resources. It permits recognition of one's origins and the practice of one's culture.

In 1996, many questions were already being raised about the impact of Bill C-31. There were concerns about possible adverse effects on the debate about whether or not someone is a band member, an issue that is not only complex, but also an integral part of a person's identity. To illustrate this complexity, I will read two excerpts from a report prepared by the Library of Parliament in February 1996 and revised in 2003.

The debate over membership is complex and multifaceted. A consideration of the issue leads to questions about what it means to belong to a community, about who has the right to define community membership, and about the changing nature of the Indian population. For many years, externally imposed rules for status and membership have produced internal divisions within Indian communities. The impacts of Bill C-31 have further emphasized political, social and financial concerns and introduced new problems.

The growth in the number of status Indians living off reserve as a result of Bill C-31 has also increased the need to clarify the responsibilities of federal and provincial governments in providing and funding the services required. Problems have arisen, moreover, because many of the programs and funds for status Indians are available only to those who live on reserve. Some of those who wished to live on reserve could not, however, because of a lack of services, such as housing. Furthermore, despite the increase in services, many off-reserve Bill C-31 registrants did not know how to access them and thus did not take advantage of them. INAC has been criticized for not making this information more readily available.

These quotes show just how complex recognition is.

Does the implementation of Bill C-3 raise new questions about the implementation of Bill C-31? The Bloc Québécois thinks it does.

The *McIvor* decision forced the government to close the loophole created by the 1951 act and the unacceptable amendment to the 1985 act, which was itself trying to close the enormous loophole created by the enactment of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The 1876 Indian Act stated that a woman marrying a non-Indian would lose her status and stop being an Indian in the eyes of Canadian law. The act and all of the legislation succeeding it marginalized women in aboriginal society and considerably diminished their social and political role in community life. Indian

### *Government Orders*

women were subject to a law that discriminated against them on the basis of their race, gender and marital status.

In 1951, the Indian Act was amended, but still marginalized women marrying non-Indians. Such women could not be registered on the new federal register of status Indians.

In 1985, after new provisions were added to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Bill C-31 attempted to close the loophole in the Indian Act, but women's children still did not have the same rights as men's children.

The federal government waited 25 years to introduce a bill recognizing the Indian status of individuals who had been discriminated against in the past. This issue is not just about First Nations and women. It is about equality and human rights. The Indian Act discriminated against women because it denied Indian status to the grandchildren of aboriginal women, but not to those of aboriginal men. Bill C-3, which was introduced today, will correct part of the problem.

If not for Sharon *McIvor's* hard work and perseverance, if not for the 2007 British Columbia Supreme Court ruling, which was confirmed by the British Columbia Court of Appeal on April 6, 2009, the federal government would never have introduced this bill.

The bill must go to committee so that various stakeholders can have an opportunity to express their opinions about the effect that Bill C-3 will have on their communities. The committee will also have to come up with a better plan for implementing the bill so as to avoid making the same mistakes that were made in 1985 with Bill C-31.

Count on us to help make that happen. The Bloc Québécois' excellent critic for this file, the member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue, will do everything in his power to ensure that the committee hears what everyone has to say.

At December 31, 2000, more than 114,000 individuals had acquired Indian status.

I will be speaking about Sharon *McIvor's* struggle, which is the basis for our debate.

In 1985, the federal government amended the Indian Act through Bill C-31, which gave Indian status to women married to non-Indians. However, in many cases, these women could not pass this status to their children.

In 1985, Sharon *McIvor*, a law student from British Columbia and descendant of the Lower Nicola Indian Band—her mother was a status Indian woman and her father a non-status Indian man—applied to regain her status. She obtained her Indian status but was told her children were not eligible.

*Statements by Members*

In 1987, Ms. McIvor wrote a letter requesting a review of the decision. In 1989, she received a reply upholding the denial of Indian status to her children. She launched a court case challenging the Indian Act.

Shortly before Ms. McIvor's case was heard in court in 2006, the federal government agreed to restore status to her children. Ms. McIvor continued with the court case. In 2006, Ms. McIvor's case was first heard in court.

In October 2006, the federal government abolished the court challenges program, which had helped Ms. McIvor defend her case. It was the Conservative government that made this decision. With the elimination of the program, Ms. McIvor found it difficult to fund the defence of her case. The government's decision came just after Ms. McIvor won her case in the British Columbia Supreme Court.

In June 2007, Justice Ross of the British Columbia Supreme Court ruled in favour of Ms. McIvor. She maintained that the law "implies that one's female ancestors are deficient or less Indian than their male contemporaries. The implication is that one's lineage is inferior."

In July 2007, the federal government announced that it would appeal the decision. In 2008, the case was heard by the British Columbia Court of Appeal. On April 6, 2009, a decision was made in favour of Ms. McIvor. I—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I must interrupt the honourable member. He will have another 12 minutes after question period.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1100)

[*Translation*]

### WOMEN'S GALA

**Mr. Bruce Stanton (Simcoe North, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, every two years, an organization in my riding, La Clé d'la Baie, presents the Gala de la Femme. The sixth edition of the gala will take place this Saturday evening at the Gryphon Theatre in Barrie.

This celebration honours women from Barrie and Simcoe County for their commitment to our francophone communities, including Penetanguishene and Lafontaine. Our finest francophone artists will provide music, comedy and dance throughout the evening.

Awards will be presented to the women for their work in five areas of community leadership: volunteer, career, youth, health/environment and mother.

I would like to thank La Clé d'la Baie for the extraordinary services it provides for the 15,000 people in Simcoe County's francophone communities, as well as for celebrating the involvement of women in our region.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### IRAQ

**Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during Saddam Hussein's reign, the Kurdish people in northern Iraq suffered horrific

atrocities. Today much has changed for the people of Kurdistan, but for many Iraqi Christians, there is still change needed in that emerging democracy.

Dangerous living conditions, terrorist attacks and forced immigration are still taking a toll. Discrimination against certain groups, such as Iraqi Christians, continues to prevent children from attending their classes and their parents from fully engaging in society. A shameful history of human rights suppression in the region has still not ended.

I call upon the government to use every diplomatic tool available to work with the Iraqi government to ensure that basic ideals of religious freedom are respected and protected. The people of Ninawa and all Iraqi Christians deserve our support and our protection. I believe that by speaking out and by constructive engagement we can help make this a reality.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Guy André (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, like many regions in Quebec, my riding of Berthier—Maskinongé is very well known for its vibrant agriculture sector, a key factor in how our land has been settled.

Yet every week, Quebec loses another farm. In order to preserve Quebec's agricultural model, which is often characterized by family farms on a more human scale, the Bloc Québécois believes it is important to encourage the next generation of farmers and the passing on of these family farms from one generation to the next.

So I was appalled to hear the Minister of State for Agriculture tell the Fédération de la relève agricole du Québec that the prospect of Chinese investors purchasing farmland in Quebec is good news. I think the minister should instead read up on the negative consequences this phenomenon has had around the world and consider the Bloc Québécois' proposals to encourage the next generation of farmers.

When will the Conservative government do something?

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### CANADIAN OLYMPIAN

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring attention to a great Canadian Olympian, Clara Hughes.

Clara Hughes was born and raised in the federal riding of Elmwood—Transcona and graduated from Elmwood High School. I have known her mother, Maureen Hughes, and grandmother, Dodie Lester, for many years as I also represented them provincially as their MLA.

It was an honour to work with Clara as we, along with other citizens, fought to save Kelvin Community Club, which was Clara's childhood community club, from closing due to municipal budget cuts.

Clara Hughes has a strong heart which she has proven not just being the only person to have won multiple medals in both the Summer and Winter Olympics in cycling and speed skating, and not just from her recent medal win at the Vancouver Winter Olympic Games at the age of 37, but also by her dedication of her time and her abilities and the use of her own money to support organizations such as Right to Play to help disadvantaged youth through sport in Canada and throughout the world. Clara Hughes has shown her heart.

I would like to bring attention to a great Canadian Olympian, Clara Hughes.

\* \* \*

#### RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Nepean—Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this evening will be the last official newscast by Max Keeping, the legendary newsman who has served at CTV for almost four decades.

Max started his career as a 14-year-old St. John's *Evening Telegram* sports director. He served as a parliamentary correspondent for CFRA and then he moved to CTV almost four decades ago.

In his position he has helped to raise funds for causes as varied as CHEO, the Food Bank, the United Way, the Heart and Stroke Foundation, and of course, the community-wide famous Max Keeping Foundation. He has not only been a news anchor, but an anchor for our entire community. He is a legend in our neighbourhood. Right across the Ottawa Valley he will be missed. We look forward to his exciting work during his retirement as an ambassador for CTV Ottawa.

Way to go, Max. We are proud of him.

\* \* \*

● (1105)

#### YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

**Hon. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the current unemployment rate among young Canadians is 16%, double the national average.

The real needs of youth living in Bramalea—Gore—Malton and across the country are not being addressed. The youth are worried about finding full-time and summer jobs, and about gaining the work experience needed to ensure their future employment. They are worried about being able to pay their tuition fees and achieve their dream of completing higher education.

The government can create jobs by giving employers greater incentives to hire our country's future workforce. This government needs to act now and show real progress in reducing the worst youth unemployment rate in a generation.

#### Statements by Members

#### PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

**Mrs. Alice Wong (Richmond, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honour two extraordinary individuals from my riding, Mr. James Armstrong and Mr. Darryl Neighbour.

Both gentlemen are phenomenal wheelchair curlers and were an integral part of Canada's wheelchair curling team that won the gold medal in the Paralympic Games in Vancouver last Saturday.

I congratulate Jim and Darryl on their incredible performance. They have made all Canadians proud.

On that note, I would also like to bring attention to the launch of the Rick Hansen Institute and applaud our government and the Government of B.C. for making a total pledge of \$38.5 million toward the project which aims to raise \$200 million for spinal injury research by 2012. Rick is Richmond's own Man In Motion.

This is only one of the many measures that our government has introduced in year two of Canada's economic action plan to help people with disabilities and their families participate more fully in our country's social and economic life.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### HAITI

**Mr. Robert Carrier (Alfred-Pellan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, operation "10,000 hats for Haiti", which my office contributed to by soliciting nearly 200 agencies, exceeded its goal by collecting 12,000 hats in all.

This operation is an initiative by the Fondation d'aide aux enfants orphelins du sida in the Saint-Vincent-de-Paul district of my riding.

The foundation operates Rainbow House in the suburbs of Port-au-Prince. Rainbow House is a shelter for AIDS orphans and it also provides help to many families.

The hats will help protect many partially or completely blind children and adults from the sun.

This operation was launched before the terrible January 12 earthquake. Its original purpose was to help children who have to walk for kilometres to get to school. Under the circumstances, it has become an even more essential relief initiative.

Many thanks to the Fondation d'aide aux enfants orphelins du sida.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### PROJECT HERO

**Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Project Hero is a great program which provides scholarships to the children of our Canadian heroes who have sacrificed their lives while serving our country.

I would like to thank honorary Lieutenant Colonel Kevin Reed, along with retired General Rick Hillier who started this program which will benefit the families of our fallen heroes.

*Statements by Members*

Needless to say, I was shocked earlier this week when a group of radical professors from the University of Regina signed a letter opposing this program. Shockingly, this group of 16 even includes a former provincial NDP candidate.

On this side of the House, we honour our men and women in uniform and we welcome programs that benefit the lives of their families.

I call upon these 16 so-called academics who are currently enjoying their comfort and security thanks to the work of the same people whom they are now opposing to reconsider their outrageous insensitive position, to join their fellow Canadians by showing their true patriot love and support Project Hero.

\* \* \*

**DON ANDERSON**

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of my colleagues and myself to pay tribute to Don Anderson.

Don ran the family farm in St. Peter's Bay. It grew to become a 500-acre mixed farming operation.

Don was very active in the farming community. Throughout his life he served as director of the P.E.I. potato marketing board. He was a member of the Canadian Dairy Commission. He was chairman of the P.E.I. potato committee. He played a major role in the P.E.I. Rural Beautification Society. He was inducted into the Atlantic Agricultural Hall of Fame in 1998.

His warm greetings and firm handshakes were well known among fellow Island producers, and he was a strong supporter of the Prince Edward Island potato industry.

Don Anderson's name became synonymous with the Island spuds in many countries around the world. No matter what Don Anderson was involved in, whether it was his church, his community or the agricultural community, he gave it his all.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the Anderson family in St. Peter's Bay today.

\* \* \*

• (1110)

**MAUREEN VODREY**

**Mr. Royal Galipeau (Ottawa—Orléans, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today we wish to thank and pay homage to someone who has truly etched the fabric of Canada's democracy. Maureen Vodrey, who we spoke of yesterday, the longest-serving interpreter in Canadian history, will retire today after 37 consecutive years of serving Parliament and Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Vodrey began her interpretation career on Parliament Hill in 1973. She has worked for nine governments, eight prime ministers, eight governors general and eight Speakers of the House of Commons and for yours truly as well.

Ms. Vodrey specializes in parliamentary procedure. She has taught at the University of Ottawa and has received numerous awards,

including the award of excellence in teaching in 2007 and the Translation Bureau quality service award in 2009.

[*English*]

Today we pay tribute to her, to her husband Robert, a corporal in the RCMP, and to their son Simon.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Vodrey's contribution to democracy will be felt for years to come. We pay tribute to her today.

\* \* \*

[*English*]**MAUREEN VODREY**

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democrats and all parliamentarians, we also join in congratulating and thanking Maureen Vodrey after 39 years of service to the House of Commons, 37 years as the House of Commons' longest-serving interpreter, even interpreting me, and that is a remarkable achievement in itself.

She was known as the female English voice of René Lévesque during the debates of the Meech Lake accord. She has been here for an incredible, wonderfully long time, and it is because of her service to this country and to all of us that our work has been much easier to do.

We want to pay special tribute to her husband, Robert, and her son, Simon. We thank them very much for sharing Maureen with all of us. She has done a tremendous job. She will be greatly missed.

On behalf of all of us in the House of Commons, we salute Maureen Vodrey for her great service and wish her the very best in her future endeavours. God bless her.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]**BLOC QUÉBÉCOIS**

**Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our government wants to protect families and ensure that Canadians can sleep well at night.

Honest citizens are already paying enough to rehabilitate criminals who are serving sentences in prison.

I cannot believe that the leader of the Bloc thinks that Clifford Olson should keep receiving his federal government pension in addition to the guaranteed income supplement.

We already knew that the Bloc Québécois was in favour of lenient sentences for criminals who traffic in young children, but Quebecers cannot believe this.

Now Quebecers know that the Bloc and its leader have only one goal: to block the Conservative government's initiatives to fight crime and protect victims.

### WORLD THEATRE DAY

**Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is World Theatre Day, created in 1961 by the International Theatre Institute. Every year, an internationally renowned artist releases a message to mark this day. These artists have included Robert Lepage and Michel Tremblay.

In Quebec, this year's message is from Suzanne Lebeau, a playwright who specializes in youth theatre and a recipient of many international awards. Here is an excerpt from her message:

These are times of crisis, and public support is being cut back...And yet... We have never seen a new generation as courageous...invading private and public spaces to reach out to these audiences. By the twos, the fours, the dozens, theatre artists bring alive and make vibrant lobbies, passageways, seats that are upright and hard. Temporary in the means that it receives, temporary in how it reinvents itself night after night, as temporary as life and daily moods, theatre is definitive in expressing the need that we have to speak and to share.

We must support the theatre; it feeds our souls.

\* \* \*

• (1115)

[English]

### TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Alan Tonks (York South—Weston, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, members will be aware that rail has played a major role in the history of Canadian nation building. Today, commuter and intercity rail must be a major part of a transportation plan that deals with two major challenges facing Canadians: urban congestion and air pollution.

The good news is that in several ridings in the GTA, within the Georgetown corridor, plans are in effect that would see the expansion of GO Transit and an integration of light rail and heavy rail services. The bad news is that residents like those in York South—Weston are concerned about increased risks to health and safety and noise from diesel locomotives.

It is unquestionable that Canada should follow the lead of European countries that have chosen electrified transit systems, both light and heavy rail. I would therefore ask the House to call upon the federal Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities and the Minister of the Environment to work with their provincial counterparts to ensure that electrified rail technologies and retrofits be a high priority in Canada's national transportation strategy.

\* \* \*

### LIBERAL PARTY CONFERENCE

**Mrs. Shelly Glover (Saint Boniface, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today the Liberal leader's spenders conference gets under way in Montreal.

The *Ottawa Sun* is reporting this morning that after not inviting MPs to the spenders conference, the Liberal Party scrambled to invite a few MPs at the very last minute for optics. Apparently, they are now being invited but are actually being discouraged from taking part.

The spenders conference is hardly reflective of Canada. Forty-three of more than fifty guest speakers are from Ontario and Quebec, and the United States and Australia have more representation than four provinces.

### Oral Questions

While the Liberal leader is off in academic fantasyland this weekend, our Conservative government is focused on the concerns of today, leading the way on creating jobs and building the economy.

At the end of the day, Canadians know that the spenders conference will only propose grandiose spending proposals that Canadians do not want.

---

## ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

### AFGHANISTAN

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the government continued its cover-up with respect to torture in Afghanistan. The papers it dumped on the table were three months late, incoherent, incomplete and calculated to mislead.

It was a gimmick to get thousands of rabbits running to a thousand different dead ends, anywhere but the truth. The whole scam is an insult to the government's new lawyer, Mr. Iacobucci.

When will the Conservatives realize that this issue goes to Canada's global reputation for integrity, and a cover-up will not work?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the government has always said that officials will provide all legally available documents. Officials have done so in the past and will continue to do so in the future. Redactions are done by independent, non-partisan public servants whose only interest is the application of the law and protection of national security.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the government literally dumped 2,500 pages of redacted documents concerning torture.

Many of these redacted documents are not even pertinent. We were given 2,500 pages of completely disorganized documents.

The Conservatives are literally obstructing the work of parliamentarians and increasing our impression that they have something to hide.

When will they stop this censorship? When will they call the public enquiry that Canadians want?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the government has always maintained that our representatives would provide all legally available documents. That is exactly what they have always done and what we will continue to do.

Retired Justice Iacobucci will also begin an independent and comprehensive review of the censorship of the documents concerning the detainees. As I have said, these documents were tabled without prejudice.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to read an excerpt from one of the documents tabled yesterday.

*Oral Questions*

Oh, I am sorry. As we can see, that would be impossible.

Yesterday the Prime Minister said that the tabling of these documents was proof of their transparency. This does not seem very transparent to me.

Transparency means answering for one's actions. It does not mean dumping boxes of redacted documents, without prior notice, to delay the work of parliamentarians.

Why such contempt for Parliament? Why this provocation? Why hide the truth from Canadians?

• (1120)

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the members across the floor asked us to table the documents. We tabled them and we will continue to provide all legally available documents. We have also added the independent report of Justice Iacobucci, who will verify the work of the independent committee.

\* \* \*

[English]

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, at first the government said that First Nations University students were simply out of luck, no more funding. Then came a glimmer of hope, first from the University of Regina and the Province of Saskatchewan and now with the federal government perhaps softening its hard line.

While the government says it is looking at its options, the students and faculty need certainty.

Can the Conservatives tell hundreds of First Nations University students whether it will be part of the solution that all the other parties are working on before the end of this fiscal year?

**Mr. John Duncan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our priority is to make sure the First Nations University students have the same educational opportunities as other Canadians. That is our priority. We want to make sure they finish their school year, and we will continue to work with people who are working hard to make this happen.

We are fully engaged.

**Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, everyone understands that this university had problems in the past, but everyone also understands that that was the past.

With commitments from the University of Regina, from the Saskatchewan government and from first nations leaders, the school is ready to turn a new page. This is now about the future.

The students are anxiously waiting. The faculty is waiting. Will the federal government get to the table and be part of the solution?

**Mr. John Duncan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, to say we are not at the table is inappropriate.

As I said, the university has now submitted a proposal under the same program that every other university in the country submits

when dealing with first nations students. We are encouraged by the changes we have seen.

We are going to make sure that our priority is helping those students finish their school year. That is our most immediate priority.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**AFGHANISTAN**

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the confusion, or should I say shambles, surrounding the government's tabling of heavily censored documents on torture in Afghanistan is clearly not a proper response to the House's order of December 10, 2009.

Does the government understand that, in order to avoid being found in contempt of the House, it must immediately submit all the documents in their original, unredacted version, as required by the motion adopted by the House?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition have asked us for the documents many times. We have made these documents public. We have transferred the documents that we are allowed to make public by law. Such documents have been made public in the past and we will continue to make them public.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this is a joke. The government cannot be the judge of its own case. It is up to the members of the House to decide what the government must hand over.

Despite Conservative censorship, the documents show that the soldiers were aware of the allegations of torture and that they proposed alternatives, but the government clearly indicated that the only possible option was to transfer the detainees to Afghan authorities, even though that violated international conventions.

Is the government not trying to hide the fact that it was responsible for violating international conventions such as the Geneva convention?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely not the case. Almost three years ago, we corrected a situation and replaced the existing agreement on the transfer of detainees. The Canadian process of transferring Taliban detainees to the authorities has evolved and improved over the years.

Let us not forget how much this was criticized when the Liberals were in power. We replaced that system with a more robust and rigorous system that allows transferred detainees to be visited at any time.

• (1125)

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, among the few unredacted documents the government let slip through, there is an email dated January 19, 2006 in which colonel Gauthier said that several Canadian soldiers had witnessed the abuse of detainees in Afghan army custody. This means that, as early as January 2006, the Canadian government was aware of the risk of torture.

*Oral Questions*

Why did the government turn a blind eye to the risk of torture? Why did it not shoulder its responsibilities under the Geneva convention?

[*English*]

**Mr. Laurie Hawn (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our government and the Canadian Forces have never turned a blind eye to that.

Of course, January 19, 2006, was before this government was elected.

The Canadian Forces take all allegations seriously. They have from the start. They fully investigate any allegations that have come to their attention. In every case, the Canadian Forces' members have been absolved of any wrongdoing. They continue to do an exceptional job for us and our allies in Afghanistan.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives had the information. They know very well what we are talking about.

According to the testimony of captain Steve Moore, the word put out by the Canadian government was to transfer detainees as quickly as possible to the Afghan forces. Regardless of consequences, the word was to get rid of detainees ASAP, as they say.

Testimony provided by the military, which was released on Thursday, echo that of diplomat Richard Colvin: the Conservative government turned a blind eye to the torture of Afghan detainees.

Is that why the government is refusing to be transparent?

[*English*]

**Mr. Laurie Hawn (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will repeat, because those members are hard of hearing, that every time an allegation has surfaced, the Canadian Forces, the chain of command, and this government have taken those allegations very seriously. They have been fully investigated.

We take very seriously our obligations under international law. We take very seriously our obligations to the Afghan people to make sure that we bring their capacity up to a level that we can help them be proud of. They will never be like Canada. We have raised them to a level they have never been to before.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are using gamesmanship to delay facing the charges of contempt to Parliament.

Why do they not stop their political gamesmanship and immediately, right now, give members secure access to the unredacted documents on the transfer of Afghan detainees?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, first, we have complied with the initial agreement to transfer all documents that we were allowed by law to release. We have done that.

Second, a few weeks ago, we announced that Justice Frank Iacobucci will also be undertaking an independent, comprehensive review of the documents related to Taliban detainees.

With what we have done, I think that light can be shed on the matter, and this light will—

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

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in the documents, one soldier reports seeing an Afghan detainee hit on the head with the barrel of a grenade launcher. Another soldier believes detainees were summarily executed. An officer reports that detainees “bore signs of injury” and that Afghan forces “don't necessarily follow our policies on detainee handling, if you know what I mean”. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows what he means.

The time for talking points is now over. The government owes it to this country to come clean. When will it call a public inquiry?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in the case of allegations, senior Canadian Forces leadership immediately ordered investigations into all of these. The Canadian Forces make sure that any allegation put forward is looked into, and all of these investigations determine whether or not the allegations are founded or unfounded, but up to now, all allegations have been unfounded.

● (1130)

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, that is pretty dodgy.

By the way, the document dump yesterday was an insult to the House of Commons and to Canadians. These documents were already ordered by the MPCC and were set to be released. I do not want to say the minister was misleading the House, but this was a tactic to delay the government's response to Parliament while preempting the MPCC.

If the government were serious at all about getting to the truth, it would comply with the House order to have access. When will the government give up the delay tactics and own up to the truth?

The minister should not point to the Iacobucci process. He is a nice guy but that process will not satisfy—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs.

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, former Justice Iacobucci is a well-respected individual whom everybody in this House has no doubt about in terms of his competence. We have called upon him to undertake an independent, comprehensive and proper review. Let Justice Iacobucci do his job.

\* \* \*

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, after four years of confusion, the Minister of National Defence desperately needs to clear the air about purchasing fixed wing search and rescue for our soldiers. Sources say that Industry Canada and the National Research Council are raising flags about the process.

### Oral Questions

Is it really fair and open, or are the Conservatives favouring one builder before the bidding even begins? Already, two Canadian companies are complaining they feel left out, while one foreign builder is still in the running.

Why is this job being so bungled by the Minister of National Defence?

**Mr. Laurie Hawn (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we are working hard to get the best equipment, the best fixed wing SAR equipment, for our airmen. I thank the hon. member for bringing up the question because it gives us an opportunity to talk about the consultations that we have undertaken.

It has taken some time, there is no doubt about it. It is a complicated project. We are looking at all options. We value the input from the National Research Council. It has some expert people whose input has been very helpful, and the project is going to move ahead with all the haste we can muster.

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what they are mustering is absolute confusion, because it has been four years, and now, each and every time the builders want to do something, Viking Air and Bombardier are both confused. They do not know what is going on because the government is favouring one builder over the other.

Last year the government staged an industry day to allow builders a chance to see what the department had in mind and even to discuss what they could provide to search and rescue. Many observers said it was unorganized and confusing and, eventually, it was closed off to the media, with no answers.

Now the minister says he is going to refurbish the current aircraft to 2014. They will be 40 years old then. Does the government really care about search and rescue?

**Mr. Laurie Hawn (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, dare I bring up the Sea King replacement when we are talking about dithering at the expense of our airmen, our forces and the people who depend on this? Anybody can apply to the fixed wing SAR program, whether they are international or national.

If Bombardier and Viking Air have an aircraft that meets the specs, they will be considered. They are free to apply. It is a process that has taken some time. We are moving ahead on that and I expect some progress in the not too distant future.

\* \* \*

### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

**Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Natural Resources was unable to explain a \$185,000 grant his department gave to a company whose chairman is the Conservative member for Calgary Centre, so let us try again.

We know that the grant was authorized on March 31, the last possible day for this kind of March madness, but does the minister really expect us to believe that his ministry did not even check the website to see who the chairman was before they handed over the money?

**Mr. David Anderson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is time for the member opposite to grow up. Canadians are sick of this kind of mudslinging. If she were paying any attention to her own question, she would know that the member for Calgary Centre has made a statement with regard to his activities in the day-to-day operations of this company. He has contacted the ethics commissioner to ensure that he is in good standing.

**Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me remind him that the kettle is calling the pot black. The member for Calgary Centre said he was unaware of the grant, but this cannot be true. In 2007, the member was advised by the ethics commissioner that he should contact her in the event of future government contracts. Small and medium size enterprises are crying foul, and rightly so.

Can the government, in this blatant conflict of interest, explain why there is funding for one well placed Conservative insider, but nothing for thousands of Canadians who have lost their jobs?

• (1135)

**Mr. David Anderson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is ridiculous. Natural Resources Canada has worked with Canadian companies seeking to bring innovative and energy efficient products to the marketplace. It approved \$185,000 in funding for Streetlight Intelligence to demonstrate technology to reduce energy consumption of street lighting. Natural Resources has been monitoring the progress of this contract and will continue to do so.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### DEMOCRATIC REFORM

**Mr. Jean Dorion (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Tom Flanagan, the Conservative guru, said out loud what many people are thinking. Adding seats in west Quebec would not only allow a majority government to be elected, but it would also isolate Quebec and marginalize the Quebec nation.

Is that not the real motive for adding 30 seats west of Quebec?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we remain committed to ensuring fair representation in the House of Commons for provinces that are growing more quickly and to guaranteeing the number of seats for the other provinces.

**Mr. Jean Dorion (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the government must understand that changes to the federal electoral map will not be acceptable unless Quebec maintains the same influence in the House.



*Oral Questions*

If the government refuses to ensure that the Quebec nation will maintain its current influence in the House, does that not show that this reform is nothing more than a completely partisan move by the Conservatives, and one that will also isolate Quebec?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, if it were only the Bloc, Quebec would have no seats in the House of Commons in Ottawa. That is clear.

But to all Quebecers who are proud to be Canadian, I can say that we are protecting the number of seats. The Bloc Québécois will definitely not be the ones giving lessons on representing Quebec here in the House.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN TELEVISION FUND**

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, over a year ago, the government announced changes to the Canadian television fund to stimulate the television industry. Recently, in Toronto, the government announced that the fund would shift its focus to digital content. The fact that television producers will be required to develop content for two platforms without sufficient additional funding is reprehensible.

Why is the minister forcing the industry to pay the price for his failure to take action on digital media? Does he not realize that there is not enough money in the fund to stimulate both television and digital content production? Why is he undermining the television industry?

[English]

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is this government, led by this Prime Minister, that has done more to support the Canadian television industry than any government in history. This includes unprecedented support for francophone programs inside and outside of Quebec. Our Canada media fund delivers over \$300 million, more support for high quality Canadian TV than ever before. Right on for Canadian TV.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary said that he listened to my question, but I get the distinct impression that he did not.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage is telling broadcasters that, from now on, they have to broadcast their content on at least two platforms, one of which must be digital. The minister is trying to force others to do what he has failed to do himself: develop a comprehensive strategy to stimulate the digital industry and prove that he has a vision.

When will he come up with something other than a piecemeal approach?

[English]

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc members question vision on the television industry. Maybe they would take issue with Pierre Karl Péladeau, the president and CEO of Quebecor Inc., who said, “The commitment from this government towards this fund is loud and clear and it is good news for Canada”.

That is what he said. I do not know what Bloc members are listening to, but they are not listening to Mr. Péladeau.

\* \* \*

**POLITICAL ACTIVISM**

**Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the darling of the reform-conservative-republican movement really outdid herself last night in Calgary. By addressing Canadian diversity, Ann Coulter said that diversity is not an advantage to a country like Canada. “It’s not a strength”, she continued. Then she went on to compare diversity to cancer. From organizing speeches to putting on cocktails, the Conservative Party’s dirty little fingerprints are all over her Canadian tour.

Will the Prime Minister immediately and publicly condemn Ann Coulter’s outrageous and intolerant views?

• (1140)

**Hon. Jay Hill (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, you and the hon. member would know that his question has absolutely nothing to do with the business of government and should be disallowed.

**Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the office of the member for South Shore—St. Margaret’s organized a Coulter cocktail. The member of Parliament for Calgary West led the applause last night from his front row seat.

The Prime Minister’s mentor, Rainer Knopff, who co-authored the reckless and divisive firewall letter, co-sponsored the speech and sat there while his guest savaged mainstream Canadian values.

Silence is acquiescence. Either the Prime Minister supports it or he does not. Which is it?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I do not see that that is a business of government administration. I do see the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister rising, so I will give him a chance to answer, but I caution members to keep their questions—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. David McGuinty:** Which is it?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, order. The member for Ottawa South will come to order.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. David McGuinty:** Go ahead.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member for Ottawa South will come to order.

I see the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister rising to answer the question. I will allow him to do so.

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member has raised a very important question about an American commentator who has come to this country with some outrageous comments: comments supporting the Iraq war, comments supporting the use of torture, and comments referring to Israel as a war criminal. But enough about the leader of the Liberal Party.

*Oral Questions*

I want to take a moment to commend the Liberal leader for one decision that he made. Originally, I thought he made the right decision by not inviting the member for Ottawa South for the great—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, order. If members want to keep talking like this, we can drop a few questions off from question period. It does not matter to me. Order, please.

The hon. member for LaSalle—Émard.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**PENSIONS**

**Mrs. Lise Zarac (LaSalle—Émard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives obviously take retirees for fools.

Almost a year ago, they promised to do something about pensions in the next 90 days. Now they want to conduct a cross-Canada tour before doing anything.

Retirees have lost confidence in the Conservatives' good faith.

Why does the government continue procrastinating, when retirees are calling for immediate reforms?

[*English*]

**Mr. Ted Menzies (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is rather harsh and rude language from a party that thought enough about retirees to hold one half-day session talking about the future of retirement income in this entire country.

I welcome the Liberals to the issue. But they should know that we have consulted already with Canadians on federally-regulated pensions. I know they do not understand the difference between federal and provincial. We are now discussing with our partners in the provinces how we can help maintain retirement income for seniors.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Lise Zarac (LaSalle—Émard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pension plans need to be improved and retirees must be protected. Everyone agrees on that. Why not give pensioners preferred creditor status immediately? Nortel pensioners are now facing bankruptcy because of the minister's failure to act. These people need help today. The time for consultations ended a long time ago.

Why does this government continue to ignore the needs of our retired workers?

[*English*]

**Mr. Ted Menzies (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, when they are talking about protecting pensions, we on this side of the House would be very interested in their position of pensions to Clifford Olson. They seem very unclear about that. They tend to protect people, to try to keep them out of jail.

Our important issue on this side of the House is protecting seniors. That is why we are actually going out across Canada, the finance minister, myself, and other members of this party, speaking to

Canadians about the impact on their lives. That is consulting with Canadians.

\* \* \*

•(1145)

**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Peter Braid (Kitchener—Waterloo, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's commitment to science and technology is beyond dispute. The Minister of State for Science and Technology recently made a great announcement regarding Canada's research chairs. This news will boost research at universities and strengthen the economy across our country.

Would the minister please tell this House how this support will help to develop, attract and retain the world's best researchers in Canada?

**Hon. Gary Goodyear (Minister of State (Science and Technology) (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I can tell members we have had a great announcement this morning. This government is supporting 187 newly-awarded and renewed Canada research chairs at 44 Canadian universities to the tune of \$165.5 million.

This government has created historic investment in buildings and laboratories, in equipment, in research, from basic to applied and to commercialization, and now we are furthering our commitment to the people and scientists.

We are getting it done to create jobs, secure our economy and—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, the hon. member for Halifax.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH**

**Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the latest reports released by the United Nations Population Fund and the Alan Guttmacher Institute prove that access to birth control saves lives and reduces pressure on health care systems in developing countries. By meeting the contraceptive needs of people around the world, we can reduce the maternal mortality rate by 70%.

Will the government commit to saving lives, yes or no?

[*English*]

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada will lead the discussion in the upcoming G8 summit on child and maternal health. We are focused on how to make a positive difference and save the lives of mothers and children in the developing world.

**Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, why is it so hard for the government to be clear? If the Prime Minister is serious about making maternal and child health Canada's signature initiative at the G8, why can he not tell Canadians exactly what he means?

*Oral Questions*

Now that the UN has proven funding for contraception saves billions on health care costs and, more important, saves lives, I ask again, will the government pursue a family planning policy that will save lives? Yes or no?

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as I stated, Canada will lead the discussion in the upcoming G8 summit on child and maternal health. We are focused on how to make a positive difference and save the lives of mothers and children in the developing world.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TRANSPORTATION**

**Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the television show *Enquête* reported that, while pilots and companies lied about actual flying hours, the Canadian government did nothing to prevent extreme fatigue in pilots. The government is turning a blind eye to this problem which affects the safety of passengers.

How can we believe that the government cares about air safety when it is giving itself another two years to deal with the issue?

[English]

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we follow all of the requirements of the International Civil Aviation Organization. It also makes supplementary recommendations. We are working hard with representatives of industry, representatives of the pilots themselves, and officials at Transport Canada, to look at what we can do to further expand the anti-fatigue measurement.

[Translation]

**Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** That is two years of insecurity nonetheless, Mr. Speaker.

The airports capital assistance program, or ACAP, will end on March 31, and there is no indication that it could be renewed. The executive director of the regional airport in Mont-Joli, Carole Duval, is particularly concerned because she would like to extend the landing strip and quickly modernize electrical installations at the Mont-Joli airport in order to reduce maintenance costs.

Will the government stop making a mystery of it, renew ACAP and enhance it to meet the needs of regional airports?

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I must tell my friend from the Bloc Québécois that the government will continue in Quebec and across Canada with this program to support municipal airports.

I appreciate the good work the Bloc critic is doing.

\* \* \*

•(1150)

[English]

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Francis Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our agri-retail sector is responsible for \$10 billion in trade of crop inputs like

fertilizer and agri-chemicals. These materials could also be used to produce explosives and methamphetamines by criminal elements.

The U.S. government has implemented a security tax credit for security upgrades at agri-retail sites in the U.S. while the Conservative government leaves our industry less competitive and Canadian sites unprotected from theft.

When will the government step up for Canadian agri-retailers and take action to keep Canadians safe?

**Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of this concern as is the Minister of Agriculture. I met with the agri-retailers yesterday. They have stated their case to me. I know that they are also working with public safety. We are having a look at this matter.

**Mr. Francis Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, surely the government wants to protect Canadians by preventing these dangerous materials from falling into the wrong hands. Industry has been asking for years for the government to join it and share the cost presented by this very real security issue, yet it cannot get a meeting with the minister.

Literally tonnes of explosive chemicals, poisonous gases, and meth-producing chemicals sit unprotected without so much as a fence to prevent criminal elements from seizing them.

When will the government stop paying lip service to public safety and take action to protect Canadians?

**Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, safety is very much a concern of this government. Canadians have seen the actions that we have taken to defend their safety. The member should check his facts. In fact, certain segments have met with me, as I mentioned, and they are working with the departments in this regard.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CANADA-COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT**

**Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Canada-Colombia free trade agreement will give preferential access to companies exploiting Colombia's natural resources. The problem is that these resources are located in areas inhabited by indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities.

Amnesty International recently revealed that there has been a significant increase in ongoing violence against these peoples.

*Oral Questions*

Are the government and the Liberals going to be party to the violence against indigenous and Afro-Colombian peoples?

[English]

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member's question and I follow this issue very closely. He forms his question deliberately to mislead. It kind of sounds like the Liberals opposite when they are chattering. It is the same type of thing. They deliberately mislead. They deliberately obstruct the facts. The reality here—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, order. The term “deliberately mislead” has been ruled unparliamentary by the Speaker. The member is out of time but might wish to retract his statement.

I believe the member for Burnaby—New Westminster has a follow-up, so if the member would do so, quickly.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Certainly, I would not want to mislead the House, Mr. Speaker, in any way, shape or form.

The reality on the minister's statement is that Canadian companies and Colombia follow the best corporate social responsibility practices.

**Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, he should apologize for his and his government's stand on Colombia. It is absolutely embarrassing.

Colombia is number one in the world for labour killings and number one in the world for violent theft of land. The government pretends that there is a democratic government in Colombia but the international election monitoring report detailed fraud, coercion and fear of violence as the election period begins.

Instead of rewarding the regime in Colombia with a privileged trade deal, why will the Conservatives and Liberals not push the regime to have free and fair elections there?

The U.S. Congress and the EU have stopped implementing free trade with Colombia. When will the government stop—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, CPC):** Again, Mr. Speaker, the member comes back with the same question.

The reality is that we have a good trade agreement with Colombia. I think the majority of Parliament will be onside with that agreement. It will create jobs and opportunity for Canadian workers. It will help Colombians who have a democratically-elected government. It will help Colombian workers. It has side agreements on human rights and on the environment.

This is a very good free trade agreement not just for Canada but for Colombia.

•(1155)

**PENSIONS**

**Mr. Russ Hiebert (South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians from across Canada and constituents from my riding of South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale were shocked and disturbed to discover that criminals, like Clifford Olson, are receiving taxpayer-funded seniors benefits.

Yesterday, the leader of the Bloc showed how out of touch he was by saying that he does not want to stop sending tax dollars from law-abiding Canadians from going to murderers.

Could the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development please inform the House what our Conservative government's position is on this very important issue?

**Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the comments made by the leader of the Bloc show once again that the Bloc is more interested in protecting the rights of criminals than the rights of victims and their families.

We, as a Conservative government, however, are focused on the rights of victims. In fact, when I heard about the situation of Mr. Olson, I was very concerned and disturbed. Members can rest assured that we are making every effort at a very rapid pace to ensure that situation does not continue and that it is prevented from happening in the future.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again the Conservatives fail to tell the truth about taxes.

This fiscal year they will increase the tax burden on jobs, health products, air security, retirement savings and education. Now, through conniving deception and cover up, they will also increase the scope of the dreaded GST.

The new Conservatives' \$1 billion tax hike from the GST will hurt ordinary Canadians, eliminating exceptions and extending the base for a \$1 billion GST increase. Does that not turn Conservative—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance.

**Mr. Ted Menzies (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would welcome the hon. member back to a policy that is exactly the same as when he sat in government.

These are simply technical clarifications in response to a court case that is seeking to address uncertainty in those cases. It merely affirms a long-standing tax policy under this government and former governments.

We announced this nearly four months ago. I am glad the hon. member woke up. We are working with industry to clear up any misunderstandings.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mr. Gérard Asselin (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, unemployed people in eastern Quebec may lose three weeks of employment insurance because transitional measures are scheduled to end on April 10. Workers were also required to work an extra two weeks to qualify for benefits.

My question is for the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development. Can the government confirm today that it will extend the transitional measures in order to avoid prolonging the spring gap for the unemployed in eastern Quebec?

**Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation and we are in the midst of making a decision. However, I would like to say one thing. It is a fact that the Bloc Québécois members have always voted against our efforts. They have voted against every measure that we have put before Parliament to help Quebec's workers and the unemployed. They voted against the additional five weeks and against measures to help long-tenured and older workers. That is shameful.

\* \* \*

[English]

**CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA**

**Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Safety has stated that double-bunking prisoners in cells designed for one person is appropriate.

However, his own Commissioner of Correctional Service Canada says that double-bunking is not correctionally sound. This practice also contravenes international standards that Canada has pledged to observe.

Overcrowding in jails poses a serious problem to both inmates and guards. It raises tensions, threatens the safety of correctional staff and makes rehabilitation more difficult, especially for those with mental illness.

Could the Minister of Public Safety please explain to Canadians how double-bunking prisoners will make Canadians safer?

**Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as has been made very clear by our government, we are concerned about the safety of Canadians in the street. We will take such necessary, humane and constitutional steps to ensure that violent and dangerous criminals stay behind bars.

\* \* \*

**AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our government has made significant commitments to the auto sector in Canada by preserving our share of the North American production and restructuring for a promising new future.

Could the minister please update the House on what General Motors has been doing to grow this important industry and work toward these goals?

● (1200)

**Hon. Gary Goodyear (Minister of State (Science and Technology) (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, more good news. General Motors just announced that it will add a third shift at its Oshawa plant, hire more people at its CAMI plant, recall 600 employees, add an additional 70 jobs by August and is committed to repaying its loan by the end of June this year.

Canada's auto sector is thriving once again due to this government's continued commitment and will emerge greater after this recession, more competitive and more prosperous than ever before. We are getting it done.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary can bluster, sputter and try to transfer the blame but the fact is that this tax will be downloaded onto ordinary Canadians.

Changing the rules on GST tax exemptions will reduce the value of RRSFs, increase the cost of insurance and increase the cost of mortgages. Who pays? It will be ordinary Canadians.

Why is the government taxing ordinary Canadians and forcing them to bear the brunt of the burden for the government's deficit?

**Mr. Ted Menzies (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is hard to take a lecture from that hon. member and his colleagues in the Liberal Party talking about taxes. His colleague, the member for Markham—Unionville, is the honorary chair of the raise the GST fan club. We have since learned, through expert analysis, that that would cost Canadians 162,000 jobs.

I am sure the Liberals will be discussing that at their thinkers' conference and I would be glad to hear what they think of it.

\* \* \*

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the Conservatives may think, the market does not care about our science-based approach to genetic engineering.

In fact, on March 18, Bulgaria adopted the most restrictive law on GMO released in the European Union. This new law includes a ban on GM wheat. Six other European Union countries, including France and Germany, have imposed bans on growing GM corn.

Argentina protects its farmers by analyzing the potential adverse effects of Argentinian GM exports. Will the minister protect Canadian farmers by following Argentina's example?

*Routine Proceedings*

**Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, farmers are best positioned to make decisions on what is best for their business, which is why industry must continue to work with our producers to evaluate any new products.

Our government understands that in order to be competitive our farmers deserve timely access to the cutting edge inputs they need, but we also understand that our system must be based on sound science. What the NDP is proposing would put a choke on research and development in the agricultural sector and would diminish the competitiveness of our farmers.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Standing Orders allow for a member to table a document referred to in question period. I therefore would request that you ask for unanimous consent for me to table the documents that I wanted to quote from.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Does the member have the unanimous consent of the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Mr. Speaker, this is a document that was tabled yesterday by the government. Why would the government not want me to table it now?

**The Deputy Speaker:** If it has already been tabled, then I am not sure of the need to re-table it. Regardless, there is no consent. It is not for the Speaker to ask why a consent has not been given. It is just to take note of the fact that there is no consent.

We will move on with tabling of documents.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

**Hon. Rona Ambrose (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has recently taken steps to recover a \$350,000 contingency or success fee paid by Shire Biochem Inc. to Wallding International Inc. in November 2001.

This fee was paid in breach of a contract provision prohibiting contingency fees under the contract between Public Works and Government Services Canada and Shire Biochem Inc. to provide seasonal flu and pandemic vaccine, when required, over a 10 year period. The contract provides that no contingency fee would be paid, directly or indirectly, by the contractor, Shire Biochem Inc. It further stipulates that if the contractor defaults on this term, the minister may recover the contingency fee from the contractor.

The contract states:

The Contractor certifies that it has not directly or indirectly paid or agreed to pay any covenants that it will not directly or indirectly pay a contingency fee for the solicitation, negotiation or obtaining of this contract to any person other than an employee acting in the normal course of the employee's duties.

All accounts and records pertaining to payments of fees or other compensation for the solicitation, obtaining or negotiation of the Contract shall be subject to the Accounts and Audit provision of the Contract.

If the Contractor certifies falsely under this section or is in default of the obligations contained therein, the Minister may either terminate this Contract for default or recover from the Contractor by way of reduction to the Contract Price or otherwise the full amount of the contingency fee.

In this section:

"contingency fee" means any payment or other compensation that is contingent upon or is calculated upon the basis of a degree of success in soliciting or obtaining a Government Contract or negotiating the whole or any part of its terms;

Wallding International Inc., a registered lobbying firm, was engaged by BioChem Vaccines Inc. to provide "—strategic advice in developing a strategy and action plan for BioChem Vaccines Inc. to be granted a long-term contract valued at approximately \$100-\$240 million with Public Works and Government Services Canada".

According to lobbyist registration 7795767-11397-1, Wallding International was retained to lobby Health Canada, Industry Canada, the Privy Council Office, the Department of Public Works and Government Services and the Federal Office of Regional Development Quebec.

The registration indicated that the lobbyist's payment was not contingent on the success of the undertaking.

A routine compliance audit and review of related documents undertaken by Deloitte & Touche for Industry Canada uncovered evidence that suggested a contingency fee in the amount of \$350,000 had been paid to Wallding International Inc. in November 2001.

Following a thorough investigation by Public Works and Government Services Canada's Oversight Branch, it was determined that the contingency fee should be recovered and that the file should be referred to the Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying to ensure that all regulations regarding disclosure of success fees were followed.

This government introduced the Federal Accountability Act in 2006, and as a result, the payment of success fees for contracts is now illegal and public office-holders are banned from lobbying after leaving office for a minimum of five years.

• (1205)

**Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that the minister would not have followed the normal practice in this place, which is to submit the statement at least 24 hours in advance of making the statement in this place. We were given no notice whatsoever and it is just now that I have heard the minister's comments.

*Routine Proceedings*

This is deeply disturbing on a number of levels. First, it shows a pattern of continued disrespect for Parliament and its institutions. It does not give us an adequate opportunity to respond, but particularly to do so on the issue of vaccines, one that obviously has gripped this nation and one with which we have been very concerned, particularly when it deals with those contracts. We had a lot of questions about them because they were sole-sourced. The government decided to put all of its eggs in one basket.

However, also consider the fact that just four months ago the Auditor General slammed the government for not having a plan when it came to emergency preparedness. Now when we are just beginning to get some semblance of action, which is hastily tossed together, we find out that the Conservatives are not discussing these matters with the people who are on the front lines in keeping our communities safe. As an example, when it comes to public health, the key individuals involved in public health, those who ensure our communities are safe or who respond to an emergency situation, were not consulted with the development of this plan. In fact, there is not even a clear chain of command.

In committee when one of our members asked a question about who was responsible, where the buck stopped, there was a long pause. The witnesses all looked at each other and eventually somebody said “Well, I guess it's me”. For a government that continually peddles in fear, in trying to balloon up issues to get people to be afraid, it is remarkable that it has no plan to actually deal with any of the situations it tries to get people to fear.

It is not just public health. When we talked to the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs, the fire chiefs said that they were not included in the development of an emergency plan at all. They are absolutely irate that fire is not in that plan, that it has been set aside.

We talked with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture about a situation with fertilizer. Today in the House the member for Guelph asked a question about that. We have a situation where fertilizer is not being secured. The United States gave tax advantages to people to ensure they were able to put proper security measures in place, yet Canada refuses to do that. In fact, ministers have not been responded to letters requesting meetings with them. People feel left in the dark.

When it comes to emergency preparedness and emergency planning, the government is all talk and no action. Even a report from the Auditor General cannot get the Conservatives to get their act together, sit down, talk with the principal stakeholders and ensure the right thing is done.

Whether the government is proroguing Parliament, or cancelling the opinion of independent agencies, such as the Information Commissioner or the RCMP Public Complaints Commissioner, or while it is not scuttling committees, in so many different instances the government shows a complete lack of respect for Parliament, its institutions and, frankly, democracy. Yet again the minister has done it here today. It is unacceptable. This is an unheard of practice to just dump it on the table like this. She should be following the practices of the House and show more respect for an issue of this kind of importance.

●(1210)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois, like the Liberal Party, is outraged that the government did not follow the usual practice. We were advised only this morning that there would be a ministerial statement today even though we received advance notice of the one to be made Monday on World War I, which gives us time to get ready.

In this case, even though there were confidential aspects, we could very well have received the text of the statement and kept it confidential, and the government knows that. Once we were informed of this ministerial statement, we asked for the text of the statement, in order to prepare an adequate response to the announcement. Clearly, we did not get the text before the statement, but we will not do like the government and improvise responses and gestures such as we saw yesterday, for example, with the introduction of 2,500 pages of completely useless redacted documents.

I must denounce the fact that it is now common practice for the Conservative government to take actions that show contempt for the work of the opposition. I give the example of the two prorogations in less than a year. There is also the refusal to abide by the order adopted on December 10, 2009. Under the circumstances, it is obvious that we will be more intelligent than the government and that we will not respond to the minister's statement before we have time to study it seriously. We will respond to it another day.

[*English*]

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, as the NDP critic for public works, I am thankful the minister raised this issue in the House today. I, too, was taken aback at the lack of notice, but she has shared with us some very useful information to shine light on perhaps the untoward influence of lobbyists in policy-making, at least in the years of the early 2000s, prior to the introduction of the Federal Accountability Act, for which the NDP was proud to vote.

We did not see a printed copy of the statement, but the words that jumped out at me was when the minister mentioned the contingency fees, the success fees, paid out to Wallding International Inc. I note that the key principal of Wallding International Inc. is none other than former senior Liberal cabinet minister David Dingwall, who had well-known and long-standing connections to big pharma in his former capacity as a minister in the Liberal government.

*Routine Proceedings*

For a Liberal minister of the Crown to cease his duties as a cabinet minister and within a year, go out and influence peddle with big pharma for a sole-source contract worth hundreds of millions of dollars for a pre-set contingency fee is not only fundamentally wrong, it is illegal in my view. The only difference between lobbying and influence peddling is about five years in prison, and influence peddling or selling one's influence, one's access to a company, is nothing short of influence peddling.

The minister has done us a great service by shining a light on this sorry bit of Canadian history. We have all known about the very cozy relationship between the Liberals and big pharma. We have all wondered about the drug patent laws, which were in fact the biggest corporate giveaway since the CPR in terms of giving big pharma almost unlimited drug patent laws. There has been essentially draining the coffers of health care budgets ever since, handing billions of dollars to the select, well connected, influential group of pharmaceutical companies that the Liberals used so well.

We all took note of senior Liberal staffers who were like a revolving door. One day they were working in the minister's office. The next day they were working for Pfizer. The next day they were working for a lobbying company. The next day they were back in the office of the Liberals. It was like a revolving door, which we noticed time and time again, ministerial staff going into big pharma and then back out again, or going into the lobbying industry and selling influence like this.

This is perhaps the most graphic illustration of the rot that crept into the Liberal regime in those years than we have seen since the sponsorship scandal. Mr. Dingwall, who was entitled to his entitlements, clearly thought one of his entitlements was to pillage the health care system by selling this privileged access to big pharma and lining his own pockets in the process. It is fundamentally wrong and I can assure members that our parliamentary committee will be seized of this issue, at the earliest opportunity, to conduct an in-depth study of these kinds of shenanigans to ensure they can never happen again.

\* \* \*

● (1215)

**CANADA SHIPPING ACT**

**Mr. Fin Donnelly (New Westminster—Coquitlam, NDP)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-502, An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, 2001 (prohibition against oil tankers in Dixon Entrance, Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound).

He said: Mr. Speaker, my bill would amend the Canada Shipping Act by prohibiting the transportation of oil in oil tankers along the north coast of British Columbia, specifically in Dixon Entrance, Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound. It would also allow the government, on the recommendation of Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, to designate other areas of the sea in which the transportation of oil by oil tankers could be prohibited.

I feel the introduction of this bill is timely. On March 24, 1989, the *Exxon Valdez* oil tanker ran aground on Bligh Reef, causing one of the most devastating environmental disasters in North American history. The environmental impact of the *Exxon Valdez* spill was enormous, killing thousands of birds, sea mammals and others.

This week first nations groups, businesses and other community activists from all across British Columbia came together to denounce the proposed Enbridge pipeline, which would bring 225 oil tankers a year through Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound to move crude oil to markets abroad. This traffic could endanger countless marine species, first nations and coastal communities. As lawmakers, I believe we have a duty to protect B.C.'s coastlines for generations to come.

I strongly encourage the federal government to protect B.C.'s coast, our salmon fishery and our amazing coastal ecosystem and invest in a new renewable energy future. It can start to do this by voting for this bill.

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

\* \* \*

● (1220)

[Translation]

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## CANADIAN HERITAGE

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I move that the 1st report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, presented on March 17, be concurred in.

I will discuss the issues related to the motion. Today, the Bloc Québécois is moving adoption of the report.

I will begin by reading the motion passed by the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

That the Committee recommends that the government amend Part VIII of the Copyright Act so that the definition of "audio recording medium" extends to devices with internal memory, so that the levy on copying music will apply to digital music recorders as well, thereby entitling music creators to some compensation for the copies made of their work.

There can be no doubt that people must be paid for their work. All workers have the right to earn wages, even my colleagues and me. Artists and craftspeople have the right to be paid for what they do and create. Consumers have the right to load the CDs they have legally purchased onto their iPods without feeling like they are breaking the law every time, without feeling like criminals.

The motion I presented to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, which was adopted, sought to update existing legislation. Since the 1990s, there has been an exception in the Copyright Act to do with private copying.



*Routine Proceedings*

The exception allows consumers to copy material for their personal use. In return, they are asked to pay a tiny fee when purchasing the blank medium they use to make copies. Everyone here has paid this fee, and I am sure that I have too. It is 24¢ for audio cassettes, although very few people buy those nowadays. For CDs, the fee is 29¢.

The problem is that CD sales have declined dramatically, but consumption of music has not. There is a problem. Video cassettes are not included in the Copyright Act's private copying exception and never have been. Some might think that is too bad, but it took a long time to update this 1997 legislation.

Two years ago, the Conservative government introduced Bill C-61. The bill proposed adding video cassettes to the list. Unfortunately, the process took so long that nobody was even using them anymore, or at least, very few people were back then, and even fewer still use them now. The technology has become obsolete.

To avoid having the same thing happen with MP3 players and iPods, the Bloc Québécois is proposing, by means of the motion I had adopted by the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, that we act swiftly to keep up with advances in technology and add iPods and MP3 players.

Unlike what the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages claims, this has nothing to do with BlackBerrys, laptops or iPhones. The minister is using scare tactics. We are talking about MP3 players, and the most well-known brand is the iPod.

This is not complicated. We are not trying to wage a new war. We do not want to change a principle. The principle is already there; it exists in the legislation. We are not trying to create a new one. We simply want to modernize the Copyright Act and add this temporary solution while we wait for a new Copyright Act. Since technology is developing quickly, we are worried that a new technology could already be invented and in use before we have a new Copyright Act and that it will be too late. As I mentioned earlier, we must act quickly.

I would like to give a bit of history. I remind members that in its 2003-04 decision on the private copying tariff, the Copyright Board of Canada approved the application by the Canadian Private Copying Collective, the CPCC, to have levies collected on flash memory cards embedded in iPods and other MP3 players, which the commission designated as digital audio recorders.

The Federal Court then ruled that the commission had erred in its decision and threw out the CPCC's case. Since then, this collective has tried to speed up the modernization of the act and to have it changed to include MP3 players, which is a good thing. The goal is essentially to ensure that artists are paid for their work.

I have an example to show that artists are not always paid for their work. On December 3, the Minister of Industry, a Conservative minister, gave a radio interview with CBC. During that interview, he bragged to host George Stroumboulopoulos that he had downloaded 10,000 songs to his iPod. He bragged about it.

● (1225)

The interviewer, Mr. Stroumboulopoulos, asked him twice whether he had obtained all those tracks legally and the minister

started laughing. The interviewer repeated the question and asked the Minister of Industry again whether all the tracks had been obtained legally and he laughed again. He was unable to clearly state that he had acquired all the tracks legally and that all the music he had downloaded onto his iPod had been paid for in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Yesterday, in the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, a respected university professor, Michael Geist, told us it is not so bad if artists, singers and musicians do not get paid for all their recordings because they can make up for those losses by putting on shows and earn money in other ways. He was reluctant to agree with a levy on MP3s.

I asked him whether he would agree to being hired as a university professor, but not paid. I told him that he is now known as a university professor and he could give talks and find other sources of income. He did not answer my question. In any event, it was not the best of questions; comparisons are always clumsy. Nonetheless, people have to get paid for their work and not just for things they do on the side.

When an artist makes a recording they have to rent a recording studio, and the recording studio does not give shows all across Quebec, Canada or the world. Professionals, sound engineers and the producer make the recording. I am talking about music, but there are also visual artists and authors whose work ends up on iPods and MP3s. The photographers, the printers and the cover designers all have to get paid for their work.

How can we expect all those people to earn an income any other way? It is unthinkable.

Last Friday we got some surprising support from the *Edmonton Journal*. I want to bring this editorial to the attention of the House. It ran last Friday, one week ago today. I will read the editorial in French. I tried to translate it, but I am not a professional translator. I have a lot of respect for translators. This is more of an interpretation, and I did the best I could. I chose certain sentences, so it is not a word-for-word translation and I hope that you will not judge my translation skills. Please do not think that I am bragging.

The title is *Creative content must be paid for*, which I translated as *On doit payer pour le contenu artistique*. I hope that that is correct and that I started off on the right foot.

Before I begin reading, I should say that the same day I managed to have a motion adopted authorizing a levy for artists on the purchase of iPods, the member for Timmins—James Bay, my NDP colleague, introduced a bill containing exactly the same proposal. Obviously, the *Edmonton Journal* is talking more about the actions of a federalist member than a Bloc member. It is surprising enough that it would support someone from the NDP; we would never have expected it to go so far as to support a motion from the Bloc. But the objective is what counts, and the *Edmonton Journal* supports it and ran a whole article about it. This is what it had to say. Once again, this is not a translation but, rather, an interpretation.

*Routine Proceedings*

It's not surprising, says the *Edmonton Journal*, that the people of the world have warmly embraced the idea of getting creative content for free. Most of us understandably prefer not paying for something whenever possible, even when securing the product gratis technically breaks a rarely enforced statute.

And the editorial in the *Edmonton Journal* continues.

Downloading music, it says, is a good example because everyone does it. It's true that some of us always dutifully buy our music online, from sources such as iTunes—I would say, rather, sites like Archambault in Quebec—which do distribute royalties, however imperfect the system.

And I would add that this is true for all systems everywhere.

● (1230)

But millions either don't do this, or share with others what they have purchased, making crooks of 11-year-olds, at least in the eyes of the law.

That is how the *Edmonton Journal* puts it.

Recognizing this reality some years ago, the Canadian government, along with others around the world, began levying a small fee on all blank recording media used to copy music, such as CDs.

Canada's private copying levy—that is its name—was introduced by the Canadian Private Copying Collective, which is a non-profit, independent organization founded in 1997 to distribute monies collected from retailers and consumers to musicians, record companies, publishing firms and other copyright holders.

The sky hasn't exactly fallen in over that legislation, although some retailers, unrepentant pirates and libertarian types have continued a bitter fight railing against the fees for years.

On the other hand, the tough-talking record companies and their agents, who beat the garbage can demanding severe penalties for perceived offenders, must also be taken with a mine shaft of salt.

I repeat, that is the opinion of the *Edmonton Journal*.

What has changed over the past 13 years is digital technology. These days, most of the file-sharing taking place—and expanding exponentially—involves the next generation of devices. Royalties would be added to the purchase price of only MP3 or iPod players, not computers, tablets or phones. The new legislation would help balance the interests of both consumers and creators.

In this editorial published in the *Edmonton Journal*, from which I am quoting rather freely, as I said, our colleague from the NDP, the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay, is quoted as saying that artists have a right to get paid and consumers have a right to access their works. That is important. Digital locks and suing fans are not going to prevent people from copying music from one format to another. By updating the legislation—I am still quoting the hon. member—, we will ensure that artists are getting paid for their work, and that consumers are not criminalized for downloading their legally-obtained music from one format to another. The comment by the member for Timmins ends here, but the *Edmonton Journal* editorial continues.

While all this seems like a perfectly reasonable compromise, to hear the Conservative government tell it, it is the Boston Tea Party circa 2010. Personally, I would talk about a revolution. The Minister of Industry, misrepresenting its contents, denounced the bill as “total nonsense”.

One might have thought that the Minister of Canadian Heritage would defend creators, but we know that he defends many causes which are not that of creators. This minister also distorted what was suggested in the proposed legislation, talking as if it included a levy on BlackBerrys, iPhones and laptops, railing oddly that consumers deserve lower, not higher taxes.

According to the *Edmonton Journal*, it is true that the royalty distribution system in Canada is far from perfect, but record companies have not exactly always been a paragon of fair-dealing when it comes to honestly compensating artists.

The system overlooks lesser known artists. The system is not perfect but it is about time that we, as a society, face the fact that those who create cultural content should be given fair compensation for their work, something we all desire.

The *Edmonton Journal* added that it usually does not support NDP bills, but that the bill introduced by the member for Timmins—James Bay is fair and balanced and worthy of everyone's support.

As I stated earlier, the bill introduced by the member for Timmins—James Bay is identical, word for word, to the motion we are presently discussing and that I was able to have the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage adopt.

The *Edmonton Journal* concludes that the Conservatives are clearly playing pandering politics, and that hopefully the opposition parties and independently-minded Conservatives will sign on to a compromise that upholds basic Canadian values of straight dealing.

That is the end of my quotes from the *Edmonton Journal*, and the end of my translating. You will have realized that it was a very loose translation. The main ideas are there but I am obviously not a translator.

● (1235)

The *Edmonton Journal* is not the only one to agree. In general, the public feels that artists should be paid for their work.

A nation-wide poll conducted in June 2006 by Environics Research Group confirmed that 60% of Canadians believe that creators should be compensated when unauthorized recordings are made of their music. The same poll indicated that of those Canadians who make private copies of recorded music, 80% feel that a royalty of 30¢ for CD-Rs and CD-RWs would be fair and reasonable. It currently stands at 29¢.

In a similar vein, 79% of Canadians who make private copies stated that a \$40 levy on iPods—which is a lot—or other 30GB digital audio recorder would be fair and reasonable. We should remember that a 30GB iPod costs several hundred dollars and that a \$40 levy on an iPod has never been considered. What had been suggested previously was an amount between \$2 and \$25.

A 30GB digital audio recorder can hold up to 7,500 songs or the equivalent of 500 CDs. That is much more than can be listened to in one week unless that is all you are doing.

On the weekend, in Quebec City, when the Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert riding association presented this same motion to the Bloc Québécois general council, it was our executive's youth representative, Frédéric Burque, who presented it. He is not even 30.

Who supported this important motion presented by the riding association executive? The Forum jeunesse, a strong, energetic, realistic youth wing that is in touch with the concerns of young Quebecers. It was the Bloc Québécois Forum jeunesse who supported the Bloc motion.

Who voted in favour of the motion recommending royalty levies on iPods? Everyone. It was unanimous. The 75 riding associations, the citizenship committee, the national bureau, the leader of the Bloc Québécois—everyone in the Bloc Québécois, from young to old, agrees with this motion.

In the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, who voted in favour of this motion? How did we manage to adopt this motion in this committee? I moved the motion and my Bloc Québécois colleague from Drummond, who, of course, has the interests of artists at heart, supported it. The member from the NDP was also in favour of such a bill since he introduced a similar one the very same day.

Two of the three Liberal members also voted in favour of the motion; the third abstained. Who was the sixth voter? A Conservative, the chair of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage himself. The hon. member for Perth—Wellington even wrote a letter to the Minister of Canadian Heritage and a letter to the Minister of Industry to ask them for changes that would modernize the legislation. The words he used are exactly the same ones used in this motion.

In closing, I hope this motion will be adopted. Unfortunately, it will not become law, but if adopted, it will send a clear message to the Conservative government to change the Copyright Act and make this correction as soon as possible.

This message also means that the new Copyright Act the government is cooking up will have to include an exception for private copying, with levies not only on obsolete audio cassettes, but also on CD-Rs, CD-RWs and digital audio equipment such as MP3 players.

• (1240)

[English]

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have only been around this place for a little over four years but I really do

### *Routine Proceedings*

believe the old saying that if one stays around here long enough, one will hear just about everything.

Today we are hearing about a tax on technology. I cannot believe we are actually talking about instituting a special tax on technology, the same kind of technology that would drive Canadian innovation and productivity.

Let us work with the number the member just gave. This tax would apply to PVRs, smart phones, iPods and every form of digital media with a memory. That is what the motion says. She mentioned perhaps a \$25 tax on a 30 gig iPod. Home computers often come with memories exceeding one terabyte now. A terabyte would be about 33 times as much memory as a 30 gig iPod. One could assume that the tax would therefore be fairly attributed to be 33 times \$25.

I am just wondering if the member would also support a tax on a home computer in excess of \$800, because that is in fact what she is advocating.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by that kind of questions that reek of bad faith.

The principle of indemnifying artists for copies made for personal use is already in the legislation. It applies to CDs and audio cassettes, the four-track cassettes that nobody uses anymore.

We are asking to update the legislation to include MP3s.

I said in my speech that the measure would apply only to MP3 digital audio recorders. We are seeing the usual scare tactics from people who say that the measure will apply to smartphones such as the BlackBerry, but that is false.

[English]

**Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the member for Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert has brought forward this concurrence motion today. I am also pleased that she spoke favourably about the work of my colleague from Timmins—James Bay and his private member's bill, which is very similar to the report that came out of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. The New Democrats strongly support this report and strongly supported it at the standing committee.

I wonder if the member could comment on the way the Conservatives have characterized this as yet another tax. It is far different from a tax. A levy is far different from the kind of tax increase the Conservatives have put forward, for instance, in Ontario and British Columbia, with the harmonized sales tax.

This levy would be completely dedicated to artists in Canada. The money that would be collected on the levy would go to them as compensation for their work. It would not go into general revenues of the government.

I wonder if she might comment a little more on that.

*Routine Proceedings*

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his extremely relevant question. True, those who are against applying the levy to MP3s call it a tax. There is a principle or an ideology behind the word tax. A tax is money collected for the government that goes into the consolidated revenue fund before it is redistributed through the financial system. A levy is totally different.

A levy is an amount that is paid, for example 29¢ on the purchase of a CD, and then given to the Canadian Private Copying Collective, which redistributes it to copyright holders through a very sophisticated mechanism.

The copyright holders are the artists who contributed to creating the music. This mechanism is not perfect; there are always some who slip through the cracks. Nevertheless, in general, artists and arts workers are extremely satisfied with this system. Tens of thousands of dollars have been distributed in this way to artists and creators, thereby increasing their incomes.

**Ms. Meili Faille (Vaudreuil-Soulanges, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I find the parliamentary secretary's reaction is quite surprising. I hope he will agree with the chair of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, one of his Conservative colleagues.

We must take a stand with the artists. They deserve an income. I held consultations in Vaudreuil—Soulanges during prorogation. I met artists and people who promote Quebec culture in the Montréal region. These people agree with the Bloc Québécois and the position that my colleague so expertly defended.

I would like to ask a question of my colleague. What was the amount of the royalties received by artists through the current law?

• (1245)

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges for her very relevant question. First of all, I have to say that artists are not rich by any stretch of the imagination, contrary to popular belief. We see them on TV, all sparkly and glamorous, but in real life, it is not the same.

In Canada and Quebec, the average artist's income is between \$20,000 and \$25,000 per year. Some of them make a lot more. There are some Céline Dions in the world, but the fact remains that most artists really do not make a lot of money.

The Canadian Private Copying Collective has collected \$180 million in royalties since 1998. These millions of dollars are redistributed as fairly as possible to the artists of Canada and Quebec. That money is the difference between living below or above the poverty line, allows artists to get a few thousand dollars more in a year or to receive a cheque from time to time to make ends meet. These royalties are a cheque to the artists and taking them away would be devastating.

We have to understand that, since people use four-track cassettes less and less, royalties are decreasing dramatically and constantly, while artists need more and more help because their CDs are not selling well—because there are too many copies.

[*English*]

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-sor, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was at committee yesterday when we

spoke to Michael Geist. In her speech the member gave the impression that she did not really agree with what he was saying. However, there is one aspect of it with which I think she would agree, which is to say that he did go on to say that further debate is needed on this. I believe in that as well and here is why.

The copyright issue has never faced a full debate in the House even though several bills have been introduced. It was debated back in the early part of the last decade but since bills C-60 and C-61 there really has not been a full vetting of what is going on. I think that is what Mr. Geist was also saying and I am sure she would agree.

Would the member agree that furthering the debate certainly would be beneficial for us as parliamentarians?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** Mr. Speaker, that is a very pertinent question. Indeed, yesterday, the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage heard the well-known Michael Geist, who gave an extremely astute presentation on the comprehensive digital strategy. While he said some very pertinent things on some points, on others I would say that he is out of touch with artists.

I agree completely with Mr. Geist when he says that we need a comprehensive digital strategy. In the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, only the Conservative members did not get that. We could see it again this morning with the Canada media fund. This is a new patch for digital because the government has no strategy and no vision for the transition to digital or for digitization. There is only tinkering around the edges while Michael Geist thinks, like me, that we need a comprehensive vision.

Mr. Geist is completely right about copyright, as well. Bill C-61 was already obsolete the day it was introduced. It talked about videocassettes when everybody was already using MP3 files. Bill C-61 created all kind of problems and was already obsolete.

I also agree with Michael Geist when he says that we need new copyright legislation. I totally agree with him on that, but I do not agree with his reluctance to give the royalties on iPods to artists on the pretence that they have other sources of income like live shows. I consider that everybody has a right to be paid for what he or she does when he or she does it.

• (1250)

[*English*]

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, first let me emphasize that our government is committed to fostering creativity, innovation and economic growth and giving Canadian creators and consumers the tools they need to keep Canada competitive internationally. We see this through all the efforts that have been made by the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

*Routine Proceedings*

He is certainly a young minister, but I do not think there is a person in the House who knows more about digital technology, emerging technology, than the Minister of Canadian Heritage. At the same time, he is transitioning with that knowledge and he is also leveraging support, whether through the Canada media fund or the Canada music fund. There is a five-year commitment to the Canada music fund. The Minister of Canadian Heritage is really leading the cultural sector in this country, and it is exciting to see.

Today, we have been asked to consider a motion proposed by the opposition members in the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, which would tax all iPods, all MP3 players, all cellphones, all BlackBerrys and any other device that can hold media.

As my parliamentary colleagues likely already know, Canada has had a levy equalling less than a dollar on blank recording media such as CDs since 1997. In the intervening years, newer technologies came along with built-in memory to store music and other electronic files.

To properly consider the motion presented before us today, we must be aware of the scope of the issues involved and the related technical details. This is indeed a very complex issue, and there are many views and perspectives that must be considered.

I want to take a few moments to describe the Canadian private copying regime. To begin with, I will remind members of the continuing impact of new technology on the copyright landscape and how it has evolved and continues to evolve in recent times. When music was just available on vinyl records or in live performances, only people with specialized skills and equipment could make copies of it. Even as tape machines became available, the task of making copies was cumbersome and difficult. In addition, there was a noticeable decline in the quality of the first and then subsequent duplications.

I am sure many of us can remember waiting beside the radio with our finger over the "record" button waiting for our favourite top-10 hit. I know in Peterborough it was 980 CHEX that I was listening to as a kid, and I remember sitting there with my tape recorder, trying to time that song just right. It did not work out very often.

As technology improved, customers found it easier to make copies. It became relatively easy for a consumer, for example, to buy a vinyl record to listen to at home and make a tape of it to listen to in the car. It was just as easy to make an additional copy for a friend or two. This practice became more widespread, and that was a problem. The holders of music copyright were not compensated for the copies of their work. For consumers it was also a problem, because making any copy at all was illegal.

At the same time, enforcing the rules was very difficult. It is one thing to pursue an individual who makes thousands of copies of a single work and then distributes them without the permission of the owner. It is quite another when it is millions of people copying thousands of works.

Canada's private copying regime, created in 1997, was a response to this difficult issue. Since copies were distributed on recordable media, such as CDs, the regime imposed a levy upon them. The moneys collected in this way were then distributed to copyright holders of the works being copied. To do this, the Copyright Act had

to be amended to allow consumers to make copies for their private use on some audio recording media. It was also necessary to give Canada's Copyright Board the power to set the levy for each medium. The Copyright Act, which assigns these powers, requires the board to consider three issues when determining these levies: the consumer's ability to pay, the impact of tariffs on black and grey markets, and the public interest.

The system is not intended to compensate owners for each copy of their works made. In fact, it could not be, since it would be impossible to track the necessary data. Nor is the system intended to levy charges in a way that was precisely related to the consumer's actual use of works. The levy is applied irrespective of the actual use of the blank media. The Copyright Board sets the levy taking into account the criteria I mentioned earlier and considering general usage patterns.

The hon. member who spoke just before me talked about the levy on CDs, CDRWs, DVDs and DVDRWs.

• (1255)

Quite often these units of storage are not used for recording music. They are used for recording things like photos. Sometimes students will use them for recording lectures at school so they can review them later. To place a levy or a tax on these media just because they could be used for music is obviously something that a lot of my constituents have often had trouble with. They do not understand why there would be just a blanket charge being placed upon them, on the assumption that is what the storage device would be used for.

The Canadian Private Copying Collective is responsible for receiving these levies and distributing them to the rights holders. Based in Toronto, this non-profit agency represents songwriters, recording artists, music publishers and record companies. In the 13 years since its inception, the Canadian Private Copying Collective has stated that it has distributed over \$180 million to copyright holders in the music sector.

The notion that Canadians should pay an additional tax on recordable media to compensate copyright holders appears to have become generally accepted, although as I noted, there are ongoing debates.

I should note that consumers purchasing CDs were not necessarily aware of it. In fact often, when I talk to folks in my constituency to ask their opinion on the motion that has been brought forward by the hon. member, I am surprised how many people are not aware that they have been paying this tax for some time. And when they find out about it, they are not necessarily happy.

One could say Canadians have accepted their new rights to make copies for private use, but I do not think that would be accurate either. A more precise way to put it would be to say that an already widespread practice has become even more so.

*Routine Proceedings*

Technology once again has radically changed the game that these rules, established in 1997, were meant to govern. Herein lies the problem. New challenges have emerged. For example, an MP3 player about the size of a credit card can store more music than was once held in an entire boxful of CDs. I own hundreds of CDs. I have purchased them all, but despite all the racks and shelves I have to hold these CDs, I can now store all of them on a device that I could fit in my pocket. In fact it would be smaller than my car keys.

Today consumers can easily download and listen to music from online sources or from previously owned copies without ever needing to purchase a recordable medium such as a CD. However there are many means by which to download media, on websites such as iTunes, where consumers pay for the music and files they download.

The opposition is suggesting that the Copyright Board simply place an extra tax on all devices that are able to store these media, which could result in a tax as high as \$80 per device, and that is just on an iPod. This is where we get into the difficult argument on this.

I asked this of the hon. member a few moments ago. She was using a tax, although she used the word levy, of \$25 on a 30-gigabyte iPod, but for home computers the hard drive capacity is now measured in terabytes, which is significantly more. How therefore would we determine the tax or levy on a device with that much memory? This is clearly a problem.

Not surprisingly, the tribunals and courts that adjudicate copyright law in Canada were asked to rule on the matter of taxing new media devices. I am not going to go into all the details of the various decisions, however the salient point is that the final decision by the Federal Court of Appeal on January 10, 2008, excluded memory in digital audio recorders, such as MP3 players, from the Canadian private copying regime. That was the decision of an independent judiciary.

The motion adopted by the opposition members on the Standing Committee on Heritage proposes to amend the Copyright Act to bring such devices under the regime. The motion provides us with the opportunity to further consider the debate over the private copying regime. What are the challenges? What are the possible solutions? And what do Canadians want? That is something that all members in this House would do well to consider.

This debate may help shed light on the preferences of Canadians and the impact of recent court decisions in the scope of the regime. It is also important that we consider whether we need to approach this debate from a micro or a macro perspective. Should we begin by considering the forest, or do we want to focus on the trees?

Should we begin, as this motion proposes, by considering one possible solution to a particular problem? Following this line of thought, we would ask ourselves whether or not we should amend the law such that MP3 players are not included in the private copying regime.

• (1300)

Thus, let me suggest we take a more holistic perspective and think about the broader issues. As I said a moment ago, we should be considering the effect on all Canadians, the effect on business, the

effect on students, the effect on the everyday constituents we all represent. That is the holistic approach we should be taking.

Before the adoption of this motion, our government had already begun thinking about the larger issues related to copyright law in Canada. In the summer of 2009, we launched a consultation process, and we committed to strengthening laws governing intellectual property and copyright in the 2010 Speech from the Throne.

To ensure the consultation process would be as open as possible, we embraced new technology and created copyright consultation websites and held live events in town halls across the country. As the Speaker would well know, one of these copyright consultations was held in Peterborough, where stakeholders from right across the spectrum took part. We also held them in major centres right across the country, such as Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. In all sectors of the country consultations were heard, and a very diverse group of Canadians came forward to talk about these complex issues.

A simple review of the results of the consultation process shows us that Canadians are clearly aware and care deeply about the issue of copyright.

The website received more than 30,000 unique visits. More than 2,200 visitors registered with the site and left more than 2,500 comments. We also received more than 8,000 written submissions on the copyright consultation.

Moreover, as I said, we hosted round-table events in Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Peterborough, Gatineau, Montreal, the city of Quebec and Halifax. In each of these venues and in online discussions, we asked Canadians to respond to questions covering five types of issues.

We asked them about how copyright law affects their individual lives. How do Canada's copyright laws affect them and how should Parliament modify the existing laws?

We then asked them to think in terms of the larger community, based on Canadian values and interests. How should the copyright system be made to withstand the test of time? As technology changes, how do we put in place a law that is always timely, that is always relevant?

We asked respondents to think in terms of creative interests. What sorts of changes to copyright rules do they believe would best foster innovation and creativity in Canada? That is so important to our future.

We asked them to think in terms of economic interests. What sort of copyright changes would best foster competition and investment in Canada?

Finally, we asked them to think in terms of Canada's remaining competitive in the global market. What kinds of changes would best position Canada as a leader in the digital economy?

What did we learn?

*Routine Proceedings*

First, we learned there are many views on any one issue pertaining to copyright, often differing even within stakeholder groups, be they creators, distributors or consumers.

Others focused on related issues. On the one hand, having been used to making copies of music that they have legally acquired, they wish to be free to continue to do so with minimal restrictions. Others are concerned with format shifting. Having purchased music in one format, they wonder why they should pay an additional tax or fee on a new device to which they will transfer these files.

Members will remember my story about all the CDs I have purchased. At some point, when I have a bit more time on my hands, I would not mind taking all those CDs and putting them onto a digital device. The question is whether, when I make that format shift, I should have to pay for all of those recordings again, because I have already purchased them once. That is something a lot of folks come to me about. They feel that if they have bought a CD they should not have to pay again. But certainly this motion would see all folks charged a levy or a tax, as I see it, on the devices onto which they would actually transfer those media.

In short, we are faced with the challenge of addressing a number of different interests and views, while ensuring Canada continues to be well positioned in today's global economy.

Our government recognizes that to succeed in today's global economy, Canada must keep step as the world races forward. The relentless pace of technology means every day there is something newer, faster and better. We are committed to strengthening laws governing intellectual property and copyright to encourage new ideas and protect the rights of Canadians whose research, development and artistic creativity continue to contribute to Canada's prosperity. We seek not just to protect the rights but also to enhance incentives to do research, to develop ideas and to create art.

I have met with rights holders right across this country. I do not know how many members in this chamber are aware of the contributions that creative Canadian companies are making globally.

We are the number two producer of video games in the entire world, right here in Canada, and producers are asking for our protection in copyright. We are one of the leaders in producing films and dramatic art.

● (1305)

Certainly I know that all members of the House are well aware of the incredible cultural contributions that we make. Our artists and musicians are leading the world in so many new and exciting ways and their work is truly inspiring.

Effective copyright law will help create a market that will protect incentives for those Canadians who develop new ideas that will enrich our lives and increase the prosperity of our nation. The last thing, though, that Canadians need is another tax.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, no matter what I say, I cannot get through to the parliamentary secretary. I said that it was a levy, not a tax. A tax goes to the government, whereas a levy goes to artists. It seems to

me that this should be understood once and for all and that the parliamentary secretary should use the proper terminology.

Moreover, this levy does not apply to BlackBerries, smartphones and laptops. It does not apply to those devices, only to MP3s, like the iPod. I do not know what more I can say to make the parliamentary secretary understand that once and for all.

I have a question for him. If he does not want to give the money from that levy to artists, what does he think they will live on? What revenues will they have if they do not get money for their music?

[*English*]

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Mr. Speaker, I hear the member still asking about the issue of a tax. I would ask her, would the people at her home distinguish between paying a tax or a levy when they purchase an MP3? I am pretty sure that if they were asked to pay an additional \$25 on an MP3, as dictated by government, most people would see that as a tax. I certainly would. It is a tax. Whether we call it a tax or a levy, it is coming out of the consumer's pocket. Her constituents and my constituents are all going to look at that and say it is a tax. I think I am pretty accurate in describing it as a tax.

Beyond that, there are important issues. The member asks how artists will survive if we do not put these taxes on these digital recording devices.

By the way, the member says she only wants it on MP3 players. I would argue that as we move forward, an MP3, an iPod, a smart phone, a laptop computer and all of these things are converging. That is where the technology is going. It is not just a matter of being relevant today but of being relevant tomorrow, and that member is out of step.

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonaville—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, maybe it is just me and maybe I am not getting this right, but I would like to bring up something to illustrate my point, and maybe this illustrates the point of my hon. colleague.

He said that whether we call it a tax or a levy, it is coming out of the consumer's pocket.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Right.

● (1310)

**Mr. Scott Simms:** A week before the budget, the government slapped an out of pocket expense on travellers going through security and said, "We have to pay for security somehow with these big new machines, so we are putting a levy or a tax on these people". When we said the government was taxing passengers, the government said, "No, no we are not taxing passengers. This is a fee, this is a levy".

No, it is money out of pocket. So is it a tax on travellers going through security, yes or no?

*Routine Proceedings*

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Mr. Speaker, what a great question by the member for Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor. I am really thrilled to get the question because the member is failing to distinguish between a user fee at an airport and the tax proposed by the other member, which would be on iPods, smart phones, home computers, PCs and everything else, because all media are converging.

Often people in my riding and the member's riding and other ridings say that airport security is important, because they want to be absolutely certain that every person getting onto a plane has been screened effectively and that there is no threat to the plane. However, I do think the member would honestly agree with me that this additional cost, this additional security screening, these user fees that are being charged are probably best charged to people who are actually using the airport rather than being placed as a general tax on everyone in his riding.

Would the member like to see people living under the poverty line paying for improvements at airports? I do not think so. I think a user fee in this case is appropriate, but I would also say that an iPod tax is going in the wrong direction.

**Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting to hear the parliamentary secretary speak in this debate, because we know the really checkered history of copyright reform from the Conservative government. The first bill the government crafted was so embarrassing the minister could not even bring himself to table it in the House. The second bill the government brought forward died on the order paper when the government called an early election, and we have not seen a bill since, though we keep hearing promises.

What is interesting to note is that even when the Conservatives did bring in a bill and finally tabled it in the House, they continued to be committed to a levy on blank CDs and tapes. Why did they do that? They did that because they know it works. They know it takes revenue and puts it into the pockets of the artists who created that music. It supplemented artists' income in a really appropriate way.

The infrastructure is already in place for that kind of system. I would say it makes sense for us to keep up with the technology and extend it to these kinds of audio recording devices. If the Conservatives are so opposed to this kind of levy, why did they include it in their own legislation?

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Mr. Speaker, as the member from Quebec who moved this motion specifically indicated, a number of these formats, loosely translated, are dying media to some extent. They are a media that are no longer in the mainstream. In fairness to the legislation, it did not make sense to go backwards. When some media are already fading in terms of popularity, what is the point in undoing something that is already there?

However, I do think we are forward-looking. Our position on this is forward-looking because we are looking at the convergence of media, the convergence of platforms and the convergence of how devices work. When I got my first BlackBerry, it did not do a lot of what this BlackBerry here does. That is the way technology is going.

Taxes like this, which the hon. members think are simple are not simple. They are incredibly complex. To put a tax on media and a tax

on advances in digital devices and digital technology is going backwards, not forwards.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Thierry St-Cyr (Jeanne-Le Ber, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, there is no copyright on my colleague's remarks, but they were so ludicrous that they are not in danger of being copied.

In my opinion, the member said very insulting things about his fellow citizens and the people of Quebec. He suggested that people could not distinguish between a royalty and a tax. What contempt for the people.

I think that he is displacing onto the general population his own misunderstanding of the issues and the facts. People can see the difference. They know that some of the money coming out of their pockets goes to the person selling the product. The money that goes to the company selling the iPod player also comes out of their pockets. They know that is not a tax. When they pay royalties, they know that these go to the artists and that they are different from a tax.

We have been given concrete examples like the EI premium increases. The Conservatives keep telling us that is not a tax. The fact remains that this is money coming out of people's pockets and going straight into the government's pocket.

Will the member admit that he is using ludicrous doublespeak, playing on words and willingly distorting the motion before the House today, because he knows that he is substantively wrong?

[*English*]

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Mr. Speaker, if one buys a dozen eggs and takes six out, there are six left. If one buys a dozen eggs and breaks six, there are six left. The member is saying that if one puts a \$25 tax on an iPod, that is a tax; but if one puts a \$25 levy on an iPod, that is not a tax any more.

It is still coming out of people's pockets. It is a tax. It would be a tax because it would be imposed by the government.

I know all the hon. members across the House do not agree with me on this, but they are clearly out of touch with Canadians. As I said, are they willing to talk about the forest or are they just going to talk about a couple of trees?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** I encourage those members who are shouting me down to go out into the streets of their respective constituencies and shout at the top of their lungs that they believe in a \$25 iPod tax. I do not think the majority of their constituents are going to agree with them.

● (1315)

**Mr. Thierry St-Cyr:** You think people are stupid, but you are wrong. People are not stupid.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Mr. Speaker, I do not happen to believe that Canadians would think this tax is fair. I think all of its effects on the Canadian economy would be negative, but then again, what do they have to worry about? I am being shouted down by members who voted against Canada's economic action plan, which is actually driving a stronger economy. What do they care about economics?



*Routine Proceedings*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement, government orders will be extended by 13 minutes.

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-  
sor, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly enjoyed the debate that just took place. I can just picture the hon. member for Peterborough driving along the road and getting stopped by an officer who gives him a speeding ticket, then turning around and saying, “How dare you tax me like that”. I mean really. “How dare you tax me. My taxes have gone up”. What a gem.

I do believe that the member is speaking of either six or half a dozen. I am not sure who took his eggs, for goodness sake. I still do not understand the analogy. I have an omelette and I have six eggs and somehow this resorts to a tax. However, it is a user fee and a user fee is not a tax. It goes to a great good, which is to secure our airports.

What happened to our artists? Where is the great good they are doing? Apparently they are not doing much good.

If this tax is so bad, if it is so decrepit, why has the government not eliminated the original tax on CDs? Has it not scrapped that tax yet? One would think the government would do that. My hon. colleague is right: I would not want to give the Conservatives that idea. It would be like giving them a free license to eliminate all money available to the artists who needed it. I retract that statement. God forbid the government actually follows through on that one. However, this is a complete and utter paradox.

The reason I am happy to see this on the floor today is that we are debating an issue that is so complex it has yet to have a full hearing in this House, and are doing so before receiving actual legislation dealing with copyright.

On one side of the House, members say that any money flowing to the government is really not such a good thing. I beg to differ, because the money returns in the form of medicare, the defence of our nation, the criminal justice system and all of those great things. Of course, we all know about that, so I will not go on about it.

However, what I do like about this particular motion is that whether or not one believes in paying the fee and whether or not one thinks it will benefit artists, the debate has to be heard.

There is a gentleman in my riding, Kevin Blackmore, from Glovertown in Newfoundland and Labrador. His group is called Buddy Wasisname and the Other Fellers. Members will have heard of them. They have a great name. They are one of the most famous groups of folk artists we have ever seen out Newfoundland and Labrador. Kevin lives in my riding and he brought up a good point. He said that the way music is proliferating through the digital media, the way it is zipped around the world and so many copies are made so quickly, it is getting to the point where it was when popular music first began, which is to say that for an artist the only way, the only way, of achieving any revenue is to have a concert. A recording will not garner it. In those days, nobody was making money from any recording, but nowadays these things are flying around the world instantaneously. Artists sweat tears and blood in doing their work. It gets sent around the world instantaneously. Somebody out there is

making money and it is not the person who put the effort into that piece of art.

That is what we need to consider. That is what we need to look at. That is what we need to debate. Do not ridicule any revenue going to an artist as if it were being taken from someone for no reason at all. There is a benefit.

That is the problem with what we just heard. No one is talking about the benefit that an artist provides to the general public. That is the debate that needs to be held. Who has the incentive to entertain us, if we do not have the right business model for them to live within and spend a full career doing music?

This is not just about the rich artists who drive around in limos and who appear on red carpets, to use a previous analogy. The vast bulk of artists do not live that lifestyle.

• (1320)

Parliament must have a debate about how we deal with artists in this country. We need to set up a framework in which they must exist to make a living. That is key to what we need to do.

My hon. colleague was challenged on a point that would include not just iPods and blackberries but all sorts of devices. The parliamentary secretary did have one valid point, which was the convergence of technologies, because it comes to a point where internal memory devices proliferate across the board. However, he is missing the intent of what is happening here.

We are dealing with MP3s, which is a medium by which music is being played, and we need to consider that what we do in one needs to be good for the other. In other words, yes, six eggs are fine but six eggs are broken and now I must go back to the store and get half a dozen eggs. However, if we do that, we need to do it right. The only way as parliamentarians we will come to terms with providing artists with a decent living is to have and flesh out this debate here in the House. I therefore warn everybody in the House not to stifle this debate.

We are a part of a Canadian system that supports our artists. One of the greatest models to use about supporting artistry in this country is actually in the province of Quebec. I had the honour of living in Quebec for five years. In Quebec there is what they call a star system by which their artists, francophone mostly but some anglophone, benefit from this system by which their material but also them as artists are promoted in a context that is global.

The world is becoming much smaller. In the 1960s and 1970s the global village was this big and now it is this big.

I would caution the people in this House to look at this as an issue that is far-encompassing, one that is just beyond levies, taxes and fees, despite the fact that we get riled up into terminology as to what is what. As I said before, if this tax is so bad then obviously the other one on CDs is just as bad but nobody wants to get rid of that one. Why is that? It is because it is of great benefit to our artists and they have told us so each and every time.

*Routine Proceedings*

However, CD sales are declining dramatically. HMV was one of the great stalwarts of business but not so much anymore. Some might blame it on the Walmarts of the world, the big box stores, but we need to lay some of that blame on the changing landscape of digital media.

We not only need to stay ahead of the curve here, we need to be in lockstep with what is going on. I have it said before and I will say it again, when it comes to legislation to clamp down on things, such as piracy and peer-to-peer sharing, we can spend a full year trying to decide how we will legislate this. We can put it in place in this House legislation that actually tries to eliminate piracy, digital locks and the like.

However, here is the problem. My son turns 16 today and I wish him a happy birthday. He is very adept at technology. We can put in legislation over a period of year but I will give my 16-year-old, like any other 16-year-old, 48 hours to get around it. We need to keep up.

I think this debate will contribute to how we can keep up, to allow artists to be artists and to make a living being artists, but at the same time allowing our 16-year-olds to actually enjoy the music, and not just the music of the famous stars but the ones who are trying to make a living doing this.

• (1325)

I commend my colleague for doing this and I commend the private member's bill simply because it proliferates the debate. We need this debate and discussion in the House before we arrive at the next copyright bill, which is coming, I anticipate in the spring, but I am sure we will find out about that very shortly.

Yesterday we spoke about Professor Michael Geist who is famous for his blog and famous because he has a great deal of insight into what is happening. Every time he speaks to a group, whether it was the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage yesterday or a smaller group here in the city of Ottawa or across the country, and even through his blog he still manages to cut through with a message that I think everyone is listening to because he understands that he is on the leading edge of the digital age.

He mentions his children as well, like I have mentioned mine today, for a very good reason. It is because we are not only monitoring what our kids watch, we need to monitor how they watch as well. What is happening is that the power of the computer mouse is now superceding the power of the remote control. The difference between the computer mouse and the remote control is empowerment. They want to watch and listen to what they want whenever they want to.

One of my favourite shows on television, a co-production with Canadians and the Irish, *The Tudors*, I legally download through iTunes. However, there are a lot of people who watch this Canadian production and they are not paying for it and they should be. My hon. colleague chuckles but it is actually a good show. He should check it out.

The thing is that it is quality programming, quality jobs and, when I say artists are involved, it is not just the actors we see on the screen. It is the people doing the lights, the make-up and the people behind the scenes creating scenery and making the wardrobe. They, too, are artists.

Getting back to music, we need to consider what we are doing. Michael Geist talks about copyright and says that it "...is an important part of a government new-media strategy". He goes on to say:

As part of that policy, I think it's absolutely crucial to ensure that we maintain a copyright balance that exists offline, in the online world.

He wants to ensure that balance exists in copyright between access to material and compensation for the artists. What existed offline now exists online. That is what my hon. colleague is trying to point out here with the particular article to amend by saying that we are shifting into the digital age.

People may not like that specific wording and they may think that applies to other types of media but debate is wholesome and good because now we need to make this shift. If Michael Geist gets it, I guarantee everyone our kids get it too. We need to stay in lockstep with them in order to make this happen.

The offline world was the CD. It was what we had to do in the Copyright Act to ensure artists were compensated. The origin of this was back in the late 1990s. The private copying collective developed a methodology by which proceeds are distributed to rights holders based on commercial radio air play and commercial sales samples. Radio college air play was ignored. There we have a good debate. Radio air play was ignored because it does not have the revenues to pay for this.

This private copyright machine was borne out of a wholesome debate that we had to compensate the artists, but at the same time allowing access that was fair for people who wanted to use it. However, we are way behind on this. I will illustrate a point. The countries of this world worked out WIPO legislation, world intellectual properties, and they signed a treaty. We have not ratified it. It was signed in 1996, for goodness sake. We are way behind. We have acknowledged it in committee. Our chair knows this is a valid point and raised the point as well. We both said that we needed to look at this and debate it because we were away behind.

• (1330)

President Obama even regarded us as being behind in copyright, which tells us that the leader of the free world, as he is so aptly called sometimes, is telling us to clean up our act in copyright. He did not talk about softwood lumber, missile defence shields or trade. He talked about copyright, and look out.

Right now we are working out a comprehensive free trade agreement with Europe and Europe is ahead of us on copyright. What we will find is that we will enter into an agreement that will leave us behind asking ourselves what the heck just happened. The Europeans will look at us and say that we had better clean up our act on copyright or there will be trouble.

*Routine Proceedings*

That brings us to the reason that we need to foster this debate. We must not get caught up in a situation of levies, taxes, fees, speeding tickets and eggs. I am not quite sure of the analogy yet but as I stand here and speak I think I am starting to understand it and, brother, that is scary. It is six of one and half a dozen of the other, but six are broken. Maybe I do get it now. Maybe six eggs are broken, and the only way they will be fixed is if everyone in the House has an honest, clear and open debate about artists, their revenue and, of course, our kids who use that for entertainment. It is vital for them but it is vital for Canada.

We live next to a giant. I do not need to go into that. All members know what I am talking about and they know exactly who I am talking about.

The proliferation of media is incredible, not just in Canada but around the world. We just happen to live next door. How do we promote an artist in this country? We do it with things like compelling radio stations that 33% of what they play on the air must be Canadian. Did our artists benefit from that? I like to think so.

I guess the only artists in Canada who can say that they reached the pinnacle of music success and they did not benefit from the rule changes was probably The Guess Who. However, since then, they all have. Where would Céline Dion and Bryan Adams be without these rules? Where would these smaller groups of artists be without this levy that was fully debated in the House in the late 1990s?

I do not have the numbers but that is a basket of eggs that they gleefully accepted and will continue to accept because it is not a question of added bonus. It is a question of the existence of the Canadian system. So let us not stray away from going after each other. Let us focus on what we were doing.

I think the other issue is that many people are doing peer-to-peer sharing. What that means is that they are getting music on line, downloading it and not paying a single soul for it. Whether it is right or wrong, people are losing money and not making money on the effort they put into their artistry.

What are we going to do? We are going to have this debate and try to find that business model to allow these people to keep doing what they are doing or else the quality of music will go down and down because artists will find absolutely no incentive to get involved because they cannot make a living at it.

The second part is that many of our kids are downloading this music and do not even realize that they are breaking the law.

Therefore, we need a wholesome debate and one that is true to what we represent in the House, which is the best for Canada, our artists and the user, the kids and adults who actually listen to music. This is a national debate.

•(1335)

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to the intervention from the hon. member. He actually touched on a number of things on which I would just like to ask his opinion.

He talked about the Canadian content laws and Canadian radio. I would agree with him that that assisted Canadian artists in getting

their names out there, getting their materials out there. He talked about the copying levy that was placed on CDs. I would agree with him.

I would also agree with the hon. member that the illegal redistribution and the pirated copies that are going on in this country is wrong. We have to put a stop to it. Creators deserve to be paid for what they are creating and that kind of illegal redistribution has to be stopped.

However, there is a bigger issue here. He talked about the convergence. I appreciate that the member understands that technologies are in fact converging, but the walls that we used to construct in Canada to create a distinct market are really becoming things of the past because we live in a global environment now. Any Canadian, his son, my nieces and nephews, all of them can access whatever they want, whenever they want. That is the power of the mouse. Borders do not exist, so we are going to have to take a look at it.

That is why I am saying this is a complex issue and it cannot be solved with one-off solutions. We need to look at it in a holistic fashion.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary is right. The empowerment of the individual through the computer mouse is incredible. It is at a stage now where I cannot fully comprehend it.

At this stage in the game though, he and I are kind of looking at this from two different directions. I look at this motion as a vanguard, or that beginning spark, in this House to say, "What is it that we are going to do?" We are going to be left behind in legislation, just like we are left behind on WIPO, so the copyright legislation that we are talking about here has to look at all this.

One of the things that Michael Geist talked about in his intervention was that we need copyright legislation that is flexible, one that is illustrative, not exhaustive. That is a valid point. That is where Bill C-61 went wrong because it was overly prescriptive in nature. There are 12 ways in which one can break the law in certain areas, when in fact it should be illustrative, as to say, "This is what we need. This is the spirit of the law, which says that one is stealing something as opposed to using it fairly".

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member for Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor a question.

He is an artist, a musician. He knows how artists think. Can he explain to the members of the House what an artist lives on?

When a musician has a good idea and records music in a studio, he has to pay people. How can he pay these people when he has not yet been paid, and how can he record a CD, which has yet to bring in revenue? What does he live off during this time? How can he make money if he does not perform the following week? An artist takes six months to make a CD and then he promotes it for a few weeks. If he's lucky, he will go on tour, but not everyone is that lucky. How do artists earn a living? How do they make money?

*Private Members' Business*

•(1340)

[English]

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Mr. Speaker, that is actually an excellent point. I have to correct her though. I am not really a musician. I was a TV weatherman and I was not a meteorologist, but I managed to convince people I was a meteorologist. I guess now I managed to convince someone I am a musician. Not bad.

The point of what she is saying is to think about the front end. We all get involved in music and for artists who are exceptional at what they do, they spend a lot of time doing it. My opinion is that what funds like this do is create a pool of cash or resources that allows artists, at the beginning of their careers, to tap into that with very little red tape. There has to be some red tape, obviously.

It is a valid point. It is a point I did not think of but that is certainly one thing that this does, and her motion actually alerts this House that we are behind. We need to move ahead for the entire life cycle of a particular artist, beginning, middle and end. If it is only left up to concerts to make money, she is right. How do we start and how do we maintain it at the beginning?

**Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we know that the Bloc supports the report from the committee. We know that the NDP supports it. In fact, we have even tabled private members' legislation paralleling the report. We know that the Conservatives are divided on this because the Conservative chair of the standing committee actually supported the report, whereas other Conservatives were opposed to it. We know that the Liberals at committee were divided. Some of them supported it and some did not.

It is still unclear to me today where the Liberal Party stands on this. I would like to ask the member, will the Liberal Party be supporting the concurrence motion when it comes to a vote in the House, and ensuring that artists are fairly paid for their work?

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleague, listen to my speech and what I am talking about here. I want him to understand that the debate is now coinciding over a period of time. I think my vote is on record. All he has to do is look it up. I think we need to further the debate. The motion goes a long way in doing that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings on the motion at this time. Accordingly debate on the motion will be rescheduled for another sitting.

It being 1:43 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### BROADCASTING ACT AND THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

The House resumed from March 8 consideration of the motion that Bill C-444, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and the Telecommunications Act (broadcasting and telecommunications policies), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** Resuming debate. When the House last dealt with this matter, the hon. member for Ottawa—Orléans had four and a half minutes remaining.

I recognize the hon. member for Ottawa—Orléans.

**Mr. Royal Galipeau (Ottawa—Orléans, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to once again speak to this bill, which would allow the creation of new regulatory bodies in Canada in areas of communications. I wish to explain why I sincerely believe that such an approach would actually hinder the development of French-speakers across Canada, including those in Quebec.

[Translation]

First of all, I want to stress the importance of communications for Canada and for Quebec. Broadcasting and telecommunications have a significant impact on local and regional distinctiveness throughout the country and in Quebec.

Canadians of all ages have many options for communicating with others, passing the time, getting information and getting to know their fellow citizens, whether they live in Iqaluit, Gravelbourg, Orléans, Saint-Isidore, Shédiac or Gaspé. Person-to-person telecommunications make it possible to talk to others and understand them and to transmit information and data that are essential to the development of our communities and businesses.

•(1345)

[English]

Quality programming produced here by skilled, creative professionals and made available through networks and broadcasters from across the country provides Canadians with entertainment and information, thereby contributing to their development and allowing them to learn more about the world around them.

The broadcasting system, as we know it, enables the expression of French culture to develop not just within Quebec itself but in every corner of Canada.

[Translation]

In fact, the great diversity in French content created in Quebec and other parts of the country is made available from coast to coast, for the benefit of all francophone communities, including many francophone minority communities.

[English]

We firmly believe that the interests of these French-speaking communities are well served by the current broadcasting system. The Broadcasting Act and the regulatory framework reflect the interests and demands of Canada's English language and French language broadcasting markets, particularly through public hearings held by the CRTC.

We are satisfied that the current regulatory framework enables French language communities in Quebec, and elsewhere in the country, to participate in and contribute to the development of a broadcasting system that reflects their needs and expectations, and to express any of their concerns that need to be considered.

*Private Members' Business*

[Translation]

I must also mention that when a licence is granted, renewed or amended, the objectives of Canada's broadcasting policy, as stated in the Broadcasting Act, must be taken into consideration. The act states that, "English and French language broadcasting, while sharing common aspects, operate under different conditions and may have different requirements".

The act also says that the Canadian broadcasting system should serve the needs and interests, and reflect the circumstances and aspirations, of Canadian men, women and children, particularly in terms of official languages.

[English]

This is why the Broadcasting Act and the current regulatory structure have managed to protect and promote the social, cultural and economic objectives of our communities and our communications companies across Canada.

The people I humbly represent in this place believe that it is crucial that all Canadians continue to enjoy the benefits through a regulatory framework for the communications industry that is unified, coherent and effective, and that places a great deal of importance on recognizing the interests and aspirations of all our communities, including French language communities in Quebec and throughout Canada.

[Translation]

We believe, without a doubt, that it would be bad for francophone communities in Canada to amend the existing regulatory framework, as Bill C-444 proposes to do.

I am opposed to this bill, as I stated on March 8.

[English]

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your careful attention and especially for keeping order during the provocative remarks that I have just made.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Lise Zarac (LaSalle—Émard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, before I begin my speech about Bill C-444, I would like to take a moment to mention Purple Day, which was started two years ago by a young girl named Cassidy Megan, from Halifax.

I am wearing purple today because of Cassidy Megan. I want to show my support for adults and children with epilepsy, and I want to promote information campaigns about this illness that affects an average of 15,500 Canadians each year. Thank you, Cassidy.

Unlike our colleagues across the way, we understand the value of culture. We know that we not only need to support it, but we also need to strengthen it in every way possible.

Previous cuts to the PromArt program, which allowed Canadian artists to promote their work and their culture abroad, and the Trade Routes program, which provided support to artistic and cultural entrepreneurs, were a slap in the face to artists and all Canadians. These cuts demonstrated the Conservative government's inability to understand the arts and its irresponsibility in this sector.

After seeing their budget, it is even more obvious that the Prime Minister and the Conservatives have no idea about culture and have not listened to the many demands from the public about this. This should not surprise us, however, because their decisions have shown that they have no interest in culture and attach no importance to it. It is the same with environmental issues. They just do not understand. If you keep artists from performing internationally, you are keeping our culture from international recognition. You are badmouthing our heritage.

Our party, the Liberal Party of Canada, believes in increasing support for Canadian artists and cultural organizations, especially in this new era of the digital economy.

However, there is another topic that concerns me today and that is Bill C-444 and the impact it will have on the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission as well as on culture.

The CRTC was created to defend and promote Canadians' attitudes, opinions, ideas, values and artistic talents. All of these things are the result of our country's history, its geographic location, its institutions and, above all, its linguistic and cultural diversity.

The CRTC's role is to ensure that both the broadcasting and telecommunications systems serve the Canadian public. The CRTC uses the objectives in the Broadcasting Act and the Telecommunications Act to guide its policy decisions.

For instance, one of the CRTC's initiatives is the local programming improvement fund, whose aim is to support and improve the quality of local television programming. This program really meets the needs and expectations of the public regarding information on what is happening in their region.

With new digital technologies, regulatory bodies are losing their powers. Barriers to entering domestic markets are becoming almost non-existent. This situation is bringing in new stakeholders that companies have to compete with.

The lines between the media, businesses, mechanisms, programs and content are blurring, and users are already beginning to control content and actively participate in creating it. In the current context, one might reasonably wonder how such legislation would help us face the challenges ahead. I will come back to this later on in my speech.

In Quebec, the CRTC has been working tirelessly to ensure that our artists can access the media and the world of broadcasting, so that the public can benefit from access to local content and our broadcasting industries can grow.

● (1350)

It is an ideal tool not only for ensuring the survival of Quebec culture, but also for sharing it with the rest of the country.

Bill C-444 would split up the CRTC and have it function in a vacuum in the provinces. It will not strengthen culture. On the contrary, dividing up the CRTC would weaken an institution that works for the survival of that culture. It would divide the population and block up our window on the world.

*Private Members' Business*

The CRTC has always been a leader in consulting the public and seeking people's opinions on matters pertaining to broadcasting and telecommunications, in order to be in tune with the needs of the people. Therefore, it is a tool of the people and not a tool of political partisanship.

I would like to know where my colleague got the idea for such a bill. No artist or cultural group could have asked for a legislative measure to create another regulatory body in Quebec. Quebec is not asking for this. It is pure political partisanship at the expense of our artists and creators.

The Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission plays a vital role as the protector of our culture. It would make no sense to weaken it when we should be working hard to secure and strengthen its role and mandate in the current political and economic context. Adding to the number of regulatory bodies would only exponentially increase the problems faced by our cultural communities.

Given the challenges of the future, Bill C-444 is not at all a step in the right direction. It would only cloud the issues and add to existing problems that we have been trying hard to resolve for many years.

Let us not erect walls or stuff our windows. Let us protect our culture by sharing it and making it known to the entire world, not hiving it off and having it become inward-looking.

I oppose Bill C-444 and will be voting against it. I urge my colleagues to do the same. I specifically invite my colleague, the member for Repentigny, to work with us. We must focus our efforts on protecting our Canadian culture, and Quebec content makes up a significant part of that culture.

• (1355)

[English]

**M. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise to speak on Bill C-444, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and the Telecommunications Act (broadcasting and telecommunications policies), so the Québécois identity is reflected in the Canadian broadcasting telecommunications policies of our country. I am happy to say our party supports the bill moving forward to committee where it can be discussed even further.

The reason why this is such a valuable bill is because it helps us talk about extending cultural sensitivities and responsiveness in our country. I thank my colleague from the Bloc for putting this forward. Also, it allows us to debate two very important issues that are fundamental interests of Canadians, and that is public broadcasting and cultural policy.

My party, the New Democrats, is a strong believer in public broadcasting. My party, the New Democrats, is a strong supporter of the CBC and Radio-Canada. I personally am a strong supporter of the CBC and of public broadcasting in every sense of those concepts.

Canada is a large and diverse country. We have strong anglophone and francophone cultures in communities across the country. We have strong, vibrant and growing multicultural communities and first nations communities of every type in every province and territory of our federation.

My riding of Vancouver Kingsway is a wonderful diverse community of communities, where languages and cultures can be heard from every corner of the world. This incredible diversity of culture is never adequately conveyed purely and solely by the private broadcasting system.

Canadians who live in communities, small and large, coast to coast to coast need a strong public broadcasting facility and a strong cultural policy in the country in order to manifest this multicultural mosaic. Geographic diversity is also never adequately reflected in the private commercial broadcasting system and never will be adequately represented solely by the private commercial broadcasting system.

Only a strong, properly funded public broadcaster, informed and backed up by a cultural policy that reflects and embraces multiculturalism and the francophone, anglophone and multicultural and first nations quadrants of our country can actually do so, so we can all, as Canadians, tell our stories.

[Translation]

This bill would ensure that francophone culture and identity are adequately represented in our national broadcasting system. The NDP fully supports this important objective. I have said it before, and I will say it again: I am proud of our country's diversity.

As the multiculturalism critic for the NDP, I also want us to highlight and celebrate this diversity.

I would now like to speak for a few moments about the diversity in my riding of Vancouver Kingsway. My friends in Quebec know that my riding is geographically one of the furthest from Quebec.

However, I want all members to know that in my province there is a francophone community that is small, yes, but also vibrant and growing. I wanted to note that, because francophones in British Columbia represent an important part of the multicultural mosaic I am so proud of and all British Columbians are proud of, I am sure.

Quebec culture and literature, as well as the French language, are alive and well throughout the province. We have festivals that celebrate Franco-Canadian culture and excellent French language instruction programs in our schools, and we acknowledge the richness of the history and heritage of Quebec and francophone Canadians.

• (1400)

[English]

Going back to the CBC, without adequate funding, it cannot survive. Underfunded by current and previous governments as it has been, it has lost and is losing its ability to fulfill its mandate. Commercialization is not the answer.

The government has mused about putting advertising on CBC Radio. It has sold off the rights to the *Hockey Night in Canada* theme song. It has dismantled the CBC Radio orchestra. As every Canadian who watches and listens to the CBC knows, there has been a distinct change in the mandate and manner in which CBC delivers its programming.

Canadians do not value CBC because it is just another commercial station. We must not go down the path of commercialization if the CBC is to fulfill its mandate to provide a forum for Canadian voices, music and ideas.

The heritage committee has called for an increase in funding to our national broadcaster. It wants it to go to \$40 per citizen in this country, up from the current \$33. Think of that: another \$7 per person a year so that our country can have a strong national broadcasting voice from coast to coast to coast that brings Canadians together by sharing our music, our stories, our histories, our cultures, our social and political ideas of every type. Seventy-four per cent of Canadians agree with that, because they believe CBC's funding should be increased.

Last year in my riding of Vancouver Kingsway, I held a town hall about the future of the CBC. I heard that citizens in Vancouver Kingsway and the Lower Mainland of British Columbia and across the country are passionate about our public broadcaster. They want it to be well funded. They support its mandate. They want balanced, intelligent, public interest media in our country in addition to a wide and diverse private sector.

The bill before us goes beyond Canadian broadcasting. It brings up broader issues of cultural policy. Arts and culture are vital to a healthy society. A vibrant arts community makes cities, towns and rural areas livable. It is another vital avenue for Canadian stories to be told. It is a vital avenue for Canadian voices to be heard.

Vancouver Kingsway has an extremely active and vibrant community of artists and cultural workers who tell these stories and whose voices are heard. We have musicians, actors, painters and sculptors who are an important part of what makes Vancouver such a great city in which to live. Many of these people, who are from every culture, whether it be south Asian, Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese, Caucasian or first nations, contribute to this cultural mosaic for the love of creating culture and for the love of this country. The average salary of an artist in Canada is under \$15,000 a year.

These cultural artists who help build our country and who give our country depth and value need a mechanism in which to have their voices and their talents expressed. Producing great works of art or culture without government support has never happened in history. The ancient Greeks supported their artists, dramatists, musicians and their cultural producers. Investing in arts and culture is investing in healthy livable communities. It is investing in our shared history and identity. It is an investment worth making.

I thank the member for Repentigny for bringing this bill forward and allowing us to have this important discussion. We support sending the bill to committee so we can continue the discussion there, so that we can build a country that has a strong culture in Quebec, British Columbia and every other province and territory for every culture that is part of the Canadian mosaic.

• (1405)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we are not here to quibble over whether Quebecers or Canadians have the stronger, more intense, more imposing culture; not at all. In the House, day after day and week after week, we see

### *Private Members' Business*

that the nation of Quebec is in a different situation and that its needs are different.

For example, this week, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission revealed a new regulatory policy for television. One aspect of this policy is that from now on, television broadcasters can reduce their Canadian content, and thus their Quebec content as well, from 60% to 55%.

This measure is essentially aimed at Canada and not at all at Quebec. Why? Because in Quebec, Quebec content is much higher than 60%. I do not have the exact figures, but during prime time, Quebec television stations must be broadcasting nearly 80% Quebec content.

Accordingly, Quebec does not face the same problems the rest of Canada does. Are Quebec's problems easier to resolve? I do not know, but they are different and they have to be treated differently.

We have different problems and a different language. However, in Quebec, there is a real star system and everything we need to nourish it. There is an audience that eats up artistic activities of any kind and that loves Quebec artists and their art. Quebecers keep asking for more; the television ratings prove it. When there is a Quebec production, a new series or a show by a Quebec artist, the public happily tunes in to watch the program.

The Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage has heard from many witnesses and we have noted that the same thing is not happening elsewhere in Canada. Other areas have difficulty producing Canadian content and when they do produce it, they have difficulty attracting an audience, likely because of the language. But I am not here to do such an analysis; Canadians can do it for themselves.

Last year the vice-president of CBC/Radio-Canada said that Canadians are the only people in the world who prefer their neighbour's television. That is not at all the case in Quebec. We are very lucky; we have everything we need. Our artists are good, we enjoy them and we do not have such problems.

When we see the CRTC lowering the requirements in terms of Canadian content, we know that this is not for us. While the commission notes that our problems are different, it always ends up proposing solutions that are enforced from coast to coast to coast, in Canada and in Quebec. Yet these solutions do not suit Quebecers, because they do not correspond at all to our reality.

When we talk about Quebec's problems and values, and about the Quebec nation, the other members of this House believe it is only natural, because we are sovereignists and all we want is Quebec independence. However, I have a letter here from Quebec's Minister of Culture, Communications and the Status of Women, Christine St-Pierre. She is not a sovereignist or a separatist. She is a Liberal, a federalist and a member of Jean Charest's government, Charest being a former Conservative leader, no less.

*Private Members' Business*

Ms. St-Pierre wrote to the Minister of Canadian Heritage on March 23, 2009. This letter was sent almost a year ago, and I have never even seen an acknowledgment of receipt. But I will come back to that.

I would like to read the letter because it is extremely important in the history of Quebec culture and communications. It is not the first letter the Quebec government has sent to the federal government. In the letter, the completely federalist Christine St-Pierre is asking the federal Conservative government to transfer responsibility for both culture and communications to the Government of Quebec.

• (1410)

I will read the letter:

Dear Minister,

I am writing to reiterate—reiterate means “repeat” or “do again”—the Government of Quebec's desire to undertake discussions about an agreement on culture and an agreement on communications with the Government of Canada. This request was made in a letter addressed to your predecessor—I cannot name her, but she is a woman, she was the Heritage minister, and she is now the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs—on April 9, 2008, and to her colleagues, the Minister of Industry and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.—The members opposite know about this because several of them received a letter.— Quebec once again stated its position on August 13, 2008, in a second letter I wrote to the Minister of Canadian Heritage—who is now the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs—.

In September 2008, the Premier of Quebec, Jean Charest, reiterated—there is that word “reiterated” again, which is a bit tiresome, but that is the word she used; some might say that more tiresome still is the fact that she had to reiterate anything at all, and they would be right—our request of the federal government to undertake negotiations about agreements on culture and communications with Quebec over the coming year. The Premier stated that Quebec wanted to assume control, within the province, of all federally funded cultural programs. He—Jean Charest, the Premier of Quebec—expressed the Government of Quebec's desire to have funds managed by Canadian Heritage and major federal funding institutions—such as the Canada Council for the Arts—transferred to it, taking into account Quebec's historical share.—I will have more to say later on about Quebec's historical share, which is not a per capita portion because Quebec's historical share of the culture and communications sector is much higher than that.—

—Now we come to a subtitle or subheading:—Agreement on Culture—and later on, we will come to Agreement on Communications. I mention this because it is no fun hearing someone read a letter without being able to see it. I am trying to read it in a way that will help everyone visualize it.—

Quebec is the only francophone state in North America, and it has a culture of its own.—As I said before, these are not sovereignists talking, but Quebec's federalist culture minister.—The Canadian Parliament has, in fact, recognized the Quebec nation.—The minister is asking the government to walk the walk, not just talk the talk. We are a nation, and we want the government to act accordingly.— Culture falls within the Government of Quebec's jurisdiction.—Maybe I should repeat that. Culture falls within the Government of Quebec's jurisdiction. Is that clear enough?— Quebec's desire to exercise its jurisdiction over culture is inextricably linked to the identity of the Quebec nation.—I will not repeat every sentence twice, but I suggest that everyone listen closely because every word is important.—The Government of Quebec must ensure the long-term survival and development of Quebec culture.—I really want to repeat that sentence because it is well put and perfectly aligned with the Bloc Québécois' thinking despite having been said not by a separatist or a sovereignist or anyone like that, but by a staunch federalist, Christine St-Pierre, in a letter to the Minister of Canadian Heritage.—

Quebec is seeking greater coherence when it comes to government-funded cultural measures. The province wishes to integrate its cultural development in the artistic, industrial and civic spheres. Greater coherence will enable the province to achieve its cultural goals as set out in the 1992 *Politique culturelle*, the cultural policy passed unanimously by the National Assembly.

The federal government's many cultural measures, though primarily directed to financing, have a definite effect on cultural development in Quebec.

• (1415)

A Canada-Quebec agreement on culture would provide Quebec with control over public funding of cultural activities within the province. The agreement should

therefore cover the complete envelope of funds associated with federal programs that subsidize and fund culture and heritage.

As far back as 1992, the Charlottetown Accord stated that “Provinces should have exclusive jurisdiction over cultural matters within the provinces”.

I want to point out that Minister St-Pierre wants to see practical mechanisms for participating in the development and definition—

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise once again in the House, this time to address Bill C-444. In reflection, I want to make a couple of comments before I get into the body of the text of my speech about the cultural identity of the various regions within Canada.

I do not think it is fair to the folks in St. John's, Newfoundland, for example, to say that they are not culturally distinct from Calgary, Alberta, or that Victoria, British Columbia does not have its own cultural identity that might be somewhat different from Peterborough. It is a strength in Canada that we have all of these culturally distinct regions and that we all come together under one flag and one nation.

We certainly saw in the Vancouver 2010 Olympics. We did not just see our athletes dominate, which by the way was spectacular. We also saw our artists. We also saw Canadians celebrating in the streets. We saw a collective strength of a nation, the likes of which I have never seen. That collective strength is supported by regions of the country that are as diverse from one another as one could possibly imagine. However, they have one thing in common, and that is a love of this nation.

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to comment on matters relevant to the regulation of broadcasting and telecommunications activities in Canada. Given proposals contained in Bill C-444, I believe we must take the time to consider the impact they would have on Canadian consumers, including those in Quebec.

We strongly believe that creating additional regulatory frameworks, as proposed under Bill C-444, could only lead to extraordinary confusion and complication. Then innovation and competitiveness in Canada's vital communications would be stifled to the detriment of Canadian consumers and the businesses that serve them.

Given the current challenges confronting the broadcasting industry, the convergence of broadcasting and telecommunications, such a division of responsibilities risks introducing complexities and inefficiencies into the system that could hamper the competitiveness and the ability of companies to respond to new market and technological developments.

Let me elaborate on this point. We are all aware of the fact that Canada's broadcasting and telecommunications systems are in the midst of a fundamental transformation. We have talked about that on other matters before the House today. Important changes are being brought on by the rapid adoption of digital technologies, which are modifying Canada's communications landscape in unprecedented ways.



Established companies are facing competition from unexpected players. Lines between industries, companies, devices, platforms and content are blurring and, in some cases, completely disappearing. More and more, these developments are allowing Canadians to take greater control and participate actively in the creation and distribution of diverse Canadian content.

The rise of digital networks and platforms is also dissolving the territorial and technical boundaries that formerly limited Canadian companies, including Quebec firms, from reaching and exploiting global audiences. These very positive developments must not be restrained by additional layers of rules and regulations.

Clearly, the future economic potential of our communications companies is bright. Innovative businesses are responding with cutting-edge ideas designed to meet new consumer behaviours and expectations. We must avoid measures that could prevent them from harnessing the potential of the digital technologies that will contribute even more to Canadian competitiveness.

Canadian and Quebec entrepreneurs recognize that unnecessary complication brought on by jurisdictional splitting and the duplication of regulations in all likelihood would hinder their future growth and competitiveness. In question period, I had a number of questions from the hon. member from Quebec who spoke just previously. I quoted Mr. Pierre Karl Péladeau from Quebecor. I indicated that we as a government believed that Canadians wanted less regulation, not more.

Here is what this leading Quebec business person and leading broadcaster in Quebec had to say about the equivalent of a CRTC in Quebec. He said, "A Quebec equivalent of the CRTC would complicate, not simplify things. My position is fairly clear. I believe the solution is the deregulation of the industry". That is what a gentleman from Quebec in the industry had to say. It is in the complete opposite direction of the Bloc's Bill C-444.

•(1420)

Adding complexity to regulation, which the passing of Bill C-444 would most certainly accomplish, would only hinder the capacity of our industries to meet the promising opportunities ahead to further develop and prosper and continue to offer Canadians a diversity of content and service choices.

Our government, which has a record of putting consumers first, strongly believes that fragmenting regulatory control and supervision would not be serving Canadians, including Quebecers, well. In fact, they would be poorly served. Such action would result in additional cost and uncertainty for consumers across the country. This is of great concern to us and that is why we are formally opposed to Bill C-444.

Just previous to the debate on this bill, we talked about an issue, which I and the minister have termed as the "itax". It may be the simplest way to convey what we talked about a bit earlier. It is the recognition of digital technologies in the ever emerging landscape. We have to acknowledge that there is tremendous platform change occurring not only in this country but globally.

Today we live in an era where every person in the House, every person from coast to coast to coast in this nation could become a

### *Private Members' Business*

broadcaster if they wanted. All they need is a camera and a home computer. It is easy. That is the context in which we live.

Trying to put barriers around things and trying to put constructs up like what we built in the sixties, simply will not work in a modern media context, in a modern broadcast environment. The complexities and regulations that the bill would seek to put in place upon the province of Quebec would hinder, not assist, the Quebec cultural economy and artists in Quebec.

Everyone in the House can acknowledge that the cultural sector in Canada has really hit its stride, whether those artists are from Quebec, Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, either of the territories, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, it does not matter. Canada has hit its stride culturally. We are leading the world when it comes to cultural innovations and creativity.

I am so proud of Canadian artists. What they do not need is a new regulatory body that would seek to hinder and restrict them with new regulations that would simply seek to rebuild something that existed from the past.

The Great Wall of China at one point was probably a very effective tool to keep invading armies on the one side, while those on the other side were safe. The Great Wall of China would not be very effective in defending a nation these days. The new technologies that have come in demonstrate that the walls of the past are simply very easily overcome.

•(1425)

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to speak to this bill. At the outset, I want to note that the Liberals and the Conservatives seem to be onside, once again opposing this legislation. We saw them yesterday join together as one to try to support Bill C-2, the Canada-Colombia free trade agreement. Today we see them join together to try to stop Bill C-444.

At second reading we are dealing with the principle of the bill. I would think the Conservatives and particularly the Liberals should be open-minded enough to at least want to send the bill to committee so they could debate it, discuss it and try to amend it. If they do not agree with it at that point, after the amendment process is concluded, by all means, they can come back to the House and vote against it. However, to simply preclude the possibility of the bill going to committee is a very bad choice on their part.

The member who spoke for the Conservatives pointed out that we did not need a new regulatory body, that we did not need duplication of existing regulations. However, he is not prepared to give us the chance to even debate the issue further, to explore the issue in committee, perhaps call witnesses to the committee, look at the issue from all different angles and perhaps come up with a solution that would make everyone happy in the House, particularly the member who introduced Bill C-444. He is prepared to shut the door tight right at the beginning, defeat the bill and move on.

*Private Members' Business*

I do not think that is a good approach, particularly since the government finds itself in a minority situation. By the looks of it, it will always be in a minority situation. I see there are signs that it is beginning to accept that fact. There are some signs that it is tentatively making approaches to the opposition. I see it selectively dealing with the Liberals on the Canada-Colombia free trade issue and certainly dealing with other parties on other issues. I applaud it for that because it means it will survive longer as a minority government and it will, at a certain point, learn how to govern properly in a minority situation.

Up until now, it has been more or less a disaster for the government in the minority situation. Clearly from the very beginning, it could never accept the idea it was a minority and so it gave up on the idea, very early on, of trying to make a minority government work. It is going to take it a while to learn. There are some signs it is learning, but this is not one of them. The government should at least be open-minded enough to send the bill to committee.

My colleague from Vancouver Kingsway also spoke on this issue earlier today. He had indicated that the bill opened up a potential debate for members of the House to deal with public broadcasting and cultural policy in the country. My party and I are very strong believers in public broadcasting. I am a very strong supporter of the CBC. Many members here are of the same age or older than I am and will know that when we were growing up we only got one channel. It was the CBC and it was in black and white, so we had a very positive view of CBC programming in those days.

Things have developed and things have changed over the years. We now have multiple stations competing for the viewers and we have introduced the private sector.

• (1430)

The government, that is basically very dedicated to whatever the private sector wants, the private sector gets, is tied to deregulation. If we could redraw the map from a Conservative point of view, we would sell off or dismantle the CBC, turnover the whole market to the private sector, and while we did all of that, we would dismantle all the regulations. We would allow free enterprise to run its course.

We would have a situation develop where we would have the big guys gobbling up the little guys to the point where we would have just one or two broadcasters, media giants, in Canada and that is in fact what has happened.

Then we get to deal with the whole issue of the too big to fail syndrome. We have a situation right now with CanWest essentially going into bankruptcy because the original owners and founders of the company managed to load the company with \$5 billion of debt. Then when the market downturn happened and the economy dove a couple of years ago, the bond holders were forced to take over the company. Now we see them basically selling off the assets to other corporate takers and that process is ongoing at this point.

Coupled with that we find ourselves in the middle of an extreme recession and the government announced last year that it was planning to sell off crown assets to, I believe, realize \$2 billion.

I am not aware that it was able to do any of that last year, but I know the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance is listening very attentively and taking notes, I might add, and I am

certain that this coming year the government will find a way to realize that \$2 billion and maybe more by selling off public assets.

We on this side of the House have suggested that one of those public assets that it may be interested in selling off might be the CBC.

**Mr. Richard Harris:** That's not going to happen.

**Mr. Jim Maloway:** The member says that is nonsense and that is not going to happen. Stranger things have happened from Conservative governments.

If the member says that is not going to happen, well then what is the government going to sell off? If the government is not going to sell off all or part of the CBC, privatize the CBC, then it should provide me a list of what it is going to sell off. The government has indicated that it is going to sell off \$2 billion in assets. If it is not the CBC, then the member should tell me what it is.

The member now wants some suggestions. The member has the balance sheet of the government and it knows what the assets are. Believe me, it knows what it is planning to sell. I think the government is working quietly behind the scenes and maybe not so quietly to interest the private sector in buying.

OMERS has indicated that it is going to cash. It is going to set aside huge amounts of cash to do exactly what I have just been talking about: purchase government assets. If OMERS is doing that, then the other pension funds will be in the same situation. We will see what happens with the government.

As I said, I would suggest that the CBC is certainly on that list of items that the government is planning to divest itself of in the next little while. If it does not do it, it is not going to be for want of trying. It will bend over backwards to package that corporation, that asset, to make it as attractive as possible to the private sector, in essence I submit almost make it a point where it will practically pay the private sector to take it over.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I understand my time is up and I thank you very much for your time.

• (1435)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Nicolas Dufour (Repentigny, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this is a pivotal moment in the debate on Bill C-444, an extremely important time, because now the time has come to decide whether or not to send the bill to committee.

I listened to my colleagues' comments, from both the Conservatives and the Liberals. They had two major concerns about a vote on the bill. I will try one last time to convince them.

However, before anything else, I would like to thank the member for Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert from the bottom of my heart for her excellent work as culture critic for the Bloc Québécois. She has done an excellent job and is always professional.

One of the first concerns brought up by the Liberals was the issue of where the bill came from. It all started with Louis-Alexandre Taschereau in 1929, who was the Liberal Premier of Quebec at the time. The letter from Ms. St-Pierre to the Conservatives' Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages shows this. Historically, the Government of Quebec has always insisted that it should play a role in broadcasting and telecommunications. In 1929, it was the first government to legislate the broadcasting sector, given the need to safeguard Quebec culture and identity.

The Government of Quebec believes that the federal government must not act alone when it comes to broadcasting and telecommunications, and it would like to see the creation of concrete input mechanisms for the development and definition of federal policies, particularly concerning decisions related to activities that primarily affect Quebec and concerning content.

A Liberal minister is calling for the creation of a CQRT. Robert Bourassa called for that as well, as did Liza Frulla. We see that the Liberals have every reason to support their provincial colleagues and even their former colleague, Liza Frulla who, at the time, was herself a minister under the federal Liberal government.

We see that it would be in the Liberals best interest to continue in the logic they are trying to apply. Of course, knowing Liberal wisdom, when it comes time to vote in the House, there may be a different outcome.

The second concern was expressed by the Conservatives. They did not understand the importance of the CQRT and said it could create new regulations, a new organization and new problems. There would not be much more administration and bureaucracy; the intent is to decentralize. The Conservatives, the right-wing ideologues, should actually be in agreement with the idea of decentralization. Is it not logical that, by allowing the provinces to legislate in this area and to manage their own broadcasting commissions, there would be less administration and bureaucracy, which is in keeping with right-wing thinking?

The Conservatives would thus be very interested in voting for this bill for this as well as another reason. They recognized the Quebec nation in the House and it was voted on. Would passing this bill not

*Private Members' Business*

be a fantastic tool and would it not give substance to the recognition of the Quebec nation? Instead of being just window dressing, this recognition would have real benefits for Quebec.

Those are two very good arguments directed at the Conservatives. As for the Liberals, they should follow in the footsteps of such colleagues as Ms. Frulla.

• (1440)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** The time provided for debate has expired. The question is on the motion.

[*English*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin):** Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, March 31, 2010, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

[*English*]

It being 2:43 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next, at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:43 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**

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

**The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MS. DENISE SAVOIE

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

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

---

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. RODGER CUZNER

MS. LIBBY DAVIES

MR. JACQUES GOURDE

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

HON. JAY HILL

HON. GORDON O'CONNOR

MR. JOE PRESTON

MR. MARCEL PROULX

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

## Third Session—Fortieth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Hon. Jim, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation	Kootenay—Columbia	British Columbia	CPC
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane, Minister of State (Seniors)	Calgary—Nose Hill	Alberta	CPC
Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of Health	Nunavut	Nunavut	CPC
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	Ontario	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	Ontario	NDP
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	New Brunswick	CPC
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	Ontario	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for Status of Women	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
Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	Ontario	NDP
Armstrong, Scott	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	Nova Scotia	CPC
Arthur, André	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier	Québec	Ind.
Ashfield, Hon. Keith, Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway	Fredericton	New Brunswick	CPC
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
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 Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Ottawa West—Nepean	Ontario	CPC
Beaudin, Josée	Saint-Lambert	Québec	BQ
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Québec	BQ
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	Alberta	CPC
Bernier, Hon. Maxime	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
Blackburn, Hon. Jean-Pierre, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)	Jonquière—Alma	Québec	CPC
Blais, Raynald	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Québec	BQ
Blaney, Steven	Lévis—Bellechasse	Québec	CPC
Block, Kelly	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CPC
Bonsant, France	Compton—Stanstead	Québec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bouchard, Robert	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Québec	BQ
Boucher, Sylvie, Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women	Beauport—Limoilou	Québec	CPC
Boughen, Ray	Palliser	Saskatchewan	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	Québec	BQ
Braid, Peter	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CPC
Brisson, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Brown, Gordon	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Lois	Newmarket—Aurora	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	Ontario	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	CPC
Brunelle, Paule	Trois-Rivières	Québec	BQ
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Cadman, Dona	Surrey North	British Columbia	CPC
Calandra, Paul	Oak Ridges—Markham	Ontario	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CPC
Cannan, Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	British Columbia	CPC
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Pontiac	Québec	CPC
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Québec	BQ
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Carrier, Robert	Alfred-Pellan	Québec	BQ
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	CPC
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
Clarke, Rob	Desnethé—Missinippi— Churchill River	Saskatchewan	CPC
Clement, Hon. Tony, Minister of Industry	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	CPC
Coady, Siobhan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis	Bourassa	Québec	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—Tecumseh	Ontario	NDP
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Québec	Lib.
Crombie, Bonnie	Mississauga—Streetsville	Ontario	Lib.
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	NDP
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, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
Day, Hon. Stockwell, President of the Treasury Board and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CPC
DeBellefeuille, Claude	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Québec	BQ
Dechert, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Mississauga—Erindale	Ontario	CPC



Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Del Mastro, Dean, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Peterborough	Ontario	CPC
Demers, Nicole	Laval	Québec	BQ
Deschamps, Johanne	Laurentides—Labelle	Québec	BQ
Desnoyers, Luc	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	Québec	BQ
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	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	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Québec	Lib.
Donnelly, Fin	New Westminster—Coquitlam	British Columbia	NDP
Dorion, Jean	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	Québec	BQ
Dosanjh, Hon. Ujjal	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Dreeshen, Earl	Red Deer	Alberta	CPC
Dryden, Hon. Ken	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Québec	BQ
Dufour, Nicolas	Repentigny	Québec	BQ
Duncan, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CPC
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Duncan, Linda	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	NDP
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	St. Catharines	Ontario	CPC
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
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 Human Resources and Skills Development	Haldimand—Norfolk	Ontario	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven, Minister of State (Democratic Reform)	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	Manitoba	CPC
Folco, Raymonde	Laval—Les Îles	Québec	Lib.
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Freeman, Carole	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	Québec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Québec	BQ
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	Ontario	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Ontario	CPC
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Québec	Lib.
Gaudet, Roger	Montcalm	Québec	BQ
Généreux, Bernard	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	Québec	CPC
Glover, Shelly, Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	CPC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Wascana	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Science and Technology) (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario) ..	Cambridge .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and to the Minister of National Revenue .....	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière .....	Québec .....	CPC
Gravelle, Claude .....	Nickel Belt .....	Ontario .....	NDP
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, Simcoe—Grey .....	Simcoe—Grey .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Guimond, Claude .....	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques ...	Québec .....	BQ
Guimond, Michel .....	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord .....	Québec .....	BQ
Hall Findlay, Martha .....	Willowdale .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister .....	Calgary Southwest .....	Alberta .....	CPC
Harris, Jack .....	St. John's East .....	Newfoundland and Labrador .....	NDP
Harris, Richard .....	Cariboo—Prince George .....	British Columbia .....	CPC
Hawn, Laurie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence .....	Edmonton Centre .....	Alberta .....	CPC
Hiebert, Russ .....	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale .....	British Columbia .....	CPC
Hill, Hon. Jay, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Prince George—Peace River ...	British Columbia .....	CPC
Hoback, Randy .....	Prince Albert .....	Saskatchewan .....	CPC
Hoepfner, Candice .....	Portage—Lisgar .....	Manitoba .....	CPC
Holder, Ed .....	London West .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Holland, Mark .....	Ajax—Pickering .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Hughes, Carol .....	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasung .....	Ontario .....	NDP
Hyer, Bruce .....	Thunder Bay—Superior North ..	Ontario .....	NDP
Ignatieff, Hon. Michael, Leader of the Opposition .....	Etobicoke—Lakeshore .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
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
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans .....	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission .....	British Columbia .....	CPC
Kania, Andrew .....	Brampton West .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim .....	Scarborough—Agincourt .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade .....	South Shore—St. Margaret's ...	Nova Scotia .....	CPC
Kennedy, Gerard .....	Parkdale—High Park .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism .....	Calgary Southeast .....	Alberta .....	CPC
Kent, Hon. Peter, Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas) ..	Thornhill .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Kerr, Greg, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs .....	West Nova .....	Nova Scotia .....	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development and to the Minister of Labour	Souris—Moose Mountain .....	Saskatchewan .....	CPC
Kramp, Daryl .....	Prince Edward—Hastings .....	Ontario .....	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Laforest, Jean-Yves	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	Québec	BQ
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	Québec	BQ
Lake, Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont	Alberta	CPC
Lalonde, Francine	La Pointe-de-l'Île	Québec	BQ
Lauzon, Guy	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	Ontario	CPC
Lavallée, Carole	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Québec	BQ
Layton, Hon. Jack	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	NDP
Lebel, Hon. Denis, Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	Québec	CPC
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	New Brunswick	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lemay, Marc	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	Québec	BQ
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Ontario	CPC
Leslie, Megan	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lessard, Yves	Chambly—Borduas	Québec	BQ
Lévesque, Yvon	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	Québec	BQ
Lobb, Ben	Huron—Bruce	Ontario	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	CPC
Lunn, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Sport)	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CPC
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of National Defence	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
Maloway, Jim	Elmwood—Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	Manitoba	CPC
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, Tony	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	NDP
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	Ontario	NDP
Mathysen, Irene	London—Fanshawe	Ontario	NDP
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	British Columbia	CPC
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville	Ontario	Lib.
McColeman, Phil	Brant	Ontario	CPC
McGuinty, David	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood	Ontario	Lib.
McLeod, Cathy	Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo	British Columbia	CPC
McTeague, Hon. Dan	Pickering—Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Ménard, Serge	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	Québec	BQ
Mendes, Alexandra	Brossard—La Prairie	Québec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Menzies, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance ..	Macleod .....	Alberta .....	CPC
Merrifield, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Transport).....	Yellowhead .....	Alberta .....	CPC
Miller, Larry .....	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound ...	Ontario .....	CPC
Milliken, Hon. Peter, Speaker of the House of Commons .....	Kingston and the Islands .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria.....	Beaches—East York .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages.....	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam .....	British Columbia .....	CPC
Moore, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism)	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.
Murray, Joyce .....	Vancouver Quadra .....	British Columbia .....	Lib.
Nadeau, Richard.....	Gatineau .....	Québec .....	BQ
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 State and Chief Government Whip .....	Carleton—Mississippi Mills....	Ontario .....	CPC
O'Neill-Gordon, Tilly .....	Miramichi .....	New Brunswick.....	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
Oliphant, Robert.....	Don Valley West .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Ouellet, Christian.....	Brome—Missisquoi.....	Québec .....	BQ
Pacetti, Massimo .....	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel ..	Québec .....	Lib.
Paillé, Daniel .....	Hochelaga .....	Québec .....	BQ
Paillé, Pascal-Pierre .....	Louis-Hébert .....	Québec .....	BQ
Paquette, Pierre.....	Joliette .....	Québec .....	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of Natural Resources .....	Mégantic—L'Érable.....	Québec .....	CPC
Patry, Bernard .....	Pierrefonds—Dollard .....	Québec .....	Lib.
Payne, LaVar .....	Medicine Hat.....	Alberta .....	CPC
Pearson, Glen.....	London North Centre.....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Petit, Daniel, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice ....	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles.....	Québec .....	CPC
Plamondon, Louis.....	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour .....	Québec .....	BQ
Poilievre, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs .....	Nepean—Carleton .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Pomerleau, Roger .....	Drummond .....	Québec .....	BQ
Prentice, Hon. Jim, Minister of the Environment.....	Calgary Centre-North.....	Alberta .....	CPC
Preston, Joe .....	Elgin—Middlesex—London ...	Ontario .....	CPC
Proulx, Marcel.....	Hull—Aylmer .....	Québec .....	Lib.
Rae, Hon. Bob .....	Toronto Centre .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Rafferty, John.....	Thunder Bay—Rainy River ...	Ontario .....	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Labour .....	Halton .....	Ontario .....	CPC
Rajotte, James .....	Edmonton—Leduc.....	Alberta .....	CPC
Ratansi, Yasmin .....	Don Valley East.....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Rathgeber, Brent .....	Edmonton—St. Albert .....	Alberta .....	CPC
Regan, Hon. Geoff.....	Halifax West .....	Nova Scotia .....	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	Alberta	CPC
Richardson, Lee	Calgary Centre	Alberta	CPC
Rickford, Greg	Kenora	Ontario	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CPC
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.
Savage, Michael	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Savoie, Denise, The Acting Speaker	Victoria	British Columbia	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CPC
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Québec	Lib.
Scheer, Andrew, The Deputy Speaker	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	Ontario	CPC
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	CPC
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CPC
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Simson, Michelle	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	Manitoba	CPC
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	Alberta	CPC
St-Cyr, Thierry	Jeanne-Le Ber	Québec	BQ
Stanton, Bruce	Simcoe North	Ontario	CPC
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, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians and Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	British Columbia	CPC
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas— Flamborough—Westdale	Ontario	CPC
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Thi Lac, Ève-Mary Thai	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Québec	BQ
Thibeault, Glenn	Sudbury	Ontario	NDP
Thompson, Hon. Greg, New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	CPC
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	Ontario	CPC
Toews, Hon. Vic, Minister of Public Safety	Provencher	Manitoba	CPC
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Ontario	Lib.
Trost, Brad	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	CPC
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Québec	Lib.
Tweed, Merv	Brandon—Souris	Manitoba	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Uppal, Tim	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	Alberta	CPC
Valeriote, Francis	Guelph	Ontario	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	Ontario	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Minister of International Trade	York—Simcoe	Ontario	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CPC
Verner, Hon. Josée, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister for La Francophonie	Louis-Saint-Laurent	Québec	CPC
Vincent, Robert	Shefford	Québec	BQ
Volpe, Hon. Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	Ontario	CPC
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
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	British Columbia	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	New Brunswick	CPC
Wilfert, Hon. Bryon	Richmond Hill	Ontario	Lib.
Wong, Alice, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism	Richmond	British Columbia	CPC
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	CPC
Wrzesnewskyj, Borys	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CPC
Young, Terence	Oakville	Ontario	CPC
Zarac, Lise	LaSalle—Émard	Québec	Lib.

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

## Third Session—Fortieth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
<b>ALBERTA (28)</b>		
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane, Minister of State (Seniors)	Calgary—Nose Hill	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for Status of Women	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CPC
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	CPC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	CPC
Dreeshen, Earl	Red Deer	CPC
Duncan, Linda	Edmonton—Strathcona	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	CPC
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	CPC
Hawn, Laurie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Edmonton Centre	CPC
Jean, Brian, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	CPC
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism	Calgary Southeast	CPC
Lake, Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont	CPC
Menzies, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Macleod	CPC
Merrifield, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Transport)	Yellowhead	CPC
Obhrai, Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Calgary East	CPC
Payne, LaVar	Medicine Hat	CPC
Prentice, Hon. Jim, Minister of the Environment	Calgary Centre-North	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	CPC
Rathgeber, Brent	Edmonton—St. Albert	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	CPC
Richardson, Lee	Calgary Centre	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	CPC
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	CPC
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	CPC
Uppal, Tim	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	CPC
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA (36)</b>		
Abbott, Hon. Jim, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation	Kootenay—Columbia	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	NDP
Cadman, Dona	Surrey North	CPC
Cannan, Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	CPC
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	NDP
Cummins, John	Delta—Richmond East	CPC
Davies, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Day, Hon. Stockwell, President of the Treasury Board and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dhaliwal, Sukh	Newton—North Delta	Lib.
Donnelly, Fin	New Westminster—Coquitlam	NDP
Dosanjh, Hon. Ujjal	Vancouver South	Lib.
Duncan, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Vancouver Island North	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	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	CPC
Hill, Hon. Jay, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Prince George—Peace River	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 State (Sport)	Saanich—Gulf Islands	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CPC
Martin, Hon. Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Lib.
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
McLeod, Cathy	Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo	CPC
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Savoie, Denise, The Acting Speaker	Victoria	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	North Vancouver	CPC
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Strahl, Hon. Chuck, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians and Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	CPC
Warawa, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Langley	CPC
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	CPC
Wong, Alice, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism	Richmond	CPC
<b>MANITOBA (14)</b>		
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	NDP
Bezan, James	Selkirk—Interlake	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven, Minister of State (Democratic Reform)	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	CPC
Glover, Shelly, Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages	Saint Boniface	CPC
Hoepfner, Candice	Portage—Lisgar	CPC
Maloway, Jim	Elmwood—Transcona	NDP
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	CPC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Hon. Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	CPC
Toews, Hon. Vic, Minister of Public Safety	Provencher	CPC
Tweed, Merv	Brandon—Souris	CPC
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North	NDP
<b>NEW BRUNSWICK (10)</b>		
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	CPC



Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Ashfield, Hon. Keith, Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway	Fredericton	CPC
D'Amours, Jean-Claude	Madawaska—Restigouche	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	Lib.
Moore, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism)	Fundy Royal	CPC
Murphy, Brian	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
O'Neill-Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	CPC
Thompson, Hon. Greg, New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick Southwest	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	CPC
<b>NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)</b>		
Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Lib.
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Coady, Siobhan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	Lib.
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Lib.
Harris, Jack	St. John's East	NDP
Russell, Todd	Labrador	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Lib.
<b>NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)</b>		
Bevington, Dennis	Western Arctic	NDP
<b>NOVA SCOTIA (11)</b>		
Armstrong, Scott	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	CPC
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Lib.
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	South Shore—St. Margaret's	CPC
Kerr, Greg, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	West Nova	CPC
Leslie, Megan	Halifax	NDP
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of National Defence	Central Nova	CPC
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Savage, Michael	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP
<b>NUNAVUT (1)</b>		
Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of Health	Nunavut	CPC
<b>ONTARIO (106)</b>		
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	NDP
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	CPC
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	NDP
Bains, Hon. Navdeep	Mississauga—Brampton South	Lib.
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Ottawa West—Nepean	CPC
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio	Vaughan	Lib.
Braid, Peter	Kitchener—Waterloo	CPC
Brown, Gordon	Leeds—Grenville	CPC
Brown, Lois	Newmarket—Aurora	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	CPC
Calandra, Paul	Oak Ridges—Markham	CPC
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Oshawa	CPC
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 Industry	Parry Sound—Muskoka	CPC
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—Tecumseh	NDP
Crombie, Bonnie	Mississauga—Streetsville	Lib.
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	CPC
Dechert, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Mississauga—Erindale	CPC
Del Mastro, Dean, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Peterborough	CPC
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Dhalla, Ruby	Brampton—Springdale	Lib.
Dryden, Hon. Ken	York Centre	Lib.
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Lib.
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	St. Catharines	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development	Haldimand—Norfolk	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	CPC
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CPC
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Science and Technology) (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)	Cambridge	CPC
Gravelle, Claude	Nickel Belt	NDP
Guarnieri, Hon. Albina	Mississauga East—Cooksville	Lib.
Guergis, Hon. Helena, Simcoe—Grey	Simcoe—Grey	CPC
Hall Findlay, Martha	Willowdale	Lib.
Holder, Ed	London West	CPC
Holland, Mark	Ajax—Pickering	Lib.
Hughes, Carol	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking	NDP
Hyer, Bruce	Thunder Bay—Superior North	NDP
Ignatieff, Hon. Michael, Leader of the Opposition	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Kania, Andrew	Brampton West	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Kennedy, Gerard	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Kent, Hon. Peter, Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas)	Thornhill	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	CPC
Lauzon, Guy	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	CPC
Layton, Hon. Jack	Toronto—Danforth	NDP
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lobb, Ben	Huron—Bruce	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety	Oxford	CPC
Malhi, Hon. Gurbax	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	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.
McColeman, Phil	Brant	CPC
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 of the House of Commons	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria	Beaches—East York	Lib.
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 State and Chief Government Whip	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	CPC
Oda, Hon. Bev, Minister of International Cooperation	Durham	CPC
Oliphant, Robert	Don Valley West	Lib.
Pearson, Glen	London North Centre	Lib.
Poilievre, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Nepean—Carleton	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	CPC
Rae, Hon. Bob	Toronto Centre	Lib.
Rafferty, John	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Labour	Halton	CPC
Ratansi, Yasmin	Don Valley East	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	CPC
Rickford, Greg	Kenora	CPC
Rota, Anthony	Nipissing—Timiskaming	Lib.
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	CPC
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Lib.
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	CPC
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Lib.
Simson, Michelle	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Stanton, Bruce	Simcoe North	CPC
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	CPC
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Thibeault, Glenn	Sudbury	NDP
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	CPC
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Lib.
Valeriotte, Francis	Guelph	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Minister of International Trade	York—Simcoe	CPC
Volpe, Hon. Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	CPC
Watson, Jeff	Essex	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Wilfert, Hon. Bryon	Richmond Hill	Lib.
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	CPC
Wrzesnewskyj, Borys	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Young, Terence	Oakville	CPC
<b>PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)</b>		
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
Murphy, Hon. Shawn	Charlottetown	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	CPC
<b>QUÉBEC (75)</b>		
André, Guy	Berthier—Maskinongé	BQ
Arthur, André	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier	Ind.
Asselin, Gérard	Manicouagan	BQ
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Beaudin, Josée	Saint-Lambert	BQ
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	BQ
Bernier, Hon. Maxime	Beauce	CPC
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	BQ
Blackburn, Hon. Jean-Pierre, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)	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 for Status of Women	Beauport—Limoilou	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Brunelle, Paule	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Pontiac	CPC
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carrier, Robert	Alfred-Pellan	BQ
Coderre, Hon. Denis	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
DeBellefeuille, Claude	Beauharnois—Salaberry	BQ
Demers, Nicole	Laval	BQ
Deschamps, Johanne	Laurentides—Labelle	BQ
Desnoyers, Luc	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Dorion, Jean	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dufour, Nicolas	Repentigny	BQ
Faille, Meili	Vaudreuil-Soulanges	BQ
Folco, Raymonde	Laval—Les Îles	Lib.
Freeman, Carole	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	BQ
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Gaudet, Roger	Montcalm	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Généreux, Bernard	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska— Rivière-du-Loup	CPC
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and to the Minister of National Revenue	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	CPC
Guay, Monique	Rivière-du-Nord	BQ
Guimond, Claude	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute- Côte-Nord	BQ
Jennings, Hon. Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
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, Hon. Denis, Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	CPC
Lemay, Marc	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	BQ
Lessard, Yves	Chambly—Borduas	BQ
Lévesque, Yvon	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	BQ
Malo, Luc	Verchères—Les Patriotes	BQ
Ménard, Serge	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	BQ
Mendes, Alexandra	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	BQ
Mulcair, Thomas	Outremont	NDP
Nadeau, Richard	Gatineau	BQ
Ouellet, Christian	Brome—Missisquoi	BQ
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Paillé, Daniel	Hochelaga	BQ
Paillé, Pascal-Pierre	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of Natural Resources	Mégantic—L'Érable	CPC
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Petit, Daniel, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	CPC
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Drummond	BQ
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	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
Thi Lac, Ève-Mary Thaï	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Lib.
Verner, Hon. Josée, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister for La Francophonie	Louis-Saint-Laurent	CPC
Vincent, Robert	Shefford	BQ
Zarac, Lise	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.

#### SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CPC
---	--------------------------	-----

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Block, Kelly .....	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar .....	CPC
Boughen, Ray .....	Palliser .....	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry .....	Yorkton—Melville .....	CPC
Clarke, Rob .....	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River ..	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Wascana .....	Wascana .....	Lib.
Hoback, Randy .....	Prince Albert .....	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development and to the Minister of Labour .....	Souris—Moose Mountain .....	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons .....	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 Deputy Speaker .....	Regina—Qu'Appelle .....	CPC
Trost, Brad .....	Saskatoon—Humboldt .....	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice .....	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin .....	CPC
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification) .....	Blackstrap .....	CPC
<b>YUKON (1)</b>		
Bagnell, Hon. Larry .....	Yukon .....	Lib.

## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of March 26, 2010 — 3rd Session, 40th Parliament)

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Bruce Stanton	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Jean Crowder Todd Russell	
Larry Bagnell Rob Clarke Earl Dreeshen	John Duncan Marc Lemay	Yvon Lévesque Anita Neville	LaVar Payne Greg Rickford	(12)

#### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Rick Casson	Randy Kamp	Brent Rathgeber
Harold Albrecht	Michael Chong	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
Mike Allen	Nathan Cullen	Greg Kerr	Blake Richards
Dean Allison	John Cummins	Ed Komarnicki	Lee Richardson
Rob Anders	Patricia Davidson	Daryl Kramp	Andrew Saxton
David Anderson	Bob Dechert	Mike Lake	Gary Schellenberger
Charlie Angus	Dean Del Mastro	Guy Lauzon	Bev Shipley
Scott Armstrong	Jean Dorion	Pierre Lemieux	Devinder Shory
Niki Ashton	Ken Dryden	Megan Leslie	Joy Smith
Gérard Asselin	Kirsty Duncan	Ben Lobb	Kevin Sorenson
Carolyn Bennett	Rick Dykstra	Tom Lukiwski	Brian Storseth
Leon Benoit	Ed Fast	James Lunney	David Sweet
Maxime Bernier	Carole Freeman	Dave MacKenzie	Greg Thompson
Dennis Bevington	Royal Galipeau	Inky Mark	David Tilson
James Bezan	Cheryl Gallant	Pat Martin	Brad Trost
Steven Blaney	Bernard Généreux	Tony Martin	Justin Trudeau
Kelly Block	Shelly Glover	Colin Mayes	Merv Tweed
Sylvie Boucher	Peter Goldring	Phil McColeman	Tim Uppal
Ray Boughen	Jacques Gourde	Cathy McLeod	Dave Van Kesteren
Peter Braid	Nina Grewal	Ted Menzies	Maurice Vellacott
Garry Breitkreuz	Richard Harris	Larry Miller	Mike Wallace
Gordon Brown	Laurie Hawn	Rick Norlock	Mark Warawa
Lois Brown	Russ Hiebert	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Chris Warkentin
Patrick Brown	Randy Hoback	Deepak Obhrai	Jeff Watson
Rod Bruinooge	Candice Hoepfner	Daniel Petit	John Weston
Dona Cadman	Ed Holder	Pierre Poilievre	Rodney Weston
Paul Calandra	Carol Hughes	Joe Preston	Alice Wong
Blaine Calkins	Bruce Hyer	John Rafferty	Stephen Woodworth
Ron Cannan	Brian Jean	James Rajotte	Terence Young
Colin Carrie			

---

## ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

**Chair:**

Paul Szabo

**Vice-Chairs:**Patricia Davidson  
Bill SiksayKelly Block  
Rick CassonWayne Easter  
Judy FooteCarole Freeman  
Pierre PoilievreGreg Rickford  
Ève-Mary Thai Thi Lac

(11)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Claude DeBellefeuille	Ed Komarnicki	Scott Reid
Harold Albrecht	Bob Dechert	Daryl Kramp	Blake Richards
Mike Allen	Dean Del Mastro	Mike Lake	Lee Richardson
Dean Allison	Earl Dreshen	Guy Lauzon	Andrew Saxton
Rob Anders	John Duncan	Jack Layton	Gary Schellenberger
David Anderson	Rick Dykstra	Pierre Lemieux	Bev Shipley
Charlie Angus	Ed Fast	Ben Lobb	Devinder Shory
Scott Armstrong	Christiane Gagnon	Tom Lukiwski	Michelle Simson
Leon Benoit	Royal Galipeau	James Lunney	Joy Smith
Maxime Bernier	Cheryl Gallant	Dave MacKenzie	Kevin Sorenson
James Bezan	Bernard Généreux	Jim Maloway	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Shelly Glover	Inky Mark	Brian Storseth
Sylvie Boucher	Yvon Godin	Pat Martin	David Sweet
Ray Boughen	Peter Goldring	Colin Mayes	Greg Thompson
Peter Braid	Jacques Gourde	Phil McColeman	David Tilson
Garry Breitkreuz	Nina Grewal	Cathy McLeod	Brad Trost
Gordon Brown	Michel Guimond	Serge Ménard	Merv Tweed
Lois Brown	Martha Hall Findlay	Ted Menzies	Tim Uppal
Patrick Brown	Jack Harris	Larry Miller	Dave Van Kesteren
Rod Bruinooge	Richard Harris	Anita Neville	Maurice Vellacott
Dona Cadman	Laurie Hawn	Rick Norlock	Mike Wallace
Paul Calandra	Russ Hiebert	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Mark Warawa
Blaine Calkins	Randy Hoback	Deepak Obhrai	Chris Warkentin
Ron Cannan	Candice Hoepfner	Robert Oliphant	Jeff Watson
Colin Carrie	Ed Holder	Pierre Paquette	John Weston
Michael Chong	Brian Jean	LaVar Payne	Rodney Weston
David Christopherson	Marlene Jennings	Daniel Petit	Alice Wong
Rob Clarke	Randy Kamp	Joe Preston	Stephen Woodworth
Joe Comartin	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte	Borys Wrzesnewskyj
John Cummins	Greg Kerr	Brent Rathgeber	Terence Young

---





## CANADIAN HERITAGE

**Chair:**

Gary Schellenberger

**Vice-Chairs:**

 Carole Lavallée  
 Pablo Rodriguez

 Charlie Angus  
 Rod Bruinooge  
 Dean Del Mastro

 Ruby Dhalla  
 Royal Galipeau

 Nina Grewal  
 Roger Pomerleau

 Scott Simms  
 Tim Uppal

(12)

### Associate Members

 Jim Abbott  
 Harold Albrecht  
 Mike Allen  
 Dean Allison  
 Rob Anders  
 David Anderson  
 Scott Armstrong  
 Niki Ashton  
 Alex Atamanenko  
 Leon Benoit  
 Maxime Bernier  
 James Bezan  
 Steven Blaney  
 Kelly Block  
 Robert Bouchard  
 Sylvie Boucher  
 Ray Boughen  
 Peter Braid  
 Garry Breitkreuz  
 Gordon Brown  
 Lois Brown  
 Patrick Brown  
 Dona Cadman  
 Paul Calandra  
 Blaine Calkins  
 Ron Cannan  
 Serge Cardin  
 Colin Carrie  
 Rick Casson  
 Michael Chong  
 David Christopherson  
 Rob Clarke  
 Bonnie Crombie  
 Jean Crowder

 Nathan Cullen  
 John Cummins  
 Patricia Davidson  
 Don Davies  
 Libby Davies  
 Bob Dechert  
 Jean Dorion  
 Earl Dreeshen  
 Nicolas Dufour  
 John Duncan  
 Rick Dykstra  
 Ed Fast  
 Hedy Fry  
 Cheryl Gallant  
 Marc Garneau  
 Bernard Gagné  
 Shelly Glover  
 Yvon Godin  
 Peter Goldring  
 Jacques Gourde  
 Monique Guay  
 Richard Harris  
 Laurie Hawn  
 Russ Hiebert  
 Randy Hoback  
 Candice Hooppner  
 Ed Holder  
 Mark Holland  
 Brian Jean  
 Peter Julian  
 Randy Kamp  
 Jim Karygiannis  
 Gerald Keddy  
 Greg Kerr

 Ed Komarnicki  
 Daryl Kramp  
 Mike Lake  
 Guy Lauzon  
 Pierre Lemieux  
 Ben Lobb  
 Tom Lukiwski  
 James Lunney  
 Dave MacKenzie  
 Inky Mark  
 Wayne Marston  
 Pat Martin  
 Colin Mayes  
 Phil McColeman  
 Cathy McLeod  
 Serge Ménard  
 Ted Menzies  
 Larry Miller  
 Brian Murphy  
 Richard Nadeau  
 Anita Neville  
 Rick Norlock  
 Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
 Deepak Obhrai  
 Robert Oliphant  
 Massimo Pacetti  
 Pascal-Pierre Paillé  
 LaVar Payne  
 Daniel Petit  
 Pierre Poilievre  
 Joe Preston  
 John Rafferty  
 James Rajotte

 Brent Rathgeber  
 Scott Reid  
 Blake Richards  
 Lee Richardson  
 Greg Rickford  
 Andrew Saxton  
 Francis Scarpaleggia  
 Bev Shipley  
 Devinder Shory  
 Bill Siksay  
 Joy Smith  
 Kevin Sorenson  
 Bruce Stanton  
 Peter Stoffer  
 Brian Storseth  
 David Sweet  
 Glenn Thibeault  
 Greg Thompson  
 David Tilson  
 Brad Trost  
 Justin Trudeau  
 Merv Tweed  
 Dave Van Kesteren  
 Maurice Vellacott  
 Mike Wallace  
 Mark Warawa  
 Chris Warkentin  
 Jeff Watson  
 John Weston  
 Rodney Weston  
 Alice Wong  
 Stephen Woodworth  
 Terence Young

## CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Chair:**

David Tilson

**Vice-Chairs:**
Maurizio Bevilacqua  
Thierry St-CyrPaul Calandra  
Olivia Chow  
Denis CoderreRick Dykstra  
Nina GrewalJim Karygiannis  
Ève-Mary Thaï Thi LacAlice Wong  
Terence Young

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
 Harold Albrecht  
 Mike Allen  
 Dean Allison  
 Rob Anders  
 David Anderson  
 Scott Armstrong  
 Leon Benoit  
 Maxime Bernier  
 James Bezan  
 Steven Blaney  
 Kelly Block  
 Sylvie Boucher  
 Ray Boughen  
 Peter Braid  
 Garry Breitkreuz  
 Gordon Brown  
 Lois Brown  
 Patrick Brown  
 Rod Bruinooge  
 Dona Cadman  
 Blaine Calkins  
 Ron Cannan  
 Colin Carrie  
 Rick Casson  
 Michael Chong  
 David Christopherson  
 Rob Clarke  
 Joe Comartin  
 Bonnie Crombie  
 John Cummins

Patricia Davidson  
 Don Davies  
 Libby Davies  
 Bob Dechert  
 Dean Del Mastro  
 Johanne Deschamps  
 Sukh Dhaliwal  
 Fin Donnelly  
 Jean Dorion  
 Earl Dreeshen  
 John Duncan  
 Meili Faille  
 Ed Fast  
 Royal Galipeau  
 Cheryl Gallant  
 Bernard Généreux  
 Shelly Glover  
 Peter Goldring  
 Jacques Gourde  
 Monique Guay  
 Richard Harris  
 Laurie Hawn  
 Russ Hiebert  
 Randy Hoback  
 Candice Hoepfner  
 Ed Holder  
 Brian Jean  
 Peter Julian  
 Randy Kamp  
 Andrew Kania  
 Gerald Keddy

Greg Kerr  
 Ed Komarnicki  
 Daryl Kramp  
 Mike Lake  
 Francine Lalonde  
 Guy Lauzon  
 Jack Layton  
 Pierre Lemieux  
 Ben Lobb  
 Tom Lukiwski  
 James Lunney  
 Dave MacKenzie  
 Inky Mark  
 Pat Martin  
 Brian Masse  
 Colin Mayes  
 Phil McColeman  
 Cathy McLeod  
 Alexandra Mendes  
 Ted Menzies  
 Larry Miller  
 Richard Nadeau  
 Rick Norlock  
 Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
 Deepak Obhrai  
 Robert Oliphant  
 LaVar Payne  
 Daniel Petit  
 Pierre Poilievre  
 Joe Preston  
 James Rajotte

Brent Rathgeber  
 Scott Reid  
 Blake Richards  
 Lee Richardson  
 Greg Rickford  
 Andrew Saxton  
 Gary Schellenberger  
 Bev Shipley  
 Devinder Shory  
 Bill Siksay  
 Michelle Simson  
 Joy Smith  
 Kevin Sorenson  
 Bruce Stanton  
 Brian Storseth  
 David Sweet  
 Greg Thompson  
 Brad Trost  
 Merv Tweed  
 Tim Uppal  
 Dave Van Kesteren  
 Maurice Vellacott  
 Mike Wallace  
 Mark Warawa  
 Chris Warkentin  
 Judy Wasylcyia-Leis  
 Jeff Watson  
 John Weston  
 Rodney Weston  
 Stephen Woodworth  
 Lise Zarac

## ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Chair:**

James Bezan

**Vice-Chairs:**

Bernard Bigras

David McGuinty

Scott Armstrong  
Blaine Calkins  
Linda Duncan

Christian Ouellet  
Francis Scarpaleggia

Justin Trudeau  
Mark Warawa

Jeff Watson  
Stephen Woodworth

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
André Bellavance  
Leon Benoit  
Maxime Bernier  
Dennis Bevington  
Steven Blaney  
Kelly Block  
France Bonsant  
Robert Bouchard  
Sylvie Boucher  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Paule Brunelle  
Dona Cadman  
Paul Calandra  
Ron Cannan  
Serge Cardin  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joe Comartin

Jean Crowder  
Nathan Cullen  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Fin Donnelly  
Jean Dorion  
Earl Dreshen  
Nicolas Dufour  
John Duncan  
Kirsty Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Ed Fast  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Marc Garneau  
Bernard Généreux  
Shelly Glover  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Claude Guimond  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoepfner  
Ed Holder  
Bruce Hyer  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian

Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Jack Layton  
Pierre Lemieux  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Ted Menzies  
Larry Miller  
Thomas Mulcair  
Joyce Murray  
Rick Norlock  
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
Deepak Obhrai  
LaVar Payne  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
John Rafferty  
James Rajotte  
Brent Rathgeber

Geoff Regan  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Lee Richardson  
Greg Rickford  
Pablo Rodriguez  
Denise Savoie  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Peter Stoffer  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Alan Tonks  
Brad Trost  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Francis Valeriote  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Chris Warkentin  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
Alice Wong  
Terence Young

**FINANCE****Chair:** James Rajotte**Vice-Chairs:**Massimo Pacetti  
Daniel PailléKelly Block  
Robert Carrier  
Bernard G n reuxRuss Hiebert  
John McCallumJohn McKay  
Ted MenziesThomas Mulcair  
Mike Wallace

(12)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
G rard Asselin  
Navdeep Bains  
Leon Benoit  
Maxime Bernier  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Ray Boughen  
Diane Bourgeois  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Dona Cadman  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
Chris Charlton  
Michael Chong  
David Christopherson  
Rob ClarkeSiobhan Coady  
Denis Coderre  
Jean Crowder  
Nathan Cullen  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Libby Davies  
Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Ruby Dhalla  
Fin Donnelly  
Jean Dorion  
Earl Dreeshen  
John Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Meili Faille  
Ed Fast  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Shelly Glover  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Martha Hall Findlay  
Jack Harris  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoepfner  
Ed Holder  
Carol Hughes  
Brian Jean  
Peter JulianRandy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Jack Layton  
Pierre Lemieux  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Jim Maloway  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
David McGuinty  
Cathy McLeod  
Larry Miller  
Maria Minna  
Richard Nadeau  
Rick Norlock  
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
Deepak Obhrai  
LaVar Payne  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
Bob Rae  
Brent Rathgeber  
Scott ReidBlake Richards  
Lee Richardson  
Greg Rickford  
Anthony Rota  
Jean-Yves Roy  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Bill Siksay  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Glenn Thibeault  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Brad Trost  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
Alice Wong  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young

## FISHERIES AND OCEANS

**Chair:** Rodney Weston

**Vice-Chairs:**

Raynald Blais  
Lawrence MacAulay

Mike Allen  
Scott Andrews  
Gerry Byrne

Blaine Calkins  
Fin Donnelly

Randy Kamp  
Yvon Lévesque

Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
John Weston

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Malcolm Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Gérard Asselin  
Leon Benoit  
Maxime Bernier  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Kelly Block  
Sylvie Boucher  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Dona Cadman  
Paul Calandra  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Jean Crowder  
Nathan Cullen

John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Earl Dreesen  
John Duncan  
Linda Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Ed Fast  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Roger Gaudet  
Bernard Généreux  
Shelly Glover  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Jack Harris  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoepfner  
Ed Holder  
Carol Hughes  
Bruce Hyer  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian

Gerald Keddy  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mario Laframboise  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Ted Menzies  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
LaVar Payne  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Brent Rathgeber  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards

Lee Richardson  
Greg Rickford  
Jean-Yves Roy  
Todd Russell  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Scott Simms  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Peter Stoffer  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Brad Trost  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
Alice Wong  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young

---

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Dean Allison	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Francine Lalonde Bernard Patry	
Jim Abbott Johanne Deschamps Paul Dewar	Peter Goldring James Lunney	Deepak Obhrai Glen Pearson	Bob Rae Dave Van Kesteren	(12)

### Associate Members

Harold Albrecht	Jean Dorion	Jean-Yves Laforest	Blake Richards
Mike Allen	Ujjal Dosanjh	Mike Lake	Lee Richardson
Rob Anders	Earl Dreshen	Guy Lauzon	Greg Rickford
David Anderson	Ken Dryden	Jack Layton	Michael Savage
Scott Armstrong	John Duncan	Pierre Lemieux	Andrew Saxton
Claude Bachand	Rick Dykstra	Ben Lobb	Gary Schellenberger
Larry Bagnell	Mark Eyking	Tom Lukiwski	Bev Shipley
Leon Benoit	Ed Fast	Dave MacKenzie	Devinder Shory
Maxime Bernier	Raymonde Folco	Inky Mark	Bill Siksay
James Bezan	Judy Foote	Wayne Marston	Mario Silva
Steven Blaney	Hedy Fry	Keith Martin	Joy Smith
Kelly Block	Royal Galipeau	Pat Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Sylvie Boucher	Cheryl Gallant	Brian Masse	Thierry St-Cyr
Ray Boughen	Marc Garneau	Colin Mayes	Bruce Stanton
Peter Braid	Bernard Généreux	Phil McColeman	Brian Storseth
Garry Breitkreuz	Shelly Glover	David McGuinty	David Sweet
Gordon Brown	Jacques Gourde	John McKay	Paul Szabo
Lois Brown	Nina Grewal	Cathy McLeod	Ève-Mary Thאי Thi Lac
Patrick Brown	Monique Guay	Dan McTeague	Greg Thompson
Rod Bruinooge	Claude Guimond	Ted Menzies	David Tilson
Dona Cadman	Jack Harris	Larry Miller	Alan Tonks
Paul Calandra	Richard Harris	Brian Murphy	Brad Trost
Blaine Calkins	Laurie Hawn	Richard Nadeau	Merv Tweed
Ron Cannan	Russ Hiebert	Rick Norlock	Tim Uppal
Colin Carrie	Randy Hoback	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Candice Hoepfner	Massimo Pacetti	Mike Wallace
Michael Chong	Ed Holder	LaVar Payne	Mark Warawa
Rob Clarke	Bruce Hyer	Daniel Petit	Chris Warkentin
Joe Comartin	Brian Jean	Pierre Poilievre	Jeff Watson
Irwin Cotler	Peter Julian	Joe Preston	John Weston
Nathan Cullen	Randy Kamp	John Rafferty	Rodney Weston
John Cummins	Jim Karygiannis	James Rajotte	Alice Wong
Patricia Davidson	Gerald Keddy	Yasmin Ratansi	Stephen Woodworth
Don Davies	Greg Kerr	Brent Rathgeber	Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Bob Dechert	Ed Komarnicki	Scott Reid	Terence Young
Dean Del Mastro	Daryl Kramp		

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

<b>Chair:</b>	Scott Reid	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Jean Dorion Mario Silva	
Irwin Cotler	Russ Hiebert	Wayne Marston	David Sweet	(7)

## GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

**Chair:**

Yasmin Ratansi

**Vice-Chairs:**Pat Martin  
Chris WarkentinDiane Bourgeois  
Patrick BrownRod Bruinooge  
Siobhan CoadyJacques Gourde  
Martha Hall FindlayEd Holder  
Richard Nadeau

(11)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Patricia Davidson	Ed Komarnicki	Lee Richardson
Harold Albrecht	Bob Dechert	Daryl Kramp	Greg Rickford
Mike Allen	Dean Del Mastro	Mike Lake	Denise Savoie
Dean Allison	Paul Dewar	Guy Lauzon	Andrew Saxton
Rob Anders	Jean Dorion	Pierre Lemieux	Gary Schellenberger
David Anderson	Earl Dreeshen	Ben Lobb	Bev Shipley
Scott Armstrong	John Duncan	Tom Lukiwski	Devinder Shory
Leon Benoit	Rick Dykstra	James Lunney	Joy Smith
Maxime Bernier	Meili Faille	Dave MacKenzie	Kevin Sorenson
James Bezan	Ed Fast	Jim Maloway	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Judy Foote	Inky Mark	Brian Storseth
Kelly Block	Royal Galipeau	Colin Mayes	David Sweet
Sylvie Boucher	Cheryl Gallant	Phil McColeman	Glenn Thibeault
Ray Boughen	Bernard G�n�reux	Cathy McLeod	Greg Thompson
Peter Braid	Shelly Glover	Ted Menzies	David Tilson
Garry Breitkreuz	Yvon Godin	Larry Miller	Brad Trost
Gordon Brown	Peter Goldring	Thomas Mulcair	Merv Tweed
Lois Brown	Nina Grewal	Rick Norlock	Tim Uppal
Dona Cadman	Jack Harris	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Dave Van Kesteren
Paul Calandra	Richard Harris	Deepak Obhrai	Maurice Vellacott
Blaine Calkins	Laurie Hawn	Daniel Paill�	Mike Wallace
Ron Cannan	Russ Hiebert	LaVar Payne	Mark Warawa
Colin Carrie	Randy Hoback	Daniel Petit	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Robert Carrier	Candice Hoepfner	Pierre Poilievre	Jeff Watson
Rick Casson	Carol Hughes	Joe Preston	John Weston
Chris Charlton	Brian Jean	James Rajotte	Rodney Weston
Michael Chong	Peter Julian	Brent Rathgeber	Alice Wong
David Christopherson	Randy Kamp	Scott Reid	Stephen Woodworth
Rob Clarke	Gerald Keddy	Blake Richards	Terence Young
John Cummins	Greg Kerr		

---



## HEALTH

<b>Chair:</b>	Joy Smith	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Joyce Murray Judy Wasylcyia-Leis	
Carolyn Bennett Patrick Brown Colin Carrie	Patricia Davidson Nicolas Dufour	Kirsty Duncan Luc Malo	Cathy McLeod Tim Uppal	(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Jean Crowder	Greg Kerr	Joe Preston
Harold Albrecht	Nathan Cullen	Ed Komarnicki	James Rajotte
Malcolm Allen	John Cummins	Daryl Kramp	Brent Rathgeber
Mike Allen	Bob Dechert	Mike Lake	Scott Reid
Dean Allison	Dean Del Mastro	Guy Lauzon	Blake Richards
Rob Anders	Jean Dorion	Jack Layton	Lee Richardson
David Anderson	Earl Dreeshen	Pierre Lemieux	Greg Rickford
Guy André	John Duncan	Megan Leslie	Andrew Saxton
Scott Armstrong	Rick Dykstra	Ben Lobb	Gary Schellenberger
Alex Atamanenko	Ed Fast	Tom Lukiwski	Bev Shipley
Leon Benoit	Carole Freeman	James Lunney	Devinder Shory
Maxime Bernier	Hedy Fry	Dave MacKenzie	Kevin Sorenson
James Bezan	Royal Galipeau	Inky Mark	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Cheryl Gallant	Keith Martin	Brian Storseth
Kelly Block	Bernard Généreux	Pat Martin	David Sweet
Robert Bouchard	Shelly Glover	Brian Masse	Greg Thompson
Sylvie Boucher	Peter Goldring	Irene Mathysen	David Tilson
Ray Boughen	Jacques Gourde	Colin Mayes	Brad Trost
Peter Braid	Nina Grewal	Phil McColeman	Merv Tweed
Garry Breitkreuz	Richard Harris	Ted Menzies	Dave Van Kesteren
Gordon Brown	Laurie Hawn	Larry Miller	Maurice Vellacott
Lois Brown	Russ Hiebert	Maria Minna	Mike Wallace
Rod Bruinooge	Randy Hoback	Anita Neville	Mark Warawa
Dona Cadman	Candice Hoepfner	Rick Norlock	Chris Warkentin
Paul Calandra	Ed Holder	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Jeff Watson
Blaine Calkins	Carol Hughes	Deepak Obhrai	John Weston
Ron Cannan	Brian Jean	Robert Oliphant	Rodney Weston
Serge Cardin	Peter Julian	Pascal-Pierre Paillé	Alice Wong
Rick Casson	Randy Kamp	LaVar Payne	Stephen Woodworth
Chris Charlton	Gerald Keddy	Daniel Petit	Terence Young
Michael Chong	Gerard Kennedy	Pierre Poilievre	Lise Zarac
Rob Clarke			

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEUROLOGICAL DISEASE

<b>Chair:</b>	Joy Smith	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Kirsty Duncan	
Patrick Brown	Luc Malo	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis		(5)

**HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH  
DISABILITIES**

<b>Chair:</b>	Candice Hoepfner	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Raymonde Folco Yves Lessard	
Josée Beaudin Ron Cannan Rick Casson	Ed Komarnicki Ben Lobb	Tony Martin Maria Minna	Michael Savage Maurice Vellacott	(12)

**Associate Members**

Jim Abbott	Jean-Claude D'Amours	Daryl Kramp	Todd Russell
Harold Albrecht	Patricia Davidson	Mike Lake	Denise Savoie
Malcolm Allen	Libby Davies	Guy Lauzon	Andrew Saxton
Mike Allen	Bob Dechert	Pierre Lemieux	Gary Schellenberger
Dean Allison	Dean Del Mastro	Megan Leslie	Judy Sgro
Rob Anders	Luc Desnoyers	Tom Lukiwski	Bev Shipley
David Anderson	Jean Dorion	James Lunney	Devinder Shory
Scott Armstrong	Earl Dreesen	Lawrence MacAulay	Bill Siksay
Niki Ashton	Nicolas Dufour	Dave MacKenzie	Joy Smith
Leon Benoit	John Duncan	Inky Mark	Kevin Sorenson
Maxime Bernier	Rick Dykstra	Wayne Marston	Thierry St-Cyr
James Bezan	Ed Fast	Pat Martin	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Carole Freeman	Irene Mathysen	Brian Storseth
Kelly Block	Hedy Fry	Colin Mayes	David Sweet
Sylvie Boucher	Royal Galipeau	Phil McColeman	Ève-Mary Thāi Thi Lac
Ray Boughen	Cheryl Gallant	Cathy McLeod	Greg Thompson
Peter Braid	Bernard Généreux	Ted Menzies	David Tilson
Garry Breitreuz	Shelly Glover	Larry Miller	Brad Trost
Gordon Brown	Yvon Godin	Anita Neville	Justin Trudeau
Lois Brown	Peter Goldring	Rick Norlock	Merv Tweed
Patrick Brown	Jacques Gourde	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Tim Uppal
Rod Bruinooge	Nina Grewal	Deepak Obhrai	Francis Valeriote
Dona Cadman	Richard Harris	Christian Ouellet	Dave Van Kesteren
Paul Calandra	Laurie Hawn	LaVar Payne	Robert Vincent
Blaine Calkins	Russ Hiebert	Daniel Petit	Mike Wallace
Colin Carrie	Randy Hoback	Pierre Poilievre	Mark Warawa
Chris Charlton	Ed Holder	Joe Preston	Chris Warkentin
Michael Chong	Carol Hughes	James Rajotte	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Olivia Chow	Brian Jean	Brent Rathgeber	Jeff Watson
David Christopherson	Marlene Jennings	Scott Reid	John Weston
Rob Clarke	Peter Julian	Blake Richards	Rodney Weston
Siobhan Coady	Randy Kamp	Lee Richardson	Alice Wong
Jean Crowder	Gerald Keddy	Greg Rickford	Stephen Woodworth
Nathan Cullen	Gerard Kennedy	Pablo Rodriguez	Terence Young
John Cummins	Greg Kerr		

---

## INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Chair:** Michael Chong

**Vice-Chairs:**

Robert Bouchard  
Anthony Rota

Peter Braid  
Gordon Brown  
Serge Cardin

Marc Garneau  
Mike Lake

Brian Masse  
Dan McTeague

Dave Van Kesteren  
Mike Wallace

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Andrews  
Charlie Angus  
Scott Armstrong  
G rard Asselin  
Navdeep Bains  
Leon Benoit  
Maxime Bernier  
Dennis Bevington  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Kelly Block  
Sylvie Boucher  
Ray Boughen  
Garry Breitkreuz  
Scott Brison  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Dona Cadman  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
David Christopherson  
Rob Clarke  
Joe Comartin  
Jean Crowder  
Nathan Cullen  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson

Don Davies  
Libby Davies  
Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Sukh Dhaliwal  
Jean Dorion  
Earl Dreeshen  
John Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Ed Fast  
Carole Freeman  
Hedy Fry  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Bernard G n reux  
Shelly Glover  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Claude Gravelle  
Nina Grewal  
Claude Guimond  
Jack Harris  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoepfner  
Ed Holder  
Bruce Hyer  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Andrew Kania  
Gerald Keddy  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp

Jean-Yves Laforest  
Guy Lauzon  
Carole Lavall e  
Jack Layton  
Pierre Lemieux  
Megan Leslie  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Luc Malo  
Jim Maloway  
Inky Mark  
Wayne Marston  
Pat Martin  
Tony Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
David McGuinty  
John McKay  
Cathy McLeod  
Ted Menzies  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
Deepak Obhrai  
Massimo Pacetti  
LaVar Payne  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Roger Pomerleau  
Joe Preston  
John Rafferty  
James Rajotte  
Yasmin Ratansi  
Brent Rathgeber

Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Lee Richardson  
Greg Rickford  
Jean-Yves Roy  
Andrew Saxton  
Francis Scarpaleggia  
Gary Schellenberger  
Judy Sgro  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Bill Siksay  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Peter Stoffer  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Glenn Thibeault  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Brad Trost  
Justin Trudeau  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Francis Valeriote  
Maurice Vellacott  
Joseph Volpe  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
Alice Wong  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Chair:**

Lee Richardson

**Vice-Chairs:**
John Cannis  
Jean-Yves LaforestDean Allison  
Scott Brison  
Ron CannanClaude Guimond  
Ed HolderPeter Julian  
Gerald KeddyMario Silva  
Brad Trost

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Malcolm Allen  
Mike Allen  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Navdeep Bains  
Leon Benoit  
Maxime Bernier  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Kelly Block  
Robert Bouchard  
Sylvie Boucher  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Dona Cadman  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Serge Cardin  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
Chris Charlton  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Siobhan Coady

Bonnie Crombie  
Nathan Cullen  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Johanne Deschamps  
Paul Dewar  
Sukh Dhaliwal  
Ruby Dhalla  
Jean Dorion  
Earl Dreeshen  
John Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Wayne Easter  
Ed Fast  
Judy Foote  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Bernard Généreux  
Shelly Glover  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoepfner  
Bruce Hyer  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp

Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Francine Lalonde  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Inky Mark  
Wayne Marston  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Ted Menzies  
Larry Miller  
Thomas Mulcair  
Rick Norlock  
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
Deepak Obhrai  
Robert Oliphant  
LaVar Payne  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
John Rafferty  
James Rajotte  
Yasmin Ratansi  
Brent Rathgeber

Geoff Regan  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Greg Rickford  
Anthony Rota  
Michael Savage  
Denise Savoie  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
Bryon Wilfert  
Alice Wong  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young

## JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

<b>Chair:</b>	Ed Fast	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Serge Ménard Brian Murphy	
Joe Comartin Bob Dechert Dominic LeBlanc	Marc Lemay Alexandra Mendes	Rick Norlock Daniel Petit	Brent Rathgeber Stephen Woodworth	(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Don Davies	Ed Komarnicki	Scott Reid
Harold Albrecht	Libby Davies	Daryl Kramp	Blake Richards
Mike Allen	Dean Del Mastro	Mike Lake	Lee Richardson
Dean Allison	Jean Dorion	Guy Lauzon	Greg Rickford
Rob Anders	Ujjal Dosanjh	Carole Lavallée	Denise Savoie
David Anderson	Earl Dreeshen	Derek Lee	Andrew Saxton
Scott Armstrong	John Duncan	Pierre Lemieux	Gary Schellenberger
Larry Bagnell	Linda Duncan	Megan Leslie	Bev Shipley
Leon Benoit	Rick Dykstra	Ben Lobb	Devinder Shory
Maxime Bernier	Carole Freeman	Tom Lukiwski	Bill Siksay
James Bezan	Hedy Fry	James Lunney	Michelle Simson
Steven Blaney	Royal Galipeau	Dave MacKenzie	Joy Smith
Kelly Block	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Kevin Sorenson
Sylvie Boucher	Bernard Généreux	Wayne Marston	Bruce Stanton
Ray Boughen	Shelly Glover	Pat Martin	Brian Storseth
Peter Braid	Peter Goldring	Colin Mayes	David Sweet
Garry Breitkreuz	Jacques Gourde	Phil McColeman	Greg Thompson
Gordon Brown	Nina Grewal	John McKay	David Tilson
Lois Brown	Jack Harris	Cathy McLeod	Brad Trost
Patrick Brown	Richard Harris	Ted Menzies	Merv Tweed
Rod Bruinooge	Laurie Hawn	Larry Miller	Tim Uppal
Dona Cadman	Russ Hiebert	Maria Mourani	Dave Van Kesteren
Paul Calandra	Randy Hoback	Anita Neville	Maurice Vellacott
Blaine Calkins	Candice Hoepfner	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Mike Wallace
Ron Cannan	Ed Holder	Deepak Obhrai	Mark Warawa
Colin Carrie	Mark Holland	Robert Oliphant	Chris Warkentin
Rick Casson	Brian Jean	LaVar Payne	Jeff Watson
Michael Chong	Marlene Jennings	Pierre Poilievre	John Weston
Rob Clarke	Randy Kamp	Roger Pomerleau	Rodney Weston
Irwin Cotler	Jim Karygiannis	Joe Preston	Alice Wong
John Cummins	Gerald Keddy	Bob Rae	Terence Young
Patricia Davidson	Greg Kerr	James Rajotte	

---

**LIAISON**

<b>Chair:</b>	Dean Allison	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Shawn Murphy	
Leon Benoit	Ed Fast	Yasmin Ratansi	David Sweet	(24)
Maxime Bernier	Hedy Fry	Lee Richardson	Paul Szabo	
James Bezan	Candice Hoepfner	Gary Schellenberger	David Tilson	
Steven Blaney	Larry Miller	Joy Smith	Merv Tweed	
Garry Breitkreuz	Joe Preston	Bruce Stanton	Rodney Weston	
Michael Chong	James Rajotte			

**Associate Members**

Claude Bachand	Don Davies	Lawrence MacAulay	Marcel Proulx
Mauril Bélanger	Mark Eyking	Pat Martin	Pablo Rodriguez
André Bellavance	Raymonde Folco	Irene Mathysen	Anthony Rota
Maurizio Bevilacqua	Yvon Godin	David McGuinty	Todd Russell
Bernard Bigras	Michel Guimond	Cathy McLeod	Bill Siksay
Raynald Blais	Mark Holland	Serge Ménard	Thierry St-Cyr
Robert Bouchard	Daryl Kramp	Brian Murphy	Peter Stoffer
John Cannis	Jean-Yves Laforest	Joyce Murray	Alan Tonks
David Christopherson	Mario Laframboise	Robert Oliphant	Joseph Volpe
Jean Crowder	Francine Lalonde	Massimo Pacetti	Chris Warkentin
Nathan Cullen	Carole Lavallée	Daniel Paillé	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Patricia Davidson	Yves Lessard	Bernard Patry	Bryon Wilfert

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS**

<b>Chair:</b>	Dean Allison	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Shawn Murphy	
James Bezan	Joe Preston	Paul Szabo	Merv Tweed	(7)
Larry Miller				

**NATIONAL DEFENCE****Chair:**

Maxime Bernier

**Vice-Chairs:**Claude Bachand  
Bryon WilfertRay Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Ujjal DosanjhCheryl Gallant  
Jack HarrisLaurie Hawn  
Keith MartinPascal-Pierre Paillé  
LaVar Payne

(12)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Guy André  
Scott Armstrong  
Larry Bagnell  
Leon Benoit  
Dennis Bevington  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Kelly Block  
Robert Bouchard  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Dona Cadman  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joe Comartin  
Nathan Cullen  
John CumminsPatricia Davidson  
Don Davies  
Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Johanne Deschamps  
Paul Dewar  
Jean Dorion  
Earl Dreeshen  
Nicolas Dufour  
John Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Ed Fast  
Christiane Gagnon  
Royal Galipeau  
Bernard Généreux  
Shelly Glover  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Monique Guay  
Richard Harris  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoepfner  
Ed Holder  
Mark Holland  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Greg Kerr  
Ed KomarnickiDaryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Francine Lalonde  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Megan Leslie  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Ted Menzies  
Larry Miller  
Maria Mourani  
Richard Nadeau  
Anita Neville  
Rick Norlock  
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
Deepak Obhrai  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
Marcel Proulx  
James Rajotte  
Brent Rathgeber  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Lee RichardsonGreg Rickford  
Anthony Rota  
Todd Russell  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Scott Simms  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Peter Stoffer  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Paul Szabo  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Brad Trost  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
Alice Wong  
Stephen Woodworth  
Borys Wrzesnewskyj  
Terence Young

## NATURAL RESOURCES

**Chair:**

Leon Benoit

**Vice-Chairs:**
Nathan Cullen  
Alan TonksMike Allen  
David Anderson  
Navdeep BainsPaule Brunelle  
Claude GuimondRichard Harris  
Russ HiebertGeoff Regan  
Devinder Shory

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
 Harold Albrecht  
 Dean Allison  
 Rob Anders  
 Scott Andrews  
 Charlie Angus  
 Scott Armstrong  
 Larry Bagnell  
 André Bellavance  
 Maxime Bernier  
 Dennis Bevington  
 James Bezan  
 Bernard Bigras  
 Steven Blaney  
 Kelly Block  
 France Bonsant  
 Robert Bouchard  
 Sylvie Boucher  
 Ray Boughen  
 Peter Braid  
 Garry Breitzkreuz  
 Gordon Brown  
 Lois Brown  
 Patrick Brown  
 Rod Bruinooge  
 Dona Cadman  
 Paul Calandra  
 Blaine Calkins  
 Ron Cannan  
 Colin Carrie

Rick Casson  
 Michael Chong  
 Rob Clarke  
 Jean Crowder  
 John Cummins  
 Patricia Davidson  
 Bob Dechert  
 Dean Del Mastro  
 Jean Dorion  
 Earl Dreeshen  
 John Duncan  
 Linda Duncan  
 Rick Dykstra  
 Ed Fast  
 Royal Galipeau  
 Cheryl Gallant  
 Bernard Généreux  
 Shelly Glover  
 Yvon Godin  
 Peter Goldring  
 Jacques Gourde  
 Claude Gravelle  
 Nina Grewal  
 Jack Harris  
 Laurie Hawn  
 Randy Hoback  
 Candice Hoeppner  
 Ed Holder  
 Carol Hughes  
 Bruce Hyer

Brian Jean  
 Randy Kamp  
 Gerald Keddy  
 Greg Kerr  
 Ed Komarnicki  
 Daryl Kramp  
 Mike Lake  
 Guy Lauzon  
 Pierre Lemieux  
 Ben Lobb  
 Tom Lukiwski  
 James Lunney  
 Dave MacKenzie  
 Inky Mark  
 Pat Martin  
 Colin Mayes  
 Phil McColeman  
 Cathy McLeod  
 Ted Menzies  
 Larry Miller  
 Rick Norlock  
 Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
 Deepak Obhrai  
 Christian Ouellet  
 LaVar Payne  
 Daniel Petit  
 Pierre Poilievre  
 Joe Preston  
 John Rafferty  
 James Rajotte

Brent Rathgeber  
 Scott Reid  
 Blake Richards  
 Lee Richardson  
 Greg Rickford  
 Andrew Saxton  
 Gary Schellenberger  
 Bev Shipley  
 Joy Smith  
 Kevin Sorenson  
 Bruce Stanton  
 Brian Storseth  
 David Sweet  
 Glenn Thibeault  
 Greg Thompson  
 David Tilson  
 Brad Trost  
 Merv Tweed  
 Tim Uppal  
 Dave Van Kesteren  
 Maurice Vellacott  
 Mike Wallace  
 Mark Warawa  
 Chris Warkentin  
 Jeff Watson  
 John Weston  
 Rodney Weston  
 Alice Wong  
 Stephen Woodworth  
 Terence Young



**OFFICIAL LANGUAGES****Chair:**

Steven Blaney

**Vice-Chairs:**Mauril Bélanger  
Yvon GodinSylvie Boucher  
Jean-Claude D'Amours  
Bernard GénéreuxShelly Glover  
Monique GuayRichard Nadeau  
Tilly O'Neill-GordonJohn Weston  
Lise Zarac

(12)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Alex Atamanenko  
Leon Benoit  
Maxime Bernier  
James Bezan  
Kelly Block  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Dona Cadman  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
Joe Comartin  
John CumminsPatricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Jean Dorion  
Earl Dreeshen  
John Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Ed Fast  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Claude Gravelle  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoepfner  
Ed Holder  
Carol Hughes  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl KrampMike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Carole Lavallée  
Jack Layton  
Pierre Lemieux  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Ted Menzies  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Pascal-Pierre Paillé  
LaVar Payne  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Roger Pomerleau  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Brent Rathgeber  
Scott Reid  
Blake RichardsLee Richardson  
Greg Rickford  
Pablo Rodriguez  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Brad Trost  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis  
Jeff Watson  
Rodney Weston  
Alice Wong  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

<b>Chair:</b>	Joe Preston	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Michel Guimond Marcel Proulx	
Harold Albrecht Rodger Cuzner Claude DeBellefeuille	Yvon Godin Randy Hoback	Marlene Jennings Guy Lauzon	Tom Lukiwski Scott Reid	(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Michael Chong	Gerald Keddy	Blake Richards
Mike Allen	David Christopherson	Greg Kerr	Lee Richardson
Dean Allison	Rob Clarke	Ed Komarnicki	Greg Rickford
Rob Anders	Joe Comartin	Daryl Kramp	Andrew Saxton
David Anderson	Jean Crowder	Mike Lake	Gary Schellenberger
Charlie Angus	John Cummins	Pierre Lemieux	Bev Shipley
Scott Armstrong	Patricia Davidson	Ben Lobb	Devinder Shory
Gérard Asselin	Libby Davies	James Lunney	Joy Smith
Mauril Bélanger	Bob Dechert	Dave MacKenzie	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Dean Del Mastro	Inky Mark	Bruce Stanton
Maxime Bernier	Earl Dreeshen	Pat Martin	Brian Storseth
James Bezan	John Duncan	Colin Mayes	David Sweet
Steven Blaney	Rick Dykstra	Phil McColeman	Greg Thompson
Kelly Block	Ed Fast	Cathy McLeod	David Tilson
Sylvie Boucher	Christiane Gagnon	Alexandra Mendes	Brad Trost
Ray Boughen	Royal Galipeau	Ted Menzies	Merv Tweed
Peter Braid	Cheryl Gallant	Larry Miller	Tim Uppal
Garry Breitkreuz	Bernard Généreux	Joyce Murray	Dave Van Kesteren
Gordon Brown	Shelly Glover	Rick Norlock	Maurice Vellacott
Lois Brown	Peter Goldring	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Mike Wallace
Patrick Brown	Jacques Gourde	Deepak Obhrai	Mark Warawa
Rod Bruinooge	Nina Grewal	Pierre Paquette	Chris Warkentin
Dona Cadman	Richard Harris	LaVar Payne	Jeff Watson
Paul Calandra	Laurie Hawn	Daniel Petit	John Weston
Blaine Calkins	Russ Hiebert	Louis Plamondon	Rodney Weston
Ron Cannan	Candice Hoepfner	Pierre Poilievre	Alice Wong
Colin Carrie	Ed Holder	James Rajotte	Stephen Woodworth
Rick Casson	Brian Jean	Brent Rathgeber	Terence Young
Chris Charlton	Randy Kamp		

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Chair:</b>	Harold Albrecht	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Chris Charlton	Christiane Gagnon	Marcel Proulx	Scott Reid	(5)

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Chair:**

Shawn Murphy

**Vice-Chairs:**
David Christopherson  
Daryl KrampJosée Beaudin  
Stéphane DionEarl Dreesen  
Meili FailleDerek Lee  
Andrew SaxtonBev Shipley  
Terence Young

(11)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
 Harold Albrecht  
 Malcolm Allen  
 Mike Allen  
 Dean Allison  
 Rob Anders  
 David Anderson  
 Scott Armstrong  
 Leon Benoit  
 Maxime Bernier  
 James Bezan  
 Steven Blaney  
 Kelly Block  
 Sylvie Boucher  
 Ray Boughen  
 Diane Bourgeois  
 Peter Braid  
 Garry Breitkreuz  
 Gordon Brown  
 Lois Brown  
 Patrick Brown  
 Rod Bruinooge  
 Dona Cadman  
 Paul Calandra  
 Blaine Calkins  
 Ron Cannan  
 Colin Carrie  
 Robert Carrier  
 Rick Casson  
 Michael Chong  
 Rob Clarke

Denis Coderre  
 Bonnie Crombie  
 John Cummins  
 Patricia Davidson  
 Bob Dechert  
 Dean Del Mastro  
 Paul Dewar  
 Jean Dorion  
 John Duncan  
 Rick Dykstra  
 Ed Fast  
 Royal Galipeau  
 Cheryl Gallant  
 Bernard Généreux  
 Shelly Glover  
 Peter Goldring  
 Jacques Gourde  
 Nina Grewal  
 Martha Hall Findlay  
 Richard Harris  
 Laurie Hawn  
 Russ Hiebert  
 Randy Hoback  
 Candice Hoepfner  
 Ed Holder  
 Brian Jean  
 Peter Julian  
 Randy Kamp  
 Gerald Keddy  
 Gerard Kennedy

Greg Kerr  
 Ed Komarnicki  
 Mike Lake  
 Guy Lauzon  
 Jack Layton  
 Pierre Lemieux  
 Ben Lobb  
 Tom Lukiwski  
 James Lunney  
 Dave MacKenzie  
 Jim Maloway  
 Inky Mark  
 Pat Martin  
 Colin Mayes  
 Phil McColeman  
 Cathy McLeod  
 Ted Menzies  
 Larry Miller  
 Thomas Mulcair  
 Richard Nadeau  
 Anita Neville  
 Rick Norlock  
 Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
 Deepak Obhrai  
 Daniel Paillé  
 LaVar Payne  
 Daniel Petit  
 Pierre Poilievre  
 Joe Preston  
 James Rajotte

Yasmin Ratansi  
 Brent Rathgeber  
 Scott Reid  
 Blake Richards  
 Lee Richardson  
 Greg Rickford  
 Gary Schellenberger  
 Devinder Shory  
 Joy Smith  
 Kevin Sorenson  
 Bruce Stanton  
 Brian Storseth  
 David Sweet  
 Greg Thompson  
 David Tilson  
 Brad Trost  
 Merv Tweed  
 Tim Uppal  
 Dave Van Kesteren  
 Maurice Vellacott  
 Mike Wallace  
 Mark Warawa  
 Chris Warkentin  
 Judy Wasylcyia-Leis  
 Jeff Watson  
 John Weston  
 Rodney Weston  
 Alice Wong  
 Stephen Woodworth  
 Borys Wrzesnewskyj

**PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY**

**Chair:**

Garry Breitkreuz

**Vice-Chairs:**Don Davies  
Mark HollandLuc Desnoyers  
Shelly Glover  
Andrew KaniaDave MacKenzie  
Phil McColemanMaria Mourani  
Rick NorlockBrent Rathgeber  
Borys Wrzesnewskyj

(12)

**Associate Members**

Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Scott Armstrong  
Claude Bachand  
Leon Benoit  
Maxime Bernier  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Kelly Block  
France Bonsant  
Sylvie Boucher  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Dona Cadman  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
Michael Chong  
Olivia Chow

Rob Clarke  
Joe Comartin  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Earl Dreeshen  
John Duncan  
Kirsty Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Ed Fast  
Raymonde Folco  
Judy Foote  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Bernard Généreux  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Jack Harris  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoepfner  
Ed Holder  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy

Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Inky Mark  
Wayne Marston  
Pat Martin  
Irene Mathysen  
Colin Mayes  
Cathy McLeod  
Serge Ménard  
Ted Menzies  
Larry Miller  
Brian Murphy  
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
Deepak Obhrai  
Robert Oliphant  
LaVar Payne  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
Bob Rae  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid

Blake Richards  
Lee Richardson  
Greg Rickford  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Bill Siksay  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Brad Trost  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
Alice Wong  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young

---

## STATUS OF WOMEN

**Chair:**

Hedy Fry

**Vice-Chairs:**
Irene Mathysen  
Cathy McLeodSylvie Boucher  
Lois BrownPaul Calandra  
Nicole DemersLuc Desnoyers  
Anita NevilleMichelle Simson  
Alice Wong

(11)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
 Harold Albrecht  
 Mike Allen  
 Dean Allison  
 Rob Anders  
 David Anderson  
 Scott Armstrong  
 Niki Ashton  
 Carolyn Bennett  
 Leon Benoit  
 Maxime Bernier  
 James Bezan  
 Steven Blaney  
 Kelly Block  
 France Bonsant  
 Ray Boughen  
 Peter Braid  
 Garry Breitkreuz  
 Gordon Brown  
 Patrick Brown  
 Rod Bruinooog  
 Dona Cadman  
 Blaine Calkins  
 Ron Cannan  
 Colin Carrie  
 Rick Casson  
 Chris Charlton  
 Michael Chong  
 Olivia Chow  
 Rob Clarke

Jean Crowder  
 John Cummins  
 Patricia Davidson  
 Libby Davies  
 Bob Dechert  
 Dean Del Mastro  
 Jean Dorion  
 Earl Dreeshen  
 John Duncan  
 Linda Duncan  
 Rick Dykstra  
 Ed Fast  
 Royal Galipeau  
 Cheryl Gallant  
 Bernard Généreux  
 Shelly Glover  
 Peter Goldring  
 Jacques Gourde  
 Nina Grewal  
 Richard Harris  
 Laurie Hawn  
 Russ Hiebert  
 Randy Hoback  
 Candice Hoepfner  
 Ed Holder  
 Carol Hughes  
 Brian Jean  
 Randy Kamp  
 Gerald Keddy

Greg Kerr  
 Ed Komarnicki  
 Daryl Kramp  
 Mike Lake  
 Guy Lauzon  
 Jack Layton  
 Pierre Lemieux  
 Megan Leslie  
 Ben Lobb  
 Tom Lukiwski  
 James Lunney  
 Dave MacKenzie  
 Inky Mark  
 Pat Martin  
 Colin Mayes  
 Phil McColeman  
 Serge Ménard  
 Ted Menzies  
 Larry Miller  
 Rick Norlock  
 Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
 Deepak Obhrai  
 LaVar Payne  
 Glen Pearson  
 Daniel Petit  
 Pierre Poilievre  
 Joe Preston  
 James Rajotte  
 Brent Rathgeber

Scott Reid  
 Blake Richards  
 Lee Richardson  
 Greg Rickford  
 Andrew Saxton  
 Gary Schellenberger  
 Bev Shipley  
 Devinder Shory  
 Joy Smith  
 Kevin Sorenson  
 Bruce Stanton  
 Brian Storseth  
 David Sweet  
 Greg Thompson  
 David Tilson  
 Brad Trost  
 Merv Tweed  
 Tim Uppal  
 Dave Van Kesteren  
 Maurice Vellacott  
 Mike Wallace  
 Mark Warawa  
 Chris Warkentin  
 Judy Wasylcyia-Leis  
 Jeff Watson  
 John Weston  
 Rodney Weston  
 Stephen Woodworth  
 Terence Young

## TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

**Chair:**

Merv Tweed

**Vice-Chairs:**Mario Laframboise  
Joseph VolpeDennis Bevington  
Lois Brown  
Bonnie CrombieSukh Dhaliwal  
Roger GaudetBrian Jean  
Colin MayesBlake Richards  
Jeff Watson

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
 Harold Albrecht  
 Mike Allen  
 Dean Allison  
 Rob Anders  
 David Anderson  
 Scott Andrews  
 Scott Armstrong  
 Niki Ashton  
 Leon Benoit  
 Maxime Bernier  
 James Bezan  
 Steven Blaney  
 Kelly Block  
 Robert Bouchard  
 Sylvie Boucher  
 Ray Boughen  
 Peter Braid  
 Garry Breitkreuz  
 Gordon Brown  
 Patrick Brown  
 Rod Bruinooge  
 Dona Cadman  
 Paul Calandra  
 Blaine Calkins  
 Ron Cannan  
 Colin Carrie  
 Rick Casson  
 Michael Chong  
 Olivia Chow  
 Rob Clarke  
 Denis Coderre  
 Joe Comartin

Nathan Cullen  
 John Cummins  
 Patricia Davidson  
 Don Davies  
 Libby Davies  
 Bob Dechert  
 Dean Del Mastro  
 Paul Dewar  
 Jean Dorion  
 Earl Dreeshen  
 John Duncan  
 Rick Dykstra  
 Wayne Easter  
 Ed Fast  
 Judy Foote  
 Royal Galipeau  
 Cheryl Gallant  
 Bernard Généreux  
 Shelly Glover  
 Peter Goldring  
 Jacques Gourde  
 Nina Grewal  
 Richard Harris  
 Laurie Hawn  
 Russ Hiebert  
 Randy Hoback  
 Candice Hoepfner  
 Ed Holder  
 Bruce Hyer  
 Peter Julian  
 Randy Kamp  
 Andrew Kania

Gerald Keddy  
 Gerard Kennedy  
 Greg Kerr  
 Ed Komarnicki  
 Daryl Kramp  
 Mike Lake  
 Guy Lauzon  
 Jack Layton  
 Pierre Lemieux  
 Megan Leslie  
 Ben Lobb  
 Tom Lukiwski  
 James Lunney  
 Dave MacKenzie  
 Inky Mark  
 Pat Martin  
 Brian Masse  
 Phil McColeman  
 Cathy McLeod  
 Ted Menzies  
 Larry Miller  
 Rick Norlock  
 Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
 Deepak Obhrai  
 LaVar Payne  
 Daniel Petit  
 Pierre Poilievre  
 Joe Preston  
 John Rafferty  
 James Rajotte  
 Brent Rathgeber  
 Geoff Regan

Scott Reid  
 Lee Richardson  
 Greg Rickford  
 Anthony Rota  
 Andrew Saxton  
 Francis Scarpaleggia  
 Gary Schellenberger  
 Judy Sgro  
 Bev Shipley  
 Devinder Shory  
 Joy Smith  
 Kevin Sorenson  
 Bruce Stanton  
 Peter Stoffer  
 Brian Storseth  
 David Sweet  
 Greg Thompson  
 David Tilson  
 Alan Tonks  
 Brad Trost  
 Tim Uppal  
 Francis Valeriote  
 Dave Van Kesteren  
 Maurice Vellacott  
 Mike Wallace  
 Mark Warawa  
 Chris Warkentin  
 John Weston  
 Rodney Weston  
 Alice Wong  
 Stephen Woodworth  
 Terence Young

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

<b>Chair:</b>	David Sweet	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Robert Oliphant Peter Stoffer	
Guy André Bonnie Crombie Greg Kerr	Ben Lobb Colin Mayes	Phil McColeman Judy Sgro	Brian Storseth Robert Vincent	(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Rob Clarke	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
Harold Albrecht	John Cummins	Ed Komarnicki	Blake Richards
Mike Allen	Patricia Davidson	Daryl Kramp	Lee Richardson
Dean Allison	Bob Dechert	Mike Lake	Greg Rickford
Rob Anders	Dean Del Mastro	Guy Lauzon	Michael Savage
David Anderson	Earl Dreeshen	Pierre Lemieux	Andrew Saxton
Scott Andrews	John Duncan	Megan Leslie	Gary Schellenberger
Scott Armstrong	Rick Dykstra	Tom Lukiwski	Bev Shipley
Claude Bachand	Meili Faille	James Lunney	Devinder Shory
Leon Benoit	Ed Fast	Dave MacKenzie	Joy Smith
Maxime Bernier	Judy Foote	Luc Malo	Kevin Sorenson
James Bezan	Carole Freeman	Inky Mark	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Royal Galipeau	Wayne Marston	Greg Thompson
Kelly Block	Cheryl Gallant	Pat Martin	David Tilson
Sylvie Boucher	Bernard Généreux	Tony Martin	Brad Trost
Ray Boughen	Shelly Glover	Cathy McLeod	Merv Tweed
Peter Braid	Yvon Godin	Ted Menzies	Tim Uppal
Garry Breitzkreuz	Peter Goldring	Larry Miller	Dave Van Kesteren
Gordon Brown	Jacques Gourde	Rick Norlock	Maurice Vellacott
Lois Brown	Nina Grewal	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Mike Wallace
Patrick Brown	Jack Harris	Deepak Obhrai	Mark Warawa
Rod Bruinooge	Richard Harris	LaVar Payne	Chris Warkentin
Dona Cadman	Laurie Hawn	Glen Pearson	Jeff Watson
Paul Calandra	Russ Hiebert	Daniel Petit	John Weston
Blaine Calkins	Randy Hoback	Pierre Poilievre	Rodney Weston
Ron Cannan	Candice Hoepfner	Joe Preston	Alice Wong
Colin Carrie	Ed Holder	James Rajotte	Stephen Woodworth
Rick Casson	Brian Jean	Brent Rathgeber	Terence Young
Michael Chong	Randy Kamp		

## SPECIAL COMMITTEES

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CANADIAN MISSION IN AFGHANISTAN

<b>Chair:</b>	Kevin Sorenson	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Bryon Wilfert	
Jim Abbott Claude Bachand Bob Dechert	Ujjal Dosanjh Jack Harris Laurie Hawn	Francine Lalonde Dave MacKenzie	Deepak Obhrai Bob Rae	(12)

## STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

**Joint Chair:**
**Joint Vice-Chair:**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Percy Downe  
Stephen Greene  
Jean Lapointe

Michael MacDonald  
Terry Stratton

Rob Anders  
Scott Armstrong  
G rard Asselin  
Mauril B langer  
Carolyn Bennett  
Dona Cadman

Rob Clarke  
Carol Hughes  
Gurbax Malhi  
Louis Plamondon  
Devinder Shory  
Brad Trost

(17)

#### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
David Anderson  
Leon Benoit  
Maxime Bernier  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Kelly Block  
Sylvie Boucher  
Ray Boughen  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Gerry Byrne  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Robert Carrier  
Rick Casson  
Michael Chong  
John Cummins

Patricia Davidson  
Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Earl Dreshen  
Ken Dryden  
John Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Ed Fast  
Royal Galipeau  
Cheryl Gallant  
Bernard G n reux  
Shelly Glover  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoeppner  
Ed Holder  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp

Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Carole Lavall e  
Pierre Lemieux  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Inky Mark  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Ted Menzies  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
Deepak Obhrai  
Daniel Paill e  
LaVar Payne  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Roger Pomerleau  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Brent Rathgeber  
Scott Reid

Blake Richards  
Lee Richardson  
Greg Rickford  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
Alice Wong  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young



## SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

**Joint Chairs:** Andrew Kania  
Yonah Martin

**Joint Vice-Chairs:** Royal Galipeau  
Brian Masse

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu  
Fred Dickson  
Mac Harb  
Céline Hervieux-Payette

Wilfred P. Moore  
Rose-May Poirier  
John Wallace

Harold Albrecht  
Scott Armstrong  
Gérard Asselin  
Ray Boughen  
Dona Cadman

Christiane Gagnon  
Cheryl Gallant  
Derek Lee  
Paul Szabo

(20)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Leon Benoit  
Maxime Bernier  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Kelly Block  
Sylvie Boucher  
Peter Braid  
Garry Breitkreuz  
Gordon Brown  
Lois Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Paul Calandra  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
Michael Chong  
Rob Clarke  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson

Bob Dechert  
Dean Del Mastro  
Earl Dreshen  
John Duncan  
Rick Dykstra  
Ed Fast  
Carole Freeman  
Bernard Généreux  
Shelly Glover  
Peter Goldring  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Randy Hoback  
Candice Hoepfner  
Ed Holder  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Greg Kerr  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mario Laframboise  
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon  
Marc Lemay  
Pierre Lemieux  
Ben Lobb  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Inky Mark  
Colin Mayes  
Phil McColeman  
Cathy McLeod  
Serge Ménard  
Ted Menzies  
Larry Miller  
Rick Norlock  
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon  
Deepak Obhrai  
LaVar Payne  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Brent Rathgeber  
Scott Reid  
Blake Richards  
Lee Richardson

Greg Rickford  
Andrew Saxton  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Devinder Shory  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Greg Thompson  
David Tilson  
Brad Trost  
Merv Tweed  
Tim Uppal  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Weston  
Rodney Weston  
Alice Wong  
Stephen Woodworth  
Terence Young

**Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees**

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

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

**The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MS. DENISE SAVOIE

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

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

## THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Stephen Harper	Prime Minister
Hon. Rob Nicholson	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Chuck Strahl	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians and Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency
Hon. Peter MacKay	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Stockwell Day	President of the Treasury Board and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway
Hon. Vic Toews	Minister of Public Safety
Hon. Rona Ambrose	Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for Status of Women
Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development
Hon. Bev Oda	Minister of International Cooperation
Hon. Jim Prentice	Minister of the Environment
Hon. John Baird	Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Hon. Lawrence Cannon	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Tony Clement	Minister of Industry
Hon. Jim Flaherty	Minister of Finance
Hon. Josée Verner	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister for La Francophonie
Hon. Jay Hill	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Peter Van Loan	Minister of International Trade
Hon. Gerry Ritz	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
Hon. Jason Kenney	Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism
Hon. Christian Paradis	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. James Moore	Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages
Hon. Leona Aglukkaq	Minister of Health
Hon. Lisa Raitt	Minister of Labour
Hon. Gail Shea	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Keith Ashfield	Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway
Hon. Gary Lunn	Minister of State (Sport)
Hon. Gordon O'Connor	Minister of State and Chief Government Whip
Hon. Helena Guergis	Simcoe—Grey
Hon. Diane Ablonczy	Minister of State (Seniors)
Hon. Rob Merrifield	Minister of State (Transport)
Hon. Lynne Yelich	Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)
Hon. Steven Fletcher	Minister of State (Democratic Reform)
Hon. Gary Goodyear	Minister of State (Science and Technology) (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)
Hon. Denis Lebel	Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Peter Kent	Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas)
Hon. Rob Moore	Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism)

## PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Pierre Poilievre	to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Daniel Petit	to the Minister of Justice
Mr. Bob Dechert	to the Minister of Justice
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Greg Kerr	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. John Duncan	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Mr. Laurie Hawn	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Gerald Keddy	to the Minister of International Trade
Mr. Andrew Saxton	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Ed Komarnicki	to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development and to the Minister of Labour
Hon. Jim Abbott	to the Minister of International Cooperation
Mr. Mark Warawa	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Brian Jean	to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Mr. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Mike Lake	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Ted Menzies	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Dave MacKenzie	to the Minister of Public Safety
Mr. Pierre Lemieux	to the Minister of Agriculture
Mr. David Anderson	to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board
Mr. Rick Dykstra	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mrs. Alice Wong	for Multiculturalism
Mr. Dean Del Mastro	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mrs. Sylvie Boucher	for Status of Women
Mrs. Shelly Glover	for Official Languages
Mr. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Randy Kamp	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans

# CONTENTS

Friday, March 26, 2010

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Gender Equity in Indian Registration Act

Mr. Day (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development).....	981
Bill C-3. Second reading.....	981
Mr. Duncan (Vancouver Island North).....	981
Mr. Russell.....	983
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre).....	983
Mr. Maloway.....	984
Mr. Harris (Cariboo—Prince George).....	984
Mr. Russell.....	984
Mr. Tonks.....	986
Mr. Laframboise.....	987

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Women's Gala

Mr. Stanton.....	988
------------------	-----

### Iraq

Ms. Sgro.....	988
---------------	-----

### Agriculture

Mr. André.....	988
----------------	-----

### Canadian Olympian

Mr. Maloway.....	988
------------------	-----

### Retirement Congratulations

Mr. Poilievre.....	989
--------------------	-----

### Youth Employment

Mr. Malhi.....	989
----------------	-----

### Persons with Disabilities

Mrs. Wong.....	989
----------------	-----

### Haiti

Mr. Carrier.....	989
------------------	-----

### Project Hero

Mr. Lukiwski.....	989
-------------------	-----

### Don Anderson

Mr. MacAulay.....	990
-------------------	-----

### Maureen Vodrey

Mr. Galipeau.....	990
-------------------	-----

### Maureen Vodrey

Mr. Stoffer.....	990
------------------	-----

### Bloc Québécois

Mr. Gourde.....	990
-----------------	-----

### World Theatre Day

Mr. Pomerleau.....	991
--------------------	-----

### Transportation

Mr. Tonks.....	991
----------------	-----

### Liberal Party Conference

Mrs. Glover.....	991
------------------	-----

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Afghanistan

Mr. Goodale.....	991
Mr. Cannon.....	991
Mr. Proulx.....	991
Mr. Cannon.....	991
Mr. Proulx.....	991
Mr. Cannon.....	992

### Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Russell.....	992
Mr. Duncan (Vancouver Island North).....	992
Mr. Russell.....	992
Mr. Duncan (Vancouver Island North).....	992

### Afghanistan

Mr. Paquette.....	992
Mr. Cannon.....	992
Mr. Paquette.....	992
Mr. Cannon.....	992
Mrs. DeBellefeuille.....	992
Mr. Hawn.....	993
Mrs. DeBellefeuille.....	993
Mr. Hawn.....	993
Mr. Dewar.....	993
Mr. Cannon.....	993
Mr. Dewar.....	993
Mr. Cannon.....	993
Mr. Dewar.....	993
Mr. Cannon.....	993

### National Defence

Mr. Simms.....	993
Mr. Hawn.....	994
Mr. Simms.....	994
Mr. Hawn.....	994

### Government Contracts

Ms. Ratansi.....	994
Mr. Anderson.....	994
Ms. Ratansi.....	994
Mr. Anderson.....	994

### Democratic reform

Mr. Dorion.....	994
Mr. Cannon.....	994
Mr. Dorion.....	994
Mr. Cannon.....	995

### Canadian Television Fund

Mrs. Lavallée.....	995
Mr. Del Mastro.....	995
Mrs. Lavallée.....	995
Mr. Del Mastro.....	995

### Political Activism

Mr. McGuinty.....	995
-------------------	-----





**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

### **SPEAKER'S PERMISSION**

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

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@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the  
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

### **PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT**

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires 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-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à  
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>