



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 017 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, November 8, 2013

—

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 8, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

•(1005)

[*Translation*]

RESPECT FOR COMMUNITIES ACT

The House resumed from November 4 consideration of the motion that Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House to speak to Bill C-2, which was previously introduced as Bill C-65 at the end of the last parliamentary session. However, it was one of the bills that ended up in parliamentary limbo with the prorogation requested by the Conservative government. It has therefore come back as Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act.

Mr. Speaker, as is my custom as the justice critic for our party—and having been one yourself, I am sure you will understand—I am looking at this bill as a lawyer. I will not claim to be an excellent lawyer, as I have heard the member for Ottawa—Orléans do in the House, but nevertheless I will have nearly 30 years of experience as a lawyer next year.

This very important bill has quite a striking title: An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. I looked at what it was amending and what it would be changing, because I like to understand what we are trying to do in the House.

The bill basically amends section 56 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, which I will read. That really enlightened me about the problem we have and often go through in the House. Prior to the proposed Bill C-2, section 56 provided the following:

The Minister may, on such terms and conditions as the Minister deems necessary, exempt any person or class of persons or any controlled substance or precursor or any class thereof from the application of all or any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations if, in the opinion of the Minister, the exemption is necessary for a medical or scientific purpose or is otherwise in the public interest.

This short provision seemed relatively clear to me. Everyone in the House agrees that we want to regulate certain drugs and other

substances, especially really hard drugs. I therefore wanted to know how the government was amending section 56. I encourage hon. members to read this atrocity. It is truly a legal atrocity. The original provision was five lines long. Now I have lost track of how many pages it is. When I say that it is many pages long, I mean that I could probably spend the next 18 minutes of my speech in the House reading out the changes that this government is trying to make.

In *Canada v. PHS Community Services Society*, the nine Supreme Court justices rendered a unanimous decision that was a major slap in the face to the government. The Supreme Court told the government that its actions were inappropriate.

This bill is the Conservative government's response to the Supreme Court of Canada. In its ruling, in very plain and clear language, the court said that InSite provides essential services and should remain open under the exemption set out in section 56 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. The court ruled that users were entitled to access InSite's services under the charter and that the delivery of other similar services should also be granted an exemption under that section.

The court therefore provided an unequivocal response to what was happening. There is no denying that this was seen as a victory in Vancouver.

No one wants to provide easy access to drugs. No one wants to tell people to go ahead and shoot up and that we will have a big party and sing *Kumbaya*. That is not at all the issue. This technique was tested and implemented. It has been shown that supervised injection sites have positive effects and result in fewer overdose-related deaths. These sites have even helped people to overcome their drug addictions.

However, this ideological government decided to simply ignore the lesson given by the Supreme Court in *Canada v. PHS Community Services Society*—a decision that, I repeat, was rendered by 9 out of 9 judges on September 30, 2011.

I encourage hon. members to read the new version of section 56 that will exist if the House passes this bill. It is an atrocity.

I will spare the House subsections 56(1) and 56(2). Instead, I will focus on subsection 56.1(3). I will not be talking about subsections 56.1(1) and 56.1(2), your honour. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker; I have court on my mind. Perhaps I am psychic, Mr. Speaker, and someday you will be a judge.

Subsection 56.1(3) reads as follows:

Government Orders

56.1(3) The Minister may consider an application for an exemption for a medical purpose under subsection (2) that would allow certain activities to take place at a supervised consumption site [we know what the government is trying to do here] only after the following have been submitted [members will be shocked]:

(a) scientific evidence demonstrating that there is a medical benefit to individual or public health associated with access to activities undertaken at supervised consumption sites [that will be easy enough to demonstrate];

(b) a letter from the provincial minister who is responsible for health in the province in which the site would be located that;

(i) outlines his or her opinion on the proposed activities at the site,

(ii) describes how those activities are integrated within the provincial health care system, and

(iii) provides information about access to drug treatment services, if any, that are available in the province for persons who would use the site;

(c) a letter from the local government of the municipality in which the site would be located that outlines its opinion on the proposed activities at the site, including any concerns with respect to public health or safety;

(d) a description by the applicant of the measures that have been taken or will be taken to address any relevant concerns outlined in the letter referred to in paragraph (c);

Paragraph (e) is about the head of the police force.

I am trying to read quickly because it would take all day to read out what applicants would have to prove in order to be granted an exemption.

56.1(3)(f) a description by the applicant of the proposed measures, if any, to address any relevant concerns outlined in the letter referred to in paragraph (e);

To understand these provisions, anyone seeking to provide a service that the Supreme Court has declared necessary to the health and safety of certain individuals would need legal and addictions experts. Good job.

56.1(3)(i) a description of the potential impacts of the proposed activities at the site on public safety, including the following:

(i) information, if any, on crime and public nuisance in the vicinity of the site and information on crime and public nuisance in the municipalities in which supervised consumption sites are located,

I will skip directly to paragraph (m).

56.1(3)(m) relevant information, including trends, if any, on the number of deaths, if any, due to overdose—in relation to activities that would take place at the site—that have occurred in the vicinity of the site and in the municipality in which the site would be located;

(n) official reports, if any, relevant to the establishment of a supervised consumption site, including any coroner's reports;

I will not discuss paragraphs (o) and (p). I will skip to paragraph (q).

56.1(3)(q) a financing plan that demonstrates the feasibility and sustainability of operating the site;

Now I will go on to paragraph (t). I am skipping some points because they are all more things that have to be proven to the minister.

56.1(3)(t) information on any public health emergency in the vicinity of the site or in the municipality in which the site would be located...

Previously, section 56 read as follows:

56. The Minister may, on such terms and conditions as the Minister deems necessary, exempt any person or class of persons or any controlled substance or precursor or any class thereof from the application of all or any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations if, in the opinion of the Minister, the exemption is necessary for a medical or scientific purpose or is otherwise in the public interest.

I would like to go back to subsection 56.1(3). I will spare you the rest of the bill. I am at paragraph (y).

56.1(3)(y) if any of the persons referred to in paragraph (w) has ordinarily resided in a country other than Canada in the 10 years before the day on which the application is made, a document issued by a police force of that country stating whether in that period that person

(i) was convicted...

Now I will go to paragraph 56.1(4)(a):

● (1010)

56.1(4)(a) evidence, if any, of any variation in crime rates in the vicinity of the site during the period beginning on the day on which the first exemption was granted under subsection (2) in relation to the site and ending on the day on which the application is submitted; and

(b) evidence, if any, of any impacts of the activities at the site on individual or public health during that period.

This goes on for pages and pages. If the government just wanted to say that it does not want any supervised injection sites, it could have simply said so, instead of having us read all this legal gibberish that will not even pass the necessary legal tests, especially considering the Supreme Court's decision in *Canada v. PHS Community Services Society*. That decision, I repeat, was like a big slap in the face to the Conservative government: nine to zero. The court told the government that what it was doing was wrong and that it was jeopardizing public safety, yet this government professes to champion public safety. It engages in all these little schemes that seem to please its militant supporters. It is sending all the wrong messages regarding the benefits this bill will have.

Reading this bill sends the message that as soon as it passes and comes into effect, in some big cities like Vancouver, for instance, which already has a program that works very well, Canadians will be in danger, much more so than before this legislation. Big cities like Ottawa are taking part in this debate. It is a divisive issue. This government really likes to pit people against one another and especially to run fundraising campaigns. That is what really turned me off about this bill, when I saw the government had used this bill to do some fundraising.

Since I am an opposition member, I am sure people will say that I am pro-terrorist and pro-pedophile, and I will probably be pro-drugs in a few minutes. There will probably be a statement by some member who listened to my speech and who will say that I am encouraging people to inject hard drugs, which is absolutely not true.

I trust the specialists and the scientists who tell us that this approach is effective and that we must not let people use drugs in our neighbourhoods or in the woods where children can find dirty needles on the ground and prick themselves with them. That can cause all kinds of problems. This situation needs to be controlled in some way, so that we can deal with the serious problem of drug addiction and try to refer these people to services that can help them get out of the hell of drug addiction that no one wishes on anyone.

This government is introducing this bill and it will be challenged again. I guess a decision of nine to zero is not enough for this government. We are going to have to say again and again that what the government is doing will cause serious problems for our public safety. What the government is doing is not fair, and it is certainly not a smart move in terms of public health. No matter which way we look at it, it seems incredibly obvious to me that this is a bad decision.

I repeat: the Conservatives need to read. We are always being told by our opponents across the way that we do not read. On the contrary, we read. In fact, this may be the difference between us: we do not read only the notes prepared by the Prime Minister's Office. We read our own documents and those that are put forward in the House. We read the bills as they are presented, and we cannot believe it.

The Conservatives claim that these sites encourage people to take drugs and that this is something we must not do, but that is not the goal of supervised injection facilities. What they are meant to do is remove drug addicts or people with problems from public areas that might be frequented by children.

Yesterday, I went to speak to young university students about political life. I went along Sparks Street—I am sure everyone here is familiar with it—and there was a young man lying on the ground. Another person came along and I listened to their conversation.

● (1015)

It was a social worker who went to see this young man. Nobody was paying any attention to him and he was lying on the ground. The social worker went to see him and asked if he was all right. He began talking to him.

In our society, there are people dealing with all kinds of problems. We cannot simply ignore them all and act as if they do not exist. They exist, and we must take care of them, and take care of them the right way.

In its ruling on *Canada v. PHS Community Services Society*, handed down on September 30, 2011, the Supreme Court said that this was a safe approach to dealing with this issue. I repeat that the decision was made by nine judges to zero. This means it was not a majority decision; it was a unanimous decision. No less than public safety and public health are at stake.

Supreme Court rulings cannot be challenged. I appreciate that the government does not seem to be showing much respect when I see the mess that it made with the latest appointment to the Supreme Court. Nonetheless, there is a limit to how much disrespect can be shown for another pillar of our democracy.

The government is responding to the unanimous ruling by the Supreme Court in 2011 with Bill C-2. This is absolutely appalling. It is disrespectful of our duties and obligations as legislators in the House.

I will stand proudly and vote against this bill, and I will support my colleague's amendment. I commend the member for Vancouver East on her remarkable work on this issue, along with all my colleagues from British Columbia.

It is also an issue that is starting to make headlines in Ottawa. When Bill C-2 is passed, I will not be able to guarantee the people in my riding that they will be any safer in the streets.

In conclusion, in addition to the fact that this bill amends section 56, which was very clear, the most appalling thing about this bill is that it is going to be called the Respect for Communities Act. This is Conservative grandstanding at its best. Unbelievable.

Government Orders

I read section 56 and then I read the amendment that goes on forever. No one will be able to meet these criteria. Then I looked at the title and I could not believe my eyes. Then I listened to the speech by my colleague from Vancouver East, who said that they had raised funds on the backs of people with serious problems in our society. You cannot get any cheaper than that.

● (1020)

[*English*]

Mr. Brad Trost (Saskatoon—Humboldt, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to my hon. colleague listing the requirements the government has put in this legislation. I may have misunderstood. I was getting the impression that she is opposed to all of the requirements. That may not be so.

Which specific requirements the government has put in do you accept, and which do you specifically reject? Do you accept, perhaps, the requirement for—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

I draw to the member's attention that comments should be directed to the Chair, not to an individual member of the opposition.

Mr. Brad Trost: My mistake, Mr. Speaker.

Which specific criteria are acceptable, and which specific criteria does the hon. member find unacceptable in the legislation?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that I do not have 20 or 30 more minutes to answer my colleague's question.

I encourage him to read subsection 56.1(3) of the bill, on page 8. He should also read the Supreme Court decision, which clearly explains what should be produced in evidence.

As I mentioned earlier, Conservatives seem to think that our one and only goal is to open injection sites to encourage drug users to have huge drug parties. That is not the case. This project is based on science. People who use supervised injection sites must first show that they take this seriously.

[*English*]

They need to have credentials. There is no problem with that.

[*Translation*]

There is a list of everything an organization would need to submit. We also see at the very end, after paragraph 56.1(3)(z.1), that an organization may submit all the required evidence and still not be approved by the minister.

This type of provision makes the bill less credible and creates a logistical problem. The government should not play people for fools. People are not fools. They are not stupid. The Conservatives should just come out and say they will never approve another project and be clear about it. It would make their position clear. I would have more respect for such a clear-cut approach than for making people believe that the government is willing to approve projects that meet 28 conditions, a dozen sub-conditions and a list of requirements that goes on and on, much like this answer I am giving.

Government Orders

•(1025)

[*English*]

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Gatineau for her usual clear and precise dissection of Conservative laws, which are designed, really, to deceive the public and the House. In particular, I like the fact that she has pointed out that the current government, which supposedly is against red tape and bureaucracy, is now establishing red tape and bureaucracy specifically to frustrate the establishment of these services that are so needed in communities like mine and, I know, her own.

One of the changes from the last time the bill was before the House is that this time it is being sent to the public safety committee instead of to the health committee. Would the member agree with me that this is an attempt to both divert attention from the Supreme Court decision and to create false public fears about the impact of safe injection sites?

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Mr. Speaker, what a great question.

[*Translation*]

Yes, that is precisely the image the government wants to convey. Even though it is supposed to be a public health bill, introduced by the Minister of Health, it is being sent to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security to create that impression. As I have said, you need only read the title. The advice I often give my colleagues in the House—though there are not many MPs who need my advice—is to look at the short title of Conservative legislation. It really says it all.

This one is called the respect for communities act. What the Conservatives are saying here is that the previous law, as well as the Supreme Court decision, do not keep our communities safe. That is outrageous, not to mention outrageously crass. How awful is it to make people believe that the position of the opposition or of the Supreme Court of Canada compromises community safety. It is patently false, but it plays on people's innermost fears.

I am not here to scare people. I am here to attempt to make their lives as pleasant as possible and allow them to grow in a safe society, without telling them a bunch of horror stories that simply do not hold up, legally or scientifically speaking.

So yes, the Conservatives are clearly playing a shell game to make people believe they are making our streets safer, even though they are actually doing the opposite.

Mr. Marc-André Morin (Laurentides—Labelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her brilliant speech. The attention to detail she brings to her work is an inspiration to all members.

We face a rather philosophical question. On the one hand, we see how easily the Conservatives show compassion and understanding towards powerful people who take drugs, act like deviant alcoholics and make death threats. We see them cry and get all worked up for these poor powerful people. On the other hand, when it comes to ordinary citizens in need, they show no compassion at all.

I would like my colleague to expand on that.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Mr. Speaker, that is a great point. I thank my colleague for his excellent question and comment.

We need to keep in mind that philosophy often guides our actions. Our friends opposite should take a little more time, on occasion, instead of using shortcuts that will not lead to the desired outcomes. They use a double standard, indeed.

My own upbringing was modest. I know what it means to be part of the middle class because that is how I grew up, like most of us here. My family had opportunities that others did not, and my parents always taught me to be compassionate. Compassion seems to be lacking in our friends opposite at times, when it comes to ordinary people, people like us.

My colleague talked about powerful people. I do not wish to pass judgment on certain major Canadian cities or certain mayors, but I notice, sadly, that the Conservatives' conscience seems more accommodating towards some people than towards the person who is lying on Sparks street right now.

•(1030)

Ms. Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe (Pierrefonds—Dollard, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Gatineau for her speech.

She and I worked together on a bill that claimed to crack down on elder abuse. I am certain she remembers it. The bill changed a handful of words in the Criminal Code so that people who abuse the elderly could be punished a bit more harshly.

It is clear more resources are needed on the ground to prevent elder abuse, respond in cases of abuse and assist seniors who suffer abuse. I see a connection here: there is evidence that injection sites work and reduce crime. Since InSite opened its doors in Vancouver, the crime rate, among other things, has dropped.

The Conservatives claim to be tough on crime, but much of what it takes to fight crime seems to elude them. Since my colleague is very active in the area of justice, I was hoping she could explain how there are other, better ways to fight crime than tinkering with the Criminal Code.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pierrefonds—Dollard.

I enjoyed working with her on the issue of seniors on the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. She and I noticed the same thing, which is that the bill, with its fancy title, claimed to put an end to elder abuse even though it only established an aggravating factor in sentencing. I am looking forward to seeing how that will work out in the field.

The government over there does not understand the meaning of health promotion and protection. It only knows how to punish and seems oblivious to the fact that if we do not address the source of the problem, it may come back to haunt us in a much more brutal fashion. That is not what I would call sound public administration policy.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act.

I am deeply saddened that the Conservative government has seen fit to introduce such a retrograde bill, and, as I will discuss, a bill that flies in the face of the unanimous 2011 Supreme Court decision on InSite. It seems obvious to many lawyers that this bill will also be struck down by the Supreme Court, costing Canadians hundreds of thousands of dollars. How many lives will be lost or wasted until that occurs?

I would first like to salute the remarkable work done by my colleague from Vancouver East, the health critic for the official opposition. Her compassionate leadership on this issue has been truly inspirational. It saddens me greatly that the Conservative government is only appearing to implement the Supreme Court of Canada judgment. In reality, this bill does nothing more than throw hurdle after hurdle in the way of those other communities across Canada that might wish to establish a safe consumption site to assist those who are suffering from the scourge of addiction.

At the outset, let us be clear, the federal government lost in the Supreme Court of Canada. The Court agreed unanimously that Vancouver's InSite clinic should be allowed to stay open and required the government to determine the conditions that would allow it and other facilities to do so. This bill is supposed to be the result of that Supreme Court judgment.

Before turning to Bill C-2, let me begin by describing the judgment of the Supreme Court. Then I want to examine the contents of the bill before turning to its importance to communities such as Victoria, which I have the honour to represent.

The court's unanimous judgment is extremely eloquent. I can do no better than to read certain portions of the judgment into the record today. It goes like this:

In the early 1990s, injection drug use reached crisis levels in Vancouver's downtown eastside [...]. Epidemics of HIV/AIDS and hepatitis C soon followed, and a public health emergency was declared [...] in September 1997. Health authorities recognized that creative solutions would be required to address the needs of the population of the [downtown eastside], a marginalized population with complex mental, physical, and emotional health issues. After years of research, planning, and intergovernmental cooperation, the authorities proposed a scheme of care for drug users that would assist them at all points in the treatment of their disease, not simply when they quit drugs for good. The proposed plan included supervised drug consumption facilities which, though controversial in North America, have been used with success to address health issues associated with injection drug use in Europe and Australia.

Operating a supervised injection site required an exemption from the prohibitions of possession and trafficking of controlled substances under s. 56 of the [Controlled Drugs and Substances Act], which provides for exemption at the discretion of the Minister of Health, for medical and scientific purposes. Insite received a conditional exemption in September 2003, and opened its doors days later. North America's first government-sanctioned safe injection facility, it has operated constantly since then. It is a strictly regulated health facility, and its personnel are guided by strict policies and procedures. It does not provide drugs to its clients, who must check in, sign a waiver, and are closely monitored during and after injection. Its clients are provided with health care information, counselling, and referrals to various service providers or an on-site, on demand detox centre. The experiment has proven successful. Insite has saved lives and improved health without increasing the incidence of drug use and crime in the surrounding area. It is supported by the Vancouver police, the city and provincial governments.

● (1035)

In 2008, a formal application for a new exemption was made. Again, I say, the Supreme Court held in favour of InSite. The court stated:

The Minister [of Health's] failure to grant a s. 56 exemption to Insite engaged the claimants' s. 7 [Charter] rights and contravened the principles of fundamental justice.

The minister's decision not to grant an exemption is not in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. It is arbitrary because it undermines the very purpose of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, the protection of health and public safety. The court continued:

It is also grossly disproportionate: during its eight years of operation, Insite has been proven to save lives with no discernable negative impact on the public safety and health objectives of Canada.

It further stated:

The effect of denying the services of Insite to the population it serves and the correlative increase in the risk of death and disease to injection drug users is grossly disproportionate to any benefit that Canada might derive from presenting a uniform stance on the possession of narcotics.

The court went on to order the minister to grant that exemption to InSite, and here is the key point. It said this:

On future applications, the Minister must exercise that discretion within the constraints imposed by the law and the Charter, aiming to strike the appropriate balance between achieving public health and public safety. In accordance with the Charter, the Minister must consider whether denying an exemption would cause deprivations of life and security of the person that are not in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. Where, as here, a supervised injection site will decrease the risk of death and disease, and there is little or no evidence that it will have a negative impact on public safety, the Minister should generally grant an exemption.

What does Bill C-2 do in the face of that judgment? It sets out a daunting list of criteria that supervised injection sites would have to meet before the minister would grant them an exemption under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. Experts agree; these criteria would make it much harder for organizations to open safe injection sites in Canada.

Do not take my word for it. Let us hear what the experts have said. Pivot Legal Society, the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, and the Canadian Drug Policy Coalition issued this statement on Bill C-2 when it was first introduced as Bill C-65. They stated the following:

The bill is an irresponsible initiative that ignores both the extensive evidence that such health services are needed and effective, and the human rights of Canadians with addictions.

It is unethical, unconstitutional and damaging to both public health and the public purse to block access to supervised consumption [sites]...

The Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian Nurses Association have also criticized the bill. This is what the CMA stated:

Supervised injection programs are an important harm reduction strategy. Harm reduction is a central pillar in a comprehensive public health approach to disease prevention and health promotion.

The Canadian Nurses Association stated:

Evidence demonstrates that supervised injection sites and other harm reduction programs bring critical health and social services to vulnerable populations...

Government Orders

The NDP's position is clear. New Democrats believe that decisions about programs that may benefit public health must be based on facts and evidence, not ideology or appeals to the base of a particular political party. InSite users were found to have charter rights to access services and that similar services should also be allowed to operate with the appropriate exemption.

Over 30 peer-reviewed studies published in famous journals, like the *New England Journal of Medicine*, *The Lancet* and the *British Medical Journal*, have all described the beneficial nature of InSite in Vancouver. There has been study after study. There were 70 safe injection sites studied in Europe and Australia. They have all shown the same thing; it is a public health achievement. Canadians should be proud of what was forged in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver.

● (1040)

Other communities that are seeking to address the scourge of addiction want similar tools to do so, and then the government passes Bill C-2. It is shocking. It is shocking that the Conservative Party's "Keep heroine out of our backyards" fundraising drive started mere hours after it introduced this bill. However, here is the irony. Bill C-2, after setting these virtually unattainable hurdles in the face of safe injection sites, is going to put heroine back in our neighbourhoods. Shame on the government.

We believe in harm reduction programs, including safe injection sites, and we believe that these exemptions should be based on the evidence, not ideology. The bill puts far too much emphasis on communities having to prove the benefits of these sites. No one, for a moment, has suggested that there should not be ample consultation with communities. Of course, there should. However, the number of hurdles in the bill are absolutely daunting.

That brings us back to what the Supreme Court said. It said there cannot be arbitrary decisions by the minister. The NDP believes that any legislation brought forward should respect that ruling imbalance between public health and safety. Bill C-2 does not do that. Therefore, we think the bill is retrograde. We think people in various communities will throw their hands up and not even bother applying, given the hurdles that I will describe. If that is the intent of the bill, which many believe it to be, then the government will have succeeded, at the cost of millions of people around the world who have had similar processes addressed through safe consumption sites, and at the loss of people struggling with addictions in various neighbourhoods in Canada.

If the bill is passed, new applicants in various communities are going to have to include unprecedented amounts of information, such as supporting letters and, ironically, scientific evidence as well. We think that the process will be slowed down. For example, there are no parameters for how long Health Canada is going to have to take to process an application. How long the minister would take to make a decision is wide open and unaddressed. It could be months; it could be years.

In addition, the bill outlines certain principles that the minister must adhere to before approving an application. They are outlined in section 5 of the bill. These principles include a number of things, some of which are entirely appropriate, but when added cumulatively show the government's real objective, which is to thwart the

ability to ever have such a facility opened. Therefore, the bill may well achieve its objective, not giving communities the opportunity for a supervised safe injection facility.

What is going on at the ground level? InSite remains the only operational supervised injection facility in our country. Since it opened, what has happened in Vancouver? There has been a 35% decrease in overdose deaths. Furthermore, InSite has been shown to decrease crime, communicable disease infection rates and relapse rates for drug users. It was part of a public health plan. This statistic is absolutely shocking. Between 1987 and 1993, there was a 12-fold increase in overdose deaths in Vancouver. As the Supreme Court said, there was a public health crisis. That is why the community came together with the police, provinces, health authority and community groups to create this remarkable achievement. Now, of course, it seems like it is going to be for naught.

After the Supreme Court made its decision other public health officials, in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa, started to consider opening supervised injection sites. So far, there has not been one such a request made to open a site.

I am indebted to my colleague, the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, for his research on the implications of Bill C-2 in our community, the lower Vancouver Island. In his earlier speech, he described the crisis in overdose deaths in Victoria and surrounding area.

● (1045)

The B.C. coroner reported last year that there were 44 deaths from illicit drug use on Vancouver Island in 2011, and 16 of those deaths occurred in greater Victoria. He noted that Vancouver Island is the region with the highest rate of deaths related to illicit drug use in British Columbia.

The Centre for Addictions Research at the University of Victoria concluded that Victoria's per capita death rate is almost 30% higher than in the Lower Mainland. That is right, so just a few kilometres away, a ferry ride away from our community, in the Vancouver community where InSite exists, 30% fewer people die from overdoses per capita than on Vancouver Island, where we do not have a safe injection site. All that Bill C-2 would do is make it virtually impossible for us to realize the public health benefits that have been achieved on the mainland.

The Health Officers Council of British Columbia has resolved that "supervised injection services have been studied enough as research projects, and that it is time to move them into the mainstream of health service provision." The College of Registered Nurses and the Canadian Nurses Association have interpreted their professional standards for nurses and nurse practitioners to encompass and support the supervision of drug consumption by clients.

Government Orders

In September 2010, the City of Victoria presented a resolution to the Union of B.C. Municipalities to lobby the province to “legislate that base levels of harm reduction services, including needle exchange and access to safe substance use equipment”, and detox and treatment beds, “be made available in every [local government]”.

In April 2008, University of Victoria addictions researcher, Dr. Benedikt Fischer, and B.C.'s provincial health officer, Dr. Perry Kendall, called on relevant authorities to implement a supervised consumption site trial for high-risk street drug users in Victoria. Their argument would be the basis for an editorial published in the *BC Medical Journal* on April 1, 2008, which said:

Victoria provides a perfect platform to implement a distinct and scientifically evaluated supervised consumption site program that is uniquely tailored to reflect the local characteristics of street drug use and associated public health needs....

I could go on, but I would like to talk about the recent response to the bill by Katrina Jensen, AIDS Vancouver Island executive director, who said there is a need for such a site in Victoria. In June she said:

“We have had eight overdose deaths in the last six months and those are deaths that could have been prevented if we had a supervised consumption site,” she said.

“I think there’s overwhelming evidence that a site in Victoria would save lives and be beneficial to the community.”

Debra McPherson, head of the BC Nurses' Union, asks:

“How does this respect the Supreme Court of Canada decision that recognized these facilities save lives?”...

She said the legislation is a smokescreen for the government’s real agenda of “pandering to prejudice and misplaced morality over health care, evidence and a coherent strategy on addictions and mental health.”

The bill does not achieve the goals that the Supreme Court of Canada set out. The Supreme Court of Canada suggested a road map for granting exemptions by the Minister of Health to allow supervised safe injection sites, consumption sites, to be established in communities.

The bill would set up all the red tape imaginable in communities that want to do something about this scourge, this public health and safety issue. These communities are only going to be frustrated by the bill. That is essentially why I oppose the bill. I think it is wrong-headed and contrary to public health and safety.

• (1050)

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I was elected as a member of Parliament for Scarborough Centre, I was a real estate representative serving the GTA and one of the things that I am concerned about with respect to these sites is the value of people's real property.

As a real estate representative, I know too well that it is not just the current condition of a house or the property that it sits on, but it is also factors that are across the street, around the corner or down the road. For example, a gas station is always something to be concerned about. A big factory or even rental properties can decrease the value of real property. With respect that, when we talk about community safety and the concerns of the community, we are also taking into account the safety of investments.

I am wondering if the member would agree with me that an injection site across the street, down the road or around the corner from a family home would actually decrease the value of real property, or does he actually believe that it would increase the value of that property?

Mr. Murray Rankin: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the parliamentary secretary about the concerns she has about real property. I have concerns about real people's lives. I live in a community where people are dying every day on the streets. I am concerned about that. Residents of Victoria are concerned about that. On this side of the House, that weighs more heavily on us than the impact on property prices and investments, as she put it.

I point out that in Vancouver, 80% of people surveyed living or working in the Downtown Eastside support InSite. That is the community, too. People live there and 80% of them are in favour because they know the impact it has had on their community.

I live in a place where people often do not know that there is the possibility of treatment. We need to create, in partnership with local governments, what they did in Vancouver with InSite, which the Supreme Court celebrated in its decision. It is a coming together of the community. The police are in favour, I remind the House, as well as the community, the City of Vancouver and all of the partners.

They figured out that they could find a way to put this in an appropriate location. We are not talking about putting it in places where the community does not want it. We accept and respect the need for ample consultation with the community. That is what happened in Vancouver and that is what would happen here.

• (1055)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is worthy to note that strong social programming in our communities, such as what we have seen in Vancouver with this particular facility, has a very strong benefit overall for all of the community. In fact, in response to the question that was just posed, the value of the community as a whole actually does improve.

I would ask the member to reaffirm what I believe to be the case, that when we bring in strong social programming, quite often what happens is that we will alleviate the concerns that many of the residents have. By centralizing or providing a service, for example, we can prevent individuals in this situation from using these illegal drugs in our schoolyards or back lanes, spread out throughout the community. The benefits far outweigh any sort of negatives that might be there by allowing facilities of this nature to exist.

As elected officials, what we should be doing is looking at creative ways in which we can start dealing with the social issues that are destroying many of our communities or that are extremely negative. This is just one of those tools, if I can put it that way, that can make a positive overall difference.

Could the member provide comment on that?

Mr. Murray Rankin: Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with my colleague's fundamental point that these strong social programs, as he puts it, do help alleviate community concerns.

Statements by Members

Let me give the House some examples of that. In a study by Wood et al in 2004 about the Vancouver situation, there was a significant drop in the number of discarded syringes, injection related litter and people injecting on the streets one year after the InSite location had opened. That means, as the member points out, that people are not shooting up in alleys and dropping syringes by schools, they are going to a supervised site.

Secondly, I would point out that at those sites, there are trained nurses. If people are ready, willing and able to seek treatment and detox and get off drugs, that is what they are there for and they will help the addicted person to achieve that.

There are also all of the benefits that come from that, economically and otherwise. First of all, wasted lives, getting people off of drugs and getting into productive lives is certainly something that we really cannot put a price on. Secondly, the cost of less law enforcement, less hospitalization and so on are some of the benefits that, as the member said, clearly outweigh the costs.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Victoria for his excellent speech.

The parliamentary secretary mentioned a potential decrease in the value of real property. Such a decrease could happen anywhere. The parliamentary secretary's use of the term says a lot about her living standards.

Cities like Toronto, Montreal, Charlesbourg and Limoilou all have back alleys. I used to own an apartment building. People would go to the alley behind the building to shoot up, and we would regularly find used syringes.

Would you agree it would be safer for the general public if people who are addicted to drugs and shoot up in back alleys were instead directed to supervised injection sites?

• (1100)

[*English*]

Mr. Murray Rankin: Mr. Speaker, I should point out, ironically, if there is any issue of real estate, I am from the west coast. We do not need to be told about real estate values. They have gone up in Vancouver. They have gone up in the Downtown Eastside. I think it is a rather specious argument.

I want to repeat that we would be working in partnership, if there were a bill that truly implemented the spirit and the letter of the Supreme Court of Canada's judgment. We would find a community partnership to address some of the concerns there.

Of course there are always benefits and costs in any public policy decision, but I am so persuaded, and all people on this side of the House in the New Democratic Party are persuaded, the benefits will clearly outweigh the cost. We need to move on the basis of public safety and health.

The Deputy Speaker: That brings to an end the debate on the bill for the time being. On resumption of debate we will have about two and a half minutes for questions and comments.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

CLÉMENCE LE MAY

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, almost 8,000 people were voted into office in Quebec municipal elections. The Bloc Québécois would like to congratulate them. We would also like to salute those who decided to pass the torch. Clémence Le May decided to retire from politics after serving the people of Saint-Christophe-d'Arthabaska for 39 years, 21 of them as mayor. A nurse by training, Ms. Lemay has taken care of people in so many different ways.

In addition to the people of Saint-Christophe-d'Arthabaska, the clients and employees of Carrefour d'entraide bénévole des Bois-Francis have also been fortunate to have known her and benefited from her talents and generosity.

Clémence Le May is a woman of character and has never hesitated to defend the integrity of her town, fight for safe drinking water, and protect her townspeople affected by two floods. A woman of conviction, she has publicly stated that she would like to see Quebec become sovereign.

Thank you, Clémence, for all your years of public service. As you said so well, you can retire with a sense of accomplishment. Congratulations.

* * *

[*English*]

AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Mr. Peter Braid (Kitchener—Waterloo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute today to the African Institute for Mathematical Sciences, which is celebrating its 10th anniversary this year.

AIMS was founded by Dr. Neil Turok, a director of the Perimeter Institute in Waterloo. His revolutionary approach nurtures Africa's brightest students, empowering them to take leadership roles in solving the complex challenges that face their continent.

There can be no more effective investment in Africa's future than in education, and I am proud that the Government of Canada invested \$20 million in this initiative. I had the rewarding experience of visiting the AIMS centre in South Africa last May. It was inspirational to meet the students and to witness the tangible results of this investment.

Congratulations to AIMS on this milestone anniversary and for demonstrating the power of knowledge to effect positive change.

* * *

DOROTHY MARY CHAMBERS

Mr. John Rafferty (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as we enter Remembrance Week, I would like to remember a recipient of the Queen's Jubilee Medal, Dorothy Mary Chambers.

Dorothy was born in Fort William and was a wonderful person, but beyond that, she was also an extremely proud veteran of the Royal Canadian Air Force. Dorothy's family offered the following about her remarkable life: "Our mom lived life to the fullest and was given the gift of a full circle of life. She was a dignified veteran, a proud Canadian and we're all extremely proud of her". I could not say it better. We are all proud.

I will gather with many others tomorrow at St. Paul's Anglican Church at 11 a.m. to remember and celebrate Dorothy's remarkable life. On behalf of her friends and the people of Thunder Bay—Rainy River, we are sincerely thankful for her service to Canada and all she did for veterans and for her community.

In closing, I would also like to offer a sincere thanks to all of Canada's veterans, our active personnel, and their families for their service and sacrifices on behalf of all Canadians.

Lest we forget.

* * *

RCAF VETERAN

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour a well-known long-time resident of Estevan, Ken Raine, a kind and trusted elder who has contributed much to his church and community throughout his lifetime. I rise also to recognize and thank him for his participation in the Second World War.

Ken joined the Royal Canadian Air Force and was posted to 434 Squadron, No. 6 Bomber Command, as leading aircraftman. He was then posted to the Northern Ireland Coastal Command.

To Ken, his family, and all veterans on this Remembrance Day, I say thanks for doing your part in the service of our country and in the service of mankind. On the 11th day of the 11th month, we will once again offer our gratitude and our commitment to never forget your service. Thank you, Ken.

* * *

● (1105)

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week, the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development tabled a report on the state of conservation of our natural heritage. The report showed that the government's track record is a pattern of unfulfilled commitments and responsibilities.

[English]

Staffing for conservation work in national parks has decreased 23% compared to the average of the previous seven years. Many national parks lack baseline data on the state of the park, so there is nothing against which to measure whether progress is being made. Environment Canada itself has shown that the ecological integrity of over 70% of fauna reserves and over half of migratory bird refuges are considered inadequate.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

We are a country defined by our natural beauty and heritage. Not only is conservation good in and of itself, it is key to preventing disruption associated with economic development.

[English]

The government must get its act together on environmental policy. It has had seven years to show some good faith on this file and some concrete actions and results. What is it waiting for?

* * *

TRUE PATRIOT LOVE FOUNDATION

Mr. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last night I attended the fifth annual True Patriot Love gala in Toronto. I joined almost 2,000 other Canadians in showing support for Canadian Forces members and their families. Two million dollars was raised for the important programs True Patriot Love runs for veterans, Canadian Forces members, and their families. I would like to thank the Minister of Veterans Affairs, the Leader of the Opposition, and many members of this House for joining me at that gala.

I also had the distinct honour to join Laureen Harper in presenting a Diamond Jubilee medal to Michelle Hickey. Michelle is a 21-year Canadian Forces veteran, a proud mom, and a member of the March to the Top expedition team.

A hearty "Bravo Zulu" to True Patriot Love and its sponsors. Congratulations to Michelle. Our thanks go to Canadians for last night and for the next week of supporting our veterans and our Canadian Forces.

* * *

[Translation]

VETERANS' WEEK

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is Veterans' Week, and it is very important for Canadians to recognize the work done by all those who serve our country during armed conflict throughout the entire year.

This year we are thinking in particular about the veterans who participated in the Korean War, which ended 60 years ago. Korean War veterans are Canadians who became heroes by defending the values our country believes in: peace, liberty, and justice.

[English]

As the member of Parliament for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, I am proud to represent three Korean War veterans: Gerry Boudreau, Calvin Atkin, and Neil MacDonald. On behalf of Canadians everywhere, I thank them for their service and for their courage. We also owe our thanks to those who served in uniform and made the ultimate sacrifice.

[Translation]

In conclusion, I urge our government to acknowledge the sacred obligation we have towards our veterans.

Lest we forget. *N'oublions jamais.*

*Statements by Members**[English]***REMEMBRANCE DAY**

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I stand and recognize New Ross Legion Branch 79 in my hometown. Branch 79, or as we say in New Ross, “the legion”, was built following World War II. My grandfather, my father, and my brother have all been presidents, and I am proud to be a 36-year member.

This year, the 60th anniversary of the Korean War, our community, like communities across Canada, will gather at the cenotaph to recognize and honour our veterans and the sacrifices they have made. It should be noted that the cenotaph in New Ross is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, World War I cenotaph in the country. It was erected in 1914-1915 to recognize the volunteers for World War I.

On November 11, we will recognize them again, along with all of our veterans, but especially our Korean War veterans in this, the 60th anniversary of that war.

* * *

• (1110)

RINGSIDE FOR HEROES EVENT

Mr. Parm Gill (Brampton—Springdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to attend a tremendous event organized by the Canadian Emergency Services Boxing Association in partnership with the Royal Regiment of Canada. The event was held at the historic Fort York Armoury and featured sanctioned amateur boxing with Canadian police and Canadian Forces versus the Boston police.

Proceeds from the event benefited Canada Company, which provides post-secondary scholarships to children of fallen Canadian Forces members. Canada Company also supports the military employment transition program to help our veterans obtain meaningful work after serving Canada.

I would like to congratulate the Royal Regiment of Canada and Inspector Barry Dolan of the Peel Regional Police, who is the founder and president of the Canadian Emergency Services Boxing Association. They put together an excellent event that builds camaraderie between emergency services, Canadian Forces, and veterans, while benefiting veterans and the children of those who gave the ultimate sacrifice for Canada.

Lest we forget.

* * *

*[Translation]***FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE**

Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since the current government came into office, a disturbing trend has emerged in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean: jobs in the federal public service have become increasingly threatened.

I would like to give a few examples: the closure of the post offices in Port-Alfred and Jonquière, the attempt to close the Chicoutimi-Nord post office, the relocation of the Service Canada and Passport

Canada offices in Jonquière, the closure of the Canada Revenue Agency counter in Chicoutimi, the contracting out of the Jonquière tax centre archives to private companies outside the region, the outsourcing of file processing for Canada Summer Jobs; the massive restructuring of jobs at National Defence, and the threat to reduce funding for the Aluminum Technology Centre.

What these examples have in common is that federal public service jobs in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean are being threatened.

To make the government aware of this problem, I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister and seven other ministers, calling on them to stop making cuts to the local services that people rely on.

I urge my colleagues to follow suit and seek firm commitments from the federal government on public service jobs.

* * *

*[English]***IMMIGRATION SUCCESS**

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Brampton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I am going to speak about an exceptional Canadian, Luigi “Loui” Marcon. We will not read about him in a textbook, but we should. He is the epitome of the Canadian immigration success story.

Loui was born on October 31, 1939, a special Halloween treat for his parents. His dream was to come to Canada. His dream came true. He immigrated in 1958 and started working almost the same day. He was a highly skilled bricklayer, respected by his employers and his colleagues. Loui worked all across Ontario on many landmark projects in the Niagara region, including Ridley College, the Pen Centre, and Niagara Square. He worked until the day he retired, never requiring government assistance.

Loui has always been grateful for the life he made for himself and his family here in Canada and has always been a very proud Canadian. If there is one thing we can hold against him, it is that he is a Boston Bruins fan.

I am proud to call Loui my father-in-law and feel privileged to have been welcomed into his family.

* * *

*[Translation]***VETERANS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in this time of remembrance, I would like to pay tribute to all of Canada's veterans and acknowledge the work of Canadian Forces personnel who are constantly striving to maintain peace in the world.

Thanks to my colleague, the member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, I recently had the opportunity to meet with veterans from my riding. I met Lucia Isabelle-Morand and Jean-Claude Morand during the annual poppy campaign in Charlesbourg.

I deeply admire and respect these Canadians, and I would ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the sacrifices made by our veterans to make Canada the peaceful country we enjoy today.

Statements by Members

Let us humbly remember that it is everyone's responsibility to be respectful, open, and resilient so that we can preserve the fragile peace that our ancestors, families, and loved ones fought so hard to win.

* * *

[English]

FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to economic management, our Conservative government is leading the world. We have overseen the creation of over one million net new jobs, signed the Wayne Gretzky of trade deals, and are staying on track to balance our budget. We also cut the GST and created tax-free savings accounts that are now benefiting more than eight million Canadians. Consumers now have more money in their wallets. We are committed to protecting them. We banned unsolicited credit card cheques, ensured that prepaid cards never expire, and made certain that credit card companies provide timely advance notice of rates and fee changes.

However, we have not stopped there. November is Financial Literacy Month. All month long, we are holding events to help consumers learn the skills they need. We are ensuring that Canadians get clear and direct information on financial products so they can make the best financial decisions for their families. I encourage all Canadians to join in and attend an event in their area.

* * *

• (1115)

[Translation]

VETERANS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us fulfill the duty we have to remember at this time of year: remembering those who sacrificed their lives for our country, most of them barely in their prime. They contributed so much; we must not forget them.

My grandfather fought in the First World War. He was wounded twice, first at Lenz and again at Passchendaele. Then he helped build this nation. My father fought in the Second World War and spent his career with the Royal 22nd Regiment.

[English]

Our veterans deserve our greatest respect, because they have gone into the face of danger. Some have not returned. Some have seen their friends perish. Some have seen the horror of mutilated bodies or the deaths of innocent civilians. Few have not been profoundly changed by their experience. Many have returned wounded in body or in spirit, or in both.

We owe them so much.

* * *

LIBERAL AND NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTIES OF CANADA

Mr. Ryan Leef (Yukon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is putting job creation and economic growth first, while the Liberals have now decided to join the NDP in its carbon tax plan. Their new

alliance opposes energy infrastructure before it has undergone independent scientific review.

The Liberal leader has lent his support to the radical NDP centrepiece of irresponsible economic management, whose \$20-billion carbon tax would raise the price on absolutely everything. However, our government rejects that idea to impose a job-killing carbon tax that would increase the price on everything, including gas, electricity, and groceries—a tax on all Canadians.

On this side of the House, we know that higher taxes hurt job creation. We know that it is the opposite of what Canadians expect of their government, so on this side of the House, we will not bow down to the NDP and Liberal coalition on a carbon tax.

* * *

[Translation]

PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Mr. Alain Giguère (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister would have us believe that his chief of staff, several employees, high-ranking members of his party, and some of his closest allies cooked up the whole Senate scheme under his nose without his knowledge. Either he takes Canadians for fools, or he has shown a serious lack of judgment when it comes to choosing his advisers. Fortunately for him, the party flushed ministerial responsibility down the toilet a long time ago. In any private enterprise, a manager who allows his closest employees to break the law, whether he knows about it or not, is quickly shown the door.

The Liberal leader may continue to prefer sexist social events over grilling the Prime Minister. However, the NDP will not give up until we learn the full truth about this Conservative scandal. We will not drop it. Canadians deserve better. They deserve the truth.

* * *

[English]

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada was built on a foundation of freedom, one that includes freedom of religion. It is one that is cherished by all Canadians, a value that is constitutionally protected.

Yesterday the minority separatist Parti Québécois government introduced some legislation, and let me be clear that our government's position is very clear: nobody should be denied a job on the basis of criteria unrelated to the performance of that job. Nobody should have to choose between their job and their religion.

Oral Questions

A Canadian is no less a Canadian because they wear a cross, a *kippa*, a Star of David, or a turban. Thankfully a majority of Quebec's National Assembly oppose this bill in its current form.

However, let us be very clear: if this bill passes, our Conservative government will act in order to protect the constitutional right to which all Canadians are entitled.

ORAL QUESTIONS

• (1120)

[*Translation*]

ETHICS

Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is fascinating to see that the Conservatives have so far refused to answer a very simple question. Let us try again.

Who in the Prime Minister's Office has been questioned by the RCMP?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, many Canadian families received good news this morning, because there are a lot of new jobs. That is good news for all Canadians.

We know that there is still a lot of work to be done, which is why we will continue to move forward with our economic action plan.

[*English*]

With respect to the member's question, Nigel Wright has identified in an affidavit the persons he brought into his confidence on this matter, but the issue, of course, is that Senator Duffy and these senators accepted payments to which they were not entitled, and those payments need to be repaid.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP): Mr. Speaker, either they respond now, or they wait for the RCMP to show up before they start answering. It is up to them.

What documents from the Prime Minister's Office regarding the Wright-Duffy affair have been requested by the RCMP?

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear. The Prime Minister's Office is not under investigation, but of course we are assisting with the RCMP in this matter.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a criminal investigation on the actions of staff in the Prime Minister's Office should be treated more seriously by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister.

When did the Prime Minister find out that the Conservative Party initially agreed to pay Mike Duffy's illegal expenses when it believed he owed only \$32,000?

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me outline the timeline.

On February 13, when Senator Duffy came to the Prime Minister to try to justify his inappropriate expenses, the Prime Minister told him he had to repay those inappropriate expenses. Mr. Duffy then went on TV, suggesting he had done that with a loan from RBC. We later learned that was not true.

On May 15, we, along with Canadians, learned that it was actually Nigel Wright who paid those expenses. That was inappropriate. Nigel Wright has accepted responsibility for doing that and is prepared to accept the consequences.

At the same time, we would hope that Senator Duffy would actually pay back Canadians. At this point he is the only one who has yet to pay back a dime.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told the House of Commons that the payment of \$13,000 to Mike Duffy's lawyers was for "valid legal fees".

Could the government explain the details of this payment so that we know how the Prime Minister is able to claim in the House that they were valid? If the Conservatives cannot, will they explain why the Prime Minister is making unsupported statements about a potential crime in the House of Commons?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have said on a number of occasions in the House, our party, like all parties in this House, does offer assistance to its members who are in good standing if they require some legal assistance.

The Leader of the Opposition accepted the same type of assistance from his party, with one exception: he had the judgment paid for. Thousands of dollars in legal fees were paid for, and the judgment.

That is not something we do on this side of the House, but as is the case with every other party, if a member in good standing requires assistance, we are there to help.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is why the RCMP is investigating.

Let us try another simple one for the parliamentary secretary. On February 13, the Prime Minister stood in this House and said he had personally reviewed Pamela Wallin's expenses and that they were "comparable to any parliamentarian".

Later that same day the Prime Minister's Office was warned by one of Pamela Wallin's former staffers not to be seen defending her expenses, because they were "really problematic".

Oral Questions

Given the Prime Minister's recent attacks on Ms. Wallin, can the Conservatives explain why it took the Prime Minister over three months to distance himself from her spending?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, just to advise the member, there was an audit completed in the Senate that outlined some of the very troubling expenses that Senator Wallin, Senator Duffy, and Senator Brazeau undertook.

We have been very clear that inappropriate expenses need to be repaid. At the same time, Canadians have been very clear that they want accountability. That is why a motion was passed in the Senate to strip these three senators of their pay.

We are the only party in this House that seems to want to stand up for Canadian taxpayers. I am glad that at least the Conservatives in the Senate took this motion very seriously and stripped these three senators of their pay.

• (1125)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Law Society of Upper Canada code of conduct states that “A lawyer shall not...knowingly assist in or encourage any dishonesty, fraud, crime, or illegal conduct”.

We know that Benjamin Perrin, the Prime Minister's lawyer, was involved in the scheme to give a \$90,000 cheque to Mike Duffy. We also know that Conservative Party lawyer Arthur Hamilton was involved.

Has the Minister of Justice reported the conduct of Benjamin Perrin and Arthur Hamilton to the Prime Minister's Office and to the Law Society of Upper Canada?

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Nigel Wright was very clear on the people he brought into his confidence with respect to this matter. We are continuing to assist officials in their investigation.

At the same time, we know that the Liberals stood very firmly behind the status quo in the Senate. It is a shame that they did that. On this side of the House, we are going to stand up for Canadian taxpayers. That is why we fought so hard to have the Senate pass this motion. I am proud of the fact that at least Conservatives in the Senate took Canadian taxpayers' desires very seriously and stripped these three senators of their pay.

Again Liberals have proven that they are entitled to their entitlements and that nothing will stand in the way of that.

Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Law Society of Upper Canada code of conduct states that a lawyer “shall not knowingly assist in or encourage any dishonesty, fraud, crime, or illegal conduct”. We know that Benjamin Perrin, the Prime Minister's lawyer, was involved in the scheme to give \$90,000 to Senator Duffy. We also know that Conservative lawyer Arthur Hamilton was involved.

Has the Minister of Justice reported the conduct of Benjamin Perrin and Arthur Hamilton to cabinet and to the Law Society of Upper Canada?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, of course there are a number of lawyers in that caucus who have illegal campaign bills that they refuse to pay. I hope the member will be referring that matter to the Minister of Justice.

We have been very clear. We will continue to assist authorities in this matter.

It is very interesting today. I was criticized for saying that the Liberal leader has been muzzled by his own party, but now I learn why he is muzzled by his own party. Last night, when he was asked what other kind of administration he admires, he stood up for a dictatorship. Why? It is because they can force things through, and if they need to go green, they can go green faster. That is the—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Westmount—Ville Marie.

Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, RCMP court filings show that Nigel Wright told the police that the Prime Minister's personal lawyer, Benjamin Perrin, was involved in the \$90,000 payment to Mike Duffy. Mike Duffy has said that he has emails that show that another PMO lawyer was involved in this scheme. Duffy has now provided these emails to the RCMP.

Will the Prime Minister tell the House who the other PMO lawyer is, or will he wait for the RCMP to lay charges before Canadians can find out?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think I have already answered that, but let me just quote the Liberal leader last night at his fundraiser. Not only did he insult millions of women across the country, but when asked what type of administration he admires, he talked about admiring a dictatorship because “...their basic dictatorship is allowing them to actually turn their economy around on a dime and say 'we need to go green fastest'”.

Let me get this straight. He has talked about policy. He supports the status quo in the Senate. He supports dictatorship. He wants a carbon tax and he wants to legalize marijuana.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I believe the parliamentary secretary has never heard the saying “a fault confessed is half redressed.” This is going to be a long process.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister confirm that Nigel Wright told Mike Duffy in December 2012 that his expenses were in keeping with all the rules? Did the Prime Minister agree with his chief of staff at the time?

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me review the timeline again for the hon. member.

Oral Questions

On February 13, Senator Duffy approached the Prime Minister to justify his inappropriate expenses. The Prime Minister told Senator Duffy that he had to repay those expenses. He also told the rest of our caucus, including the senators, that if we had inappropriate expenses, we had better pay them back, because that is not something we would support in our caucus.

After Mr. Duffy went on TV and said he had repaid expenses by taking out a Royal Bank loan, we then learned, as all Canadians did, that what Mr. Duffy had said was not true. We also know that Nigel Wright repaid those expenses by using his own resources. He has accepted full responsibility for doing that and is prepared to accept the consequences.

• (1130)

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, now I have that banking commercial, “You’re richer than you think”, come to mind.

[Translation]

Once again, the government is not giving us an answer.

The Prime Minister confirmed that employees in his office gave advice to senators about talking to the media.

I would therefore like to know which employee or former employee of the PMO told Mike Duffy to say that he took out a bank loan to repay the \$90,000. What is that employee's name?

[English]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, I, like many other Canadians, saw Mike Duffy go on TV and say that he took out a loan to repay those inappropriate expenses. We obviously learnt that was not true on May 15 when it was reported in the media. At the same time, the Prime Minister said he expected more from his staff.

Nigel Wright has accepted sole and full responsibility for this. He is prepared to accept the consequences of that decision. I hope that Mike Duffy will do the same. He is the only one who has not paid a dime back of any expenses, and he should do that.

[Translation]

Ms. Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe (Pierrefonds—Dollard, NDP): Mr. Speaker, no answer. What a surprise. We will try again.

With regard to the emails mentioned by Mike Duffy, the RCMP said: “The existence of such documentation may potentially be evidence of criminal wrongdoing by others.”

This documentation pertains to the behaviour of staff in this Prime Minister's Office.

What documents has the Prime Minister's Office given to the RCMP?

[English]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, of course, as I have mentioned on a number of occasions, we are assisting the authorities on this matter. At the same time, I was glad to hear that, finally, Senator Duffy is co-operating with the RCMP. He might also take the opportunity to cut a cheque to the Canadian

taxpayer for the thousands of dollars in expenses that he owes the Canadian people.

At the same time, I hope that the Liberals will reflect on this and try to put Canadians first, and when it comes to protecting the status quo in the Senate, maybe think twice and get on board with some of the reforms that our minister of democratic reform has brought forward with respect to the Senate.

[Translation]

Ms. Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe (Pierrefonds—Dollard, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question was not: were documents given to the RCMP? My question was: which documents were given to the RCMP by the Prime Minister's Office?

Perhaps the parliamentary secretary did not understand my question. Perhaps he does not know the answer. Perhaps he cannot give the answer, all these answers, any of these answers.

To help the parliamentary secretary, I will try to ask a very short and very simple question. On exactly which date did Nigel Wright visit the Langevin Block for the last time?

[English]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me suggest that this member take her acting classes, not from the member for Papineau, but from the member for Jeanne-Le Ber, because he is a much better actor than she is.

At the same time, she asked about what documents the RCMP have. They have whatever they have asked for.

[Translation]

Ms. Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe (Pierrefonds—Dollard, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about a schoolyard quarrel here. We are talking about a criminal investigation. One would think that the parliamentary secretary would take this a little more seriously.

What was the exact date of the most recent conversation between the Prime Minister and his former chief of staff, Nigel Wright?

[English]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a member who gets up and acts out a question every day and then talks about being serious in the house. Come on, give me a break.

I will tell the House what we are serious about. We are serious about democratic reform on this side of the House. That is why we have a number of reforms that we have put in front of the Supreme Court of Canada, so that we can actually get a road map to changing the Senate, so that we do not get mixed up in big, long constitutional battles with our provincial partners.

We are serious about growing the economy. That is why I am happy that the economy has grown by 2% annually. That is why I am glad that new jobs were created. That is why I am glad that we have an economic—

Oral Questions

Mr. Dan Harris (Scarborough Southwest, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that member gets up and gives laughable answers time and time again, and he expects people not to laugh at him.

The RCMP is now knocking at the door of the Prime Minister's Office. Conservatives should really take answering questions a little more seriously because Canadians deserve the truth.

When was the last time anyone in the Prime Minister's Office spoke with Nigel Wright?

• (1135)

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the questions from the opposition get more laughable by the minute. Let me get this straight. We have in front of us an economy that is doing better but still has a lot of challenges in front of it. We have the biggest trade deal in Canadian history. We have natural resources that need to get to market. We have pipelines that need to be built in order to do that, and he wants to know who talked to who last.

My daughter sometimes asks me about that. She asks "When was the last time I talked to Natasha, Daddy? I had better give her a call", but she is in grade one. She is not sitting in the House of Commons.

Mr. Dan Harris (Scarborough Southwest, NDP): Mr. Speaker, she might be in grade one, but I bet she would give more truthful answers than that member.

This is no fishing trip. These are serious questions about people being named in connection with a potential criminal cover-up orchestrated out of the Prime Minister's Office. Outside of the House, Conservatives are speaking with Nigel Wright and saying that he has quite the story to tell. Even some ministers are now defending Mr. Wright.

Can the Minister of Employment and Social Development tell us the last time he spoke with Nigel Wright?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he is a real tough guy when he is covered by immunity in the House of Commons. He is probably not so tough in front of the TV cameras outside of this place.

This is about what the NDP or Liberals want to make it about, making victims of these senators. This is about the fact that these senators accepted payments that they did not incur and they need to repay those expenses. We have accountability in the Senate because our senators passed a motion that would see these senators suspended. We will continue to fight for the taxpayer; they can continue to fight for the status quo in the Senate and for these three senators who are rightfully out of the Senate.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as one father to another, I will ask my hon. colleague not to use his children to defend corruption.

Maybe I will give him a break. Surely somebody over on that side has been paying attention to the culture of corruption that has gone in the Prime Minister's Office. We know the Minister of Justice has been out in the media defending Nigel Wright. Maybe the Minister

of Justice, now that he is supporting Nigel Wright, would tell us when was the last time he spoke with him.

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me just say this. A lot of people are upset at the fact that I talk about my family. They are upset at the fact that I talk about my parents. On the other side, they laugh about those stories.

Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. It was my parents who gave me the confidence to be here, and unlike maybe some other members, it is for my kids that I am here every single day, trying to build a bigger, better, stronger, safer Canada. That is what my parents did for me, and that is what I want to do for them. I am not embarrassed or ashamed to talk about how proud I am of my kids or my family, or to get up in the House and fight for them every single day.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, here is something we will ask if he is proud of.

Section 121 of the Criminal Code, "Frauds on the government", reads:

(1) Every one...who

(a) directly or indirectly...

...demands, accepts or offers or agrees to accept from any person...

a loan, reward, advantage or benefit of any kind as consideration for cooperation, assistance, exercise of influence or an act or omission in connection with...

...any matter of business relating to the government...

...is guilty of an indictable offence...

Will the member tell us who over on that side has broken the law? Who is guilty of this offence?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it might surprise the hon. member to learn that I am not actually a police officer. That is why there is an investigation and that is why we are assisting the authorities. I will let them make that decision.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Chris Woodcock was the Prime Minister's director of issues management, the top official, the go-to guy for handling dangerous political files. He crafted the strategy to cover up the Wright-Duffy deal; he wrote the false media lines which instructed Mr. Duffy to hide the real source of the \$90,000 cheque.

Mr. Duffy has provided the RCMP with all his emails and records related to Mr. Woodcock. Has the government turned over to the RCMP all of Mr. Woodcock's records relating to Mr. Duffy?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Again, as I have said on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, we are assisting all authorities on this matter and providing anything that is asked of us.

• (1140)

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that the PMO was forced to provide emails and other records to the RCMP. For months, countless ministers stood up in the House and asserted there was no written agreement between Wright and Duffy. Over and over again, it was outright denial.

Oral Questions

Can the government confirm that one of the documents it turned over to the RCMP is the February 20 email which summarizes the Wright-Duffy legal agreement, and can it confirm that Mr. Woodcock has had this email in his possession since last spring?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Again, Mr. Speaker, we are assisting authorities and providing any information that is required. At the same time, it is nice to be in a Parliament where these things can be discussed day in and day out, unlike the administrations that the hon. leader of the third party seems to support, dictatorships, so that Liberals can ram down a carbon tax on people. I wonder, in those dictatorships that the hon. leader of the third party supports, if they would be getting this type of accountability in their legislation. I somehow doubt it.

While we will let the leader of the Liberal Party stand up for the status quo and we will let him stand up for dictatorships, we will stand up for democracy and taxpayers.

[Translation]

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, despite access to information requests and questions asked in the House, the government said for months that it had no information.

Now we know about the hundreds of emails, but Canadians might have to wait for a criminal trial before they can see those emails for themselves. It is unbelievable that Mr. Woodcock is now the chief of staff to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Can the government confirm whether Mr. Woodcock has had any contact whatsoever with the RCMP?

[English]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this member should know that it was actually the Liberals who exempted the Prime Minister's Office from access to information. I believe it was Prime Minister Trudeau who did that.

Unlike the Liberals, when it comes to openness and accountability, we are the party that Canadians can count on. That is why we opened up 70 new institutions to access to information. That is why the President of the Treasury Board has undertaken an open government policy.

We are very proud of what we are doing to make our government open and accountable to the Canadian taxpayers. That is why the first act that we brought forward was the Accountability Act, so that Canadians could understand what was happening to take out the influence of big money and unions in government.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on Remembrance Day, Canadians will be taking time to reflect and to honour the service veterans have provided to all Canadians.

Unfortunately, Conservative policies mean that some who serve are being cut off from the benefits they have earned. Wounded soldiers are being forced out before they are eligible for their pensions.

This is unacceptable. Instead, when will the minister do the right thing and provide these women and men the respect and support they deserve?

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all our military who have served us so proudly over the years.

As we have said before, we have been working with the Chief of the Defence Staff and the chief of military personnel to ensure that members of the Canadian Armed Forces are not released until they are prepared.

I will again remind the member opposite that every possible accommodation is made to ensure that soldiers are kept in the forces and provided with the best possible support before being considered for release.

I want to thank the Minister of Veterans Affairs for tabling Bill C-11, priority hiring for injured veterans act, which will help medically released personnel transition into meaningful public service careers.

[Translation]

Mr. Tarik Brahmī (Saint-Jean, NDP): Mr. Speaker, despite what the Minister of National Defence claimed all week and what the parliamentary secretary just said, there are unfortunately some members of the Canadian Forces who returned to civilian life before getting their pensions.

These men and women fought for Canada. To treat them this way is absolutely shameful.

Why will the government not simply admit that it made a mistake, say that it will correct the situation and help those who have been the victims of this injustice?

[English]

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have been working with the chief of military personnel to ensure that members of the Canadian Armed Forces are not released until they are prepared.

Every possible accommodation is made to ensure that soldiers are kept in the forces. Before being released, members of the Canadian Armed Forces work with the military on a transition plan. Ill and injured Canadian Forces members are provided with physical, mental and occupational therapy services for their eventual transition to civilian life.

• (1145)

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, not only are the Conservatives refusing to ensure that no more military personnel are forced out before qualifying for their pension, but they are also creating obstacles for veterans who are trying to access services.

How ironic, given how these brave men and women have served our country. Closing offices to save a few extra dollars shows a complete lack of respect for our veterans.

Will the minister reverse his decision to close the offices?

[English]

Mr. Parm Gill (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has made substantial investment to support Canada's veterans, including almost \$5 billion in new additional funding since taking office.

The funding has been put toward improved financial benefits, world-class rehabilitation, and tuition costs to help veterans transition to civilian life.

While our government is making improvements to veterans' benefits, it is the Liberals and the NDP who have voted against new funding for mental health treatment, financial support and home care services.

Mr. John Rafferty (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, veterans across the country are speaking out against the Conservative government's closure of veterans' offices, like the one in Thunder Bay.

Cuts and closures to these offices will mean the end of one-to-one contact for many aging veterans. They will be forced to travel outside of their communities, forced to endure unnecessary stress, and will lose yet another good friend.

These men and women fought for our country. Why will the minister not respect that? Stop the cuts. Keep these offices open.

Mr. Parm Gill (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are now 600 new additional points of service across the country available to Canada's veterans. A critically injured veteran no longer has to drive to a district office. Our government now sends a registered nurse or case manager to visit them in the comfort of their home.

I would also like to remind the hon. member and all opposition members that it is them and their party who have voted against every single initiative we have introduced as a government to support our veterans.

* * *

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the separatist Parti Québécois government introduced legislation that would violate the inherent rights of Canadians. It is one that would force people to choose between their faith and jobs.

I am proud to be part of a government that has not remained quiet on this issue. Freedom of religion does not mean freedom from religion.

While the bill is currently opposed by the majority in the national assembly, what is the federal government's position if the bill becomes law?

Hon. Tim Uppal (Minister of State (Multiculturalism), CPC): Mr. Speaker, my parents were welcomed when they immigrated to

Canada, and now I have three beautiful Canada-born children. We are a proud Canadian family.

A Canadian is no less a Canadian because they wear a cross, a *kippa*, a Star of David, or a turban.

The Prime Minister has been clear that nobody should be denied a job on the basis of criteria that are unrelated to the performance of that job. The Government of Canada will not hesitate to protect the constitutional rights that are given to all Canadians if the bill were to pass in its current form.

* * *

[Translation]

PENSIONS

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians approaching retirement age are increasingly concerned about their financial security. Enhancing the Canada pension plan and the QPP is the best way to improve retirement security for all Canadians. The provinces are ready to take action. The only one stalling is the Conservative minister.

Why is the minister waiting for a full-blown crisis before improving the system?

[English]

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we will continue to work with the provinces and territories to improve the Canada pension plan. However, we do not believe that this is the time to add further burden onto Canadian employers and employees with higher premiums during this fragile economic recovery.

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the member opposite got the latest talking points from the minister.

Yesterday, the Minister of Finance said that boosting the Canada pension plan is "good in the long run for Canadians", but still he is refusing to act.

Increasing the CPP is the right thing to do to ensure that all Canadians can afford to retire with dignity. Why is the minister choosing to antagonize the provinces instead of working with them to fix Canadians' retirement security?

● (1150)

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we do continue to look at Canada pension plan reform.

We can assure the House that the NDP's plan to double the Canada pension plan premiums while the economy is still fragile is not a moderate proposal. Despite the NDP's risky schemes, we continue to stand up for seniors and for retirement during this global recovery.

*Oral Questions***INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance does not seem to understand that working with the provinces is a key part of his job.

Internal government studies praised the effectiveness of provincial training programs, yet Conservatives ignored the evidence, failed to work with the provinces and mismanaged skills training.

Will they now agree to work with the provinces so we can help get Canadians the skills training programs they deserve?

Hon. Candice Bergen (Minister of State (Social Development), CPC): Mr. Speaker, we believe that the best people who know what kinds of skills are required are employers. That is why we introduced the Canada job grant. It brings employers into the whole equation as to what skills are required.

We are focused on jobs, the economy and growth. One of the ways we can continue to do that is to fix the mismatch of people without jobs and jobs without people. That is what the Canada job grant will do. Bureaucrats are not the experts on this, the employers are.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, they created this program without consulting the provinces. The Conservatives still have not learned their lesson. They continue to turn a deaf ear and refuse to listen to the provinces.

Training programs are a crucial part of ensuring that everyone can find work. We need a government that offers solutions, not a government that is looking to pick fights with the provinces.

Is the minister ready to turn the page and engage in a meaningful discussion with the provinces about training for workers so that we can avoid the kinds of mistakes that were made with employment insurance reform?

[*English*]

Hon. Candice Bergen (Minister of State (Social Development), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why the opposition is opposed to a program that would train Canadians for jobs that are available. That is what the Canada job grant program will do. Let us talk about who is supporting this. We have been consulting over the summer and indeed currently the minister is meeting with the provinces in good faith. We have been listening to the provinces and to organizations so that we have flexibility within the Canada job grant.

Employers include the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the federation of progressive contractors, Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters, the National Association of Career Colleges, the Canadian Institute of Plumbing & Heating, and I could go on. They are employers who want to see this program implemented because it trains Canadians for jobs that are—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the NDP leader goes to Calgary and claims that he supports the development of the oil sands. However, in Toronto Centre the New Democrats are actively campaigning against the oil sands. The NDP candidate wants a moratorium.

Meanwhile, the Conservatives' total failure to advance stronger environmental policy has prevented Canada from getting oil to market responsibly.

When will the Conservative government get its act together on the environment to ensure that Canada can move its resources to market sustainably?

Mrs. Kelly Block (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government is concentrating on what matters to Canadians: jobs and economic growth.

The fact is that the oil sands are responsible for over 275,000 jobs across this country. That number is expected to grow to 630,000 jobs. Government revenues from upstream oil and gas average \$22 billion over the past five years. That is how many jobs the opposition members say no to when they oppose this important industry.

That is revenue for important social programs, which the opposition members say no to when they bash Canada abroad.

* * *

TOURISM

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government will step down from the Bureau International des Expositions, and in doing so, will kill any success of Toronto's potential bid to host World Expo 2025, an event that could attract up to 40 million visitors. This defection was made without consideration of Toronto City Council's upcoming feasibility report.

Why is the government wasting this exceptional opportunity to boost Toronto's economy, job market, and tourism and to promote Canada's accomplishments to the world?

• (1155)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maxime Bernier (Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleague that we are promoting Canada, both within the country and abroad.

I recently went to China with the Canadian Tourism Commission to ensure that our Chinese friends can travel to Canada. As everyone knows, we signed a co-operation agreement with the Chinese government. There will be even more Chinese tourists, and that is good for the Canadian economy.

*Oral Questions**[English]***FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, government officials confirmed yesterday that Bill C-6 would still allow Canadian personnel to authorize the use of cluster munitions. People are concerned this could undermine the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Seventeen NATO countries have already ratified the treaty without this kind of exception.

Will the government work with us to close the loopholes in the bill?

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for this thoughtful and important question.

Obviously, these weapons cause devastating effects on civilian populations. Some 30 years after the war in Vietnam, Laos still has more than 80 million unexploded ordinances, and this is killing people each and every week, maiming them, taking their limbs.

We want to implement this convention as effectively as possible. We are always very pleased to work with the opposition. I can guarantee that the Canadian Forces would never use these types of munitions and we are prepared to eliminate the stockpiles that we have.

[Translation]

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada ratified the Anti-Personnel Mines Convention without including exceptions for interoperability. This has not affected in the least our joint missions with the U.S. and our other allies. The bill to implement the Convention on Cluster Munitions does provide for exceptions in the name of this interoperability.

Civilians represent 98% of the victims of cluster munitions. Is the government ready to work with us in order to fix this bill?

[English]

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have visited the victims of these cluster munitions. More than 30 years after wars have ended, these weapons continue to take limbs and lives. We want to do everything we can to rid the world of the scourge of these weapons.

Not all countries have adopted the position that Canada has. There are a small number, which could be counted on one hand, per year. The Obama administration has not signed on, and we wish it had, but we are prepared to work with the opposition to create as strong a bill as possible, at the same time supporting the training of our military leadership when they have interoperability measures with the United States.

* * *

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week we learned that the leader of the Liberal Party insulted women across this country and across all party lines with an invitation to a women-only event in Toronto. Sadly, the invitation implies that women are only concerned with pressing issues, such as their favourite virtues. Well, how demeaning.

Personally, as the father of three daughters, I can say that all members on this side of the House believe every issue and all issues are women's issues.

Could the Minister of Status of Women update the House on our government's actions to create jobs for not only women but all Canadians?

Hon. Kellie Leitch (Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is focused on what matters to Canadians, including women: jobs and long-term prosperity. In Canada in 2013, women are accountants, electricians, engineers, and even pediatric orthopedic surgeons. The invitation to the fundraising event was both demeaning and unacceptable. It suggested that women are shallow and incapable of discussing serious issues.

Important issues face Canada right now. Unlike the Liberal leader who thinks that women are incapable of participating and contributing to Canada's economy, our government applauds women and all their capabilities. Maybe the reason he refuses to discuss economic issues with women is that he is actually incapable of doing so. I think he is in a little over his head.

* * *

*[Translation]***OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

Ms. Lise St-Denis (Saint-Maurice—Champlain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the last report from the Commissioner of Official Languages points to a disturbing situation regarding of the use of French in the federal public service. The report makes a link between the inadequate delivery of services in French and budget cuts in the public service.

Has the government examined the negative effects of these cuts, and has it consequently planned measures to address this reduction of services in French?

● (1200)

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her question and congratulate her for currently sitting in the parliamentary committee where I have the pleasure of working with her.

I would like thank the Commissioner for his annual report. I am proud of our government's unprecedented commitment to both of our official languages. We will continue giving Canadians the opportunity to learn our two national languages to enhance the vitality of our official-language minority communities.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. François Lapointe (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, NDP): Mr. Speaker, mourning will take time, but the very courageous people of Lac-Mégantic are ready to rebuild.

Oral Questions

Business people will be part of the solution, but many of them are struggling right now because the town's commercial core was decimated by the tragedy.

Will the Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec listen to the chamber of commerce and business people in the Mégantic region and set up a special funding program to help businesses get back on their feet, in addition to the decontamination and reconstruction budget that has already been announced?

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec's mandate focuses on economic development. We are always concerned about regions that are struggling, and we will help them.

* * *

[English]

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians were told yesterday, in a shocking admission, that the leader of the Liberal Party believes that dictatorships—countries without freedom, human rights, or basic rule of law—are nations to uphold and celebrate. These inflammatory comments further demonstrate that the leader of the Liberal Party lacks the judgment to lead.

Would the Minister of State for Multiculturalism please update the House on the values our Conservative government upholds at home and abroad?

Hon. Tim Uppal (Minister of State (Multiculturalism), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the comments made by the leader of the Liberal Party are an insult to the many Canadians who have fought for the basic values and freedoms we enjoy today. His answer demonstrates again the long-standing position of our party that he is in over his head.

Having met so many Canadians who have faced persecution abroad, I assure them that we will always stand up to promote and defend the values Canadians cherish, including democracy and freedom, not dictatorships.

Yet again, the Liberal leader's comments demonstrate that he is not fit to lead the greatest democracy in the world.

* * *

[Translation]

PASSPORT CANADA

Mr. Claude Patry (Jonquière—Alma, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government has slated the Jonquière passport office for elimination even though the office runs well, is familiar to people, and is ideally located in the centre of the region. People are taking action. They are asking Ottawa to keep the service near them. They have every reason to fear that the closure will have a negative impact.

Why does the government want to take the passport office away from the people of Jonquière? Will it instead commit to keeping these offices open?

[English]

Hon. Candice Bergen (Minister of State (Social Development), CPC): Canadians continue to benefit from the high quality of service they have always received from the passport program, now at Service Canada offices. There will be no staff reductions as a result of this change. Some of the changes that have occurred mean that there are Service Canada passport offices very close by. In fact, we have increased the number of offices in Canada where passport services are available so that more communities have passport services than ever before.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, two years ago, Mark Carney and I called for Alberta oil to flow to eastern Canada, but this is a good idea only if we require that the pipeline fuel Canadian jobs and energy security.

We export discounted crude while eastern Canada depends on expensive oil from Arabia and Venezuela.

Buy high, sell low, export jobs: a brilliant business plan. When will our Prime Minister stop shilling for U.S. oil interests?

● (1205)

Mrs. Kelly Block (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government welcomes the prospect of transporting Canadian crude oil from western Canada to consumers and refineries in eastern Canada, and ultimately, to new markets abroad.

We are encouraged by the Deloitte Touche study that predicts a high potential for construction and operating jobs and economic growth, particularly in Ontario, Quebec, and Atlantic Canada.

We will only allow energy projects to proceed if they are proven safe for Canadians after an independent, science-based environmental and regulatory review has taken place.

* * *

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, Cons. Ind.): Mr. Speaker, this week, the Saskatchewan legislature voted unanimously in support of abolishing the Senate. In his remarks, Premier Wall stated that reforming the Senate is no longer viewed as a viable option.

I want to be clear. I stand with the member for Beauce, as a matter of fact, in support of Saskatchewan's conclusion and feel it is time to give Canadians a say on the future of the Senate through a clear referendum question. While I understand the Constitution does not allow for abolition through referendum, it would provide support and inform the Supreme Court, provincial legislatures, and indeed, this Parliament if we did, in fact, proceed to a referendum.

Would the Minister of State for Democratic Reform indicate to the House whether he is considering such a move?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of State (Democratic Reform), CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, I congratulate both Premier Wall and that member for raising a very important issue. Canadians have waited almost a century and a half for the Senate to change. Unfortunately, it has been frozen in time since Confederation.

We continue to believe that the preferable option is democratic bicameralism, an elected Senate accountable to Canadians, representing the regions from coast to coast. We hope to make some incremental progress toward that goal in the coming weeks, but our position has also been that if the Senate does not change, is not reformed, then, like its provincial counterparts, it should vanish.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

The Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the annual reports on the Access to Information and the Privacy Acts of the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages for the year 2012-13.

[Translation]

This report is deemed permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

* * *

[English]

DRUG-FREE PRISONS ACT

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of the Environment, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-12, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

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

* * *

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Brad Trost (Saskatoon—Humboldt, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament, entitled “Quorum and Mandate of the Committee”.

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Lois Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development concerning the situation of Jewish refugees from Middle Eastern nations.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

• (1210)

PETITIONS

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

Mr. Bryan Hayes (Sault Ste. Marie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a certified petition calling on the Government of Canada to provide stronger control in the form of GPS tracking technology to trace the whereabouts of violent criminals who have been released into the general public.

A failure of policy allowed Andre Denny to be out, unsupervised, from the East Coast Forensic Hospital, which resulted in the tragic death of my constituent's brother, Mr. Raymond Taavel. May he rest in peace.

[Translation]

RESTRICTIONS ON NAVIGATION

Mr. Marc-André Morin (Laurentides—Labelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House six petitions signed by people in my riding and elsewhere in Canada. The petitioners are calling on the House to adopt my motion, Motion No. 441, which will be debated today. It aims to simplify the process for obtaining restrictions on navigation on lakes and waterways.

[English]

CLUSTER MUNITIONS

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise today to table a petition. The petition is signed by local residents who are urging the government to prohibit any Canadian from being involved with the use of cluster munitions anywhere in the world. I am pleased to table this petition. I look forward to the government's response.

NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR DEMENTIA

Mr. Brad Trost (Saskatoon—Humboldt, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting a petition on behalf of my constituents calling on the Minister of Health and the House of Commons to support an act respecting a national strategy for dementia.

[Translation]

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition to the House in support of Bill C-452 to combat human trafficking and sexual exploitation. Some people may be surprised to learn that the proceeds of crime related to human trafficking are estimated at \$32 billion a year. That is significant, which is why I would like to present this petition.

VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by people from across Canada, from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island, including Quebec, in support of my bill, Bill C-504, the support for volunteer firefighters act.

Government Orders

These people believe that my bill could help small communities get firefighters. It is very important that their voices be heard and that we help firefighters by passing my bill. That is why I am presenting this petition here today.

ANIMAL TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present to the House today.

The first was signed by people from across Quebec, from Montreal's north shore to neighbourhoods in Laval, including Saint-Vincent-de-Paul, Duvernay, Saint-François, Auteuil and Vimont. The petitioners are asking the government to strengthen Canada's animal transportation regulations.

ALVAREZ RIVERA FAMILY

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I would like to present today was signed by hundreds of Quebeckers who want the Minister of Public Safety to review the decision to deport members of the Alvarez Rivera family to their home country.

People are taking action on this. I would like to highlight the excellent work of students at Mont-de-La Salle school in Laval who created this petition, got people to sign it, and got thousands of Quebeckers to do something about the plight of the Alvarez Rivera family.

[English]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I bring forward today a petition regarding Lake Winnipeg that has been signed by residents of Winnipeg North and many other Manitobans. It deals with the issue of Lake Winnipeg being one of the largest freshwater lakes in the world. It was named "Threatened Lake of the Year" in 2013 by the Global Nature Fund.

The petition calls upon members of Parliament, in particular the Prime Minister, to take necessary action to ensure that Lake Winnipeg receives adequate, if not better, stewardship.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Dan Albas (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1215)

[Translation]

RESPECT FOR COMMUNITIES ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord.

First, I would like to go back to the legal aspects of this legislation. Bill C-2 creates so many legal complications that it is now virtually impossible for a safe injection site to meet all these obligations. Even if it did, the minister could still approve or reject the application.

I want to show that this really does not make sense. In fact, this is disguised legislation to convey the message that the government does not want such sites. However, instead of just saying so, the government prefers to make the legal obligations so complicated that none of these sites will be able to meet all of them. The hon. member for Gatineau demonstrated it very clearly in her speech.

I will restrict my comments to the legal aspects of this legislation. I am going to talk about what the safe injection sites do and about drug addiction.

First, we must understand that safe injection sites rely on an approach used by a number of health care professionals, namely the harm reduction approach.

Under this approach, we know that certain behaviours will be exhibited, even though we would prefer that they were not. Consequently, we deal with these behaviours as best we can to minimize their negative impact.

For example, in the case of sexually transmitted diseases, we realized that even if we told young people not to have sex, they still did. We then decided that since young people were still having sex, we would make condoms available in schools and ensure that young people had access to them. That is what this approach is based on.

It is the same with alcohol. If we tell people not to drink, it does not work. People will continue to consume alcohol. That approach is not effective. This is why we tell them that if they drink they should not drive, that they should drink moderately, or that they should have three or maybe four beers instead of a case of 24. We try to minimize the negative impact. We provide alcoholism treatment programs and support groups for those who need them. At least, we are not burying our heads in the sand and telling ourselves that since no one is taking action we are not going to do anything.

It is exactly the same with safe injection sites. We try to minimize the negative impact of this addiction. There are all sorts of consequences, including overdoses. People may die if they go too far. There is also the whole issue of blood-borne infections because people use dirty needles.

I should also mention that, unfortunately, some people who use these sites resort to prostitution to buy drugs. That is why we step in and hand out condoms. We try to minimize the harmful behaviour that may result from this lifestyle.

Safe injection sites prevent people from getting infections from dirty needles. For example, they prevent children from falling on needles in a park or a public area.

Safe injection sites also try to prevent other health problems. We are dealing with people whose hygiene is often a problem. If they go to a safe injection site, we can see whether they have an infection or the first symptoms of pneumonia, and we can encourage them to seek treatment. As for the rest, we can at least try to help these people live a healthier lifestyle.

In a safe injection site, we know that people will inject drugs anyway. Even if we try as hard as we can to prevent them from doing so, we know they will do it.

I searched high and low and, in my opinion, there is no strategy that is safer.

• (1220)

If we tell people to inject drugs at home, they might overdose without anyone around to help them. There are also some who will shoot up on the street. The discarded needles then become a problem because children can fall on them. Then there are people who will do it in apartments, in makeshift shooting galleries, where sanitary conditions are inadequate. I believe that a safe injection site is the best option.

Hon. members may not have noticed, but in hospitals, the yellow boxes containing discarded contaminated needles are locked. This may seem strange, but if they are not locked, people will steal them and use the contaminated needles to inject drugs. This happened to nurses whom I know. People just stole the boxes. Therefore, safe injection sites help prevent health problems that could be much more serious.

Moreover, it is not just in the big cities that people inject drugs. Unfortunately, this also happens in my area. I work with street nurses and I know that clean needles are handed out to prevent the spread of infection. Unfortunately, people are injecting drugs even in remote rural areas like Abitibi—Témiscamingue. We should not bury our heads in the sand when it comes to this issue.

I would also like people to understand that when people who inject drugs come into a safe injection site, the workers do not just show them where things are. An assessment can only be done when contact is made. Nurses assess them when they come in. This is what we always do, as nurses. We constantly assess people's health. It is something of an occupational hazard.

When people come in looking somewhat dishevelled, the nurses will ask questions to see whether those people have a place to sleep, for example. If they do not, workers will then be able to intervene. They will observe how their patients are doing and maybe even realize that they have some kind of untreated injury because they do not want to go to a hospital. There will be a health care intervention.

Government Orders

If the nurses observe increased confusion or symptoms of mental illness or depression, they will be able to intervene and advise the person. That only takes a few seconds. Experienced workers are able to notice these health problems rather quickly. They will talk with the person right away. If the patient has a persistent cough and has trouble breathing, then perhaps the nurse will realize that there is another health problem. If that person is getting a skin infection, someone will follow up.

This means that when people go there for injections, they get a regular health check-up, and a familiar nurse will be able to intervene quickly and provide advice. The individual may not listen to that advice, but at least action is being taken and no one is ignoring the problem. They detect risks and intervene socially, because there are risks associated with injecting drugs.

For example, if centre workers notice that overdoses are increasing in number, they will pass the message along to let people know that there could be drugs going around that may be impure or may be cut with dangerous products that are stronger than normal. They will caution people so that this information can get around. If some people who inject are also involved in prostitution and were in contact with violent or aggressive people, staff will be able to let others know to be careful, because other people have been attacked and they may be at risk.

These centres provide practical social intervention that cannot be found elsewhere. No one would truly rather have this happen in the street and to find someone who died from an overdose in the alley next to their home. That makes absolutely no sense. It should be done in a centre at the very least.

What is more, these centres can help in developing a trusting relationship with the individual.

• (1225)

That way, when an individual feels strong enough to quit doing drugs, someone at the centre can counsel them. Drug addicts will be much more likely to succeed in overcoming their addiction.

[*English*]

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated my colleague's speech and perspective on this issue, but I think, as a nurse, she has probably had many patients over the years who were absolutely desperate to get into detoxification services and rehabilitation services. To be quite frank, those services were not available. People who were ready to make changes in their lives were unable to get the help they needed.

As a nurse, how can the member support putting finances and funding into something when she has told many patients, "I'm sorry. I know you were looking for rehabilitation services and you would really like to have the opportunity to have a life free of drugs".

How can she support that position without having the money spent where people really need it, on those who are looking for true changes in their lives?

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Moore: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that there are services for people dealing with addiction. Up to this point, it has not been that difficult to access those services. The hard part is convincing people to go, especially by using a heavy-handed approach, saying that what they are doing is unacceptable. It would be better to tell them that what they are doing is dangerous and that we are there to help, to develop a relationship of trust. In the meantime, we do not want them to get sick or get AIDS because of their behaviour. When they are ready, they need to know that someone will be there to send them off to get help. The services are available. The hardest part is convincing people. If we judge them before trying to convince them to get help, it will often be completely ineffective and there will be no opportunity to develop a relationship of trust. The gentle nudge offered at safe injection sites to convince people to get help will not exist.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important to recognize that there are many communities across Canada that have different challenges. One of these challenges is trying to deal with the infrastructure of many social injustices, such as drug abuse, which leads to all sorts of elements of crime, let alone social factors that are not very positive.

We need to develop good solid programming that would build on making our communities that all of us live in safe. When we look at injection sites, particularly the one site we have in Canada, I believe there are studies that would demonstrate that the community as a whole has benefited, not to mention the individuals themselves who have benefited.

The member might want to provide further comment in terms of how the community as a whole does benefit, obviously knowing that the individual in question benefits as well.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Moore: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the community does benefit. There will be fewer needles and overdoses in the streets. There are tangible benefits for communities. There are smaller communities that will not necessarily have a supervised injection site. However, they have gradually implemented concrete measures. That was not the case 10 years ago. Today, street nurses carry with them materials needed for a safe injection and condoms. They will use these types of interventions in areas where the number of people struggling with this problem is not sufficient to establish a supervised injection site.

These public health measures are extremely effective. However, they have to be implemented together with different social measures as part of a comprehensive solution. It is not enough to have just supervised injection sites. We must address access to education, poverty and different social measures that will help these people to do better. It is a package. This measure has to be part of a set of measures that a responsible government, one that does not look the other way, should adopt in order to fight these kinds of problems.

• (1230)

Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to speak for 10 minutes to Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. Before prorogation, it also

went by the name of C-65, for those who have been following this matter, which has after all been in the public domain for some years.

In 2007, unfortunately, the Conservative government sought to close the only supervised injection site in Canada, InSite in Vancouver. At each stage in the legal process, the government faced defeat. The courts—both the appeal courts of British Columbia and the Supreme Court—stressed that these sites served a purpose in Canada and that they followed the guidelines available to users in this country.

I deplore the ideology behind this. In Canada, after all, we do have an anti-drug strategy, like many other governments, except that an incident occurred in 2007. Before the Conservative government came into power in 2006, we already had an anti-drug strategy with four pillars. It was based on prevention, treatment, enforcement and, fourth, harm reduction.

I say “had” because in 2007, the government updated its national anti-drug strategy, and it mysteriously rested on just three pillars. Harm reduction had disappeared. That is where ideology comes in, because the InSite supervised injection site in Vancouver was intended precisely to reduce harm.

It is therefore understandable that the Conservative government should endeavour to make such a change by all possible means, both legal and legislative. The matter went as far as the Supreme Court of Canada. The Supreme Court informed the government that it had lost its case on three occasions. Under the law, people have a right to access a supervised injection site. A little later in my speech, I will explain why such sites can be a good thing for the public.

Obviously, the government has turned around and used the last card it held: changing the law so that it becomes illegal and unacceptable to have such sites in Canada, without even considering the studies done over the years.

InSite has been in operation for many years. It is the first, and the one and only supervised injection site to have been set up in Canada. Its purpose is to research ways of helping addicts who have reached the end of the road and who, unfortunately, use drugs. These are not people who use drugs recreationally, but people who have, for a variety of reasons, reached a point in their lives where they really cannot stop. Such people should not be left to their own devices. They need help.

In the NDP, we are really going to ensure that no Canadian is left behind. I thank my colleague from Timmins—James Bay for sharing our belief that the people of Canada deserve a government that cares about Canadians, and not just about their Conservative Party buddies.

This is a thinly veiled attempt by the Conservative government to put an end to supervised injection sites across Canada. Vancouver is not the only city that wants one; Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa do as well. Other Canadian cities have looked at the same scientific studies as we have and have concluded that it is a part of Canada’s anti-drug strategy to provide assistance for people who—let us face it—may continue to use drugs.

My colleague from Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles was speaking earlier about apartment buildings she owns in upscale suburban neighbourhoods in Quebec City, where people were unfortunately shooting up in the alleyways.

● (1235)

They left their potentially contaminated paraphernalia in the alleys, near places frequented by young and not-so-young members of the public.

It is therefore burying our heads in the sand to believe that the solution is to close injection sites in Canada and that our streets will be safer and our neighbourhoods less dangerous for our children. That is not true. It has actually been demonstrated that if these people are not using drugs in supervised injection sites, they will do so anywhere, even in places that cause concern. I am referring, for example, to playgrounds in this country.

I do not wish to oversimplify either, but I am genuinely convinced that my Conservative colleagues would prefer to have heroin addicts using drugs in a supervised injection site, with nurses and social workers who can help them overcome their difficulties, rather than in neighbourhood parks where children play.

I said that there had been studies on the subject, and it is true. More than 30 peer-reviewed studies have been published in such journals as the *New England Journal of Medicine*, *The Lancet* and the *British Medical Journal*. The writers describe the benefits of InSite in Vancouver. Moreover, studies of more than 70 similar supervised injection sites in Europe and Australia report similar outcomes. InSite constitutes one of the most important public health breakthroughs in Canada. We believe that this site and other sites in Canada can generate similar benefits and should be allowed to provide services under appropriate supervision.

The word “supervision” is really important here. I will provide some explanation of how InSite operates. First, it is open seven days a week, from 10 in the morning to 4 in the afternoon. There are 12 injection stations. Users bring their own substances. People at home should not get the idea that the government pays for people’s drugs through InSite. On the other hand, staff members provide injection equipment. It is this that is so important, because we know that there are many health risks if users use the same needles or share them around. People in utter misery are not overly careful.

People can develop and transmit blood-borne infections. I am talking about diseases such as hepatitis and HIV. This is a huge burden on the Canadian health care system. However, the Conservative government decided to cut \$31 billion from health care transfers to the provinces. It will be harder and harder for the provinces to balance their health care budgets. Of course, it is even more difficult for the provinces to treat people with HIV or hepatitis A, B or C.

I really wonder whether the government has a heart. Where is its compassion? Does the idea of helping one’s neighbour still exist? Helping one’s neighbour should be a universal value, but perhaps the Conservative members prefer helping their neighbours only if their neighbours can help them back or only if they have never in their life made a mistake.

Government Orders

However, people do find themselves on the street, they become prostitutes or they use drugs, if not both. Some of them have had a difficult life. Sometimes, they were abandoned by their family or they experienced violence and sexual abuse in their childhood. It is no secret that adults take drugs, and it is not surprising that children take drugs. People who find themselves on the street join together, and unfortunately sometimes they fall into the hell of drug use. We must do more to help them.

The Conservative government thinks that it will solve the problem by closing supervised injection facilities in Canada. In fact, the reverse is true.

I am going to end on this note. I really think the government’s anti-drug strategy—a strategy I hope it will soon change—should include the fourth pillar I mentioned: harm reduction.

● (1240)

Prevention is important, but I would like to stress the fact that treatment is just as important. It is important to punish drug dealers, but when people are needy and destitute, they need help finding a way out. They need help, and this help can come from supervised injection sites.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to my hon. colleague and to the debate all this morning.

Twenty-five years ago, I was working on the streets of Toronto with the homeless men coming out of prison and dealing with issues of addiction. Twenty-five years later, my daughter is now doing similar work on the streets of Toronto. When we talk about what has changed, it is really dismal to see how conditions have actually become worse for people on the streets, thanks of course to actions such as the Harris government’s cutting of social housing and mental health services.

What my daughter tells me in terms of addiction is that the biggest costs they are facing right now are in the emergency wards, with people getting sick and people dying, as well as the heavy cost of police, who actually have become the front-line social workers in many situations. When we talk to the police on the ground on inner-city Toronto, they are saying that it is a complete waste of their resources.

My Conservative colleagues are always talking about being tough on crime, but the real dangers of crime that we see in the inner cities are desperate addicts. It is the same even in smaller communities, where people who are not on methadone and are not able to have safe injection become dangerous criminals. Then the police and the emergency services are the ones who have to deal with these very sad cases.

I would ask my hon. colleague this question: why would the Conservatives once again choose a dumb-down approach when very straightforward systems that work with health care and police have been proven time and again to be effective?

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Dany Morin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my NDP colleague for his question, and I congratulate him on his understanding of the issue.

Many studies have shown that supervised injection facilities were good for the public, that they improved public safety and that they were less costly for taxpayers, who must pay for hospitals and emergency centres. Taxpayers also pay the salaries of police officers.

To explain how much these facilities help people, I will say that in one year, 2,171 InSite users were referred to addictions counselling and other support services in order to get off drugs. Those who used InSite at least weekly were 1.7 times more likely to enrol in a detox program than those who visited only rarely.

These statistics show that this kind of facility can help people get off drugs and become productive members of society.

[English]

Mr. Dan Albas (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have been to Vancouver several times over the past few years, and I have looked into this issue. Has the member actually ever been to Vancouver and seen the people on Hastings and seen whether the policy he is espousing in this House matches the reality that is on the ground?

The member has mentioned that we need to look at these holistically. He is accusing the government of not looking into such issues as homelessness. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Working with the Government of British Columbia, we have together supplied more affordable housing in the Lower Mainland than any other government, particularly the NDP government that made cuts to a number of different areas. We have also helped support the provinces with record-high amounts of transfers, both in social transfers and in health transfers.

All of these things this member has opposed. After all of these investments, he continues to accuse us of not being compassionate. That is how we get things done in this country. It is not by saying things that are not true in this House, but by getting real things done.

I would like the member to comment on those matters.

●(1245)

[Translation]

Mr. Dany Morin: Mr. Speaker, the question from my Conservative colleague goes to show how arrogant the government is. He assumes that I have never been to Vancouver, whereas in fact I have been there several times. In Chinatown, there are people on the street who are clearly living in poverty.

The Conservative government boasts about helping the Canadian provinces and fighting homelessness and poverty, but it is not true. The Conservative government slashed the homelessness partnering strategy, the HPS, which benefited Quebec. This is a government that likes to talk the talk but seldom walks the walk on these important issues.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Malpeque.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Here comes intelligence.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a little heckling on the other side. We were having a little discussion across the aisle, but it is a friendly discussion.

I really did not intend to speak on Bill C-2, because it will in fact go to the public safety committee, of which I am a member, and which I very seriously think that it is the wrong committee for the bill to go to. It should be going to the health committee.

However, what encouraged me to speak on the bill before it gets to committee was something I heard while driving in yesterday morning. There was quite an extensive interview on CBC's *Ottawa Morning* by Robyn Bresnahan with Dr. Gabor Maté, if I am pronouncing that name correctly. At some point in my remarks, I want to quote some of the information that Dr. Maté presented, because he works at InSite and presents some very good evidence that we should be considering as a committee and in the House in our discussion of this bill.

I might say as background, because it came up in earlier discussions and questions when people asked if they have ever been to InSite in Vancouver or to the Downtown Eastside or Hastings, that I have been there a number of times, some of those times as Solicitor General.

I have said a few times that my initial impression was what a loss of humanity, to a great extent. I can remember driving up a back alley one night in a marked police car when we saw a young woman—whose age I could not tell, but I suspect she was around 18 to 25—sitting on a step with a needle in her arm. It was not necessarily a clean needle. That shocked me. We stopped and talked to her. We were not there to arrest her at the time; I was doing an oversight of that particular area.

I will admit that when I first visited the safe injection site, I did have mixed opinions, because on the one hand, there we were, giving and injecting illegal drugs, and maybe that really does not click rightly with our psyche.

However, when we look at the results, we very quickly start to change our opinion. When we talk to some of those people and actually sit down and have a sensible discussion, rather than completely judging them for what they are doing and how they got into these illegal drugs and got addicted, and when we learn something of their backgrounds—whether they got into prostitution, were on the street, were in abusive families, or whatever it might have been—we can restrict our judgment somewhat and look at what InSite is doing for them in giving them their lives back to a great extent and, I think, providing much better public safety for the community.

That is important. There are fewer needles, and they are using safe needles. They are using proper sanitary conditions. It is proven that there is less HIV as a result. There are a whole lot of health benefits as a result of the injection sites, and we have to look at the evidence.

Government Orders

●(1250)

I will admit that when I went to InSite initially—and I was one of the ones involved in the decision to do it—one of my first questions was “Why would we do this?” I mean, it just goes against the grain to see illegal drugs injected. However, when we look right through to the end, we realize there are benefits to the individuals, benefits to the public, and benefits to health and safety as a whole.

That is what we should be looking at. This is more a health issue than a public safety issue, although I will admit it is both, but from both perspectives, whether we are talking about health or public safety, Bill C-2, as introduced by the Minister of Health, is a very bad and very dangerous bill. If passed, it will hurt public safety. It will injure health and will end up increasing crime.

The government has an agenda of being tough on crime, but I maintain that the net result of this particular bill 10 years down the road will show very clearly that it was a bad bill and the wrong direction to go.

As a party, we support evidence-based policies that reduce harm and protect public safety. That is what InSite was proven to do.

To give a little more background, the bill really flows from a 2011 Supreme Court ruling that declared the Minister of Health's 2008 decision not to grant an extension of the exemption of subsection 56 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, which had allowed Vancouver's safe consumption site to operate since September 2003, had violated section 7 of charter rights.

That section says:

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

Determining whether there has been a breach of section 7 involves a two-part analysis for the courts. In considering potential section 7 violations, they must ask two questions: whether there is deprivation of the right to life, liberty, or security of the person, and if so, whether that deprivation is in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

The Supreme Court found that both conditions had been met. Therefore, the Supreme Court ordered that the minister grant an exemption to InSite under subsection 56 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. That is partly why we are here today.

The Supreme Court further explained that the Controlled Drugs and Substances Acts has a dual purpose, public health and public safety, and that the minister should strike an appropriate balance between the two. Therefore, here we are with Bill C-2, and I submit that the bill does not strike the appropriate balance. In fact, Bill C-2 goes far beyond what the Supreme Court ruled in terms of factors to be considered when granting an exception. That is why we are somewhat faced with a dilemma.

I will first go to what provoked me to speak on this issue. That was the interview I heard on the radio, which I think is very good documentation that should be on the record in the House.

●(1255)

To back up, the arguments made by Dr. Gabor Maté were as a result of an interview with Robyn Bresnahan yesterday morning on CBC. I will quote from the transcript. Dr. Maté, when asked a question about where we are at as a country on addictions, and our treatment of addictions, said:

It's better than some countries in the world, but in terms of science, in terms of human compassion, in terms of what we know about addiction, it's very backward.

He means our policy. He went on to say:

Because it [meaning Canada] sees addiction either as a matter of choice that needs to be punished, and so we have increasingly draconian laws against people that use substances despite all the international evidence that that approach simply does not work.

Or it sees addiction simply as a primary brain disease, as if there was some genetic reason why people become addicted. The reality is that people are becoming addicted because they were traumatized and hurt in childhood. And that early trauma and that early emotional loss in childhood shapes the personality in such a way as to create low self-esteem and shapes the brain's physiology in such ways as to make that person susceptible to substances.

And so neither our treatment, nor our legal approaches take into account the impact of trauma and emotional loss and their effect on brain physiology.

He makes the argument about why some people are addicted. When asked a question about the work he has done in lower eastside Vancouver, he was asked if he could give an example of what we are talking about here. He answered as follows:

Yes, and I worked for 12 years in Vancouver's downtown east side, including at the supervised injection site which our current government tried to shut down. In 12 years of work, I did not meet a single female patient who had not been sexually abused as a child.

He went on to make the argument of how some people turn to drugs to either overcome trauma or stress, or whatever. I am quoting him because we should be careful, in all instances, not to judge people and say they clearly had a choice. People say yes or no, but there are reasons that these things happen in some people's lives, and that is a sad thing.

Further on in the interview, and this is where he turns to evidence on the value of InSite, he talks to people about drug injection sites. He said:

I get emails, hundreds of them, thanking me for this perspective.

The only sense I'm yelling into the wind is when it comes to policy. The people higher up seem not to understand these things. They don't want to seem to hear them. And one example of that of course is what's happening currently with the government's withdrawal of Health Canada's decision that would allow Vancouver physicians to prescribe heroin to a small number of patients.

What I'm saying is that there's tremendous appreciation...for this perspective.

He means that InSites are valuable, but not from the people who make the policies. He is saying that people on the ground, people who work with these individuals on a daily basis, know that it helps these individuals and that it is good for public safety. That is evidence. We need to be looking in this discussion at the evidence, not at the ideology. He went on to say:

Well, we do our best to articulate a scientific, evidence based perspective and my only wish is that as a physician, if I'm expected to practice evidence based medicine, so should the politicians be expected to practise evidence based politics.

●(1300)

The evidence internationally does not favour what is currently happening in this country by going against the InSites.

Government Orders

The last point I would make from that interview is what he said about the supervised injection site itself. He said:

But supervised injection sites don't promote addiction. They simply reduce the harm. It makes a lot more sense to use sterile water than puddle water from the back alleys. It makes a lot of sense to use clean needles rather than share them, dirty ones, and transmit HIV. So that the evidence from Vancouver, evidence in dozens of studies now is that there's less disease transmission, better health, more movement into treatment facilities, much less cost to society, every piece of evidence point to benefit and no evidence point to any kind of harm.

Listening to that interview yesterday morning, I thought it was the picture for Bill C-2. That person has spent more than a decade working in that environment and has seen the benefits of injection sites. Bill C-2 turns us away from the potential to give people the opportunity to get their lives back.

These sites protect others in the area, and society in general. They have controlled injections, and there are less dirty needles and less HIV.

My colleague from Vancouver Quadra made the argument the other day about less disease. She pointed out, as we all know in this House, that this site is supported by the province. It is supported by the police authority. Why, then, is the government in this Ottawa bubble, in this town of seeming ideology these days, looking to shut it down and move backward?

I firmly believe that this is an ideological bill, from a government that seems to oppose evidence-based harm reduction measures such as safe injection sites. We certainly believe that safe injection sites should not just be in isolation. They should be part of an evidence-based national drug policy that saves lives, reduces harm and promotes public health.

There is more that needs to be added. When I was in Downtown Eastside Vancouver, there were drug courts, I believe they were called at the time. They have a purpose too. Instead of being sentenced to prison, the addict agrees to certain conditions set down by the court, and if they meet those conditions, they do not end up in prison and they can regain their lives. We need a broader national strategy than just safe injection sites.

I submit that the results of the bill would increase crime, not lessen it. It would damage health care to others in society, take away the opportunity for the people who use those injection sites to be better citizens and contributors to the economy of the country, and lead them to more crime.

I believe the bill would lead to more dangerous streets, greater costs in hospitals, and a tremendous increase in the loss of human dignity. The bill is clearly the wrong way to go.

•(1305)

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a few points that the member perhaps did not address very well.

As someone who was formerly involved in local politics, decisions around what goes in neighbourhood zoning is very important to those communities. The ability for a community to have some say in terms of what is located where is a critical measure. I am wondering why, for one, he does not believe that communities should have the ability to have input into these decisions.

I have a second point that I would really like the member to focus in on. One of the rationales is that this is going to allow people to move through into treatment. From my experience, there are many people who want to deal with the difficult demons of their addictions and their rehabilitation. There are not enough services. There is not enough support.

On the opportunity in terms of increased detox, increased rehabilitation, why is the member not really focusing on the people who are desperate, struggling to get off drugs, and do not have programs and services available to them?

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, they are not going to get those programs and services from the current government. The government is taking them all away.

This is a government that believes in punishment. That is what is wrong with this particular bill. It is what is wrong with the government's tough on crime approach in Canada. It is going to lead to greater crime 10 years down the road. There is no question about it.

Let me come back to the member's point on communities. Of course communities will make the decision about where these sites go. When it is being done on evidenced-based policies, then the community should see the full information and it would be up to the community to decide.

It should not be for us on this ground to order what the community should do. The community should have the choice and the opinion to make those decisions. What the government is doing with the bill is taking that opportunity to assist people away. It should be giving those opportunities to people and doing it in a way that would have the support of the community.

The municipality in Vancouver, the police services in Vancouver and the province of B.C. support the policy of InSite in Vancouver. The government would take it away.

•(1310)

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member for Malpeque gave a very informed speech, with a just emphasis on the real evidence about the impacts of safe injection sites, not the fears the government is trying to create around safe injection sites with the bill.

I wonder if he shares with me the sense of irony that the government, which claims to be against bureaucracy and red tape, is actually using bureaucracy and red tape in the bill to prevent the establishment of any additional safe injection sites in communities around the country; communities like mine where 18 people a year are dying from overdoses, and where we might be able to get them into treatment programs if we had such a facility.

The bill sets out 26 criteria and then at the end it says that even if they have met the criteria, the minister does not have to grant the permit.

Government Orders

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, the member's question shows that there is no question the government is talking red tape and that it is really a government of absolute contradiction. It says one thing and does another.

First, the very essence of the bill, from a to z, is more about punishment than support. Second, it is a series of restrictions that make it near impossible to implement those strategies in some other areas where they maybe could be implemented. Clearly, the member is correct. The bill sets up a regulatory regime that is pretty near impossible to master, if we want to do the correct human thing in terms of establishing other InSite locations to help other people.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, years ago, an addictions expert told me that being addicted to something means that a person pretty much has no freedom. It is the antithesis of being free, because one is addicted. Right now, in Canadian society, people are watching on television the goings-on and the playing out of a very troubled situation in Toronto, where there is a mayor who is clearly dealing with a very serious challenge with substance abuse.

Canadians know about substance abuse. They know about the difficulties around addiction. However, I want to ask my colleague a question about health care costs.

He talked about the Supreme Court saying that it is a balance between public health and public safety.

In the city of Ottawa several years ago, there was a meaningful debate about an InSite injection site. At that time, the public health officer informed the citizenry that it costs between \$600,000 and \$1 million in health care costs to treat one HIV patient. That is one HIV patient. That does not count the millions of dollars in costs from hepatitis C infections and beyond.

I would have thought that a fiscally Conservative regime like the one across the floor would be weighing heavily the implications of health care costs, with scarce dollars being allocated to our health care system. I am wondering if my colleague can comment on the fact that the Conservative government is not even mentioning the health care costs that can be held in abeyance and prevented if we actually take a more public health approach to this than simply pounding people on the head saying that this is all about crime and then locking people up.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the numbers are startling. It is \$600,000 to \$1 million to treat one patient with HIV. Clearly what these InSite injection sites do, which I said in my remarks, is prevent the use of dirty needles and an increased incidence of HIV.

I will quote a member who spoke about HIV the other day, the member for Vancouver Centre, a doctor, who has a lot of knowledge in this particular area. She said:

I just wanted to talk about HIV for a second. I wanted to paint a picture of what was then and why people felt it was essential to move forward on this issue. In 1989, there were 120 new cases out of 100,000 in Canada. After InSite, in Vancouver alone, this had dropped to 31. In the rest of Canada, the number of new cases remained the same.

The point is that the evidence is there if we want to look for it. We have to look for it. The government has a tendency to avoid the evidence. The evidence is there. Look at the economic savings to Canada, to say nothing of the potential for a better human

experience. The economic savings alone as a result of reducing HIV and other health costs are tremendous.

● (1315)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if I were to say that there is a system we can use to reduce the number of deaths and communicable diseases in a community, to reduce health care costs and drug use in public places, people would say that is absolutely fantastic and we should do it right away. Tomorrow, even.

Well, there is such a system. There is something that can achieve all of those goals: supervised injection sites like those found around the world, including the well-known InSite in Vancouver.

The bill we are debating today would stop that from happening. It would stop us from reducing the number of deaths, the incidence of communicable disease, health care costs, crime and drug use in public places. That is it in a nutshell. Nobody is asking about the real purpose of the bill, which is to shut down InSite and prevent similar sites from opening.

I am having a very hard time understanding what the Conservatives want. Do they want more sick people, more hepatitis and AIDS cases in our communities? Do they want more crime? Is that really what they want?

People in my riding, Laurier—Sainte-Marie, want fewer sick people, less crime and fewer problems. My riding certainly has drug use issues, but we also have a range of solutions. People working for CACTUS, L'Anonyme, the CSSS network and EMRI have great initiative. However, if we can do more, in consultation with the community, to prevent death, crime and disease, we should do more.

Consider drug use in public places. In Laurier—Sainte-Marie, I have picked up needles lying in the streets, needles that kids could have played with. Do we not want to try to avoid that kind of thing? I do not understand. I am not the only one who thinks that these sites deserve a strictly regulated place in Canada; the Supreme Court thinks so too.

Let us consider the facts. This all started in 2008 when InSite's exemption under section 56 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act expired.

The InSite exemption expired, and the Minister of Health denied the organization's renewal request. The case obviously went to court. It first went to the Supreme Court of British Columbia, which ruled that InSite should receive a renewed exemption. The Conservative government of course did not agree. It appealed, and the case went to the British Columbia Court of Appeal, which ruled that InSite should remain open.

The case then ended up before the Supreme Court of Canada, which ruled that the minister's decision to shut down InSite violated the rights of its clients as guaranteed under the charter. This is what the court had to say about the decision:

It is arbitrary, undermining the very purposes of the *CDSA*, which include public health and safety."

Government Orders

I think that is rather clear and no one can claim that it was a partisan decision. The court based its decision on section 7 of the charter, which states that everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person, and that an individual can only be deprived of those rights in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

• (1320)

The court also declared that:

The infringement at stake is serious; it threatens the health, indeed the lives, of the claimants and others like them. The grave consequences that might result from a lapse in the current constitutional exemption for InSite cannot be ignored. These claimants would be cast back into the application process they have tried and failed at, and made to await the minister's decision...

The Supreme Court determined that InSite and other supervised injection sites must be granted the exemption provided for in section 56, since the opening of such sites will:

decrease the risk of death and disease, and there is little or no evidence that it will have a negative impact on public safety...

I raise this point because people often express concerns whereby opening such a site will have an impact on public safety. Studies and previous experiences in Canada and elsewhere have shown that there is no negative impact on public safety. In some cases, it even has a positive impact on public safety, by reducing, as I was saying, the injection of drugs in public, the violence sometimes associated with drug use and the discarded drug paraphernalia associated with illegal drug use.

The Supreme Court of Canada was very clear, as were the B.C. Supreme Court and the B.C. Court of Appeal. Obviously, the Conservatives decided they wanted to circumvent the Supreme Court decision with this new bill. The Conservatives claim to like the rule of law, but they are not really willing to respect it when it does not agree with their ideology. This has nothing to do with facts and reality, it really is a matter of ideology. They do not have any justification to refuse to allow other sites to open or InSite to continue operating.

The Supreme Court was clear. If a site can cause harm to a community, it can be banned. That is official. However, this harm must be demonstrated and not just a product of unfounded fears. This is true and I will say it again, people are sometimes afraid. However, we should look at Vancouver and examine what is happening around InSite. Fully 80% of the people who live and work in the area around InSite support the project. This is quite impressive. We see the same numbers when we look at what is being done in Europe. People who live in the neighbourhoods of these projects and who can see the results show overwhelming support for this type of initiative. Obviously there must be a balance between health and public safety, but we can have both at the same time.

I quoted the Supreme Court of Canada quite often. Indeed, I think it very often hands down very carefully reasoned decisions. It is still our Supreme Court. The judges spend considerable time analyzing the issues and thinking them through.

However, the Supreme Court is not the only party defending the usefulness of safe injection sites. The Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian Nurses Association have both criticized the government for introducing Bill C-2.

According to the Canadian Medical Association:

Supervised injection programs are an important harm reduction strategy. Harm reduction is a central pillar in a comprehensive public health approach to disease prevention and health promotion.

The Canadian Nurses Association had this to say:

• (1325)

Evidence demonstrates that supervised injection sites and other harm reduction programs bring critical health and social services to vulnerable populations—especially those experiencing poverty, mental illness and homelessness...A government truly committed to public health and safety would work to enhance access to prevention and treatment services—instead of building more barriers.

As you can see, all this bill does is create obstacles.

At new supervised injection sites, preparing an application will be such a cumbersome process that it may dissuade applicants from even opening a file. Department officials told us that if an applicant mistakenly forgets to include something, the application could be automatically denied. Even if an applicant manages to obtain all of the documents needed for the application, if the application is perfect, iron-clad from start to finish and has the community's full support, the minister always has the option of arbitrarily denying it.

The NDP feels that decisions about programs that could benefit public safety should be based on fact and not ideology. That is why I will be voting against this bill.

Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the NDP very much for her wonderful speech. I know that she represents a constituency in Montreal. In fact, Montreal is one Canadian city that could be interested in a supervised injection site, along with Toronto and Ottawa.

Could the hon. member tell us how badly communities and people in the field would be hit if the Conservative government succeeds in passing this bill? Indeed, the bill aims not only to destroy any chances of survival for the site in Vancouver, but also to keep other sites from opening across the country, even though research has shown that these sites have a positive impact on communities.

Ms. Hélène Laverdière: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his question.

Indeed, I met with many people. Most were from community organizations, but others came from all levels of the public sector. They discussed this issue, talked about the bill and expressed many concerns.

The Deputy Speaker: There will be about eight minutes left for questions and comments when we resume debate on Bill C-2.

[English]

It being 1:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

•(1330)

[*Translation*]

NAVIGATION RESTRICTIONS

Mr. Marc-André Morin (Laurentides—Labelle, NDP) moved:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should, following consultations with provinces, territories, municipalities and First Nations, carry out a review of the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations with the objective of facilitating and accelerating the process allowing local administrations to request restrictions regarding the use of vessels on certain waters in order to improve how waters are managed, public safety and the protection of the environment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to move Motion No. 441, which aims to carry out a review of the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations.

At present, there is nothing to limit the right to navigate on our lakes. Motion No. 441 calls on the federal government to review the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations in order to provide municipalities with a faster, more predictable, more effective tool to manage bodies of water located in their territory, whether to improve how waters are managed, or enhance public safety and the protection of the environment.

This motion is very important for rural communities across Canada, especially those located beside a lake. In my riding, Laurentides—Labelle, and elsewhere, municipalities come up against considerable challenges when they try to manage their bodies of water better. The municipalities are close to their citizens and are well positioned to act on their behalf. That is why we believe that the current process needs to be streamlined, so that communities can have the tools they need to improve how waters are managed, and enhance public safety and the protection of the environment.

I hope that my colleagues will support this motion. This need not be a partisan issue. This would really have a positive impact on all Canadian municipalities. At first glance, Motion No. 441 might seem complex, so allow me to explain it in greater detail.

As we know, the Constitution Act, 1867 gives Parliament the power to legislate on matters related to navigation. Although the provinces have jurisdiction over riverbanks and shorelines, the federal government has exclusive jurisdiction over shipping and recreational boating.

Under the 2008 Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations, whose enabling legislation is the Canada Shipping Act, it is possible to set out and enforce restrictions on boating on a waterway. The regulations allow for a series of restrictions to be enforced, to be listed in one of its schedules. For instance, there are restrictions on power-driven or electrical propulsion vessels, speed limits on entire waterways or at least limits to the size of motors, as well as guidelines for water skiing activities.

Under section 4 of the regulations, a municipality can, through the provincial government, ask the federal government to designate a body of water and add restrictions. To do so, local authorities must comply with the procedure established by Transport Canada in the Local Authorities' Guide to Boating Restriction Regulations. The

Private Members' Business

problem is that the process described in the guide is extremely long, complex and costly.

The process is explained in a 20-page document. It requires local authorities to follow a complicated process that involves, among other things, holding a three-step public consultation, exploring non-regulatory alternatives and applying for a restriction on the body of water in question, as well as a complex review process that meets government requirements.

A number of Canadian municipalities, and also environmental groups and experts in the field, have expressed their displeasure with this process. They say that the slowness of Transport Canada's process and the guide's requirements make it very difficult, if not impossible, to request boating restrictions. These requirements include a wide range of stakeholders who must be consulted, as well as a detailed review of all the alternatives. This means that regulations can only be a last resort.

According to the Regroupement des associations pour la protection des lacs et cours d'eau des Hautes-Laurentides, several municipalities became discouraged and gave up before the end of the process.

•(1335)

In speaking with various stakeholders, I learned that in many cases municipalities just decided to withdraw from this administrative process.

In some cases, the battle lasted for years. For example, let us take the application for restrictions on power boats in the Columbia River wetlands in British Columbia. The efforts to restrict navigation have been going on for close to 15 years. Following a judicial process undertaken in 1998, an official application for an administrative restriction was submitted in 2002. To this day, only two of the three sections of the Columbia River have been regulated. It is unthinkable. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Ellen Zimmerman and the whole Wildsight team for their hard work.

In my riding of Laurentides—Labelle, municipalities such as Nominigüe have been preparing such an application for three years. The length and complexity of the process may have got the better of waterfront property owners. They wonder how boats with 350-horsepower engines can be allowed on a 0.85 km² lake.

Given such a void, municipalities are turning to voluntary codes of ethics to better control boating activities on their lakes. While we support such codes, they rely solely on the people's goodwill. Since these codes do not have force of law, anyone can ignore them and invoke his right to navigate.

We believe that a review of the regulatory process and resources allocated to its management could, in the short term, help municipalities better control the use of motorized vessels on bodies of water. Streamlining the process for enforcing the regulations would improve how waters are managed, the protection of the environment, and public safety and resolve many local disputes over the use of lakes and waterways. Motion No. 441 proposes such a review. A proper review must necessarily be conducted in consultation with the provinces, territories, municipalities and first nations. The use of existing legislation and regulations prevents jurisdictional disputes.

Private Members' Business

It is important to note that the idea is not to prevent pleasure boating. On the contrary, I am an avid fisherman and could not do without my time on the water. However, I firmly believe that, in order to retain this right to navigation, it is vital that waterways be properly managed by local communities. After all, they are the ones who have to put up with the inconveniences.

In my many discussions with various stakeholders, three main aspects came up over and over again: social peace through better municipal control, greater environmental protection and less red tape. I will quickly explain these three points.

As stated in the summary of the regulatory impact analysis, in 2008, the increase in waterway activity led to an increase in disputes between waterway users. Local administrations reacted by asking for restrictions on navigation.

However, since the entry into force of the regulations, municipalities have faced the same problems. The 2008 regulations, in their current form, are inadequate. I have too often witnessed situations where poor waterway management has created conflict among constituents in my riding.

We believe that municipalities should have easier access to a measure that exists only in theory. They know the people in their municipalities and are well positioned to ensure social peace.

This motion is also important because it will allow municipalities to better protect the environment. I do not feel the need to explain why power-driven vessels can be harmful to the environment if they are not appropriate for the type of lake on which they navigate.

• (1340)

On some of the more fragile lakes, larger vessels can cause significant shoreline erosion, increase the presence of algae and aquatic plants and cause premature aging.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that the current process needs to be simplified. Since the government claims to advocate decentralization and says it wants to cut red tape from the federal regulatory system, it seems to me that this would be a good place to do that. The Conservatives have decimated so many laws that I have lost track. Why not streamline the process in an area where cutting red tape would actually benefit people?

The current regulatory framework shows that the system is slow and inefficient. It is about time we changed how it works.

I could go on for quite some time about the advantages of this motion, but I would like to share some of the feedback we have received over the past few months. All of my colleagues should support Motion No. 441.

Over 40 municipalities have each indicated their support for this motion. Several watershed committees and associations have expressed an interest in being involved in or represented during future consultations about this issue.

The Fédération québécoise des municipalités has gone even further than our motion does. It passed a resolution stating that the provinces and/or the municipalities should have the power to set navigation standards and rules.

Moreover, the Regroupement des organismes de bassins versants du Québec, a coalition of watershed associations across the province, supports the approach suggested in the motion as a way of better managing vessel restrictions on the bodies of water they deal with.

In addition, the Quebec chapter of the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society applauded the motion, which they say is a simple and practical solution for managing waterways, particularly for smaller communities that do not have the resources to handle the current approach.

Renaissance Brome Lake, a local watershed committee, considers this initiative to be critical to the protection and appropriate use of waterways.

In closing, I would like to say that we should support Motion No. 441 because it is critical to faster, more predictable, more efficient management of waterways from a waterway management, public safety and environmental protection perspective, not to mention for social harmony.

That is why I am asking my colleagues to support Motion No. 441.

[*English*]

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague, the hard-working member for Laurentides—Labelle, for his very thoughtful presentation today. I know him to be an avid boater, an avid fisherman. He is bringing this forward, I think he said for several reasons: social peace, more empowerment to the community, the environment and cutting red tape.

I would like to ask the member to explain a bit further the current problem for a municipality in getting such a matter through, under the current regulation. How does it work?

• (1345)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc-André Morin: I will do him one better, Mr. Speaker. All the requirements to amend the regulations are set out in the 20-page guide.

The process can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, and some of the smaller municipalities do not have that kind of money. The process can be drawn out over several years, as in the examples I cited.

This is a virtual right. We are used to the Conservatives granting virtual rights.

In the real world, it is impossible to exercise. Discouragement sets in before the process even begins.

[*English*]

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the process, so that we are clear, the member has referred to two things. One is regulations, and of course the other is a guidebook explaining the pathway to regulations. At times, it seemed as though they were used interchangeably, but I think we have to keep them separate here.

The way the process essentially works is that co-operation is encouraged among the municipality and its stakeholders to try to come to some agreement on this before the municipality then triggers an ask of Transport Canada and a very formal rule-making process that is standard for regulations across government.

I do not think that the member is suggesting we change the rule-making process to actually make the regulation. Where is he suggesting that the process be simplified? Is it that we should not ask the municipalities to work in a co-operative way first to try to resolve this? I am looking for some clear guidance or some suggestions on where the member thinks that this should be streamlined.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc-André Morin: In fact, Mr. Speaker, the issue is with the spirit of the regulations.

In order to amend the regulations, the applying municipality must prove beyond any doubt that all other options have been attempted. That implies consulting dozens of stakeholders. It would also require tremendous resources. A town of 1,500 people cannot undertake willy-nilly a process that could take years. It would need to retain legal counsel, which is resource-intensive. Worse still, the solutions it would find would never have any legal value. If the vast majority of people who live by a lake agree to impose a restriction, a single person can disobey the order and ride his 300-horsepower motorboat on a lake no bigger than this chamber. That is the problem. The process is too cumbersome and needs to be simplified. I am not saying it should be trivialized, but simplified in a way that communities would have a real chance of using that piece of legislation that already exists and that has already been used in hundreds of cases all across Canada, including some involving lakes in my own riding.

[*English*]

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to explain our government's position on Motion No. 441. As members know, this motion was moved by the hon. member for Laurentides—Labelle, who has suggested that the process for restricting the use of recreational boats should be changed.

The hon. member has proposed that the government review the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations to streamline the process and make it easier for local administrations to request restrictions on the use of vessels in certain waters.

Our government believes the process that is currently in place under these regulations needs no review. It is the result of consultation with Canadians and was designed specifically to provide an effective response to the legitimate needs of local communities.

This process has worked successfully for many years. Since 2008, it has been required under the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations, which falls under the authority of Transport Canada. Before that, it was covered by the boating restriction regulations, for which the Canadian Coast Guard was responsible.

I would like to outline the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations process for the House to explain how it works and why it is effective. First I want to make clear that navigation is an

Private Members' Business

exclusively federal responsibility under the Constitution Act, 1867. As a result, only the federal government can regulate it.

This was upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada in a 2010 decision. In Quebec, the municipality of St-Adolphe-d'Howard enacted a bylaw prohibiting access by non-residents to local jetties, but the court overturned it on the grounds that the municipality did not have the legal authority to set its own rules.

However, under the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations, any level of government, whether municipal, provincial or territorial, can ask Transport Canada to impose restrictions on the use of boats in a particular body of water. These restrictions may be requested to increase safety or to protect the marine environment. They may also be proposed in the public interest, for example, to reduce noise.

Restrictions may prohibit all boats from accessing a given waterway, or they may limit access only by certain kinds of vessels, such as those with a specified engine power or type of propulsion. The regulations make it possible to impose speed limits, restrict certain activities such as water skiing, or prohibit events like regattas.

These restrictions may apply at all times or be specific to certain times of the day, week, month or year. They may apply to an entire waterway or only part of it. That is flexibility. This flexibility allows local authorities to request restrictions that are fair and that accommodate boaters while also acknowledging the rights of other community members.

At the same time, imposing restrictions in this way should be a last resort. No one wants to be subject to regulatory requirements that can be made arbitrarily or without sufficient input from those who would be directly affected by them. The government would never consider making restrictions in that way.

For this reason, a requesting authority must demonstrate to Transport Canada that reasonable efforts have been made to work with communities to resolve any conflicts around use of the waterway in question. For example, alternative approaches must have been tried and documented. These include enforcing provisions of existing acts or regulations, as well as educating boaters and others through outreach about the effects of their activities.

This can be achieved, for example, by posting notices at waterway access points, organizing public meetings, contacting local associations to ask them to inform their members, conducting a flyer campaign, or appearing on local radio or television shows. These are inexpensive but effective means of reaching people in the community.

The authority should also show that all appropriate stakeholders have been consulted and have had the opportunity to make their views known. It is important to demonstrate that stakeholders have come to a consensus on what the best solution actually is and that this can be achieved only through a regulatory amendment.

Private Members' Business

Transport Canada offers assistance to local administrations that are considering how to address issues relating to recreational boating. Communities can also consult the local authorities' guide, which is available from the department.

• (1350)

What are some of the other legal considerations? If the requesting authorities are able to demonstrate a clear need for a restriction and can also show that all other possibilities have been exhausted, they can apply to Transport Canada for a regulatory amendment, something, by the way, that does not cost them anything.

As members of the House are already aware, there is a legal process in place for amending regulations. That process is guided by the Statutory Instruments Act and by the "Cabinet Directive on Regulatory Management". It applies to any proposed amendment to the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations, just as it applies to proposals to make any other regulations.

These instruments require a review of proposed regulations to ensure that they do not conflict with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms or with the Canadian Bill of Rights. They must not exceed the legal authority under which they are proposed.

Additionally, the impact of any proposed regulation must be adequately assessed, including a quantitative and qualitative analysis of expected costs and benefits, before cabinet considers the matter. The cabinet directive also requires that, where appropriate, first nation, Metis, and Inuit peoples are to be consulted.

This review of the legal and social impacts of regulatory requirements is an essential part of the process. It forms an important system of checks and balances that helps protect all Canadians from measures that are unfair or that would infringe their rights.

Furthermore, any proposed regulatory amendment is normally also published in the *Canada Gazette*, part 1 and is then open to public comment for a specified period. This ensures that potentially affected members of the public have every opportunity to participate in the process. All comments received are recorded and duly considered.

In the event that a proposed regulation is significantly altered following such comments, it is then re-submitted to the *Canada Gazette*, part 1 and is opened up to public consideration a second time.

This careful but rigorous process for making regulations also applies to the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations themselves, which came into effect only after the necessary review and public consultation.

Consultation with stakeholders does not end when regulations come into effect. Transport Canada regularly consults with Canadians in various ways. For instance, recreational boaters communicate with Transport Canada officials through the National Recreational Boating Advisory Council, which provides advice on all questions of interest to the boating community. These include safety, security, and enforcement issues and related regulatory initiatives.

The Canadian Marine Advisory Council and its regional counterparts also hold regular meetings with representatives of Transport Canada. At these gatherings as well, recreational boating is a topic of discussion, and there is a standing committee dedicated to it.

In these ways, Transport Canada maintains close ties with the marine community, including those with an interest in recreational boating.

This ongoing contact with stakeholders, including provinces and municipalities, keeps the department informed of their concerns. As a result, Transport Canada is well positioned to take their views on marine policy, legislation, and regulation into full account.

To conclude, if a complaint is made to Transport Canada officials about this process, we will continue to respond to and support the community by developing their boating restrictions and processing their requests, where needed, for Governor in Council approval.

The process includes appropriate checks and balances to make certain that the government does not intervene inappropriately. It encourages communities to find ways to solve their own problems, and it requires public input at several stages. It also contains safeguards to ensure that regulatory measures do not infringe upon Canadians' constitutional or other legal rights.

In short, the system already takes great care to prevent unnecessary or unjust regulation. For all these reasons, I urge all members of the House to vote against Motion No. 441.

• (1355)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in his speech my colleague from Laurentides—Labelle took the opportunity to list all the groups, municipal governments and associations that support his motion. I would like to tell him that he can add the Liberal caucus to his list, because we will be supporting this motion.

Indeed, we support it, not because we know in advance what will come out of the consultations that the member is calling for, but because our political philosophy is based on the principle that any system created by human beings can be reformed and sometimes improved to better serve our society.

We believe that the idea of a study and consultations with the provinces and territories, municipal governments and first nations to determine whether the current regulatory regime for navigation on our lakes could be changed in some way is a good idea in itself.

Unlike my colleague, I represent a non-rural riding. My riding is on the Island of Montreal. However, many of my constituents have second homes on the lakes in my colleague's region. This is an issue that concerns me in any case, and it is also relevant to me because I am the member in our caucus who focuses on water resources issues. That brings me to my comments.

Canada is recognized around the world for a number of very unique attributes. First, I am thinking of its natural attributes. Second, I would mention the system of governance that we created, and members mentioned the Constitution of 1867, of course. Third, we are recognized worldwide for our technological innovation, which has led to all kinds of products used not only by Canadians, but also by people around the world. To be a little more specific, my colleague's motion addresses these three aspects of our national identity and the image we project to the world.

Indeed, we are rich in water resources. We have about one million lakes in Canada. I say "about" because if you ask a scientist, he or she will say that it is impossible to accurately estimate the number of lakes we have in Canada, for a variety of technical reasons. We can say, for the sake of argument, that there are about 1 million lakes in Canada, and I would say that about 250,000 of them are in Quebec. This issue is of concern to many Canadians, since we have such a large number of lakes.

As my colleague and the Conservative member mentioned, navigation is an exclusively federal responsibility under the Constitution. We have built companies around recreational products for use on lakes and waterways in Canada, much like we have done for snow-related activities.

• (1400)

I believe that Bombardier may have moved away from that, but for years the company sold motorized recreational vehicles that were used on our lakes in Quebec, Canada and elsewhere. Clearly, this motion is very relevant.

Canadian society is constantly changing and evolving, even though our Constitution is very difficult to amend. I do not believe that my colleague is asking for a constitutional amendment to make navigation an area of provincial jurisdiction. However, even though our Constitution is relatively unchangeable, we need to find ways to work within its boundaries so that we have some flexibility. As I said, society is evolving, technologically, economically and in terms of democratic values.

There was a time when there were no motorized boats. It was not a challenge to limit navigation activities on lakes. There were rowboats and there were canoes. The problem did not exist.

Now we have a whole array of motorized vessels that people can buy for their enjoyment, sometimes at their summer home. That is a major shift that requires subsequent changes in order to manage conflicts that could arise between individuals. Some people enjoy boating or using other motorized vehicles. Some people go to their summer home, or live in the area, and enjoy having a place to relax and find a bit of peace and quiet, especially in a world that is always on the go and where some people work 60 hours a week. There are conflicts, and a balance must be found.

Our democratic values have also evolved. A few years ago, people did not think they had the right to influence this kind of decision, such as creating navigation restrictions for our lakes. There was a time when people would say that it was the government's job and that we, in Ottawa, had the power and the responsibility, and that people had nothing to say about the whole thing. We had to live with what we were told in terms of regulations and legislation. That is no

longer the case. Nowadays, young people want to have their say. They want to be able to influence what is going on in their communities, even if the federal government, in Ottawa, ultimately has the jurisdiction. People want to have their say.

Based on what I have read about the motion, it seems as though the process to change navigation restrictions is rather cumbersome. It might make sense to find ways to improve and streamline this process to enable citizens—the people who live on these lakes, whether it is a primary or secondary residence—to influence what is going on in their communities. Maybe we could eventually find a better way for this to happen. As soon as we start talking about the duty to consult, things get complicated, especially when a lot of stakeholders have to be consulted: municipalities, associations, outfitters or marinas.

• (1405)

It gets complicated. There may not be a way around the problem, but we have to try. My colleague had the courage to suggest that we do something.

[English]

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to rise in favour of Motion No. 441, a motion to carry out a review of the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations, and I am so pleased to have the honour of seconding this motion presented by my colleague from Laurentides—Labelle.

This is a very straightforward motion. It masks a complicated issue, but all it really asks this House to do is study and look at how we can improve and streamline the existing regulation that was passed. It speaks of creating a streamlined process to enable local administrations to request restrictions on the use of vessels on certain waters in an effort to improve how waters are managed, all in the interests of public safety and environmental protection.

It is pretty straightforward. All we are asking the government to consider is whether this 2008 regulation, in light of the evidence that my colleague has presented, is working effectively. We would really welcome the opportunity, speaking for myself as the seconder, to work with the government to see if we can make it better.

My colleague spoke of three principal reasons.

First is the need for social peace on some of these little lakes. I live in British Columbia, and I have seen the fisticuffs that can happen when we have people with Ski-Doo's and powerboats versus people who want to kayak or have canoes. I think that is something we really want to talk about. I thought my colleague did an excellent job in outlining that objective.

The second reason, of course, is enhanced environmental protection, letting municipalities get at this issue and improve it for the purposes of environmental protection.

The third one, which I would hope would attract the government's attention, is red tape reduction, something the government has spoken very effectively on. This is an area where we could actually make a difference by working together.

Private Members' Business

As someone who comes from an urban riding in Victoria, I can attest to the kinds of conflicts that happen even in urban areas as people try to undertake outdoor activities on lakes. Sometimes, as I say, conflicts occur on lakes even in our area.

These regulations are five years old, and I think the simple plea that my colleague's motion makes is that we should try to improve them if we see problems. I believe, for reasons I will come to, that he has identified some very clear problems.

They start with the fact that the process set out in the guide that he spoke of pursuant to the regulation is extremely lengthy and complex. He talks about municipalities having to do a three-step public consultation process, explore non-regulatory alternatives, apply for a restriction on the body of water in question, and carry out a complex review in which the Office of Boating Safety reviews the file and ensures the process meets a particular cabinet directive, of which the member for Essex, the hon. parliamentary secretary of transport, spoke, namely the cabinet directive on streamlining regulation.

I think it is telling that my colleague's excellent and assiduous work on this issue has unearthed so much support from people in different areas.

The Quebec chapter of the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society applauds this motion. It says that:

It is a simple and practical solution for managing our waterways, especially for smaller communities that lack the resources needed for this kind of endeavour. We hope Parliament adopts this motion.

That is from CPAWS, the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society.

Fédération Québécoise des Municipalités, the federation of all Quebec municipalities, applauded this motion as well.

There is a problem. People identify a problem.

The former mayor of North Hatley, Pierre Levac, talked about the difficulties and complexity. He said that even federal officials are saying that the process is much more complicated than before, that they are going to need a project manager just to apply for a regulatory amendment.

That is from the former mayor of the Township of Hatley.

My colleague has done so much consultation in trying to get to the bottom of this that many other people have come to the same conclusion: that there is a problem and that we should try to work together to fix it.

Again, what we are asking for is to work together to fix a problem that has been identified by many stakeholders. It is merely a request that we sit down and try to improve this regulation. I am disappointed that the government has apparently slammed the door in my colleague's face on this initiative. I am hoping we can persuade the government that this is a problem that we can work on together to fix.

• (1410)

My colleague was very clear in noting, as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities did as well, that navigation and shipping, under section 91 of

the Constitution Act, 1867 is without doubt the exclusive domain of the federal government. My colleague was very clear that there is no effort whatsoever to derogate from that. All he is seeking is to empower municipalities and local governments, aboriginal and other, to address the problem when it arises, and to have real teeth.

He pointed out a very serious and specific problem. He talked about a tiny municipality, such as a rural municipality in northern British Columbia, or in the Laurentians, in the case of my colleague, say of 1,500 people. They have to get legal advice and do all of those steps I talked about, all that consultation and spending all that money. If it has 97% in favour, that is still not enough because one person can thwart the consensus that has been achieved in this code of conduct.

We can do better than that and put real teeth behind this. If it happens that a local government's people, having done the consultation with all the parties, including aboriginal and non-aboriginal, comes to a consensus position, they can get this passed without the kind of difficulty and red tape that my colleague has demonstrated so obviously exists in this process.

I know this has been an issue all over Canada. It has certainly been an issue in my province of British Columbia. The member even referred to the frustration on Columbia Lake, where after years and years only two or three sections have been able to be set apart and restricted, as per the wishes of that local area. The point I am trying to make, in short, is that there is an issue. With the greatest of respect, I do not understand why such a simple issue cannot be addressed in good faith by both sides of this House now that the issue has been identified so clearly by so many people. It is a simple matter to say that we have a regulation that is not working, so let us fix it. I thought that is how we were supposed to work together.

There is also the second issue of environmental protection. That is at the bottom of the complaints that local governments get, for example, there are too many motor boats and they are causing pollution in the water. There are other things about water management that has attracted municipal attention in the past, where power boats, for example, are involved. Eutrophication of the lake can be exacerbated by the use of motor boats. This could contribute to shoreline erosion. There can be greater turbidity in the water, which causes sediments to rise from the bottom of the lake. There can be increased density of algae that is created.

These issues come to the attention of local governments when the community is located right on the lake or the water body. The government officials say they know it is a federal issue, but they want to try to fix it and they try to use this legislation. My colleague has pointed out very, very clearly that it does not work. It seems to me fairly self-evident that we should try to take such a simple problem and work through it.

I would have thought that the red tape reduction initiative would attract the attention of the other side of the House. We hear a lot about that, but when we come to those members with a specific and demonstrable example, they seem to turn away from it. I do not understand that. This regulation costs nothing. This is a question, not of money, but about trying to reduce the number of obstacles thrown in the way when the people in municipalities want to get involved and take action on the waterway on which they are located.

Private Members' Business

There are many solutions that can be addressed. However, we are simply asking the Conservatives to review the regulations, consult with the provinces and the municipalities and the first nations, and produce strategies that would work for Canadians to simplify this process and make it work. We understand the regulation was enacted in good faith, with a desire to address this problem. We agree with the regulation; we just want to make it work better.

Again, I would ask that the Conservatives think seriously about how we could work together to address this very specific but very real problem.

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would really like to thank my hon. colleague from Laurentides—Labelle for his excellent motion, Motion No. 441, which calls for a review of the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations.

Basically, this motion wants to give greater flexibility to municipalities, especially rural municipalities, that have lakes or rivers within their territory, including waterways that some people might be abusing by failing to respect others regarding the use of vessels. My NDP colleague's motion will give those municipalities greater flexibility by giving municipal laws more teeth in order to deal with such people who disrespect these rules.

I would remind the House that navigation falls under federal jurisdiction. We should therefore be able to expect the federal government to take its role seriously and actively help the municipalities regulate navigation practices on their waterways.

Unfortunately, there is a vacuum in this area. As some of my colleagues have pointed out, perhaps the existing regulations are not up to date. The way Canadians, Quebecers and the people of Saguenay use waterways has evolved over time. It is time to build a new partnership between the federal government and municipalities, in order to properly regulate recreational and commercial navigation practices on our waters.

We believe that the municipalities should have greater powers to propose changes to the management of waterways in their territories.

The municipal level is the one closest to the people. It is well positioned to ensure social peace on this issue. I mentioned social peace because, unfortunately, there are a lot of complaints. I come from a rural area, Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, and I represent the riding of Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, which has one large city and many small municipalities.

As my colleagues have said, the current process is very expensive and is imposed on small municipalities by the federal government. The municipalities have to pay dearly in order to have their say on how their bodies of water are used.

I am proud to tell my NDP colleague that his motion even has the support of the municipalities in my riding. I have here a letter from Rivière-Éternité, a charming village of about 500 people. With so few inhabitants, its financial means are already limited. It already has many priorities for municipal investment in infrastructure, such as a clean drinking water supply, waste water treatment and roads.

Managing these priorities is taken somewhat for granted by large cities. However, small municipalities are not rich, nor is the provincial government. The federal government can be of greater assistance. We are not even asking for money; we are only asking to make things a little easier for small municipalities.

The Rivière-Éternité municipal council wrote a letter stating its support for Motion No. 441, which asks the Government of Canada to carry out a review of the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations. It points out that this motion addresses the concerns of many municipalities and that, moreover, the review of the regulations would foster the standardization of uses among the various users on bodies of water. He attached his resolution to this letter.

My Conservative colleague seemed to suggest that the government will vote against the motion. I regret that, because the Conservatives are showing how out of touch with reality they are. The NDP represents all regions in Canada—urban regions and rural regions. This is a rural issue. In 2011, during the federal election, the Conservatives slogan in my region was, ironically, "Our region in power". We see that the government has abandoned the regions. That is very unfortunate.

A government must represent everyone, whether they live in major cities or in outlying areas. As my colleague from Victoria said, we have the opportunity to work in a non-partisan manner on this issue. It is not a political issue. It will be good for rural regions in British Columbia and the prairies as well as for those in Quebec and Ontario.

• (1420)

We can all work together, and I believe that mayors from Conservative and Liberal municipalities would be very happy to see us set partisanship aside in order to work on this issue with them. The process is currently extremely complicated when municipalities want to regulate what happens on their waters.

I would like to explain the process. First, the municipalities must conduct a three-step consultation. Then, they must look at solutions other than regulations, then they must make a request to put restrictions on the body of water. Finally, through a complicated process, the Office of Boating Safety examines the file and ensures that it meets the requirements of the Cabinet Directive on Streamlining Regulation.

My colleague from Laurentides—Labelle brought out the document that is given to municipalities that want to change regulations for their waterways. It is not realistic, and the Conservative government is creating a lot of red tape for the municipalities. Municipalities do not have a lot of financial resources to dedicate to this long and tedious process, especially if we are talking about a municipality with 500 residents.

For example, the municipality of Rivière-Éternité has very few employees, because small municipalities have little room to manoeuvre. They therefore cannot hire someone specifically to work with this long process, which is not very practical. I referred to the support from Rivière-Éternité, but I should also mention Saint-Fulgence, a municipality of about 2,000 people in my riding. Their town council also passed a resolution to support the NDP initiative.

Private Members' Business

As I said earlier, the process is so long and tedious that municipalities often turn to other solutions, specifically codes of ethics. First, I would like to commend the municipalities for trying to find alternative solutions, despite all the obstacles that the Conservative government puts in their way. Unfortunately, a code of ethics is not mandatory, and municipalities would like to have more power and more regulatory control over what happens on their lakes and rivers. Their goal is not to prevent the majority of their community from enjoying water activities. However, we know that some people have a little less respect for the rest of the community and they may be a little selfish about how they do things. Smaller municipalities should be given more power precisely to handle these few people who are a threat to social peace and the collective good.

Municipalities therefore use codes of ethics to better manage navigation on their lakes. Even though we support such codes of ethics, they rely on people's good will. It is very problematic for people who resist the constraints that municipalities impose. People can pretty much ignore these codes because there is no law to legitimize them.

It comes down to the fact that the government has jurisdiction over navigation on waterways. It should therefore be up to the federal government to introduce a bill to do a better job of helping these municipalities. It has not done so for many years, which is why

my NDP colleague had no choice but to do it himself. He represents a beautiful riding in Canada's boreal region, which is also where my riding is. He did an incredible job consulting people on this, and I would like to congratulate him on that. At the time I was writing my speech, over 40 municipalities, most of them in Quebec, had each expressed support for the motion. That is quite impressive.

In closing, I would add that this is also good for the environment. Enabling municipalities to better manage navigation on their waterways and to limit the presence of motorized vessels will help us do a better job of protecting the environment. This is good for everyone: for people, for municipalities and for the environment. Why would the Conservatives vote against it?

● (1425)

The Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired, and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

[*English*]

It being 2:30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, November 18, 2013, at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:30 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. ANDREW SCHEER

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. JOE COMARTIN

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BRUCE STANTON

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. ANDREW SCHEER

MR. NATHAN CULLEN

HON. JOHN DUNCAN

MS. JUDY FOOTE

HON. ROB MERRIFIELD

MS. NYCOLE TURMEL

HON. PETER VAN LOAN

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Forty-first Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	Alberta	CPC
Adams, Eve, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Mississauga—Brampton South	Ontario	CPC
Adler, Mark	York Centre	Ontario	CPC
Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council	Nunavut	Nunavut	CPC
Albas, Dan, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CPC
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	Ontario	CPC
Alexander, Hon. Chris, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Ajax—Pickering	Ontario	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	Ontario	NDP
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	New Brunswick	CPC
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	Ontario	CPC
Ambler, Stella	Mississauga South	Ontario	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Health	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	Alberta	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	CPC
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CPC
Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	Ontario	NDP
Armstrong, Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Social Development	Cumberland—Colchester— Musquodoboit Valley	Nova Scotia	CPC
Ashfield, Hon. Keith	Fredericton	New Brunswick	CPC
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Aspin, Jay	Nipissing—Timiskaming	Ontario	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	British Columbia	NDP
Aubin, Robert	Trois-Rivières	Québec	NDP
Ayala, Paulina	Honoré-Mercier	Québec	NDP
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Ottawa West—Nepean	Ontario	CPC
Bateman, Joyce	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	CPC
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
Benskin, Tyrone	Jeanne-Le Ber	Québec	NDP
Bergen, Hon. Candice, Minister of State (Social Development)	Portage—Lisgar	Manitoba	CPC
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture)	Beauce	Québec	CPC
Bevington, Dennis	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	NDP
Bezan, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CPC
Blanchette, Denis	Louis-Hébert	Québec	NDP
Blanchette-Lamothe, Lysane	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Québec	NDP
Blaney, Hon. Steven, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Lévis—Bellechasse	Québec	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Block, Kelly, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CPC
Boivin, Françoise	Gatineau	Québec	NDP
Borg, Charmaine	Terrebonne—Blainville	Québec	NDP
Boughen, Ray	Palliser	Saskatchewan	CPC
Boulerice, Alexandre	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	Québec	NDP
Boutin-Sweet, Marjolaine	Hochelaga	Québec	NDP
Brahmi, Tarik	Saint-Jean	Québec	NDP
Braid, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CPC
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Brosseau, Ruth Ellen	Berthier—Maskinongé	Québec	NDP
Brown, Gordon	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Lois, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development	Newmarket—Aurora	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	Ontario	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	CPC
Butt, Brad	Mississauga—Streetsville	Ontario	CPC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Calandra, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs	Oak Ridges—Markham	Ontario	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CPC
Cannan, Hon. Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	British Columbia	CPC
Carmichael, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	CPC
Caron, Guy	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	Québec	NDP
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Casey, Sean	Charlottetown	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Cash, Andrew	Davenport	Ontario	NDP
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	NDP
Chicoine, Sylvain	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	Québec	NDP
Chisholm, Robert	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Nova Scotia	NDP
Chisu, Corneliu	Pickering—Scarborough East	Ontario	CPC
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	Ontario	CPC
Choquette, François	Drummond	Québec	NDP
Chow, Olivia	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	NDP
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	Ontario	NDP
Clarke, Rob	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River	Saskatchewan	CPC
Cleary, Ryan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	Newfoundland and Labrador	NDP
Clement, Hon. Tony, President of the Treasury Board	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	CPC
Comartin, Joe, The Deputy Speaker	Windsor—Tecumseh	Ontario	NDP
Côté, Raymond	Beauport—Limoilou	Québec	NDP
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Québec	Lib.
Crockatt, Joan	Calgary Centre	Alberta	CPC
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Daniel, Joe	Don Valley East	Ontario	CPC
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	CPC
Davies, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
Day, Anne-Marie	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	Québec	NDP
Dechert, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Mississauga—Erindale	Ontario	CPC
Del Mastro, Dean	Peterborough	Ontario	Cons. Ind.
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	Ontario	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	NDP
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Québec	Lib.
Dionne Labelle, Pierre	Rivière-du-Nord	Québec	NDP
Donnelly, Fin	New Westminster—Coquitlam	British Columbia	NDP
Doré Lefebvre, Rosane	Alfred-Pellan	Québec	NDP
Dreeshen, Earl	Red Deer	Alberta	CPC
Dubé, Matthew	Chambly—Borduas	Québec	NDP
Duncan, Hon. John, Minister of State and Chief Government Whip	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CPC
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Duncan, Linda	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	NDP
Dusseault, Pierre-Luc	Sherbrooke	Québec	NDP
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	St. Catharines	Ontario	CPC
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Fantino, Hon. Julian, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Vaughan	Ontario	CPC
Fast, Hon. Ed, Minister of International Trade	Abbotsford	British Columbia	CPC
Findlay, Hon. Kerry-Lynne D., Minister of National Revenue	Delta—Richmond East	British Columbia	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Haldimand—Norfolk	Ontario	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	Manitoba	CPC
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Fortin, Jean-François	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	Québec	BQ
Freeman, Mylène	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	Québec	NDP
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	Ontario	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Ontario	CPC
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Québec	Lib.
Garrison, Randall	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	NDP
Genest, Réjean	Shefford	Québec	NDP
Genest-Jourdain, Jonathan	Manicouagan	Québec	NDP
Giguère, Alain	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	Québec	NDP
Gill, Parm, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Brampton—Springdale	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Glover, Hon. Shelly, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages.....	Saint Boniface.....	Manitoba.....	CPC
Godin, Yvon.....	Acadie—Bathurst.....	New Brunswick.....	NDP
Goguen, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	New Brunswick.....	CPC
Goldring, Peter.....	Edmonton East.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph.....	Wascana.....	Saskatchewan.....	Lib.
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario).....	Cambridge.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Gosal, Hon. Bal, Minister of State (Sport).....	Bramalea—Gore—Malton.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec.....	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière.....	Québec.....	CPC
Gravelle, Claude.....	Nickel Belt.....	Ontario.....	NDP
Grewal, Nina.....	Fleetwood—Port Kells.....	British Columbia.....	CPC
Groguhé, Sadia.....	Saint-Lambert.....	Québec.....	NDP
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister.....	Calgary Southwest.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Harris, Dan.....	Scarborough Southwest.....	Ontario.....	NDP
Harris, Jack.....	St. John's East.....	Newfoundland and Labrador.....	NDP
Harris, Richard.....	Cariboo—Prince George.....	British Columbia.....	CPC
Hassainia, Sana.....	Verchères—Les Patriotes.....	Québec.....	NDP
Hawn, Hon. Laurie.....	Edmonton Centre.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Hayes, Bryan.....	Sault Ste. Marie.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Hiebert, Russ.....	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale.....	British Columbia.....	CPC
Hillyer, Jim.....	Lethbridge.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Hoback, Randy.....	Prince Albert.....	Saskatchewan.....	CPC
Holder, Ed.....	London West.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Hsu, Ted.....	Kingston and the Islands.....	Ontario.....	Lib.
Hughes, Carol.....	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing.....	Ontario.....	NDP
Hyer, Bruce.....	Thunder Bay—Superior North.....	Ontario.....	Ind.
Jacob, Pierre.....	Brome—Missisquoi.....	Québec.....	NDP
James, Roxanne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness.....	Scarborough Centre.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Jean, Brian.....	Fort McMurray—Athabasca.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Jones, Yvonne.....	Labrador.....	Newfoundland and Labrador.....	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
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim.....	Scarborough—Agincourt.....	Ontario.....	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.....	South Shore—St. Margaret's.....	Nova Scotia.....	CPC
Kellway, Matthew.....	Beaches—East York.....	Ontario.....	NDP
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism.....	Calgary Southeast.....	Alberta.....	CPC
Kent, Hon. Peter.....	Thornhill.....	Ontario.....	CPC
Kerr, Greg.....	West Nova.....	Nova Scotia.....	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed.....	Souris—Moose Mountain.....	Saskatchewan.....	CPC
Kramp, Daryl.....	Prince Edward—Hastings.....	Ontario.....	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lake, Hon. Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods— Beaumont.....	Alberta	CPC
Lamoureux, Kevin	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	Lib.
Lapointe, François	Montmagny—L'Islet— Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	Québec	NDP
Larose, Jean-François	Repentigny	Québec	NDP
Latendresse, Alexandrine	Louis-Saint-Laurent.....	Québec	NDP
Lauzon, Guy.....	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengary	Ontario	CPC
Laverdière, Hélène	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Québec	NDP
Lebel, Hon. Denis, Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Devel- opment Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean.....	Québec	CPC
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour.....	New Brunswick.....	Lib.
LeBlanc, Hélène.....	LaSalle—Émard.....	Québec	NDP
Leef, Ryan	Yukon.....	Yukon	CPC
Leitch, Hon. Kellie, Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women	Simcoe—Grey	Ontario	CPC
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture.....	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell .	Ontario	CPC
Leslie, Megan	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
Leung, Chungsen, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism ...	Willowdale	Ontario	CPC
Liu, Laurin.....	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.....	Québec	NDP
Lizon, Wladyslaw	Mississauga East—Cooksville .	Ontario	CPC
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
Lunney, James.....	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CPC
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island....	Lib.
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave	Oxford	Ontario	CPC
Mai, Hoang	Brossard—La Prairie	Québec	NDP
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek .	Ontario	NDP
Martin, Pat.....	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Masse, Brian.....	Windsor West	Ontario	NDP
Mathysen, Irene	London—Fanshawe.....	Ontario	NDP
May, Elizabeth	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	GP
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, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and for Western Economic Diversification	Kamloops—Thompson— Cariboo	British Columbia	CPC
Menegakis, Costas, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Richmond Hill	Ontario	CPC
Menzies, Hon. Ted.....	Macleod	Alberta	CPC
Merrifield, Hon. Rob	Yellowhead	Alberta	CPC
Michaud, Éline	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.....	Québec	NDP
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound...	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Moore, Christine	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	Québec	NDP
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Industry	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	CPC
Moore, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Fundy Royal	New Brunswick	CPC
Morin, Dany	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Québec	NDP
Morin, Isabelle	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Québec	NDP
Morin, Marc-André	Laurentides—Labelle	Québec	NDP
Morin, Marie-Claude	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Québec	NDP
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	Québec	Ind.
Mulcair, Hon. Thomas, Leader of the Opposition	Outremont	Québec	NDP
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Nantel, Pierre	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	Québec	NDP
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	Ontario	NDP
Nicholls, Jamie	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Québec	NDP
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of National Defence	Niagara Falls	Ontario	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	Ontario	CPC
Nunez-Melo, José	Laval	Québec	NDP
Obhrai, Hon. Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights	Calgary East	Alberta	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	Ontario	CPC
Oliver, Hon. Joe, Minister of Natural Resources	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	CPC
O'Neill Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	New Brunswick	CPC
Opitz, Ted	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	CPC
O'Toole, Erin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	Durham	Ontario	CPC
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Québec	Lib.
Papillon, Annick	Québec	Québec	NDP
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of International Development and Minister for La Francophonie	Mégantic—L'Érable	Québec	CPC
Patry, Claude	Jonquière—Alma	Québec	BQ
Payne, LaVar	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CPC
Péclet, Ève	La Pointe-de-l'Île	Québec	NDP
Perreault, Manon	Montcalm	Québec	NDP
Pilon, François	Laval—Les Îles	Québec	NDP
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	Québec	BQ
Poilievre, Hon. Pierre, Minister of State (Democratic Reform)	Nepean—Carleton	Ontario	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Ontario	CPC
Quach, Anne Minh-Thu	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Québec	NDP
Rafferty, John	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	Ontario	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Transport	Halton	Ontario	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	Alberta	CPC
Rankin, Murray	Victoria	British Columbia	NDP
Rathgeber, Brent	Edmonton—St. Albert	Alberta	Ind.
Ravignat, Mathieu	Pontiac	Québec	NDP
Raynault, Francine	Joliette	Québec	NDP
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Rempel, Hon. Michelle, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)	Calgary Centre-North	Alberta	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	Alberta	CPC
Rickford, Hon. Greg, Minister of State (Science and Technology, and Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Kenora	Ontario	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CPC
Rousseau, Jean	Compton—Stanstead	Québec	NDP
Saganash, Romeo	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	Québec	NDP
Sandhu, Jasbir	Surrey North	British Columbia	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CPC
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Québec	Lib.
Scheer, Hon. Andrew, Speaker of the House of Commons	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	Ontario	CPC
Scott, Craig	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	NDP
Seeback, Kyle	Brampton West	Ontario	CPC
Sellah, Djaouida	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Québec	NDP
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	CPC
Shipley, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CPC
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Sims, Jinny Jogindera	Newton—North Delta	British Columbia	NDP
Sitsabaiesan, Rathika	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	NDP
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	Manitoba	CPC
Sopuck, Robert	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	Manitoba	CPC
Sorenson, Hon. Kevin, Minister of State (Finance)	Crowfoot	Alberta	CPC
Stanton, Bruce, The Acting Speaker	Simcoe North	Ontario	CPC
St-Denis, Lise	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	Québec	Lib.
Stewart, Kennedy	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	Alberta	CPC
Strahl, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	British Columbia	CPC
Sullivan, Mike	York South—Weston	Ontario	NDP
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	Ontario	CPC
Thibeault, Glenn	Sudbury	Ontario	NDP
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	Ontario	CPC
Toet, Lawrence	Elmwood—Transcona	Manitoba	CPC
Toone, Philip	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Québec	NDP
Tremblay, Jonathan	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord	Québec	NDP
Trost, Brad	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	CPC
Trottier, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Ontario	CPC
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Québec	Lib.
Truppe, Susan, Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women	London North Centre	Ontario	CPC
Turmel, Nycole	Hull—Aylmer	Québec	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Uppal, Hon. Tim, Minister of State (Multiculturalism)	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	Alberta	CPC
Valcourt, Hon. Bernard, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Madawaska—Restigouche	New Brunswick	CPC
Valeriote, Frank	Guelph	Ontario	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	Ontario	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	York—Simcoe	Ontario	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CPC
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	Ontario	CPC
Warawa, Mark	Langley	British Columbia	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	Alberta	CPC
Watson, Jeff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Essex	Ontario	CPC
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	British Columbia	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	New Brunswick	CPC
Wilks, David	Kootenay—Columbia	British Columbia	CPC
Williamson, John	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	CPC
Wong, Hon. Alice, Minister of State (Seniors)	Richmond	British Columbia	CPC
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	CPC
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular)	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CPC
Young, Terence	Oakville	Ontario	CPC
Young, Wai	Vancouver South	British Columbia	CPC
Zimmer, Bob	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	CPC
VACANCY	Bourassa	Québec	
VACANCY	Toronto Centre	Ontario	
VACANCY	Brandon—Souris	Manitoba	
VACANCY	Provencher	Manitoba	

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Forty-first Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (28)		
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Health	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CPC
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	CPC
Crockatt, Joan	Calgary Centre	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, Hon. Laurie	Edmonton Centre	CPC
Hillyer, Jim	Lethbridge	CPC
Jean, Brian	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	CPC
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism	Calgary Southeast	CPC
Lake, Hon. Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont	CPC
Menzies, Hon. Ted	Macleod	CPC
Merrifield, Hon. Rob	Yellowhead	CPC
Obhrai, Hon. Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights	Calgary East	CPC
Payne, LaVar	Medicine Hat	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	CPC
Rathgeber, Brent	Edmonton—St. Albert	Ind.
Rempel, Hon. Michelle, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)	Calgary Centre-North	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	CPC
Sorenson, Hon. Kevin, Minister of State (Finance)	Crowfoot	CPC
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	CPC
Uppal, Hon. Tim, Minister of State (Multiculturalism)	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	CPC
BRITISH COLUMBIA (36)		
Albas, Dan, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	NDP
Cannan, Hon. Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	CPC
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	NDP
Davies, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Donnelly, Fin	New Westminster—Coquitlam	NDP
Duncan, Hon. John, Minister of State and Chief Government Whip	Vancouver Island North	CPC
Fast, Hon. Ed, Minister of International Trade	Abbotsford	CPC
Findlay, Hon. Kerry-Lynne D., Minister of National Revenue	Delta—Richmond East	CPC
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Garrison, Randall	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	NDP
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	CPC
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	CPC
Hiebert, Russ	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	CPC
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CPC
May, Elizabeth	Saanich—Gulf Islands	GP
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
McLeod, Cathy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and for Western Economic Diversification	Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo	CPC
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Industry	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Rankin, Murray	Victoria	NDP
Sandhu, Jasbir	Surrey North	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	North Vancouver	CPC
Sims, Jinny Jogindera	Newton—North Delta	NDP
Stewart, Kennedy	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Strahl, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	CPC
Warawa, Mark	Langley	CPC
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	CPC
Wilks, David	Kootenay—Columbia	CPC
Wong, Hon. Alice, Minister of State (Seniors)	Richmond	CPC
Young, Wai	Vancouver South	CPC
Zimmer, Bob	Prince George—Peace River	CPC
MANITOBA (12)		
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	NDP
Bateman, Joyce	Winnipeg South Centre	CPC
Bergen, Hon. Candice, Minister of State (Social Development)	Portage—Lisgar	CPC
Bezan, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Selkirk—Interlake	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	CPC
Glover, Hon. Shelly, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages	Saint Boniface	CPC
Lamoureux, Kevin	Winnipeg North	Lib.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	CPC
Sopuck, Robert	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	CPC
Toet, Lawrence	Elmwood—Transcona	CPC
VACANCY	Brandon—Souris	
VACANCY	Provencher	
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	CPC
Ashfield, Hon. Keith	Fredericton	CPC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Goguen, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	Lib.
Moore, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Fundy Royal	CPC
O'Neill Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	CPC
Valcourt, Hon. Bernard, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Madawaska—Restigouche	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	CPC
Williamson, John	New Brunswick Southwest	CPC

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)

Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Lib.
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Cleary, Ryan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	NDP
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Lib.
Harris, Jack	St. John's East	NDP
Jones, Yvonne	Labrador	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Lib.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)

Bevington, Dennis	Western Arctic	NDP
-------------------	----------------	-----

NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Armstrong, Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Social Development	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	CPC
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Lib.
Chisholm, Robert	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	NDP
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	South Shore—St. Margaret's	CPC
Kerr, Greg	West Nova	CPC
Leslie, Megan	Halifax	NDP
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Central Nova	CPC
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP

NUNAVUT (1)

Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council	Nunavut	CPC
--	---------	-----

ONTARIO (105)

Adams, Eve, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Mississauga—Brampton South	CPC
Adler, Mark	York Centre	CPC
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	CPC
Alexander, Hon. Chris, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Ajax—Pickering	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	NDP
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	CPC
Ambler, Stella	Mississauga South	CPC
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	NDP
Aspin, Jay	Nipissing—Timiskaming	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Ottawa West—Nepean	CPC
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Braid, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities	Kitchener—Waterloo	CPC
Brown, Gordon	Leeds—Grenville	CPC
Brown, Lois, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development	Newmarket—Aurora	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	CPC
Butt, Brad	Mississauga—Streetsville	CPC
Calandra, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs	Oak Ridges—Markham	CPC
Carmichael, John	Don Valley West	CPC
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Oshawa	CPC
Cash, Andrew	Davenport	NDP
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	NDP
Chisu, Corneliu	Pickering—Scarborough East	CPC
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	CPC
Chow, Olivia	Trinity—Spadina	NDP
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP
Clement, Hon. Tony, President of the Treasury Board	Parry Sound—Muskoka	CPC
Comartin, Joe, The Deputy Speaker	Windsor—Tecumseh	NDP
Daniel, Joe	Don Valley East	CPC
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	CPC
Dechert, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Mississauga—Erindale	CPC
Del Mastro, Dean	Peterborough	Cons. Ind.
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Lib.
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	St. Catharines	CPC
Fantino, Hon. Julian, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Vaughan	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Haldimand—Norfolk	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	CPC
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CPC
Gill, Parm, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Brampton—Springdale	CPC
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)	Cambridge	CPC
Gosal, Hon. Bal, Minister of State (Sport)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	CPC
Gravelle, Claude	Nickel Belt	NDP
Harris, Dan	Scarborough Southwest	NDP
Hayes, Bryan	Sault Ste. Marie	CPC
Holder, Ed	London West	CPC
Hsu, Ted	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Hughes, Carol	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing	NDP
Hyer, Bruce	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ind.
James, Roxanne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Scarborough Centre	CPC
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Kellway, Matthew	Beaches—East York	NDP
Kent, Hon. Peter	Thornhill	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lauzon, Guy	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	CPC
Leitch, Hon. Kellie, Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women	Simcoe—Grey	CPC
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	CPC
Leung, Chungsen, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism	Willowdale	CPC
Lizon, Wladyslaw	Mississauga East—Cooksville	CPC
Lobb, Ben	Huron—Bruce	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave	Oxford	CPC
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	NDP
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	NDP
Mathyssen, 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.
Menegakis, Costas, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Richmond Hill	CPC
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	CPC
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	NDP
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of National Defence	Niagara Falls	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	CPC
Oliver, Hon. Joe, Minister of Natural Resources	Eglinton—Lawrence	CPC
Oritz, Ted	Etobicoke Centre	CPC
O'Toole, Erin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	Durham	CPC
Poillievre, Hon. Pierre, Minister of State (Democratic Reform)	Nepean—Carleton	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	CPC
Rafferty, John	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Transport	Halton	CPC
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	CPC
Rickford, Hon. Greg, Minister of State (Science and Technology, and Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Kenora	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	CPC
Scott, Craig	Toronto—Danforth	NDP
Seeback, Kyle	Brampton West	CPC
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Lib.
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	CPC
Sitsabaiesan, Rathika	Scarborough—Rouge River	NDP
Stanton, Bruce, The Acting Speaker	Simcoe North	CPC
Sullivan, Mike	York South—Weston	NDP
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	CPC
Thibeault, Glenn	Sudbury	NDP
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	CPC
Trottier, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	CPC
Truppe, Susan, Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women	London North Centre	CPC
Valeriote, Frank	Guelph	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	York—Simcoe	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	CPC
Watson, Jeff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Essex	CPC
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	CPC
Young, Terence	Oakville	CPC
VACANCY	Toronto Centre	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
Casey, Sean	Charlottetown	Lib.
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	CPC
QUÉBEC (74)		
Aubin, Robert	Trois-Rivières	NDP
Ayala, Paulina	Honoré-Mercier	NDP
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	BQ
Benskin, Tyrone	Jeanne-Le Ber	NDP
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture)	Beauce	CPC
Blanchette, Denis	Louis-Hébert	NDP
Blanchette-Lamothe, Lysane	Pierrefonds—Dollard	NDP
Blaney, Hon. Steven, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Lévis—Bellechasse	CPC
Boivin, Françoise	Gatineau	NDP
Borg, Charmaine	Terrebonne—Blainville	NDP
Boulerice, Alexandre	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	NDP
Boutin-Sweet, Marjolaine	Hochelaga	NDP
Brahmi, Tarik	Saint-Jean	NDP
Brosseau, Ruth Ellen	Berthier—Maskinongé	NDP
Caron, Guy	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	NDP
Chicoine, Sylvain	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	NDP
Choquette, François	Drummond	NDP
Côté, Raymond	Beauport—Limoilou	NDP
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Day, Anne-Marie	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	NDP
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Dionne Labelle, Pierre	Rivière-du-Nord	NDP
Doré Lefebvre, Rosane	Alfred-Pellan	NDP
Dubé, Matthew	Chambly—Borduas	NDP
Dusseault, Pierre-Luc	Sherbrooke	NDP
Fortin, Jean-François	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	BQ
Freeman, Mylène	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	NDP
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Genest, Réjean	Shefford	NDP
Genest-Jourdain, Jonathan	Manicouagan	NDP
Giguère, Alain	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	NDP
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Groguhé, Sadia	Saint-Lambert	NDP
Hassainia, Sana	Verchères—Les Patriotes	NDP
Jacob, Pierre	Brome—Missisquoi	NDP
Lapointe, François	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska— Rivière-du-Loup	NDP
Larose, Jean-François	Repentigny	NDP
Latendresse, Alexandrine	Louis-Saint-Laurent	NDP
Laverdière, Hélène	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	NDP
Label, Hon. Denis, Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	CPC
LeBlanc, Hélène	LaSalle—Émard	NDP
Liu, Laurin	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	NDP
Mai, Hoang	Brossard—La Prairie	NDP
Michaud, Élane	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier	NDP
Moore, Christine	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	NDP
Morin, Dany	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	NDP
Morin, Isabelle	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	NDP
Morin, Marc-André	Laurentides—Labelle	NDP
Morin, Marie-Claude	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	NDP
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	Ind.
Mulcair, Hon. Thomas, Leader of the Opposition	Outremont	NDP
Nantel, Pierre	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	NDP
Nicholls, Jamie	Vaudreuil-Soulanges	NDP
Nunez-Melo, José	Laval	NDP
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Papillon, Annick	Québec	NDP
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of International Development and Minister for La Francophonie	Mégantic—L'Érable	CPC
Patry, Claude	Jonquière—Alma	BQ
Péclet, Ève	La Pointe-de-l'Île	NDP
Perreault, Manon	Montcalm	NDP
Pilon, François	Laval—Les Îles	NDP
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Quach, Anne Minh-Thu	Beauharnois—Salaberry	NDP
Ravignat, Mathieu	Pontiac	NDP
Raynault, Francine	Joliette	NDP
Rousseau, Jean	Compton—Stanstead	NDP
Saganash, Romeo	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	NDP
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Sellah, Djaouida	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	NDP
St-Denis, Lise	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	Lib.
Toone, Philip	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	NDP
Tremblay, Jonathan	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute- Côte-Nord	NDP
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Lib.
Turmel, Nycole	Hull—Aylmer	NDP
VACANCY	Bourassa	

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CPC
Block, Kelly, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	CPC
Boughen, Ray	Palliser	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CPC
Clarke, Rob	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River ..	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph	Wascana	Lib.
Hoback, Randy	Prince Albert	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed	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	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CPC
Scheer, Hon. Andrew, Speaker of the House of Commons	Regina—Qu'Appelle	CPC
Trost, Brad	Saskatoon—Humboldt	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	CPC
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular)	Blackstrap	CPC
YUKON (1)		
Leef, Ryan	Yukon	CPC

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of November 8, 2013 — 2nd Session, 41st Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Chris Warkentin

Vice-Chairs:

Carolyn Bennett
Jean Crowder

Diane Ablonczy
Dennis Bevington
Ray Boughen

Rob Clarke
Jonathan Genest-Jourdain

Jim Hillyer
Carol Hughes

Kyle Seeback
Mark Strahl

(12)

Associate Members

Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Niki Ashton
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
Tyrone Benskin
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Peter Braid
Garry Breitkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael

Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Joan Crockatt
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreesen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent

Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Mathieu Ravignat

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Romeo Saganash
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Chair:

Pat Martin

Vice-Chairs:
Scott Andrews
Patricia DavidsonCharlie Angus
Charmaine Borg
Paul CalandraJohn Carmichael
Earl DreeshenJacques Gourde
Colin MayesTilly O'Neill Gordon
Mathieu Ravignat

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Bob Dechert
Pierre-Luc Dusseault
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton

Gary Schellenberger
Craig Scott
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:	Bev Shipley	Vice-Chairs:	Malcolm Allen Mark Eyking	
Alex Atamanenko Ruth Ellen Brosseau Richard Harris	Randy Hoback Pierre Lemieux	LaVar Payne Joe Preston	Francine Raynault Bob Zimmer	(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Colin Carrie	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
Eve Adams	Corneliu Chisu	Peter Kent	Blake Richards
Mark Adler	Michael Chong	Greg Kerr	Andrew Saxton
Dan Albas	Rob Clarke	Ed Komarnicki	Gary Schellenberger
Harold Albrecht	Joan Crockatt	Daryl Kramp	Kyle Seeback
Mike Allen	Joe Daniel	Mike Lake	Devinder Shory
Dean Allison	Patricia Davidson	Guy Lauzon	Joy Smith
Stella Ambler	Bob Dechert	Ryan Leef	Robert Sopuck
Rob Anders	Earl Dreesen	Chungsen Leung	Brian Storseth
David Anderson	Linda Duncan	Wladyslaw Lizon	Mark Strahl
Scott Armstrong	Rick Dykstra	Ben Lobb	David Sweet
Keith Ashfield	Steven Fletcher	Tom Lukiwski	David Tilson
Niki Ashton	Royal Galipeau	James Lunney	Lawrence Toet
Jay Aspin	Cheryl Gallant	Dave MacKenzie	Brad Trost
Joyce Bateman	Parm Gill	Pat Martin	Bernard Trottier
Leon Benoit	Robert Goguen	Colin Mayes	Susan Truppe
James Bezan	Peter Goldring	Phil McColeman	Dave Van Kesteren
Kelly Block	Jacques Gourde	Cathy McLeod	Maurice Vellacott
Ray Boughen	Nina Grewal	Costas Menegakis	Mike Wallace
Peter Braid	Laurie Hawn	Ted Menzies	Mark Warawa
Garry Breitzkreuz	Bryan Hayes	Rob Merrifield	Chris Warkentin
Gordon Brown	Russ Hiebert	Larry Miller	Jeff Watson
Lois Brown	Jim Hillyer	Rick Norlock	John Weston
Patrick Brown	Ed Holder	Deepak Obhrai	Rodney Weston
Rod Bruinooge	Carol Hughes	Gordon O'Connor	David Wilks
Brad Butt	Roxanne James	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	John Williamson
Paul Calandra	Brian Jean	Ted Opitz	Stephen Woodworth
Blaine Calkins	Peter Julian	Erin O'Toole	Terence Young
Ron Cannan	Randy Kamp	James Rajotte	Wai Young
John Carmichael			

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair:

Gordon Brown

Vice-Chairs:
Stéphane Dion
Pierre NantelRay Boughen
Matthew Dubé
Rick DykstraJim Hillyer
François LapointeChungsen Leung
Irene MathysenBlake Richards
Terence Young

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
Tyroné Benskin
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Charmaine Borg
Peter Braid
Garry Breitreuz
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John CarmichaelColin Carrie
Andrew Cash
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald KeddyPeter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James RajotteScott Reid
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Harold Albrecht

Vice-Chairs:
Megan Leslie
John McKayRobert Aubin
Colin Carrie
François ChoquetteMylène Freeman
James LunneyRobert Sopuck
Brian StorsethLawrence Toet
Stephen Woodworth

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Robert ChisholmCorneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreshen
Linda Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter JulianRandy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar PayneJoe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

FINANCE

Chair: James Rajotte

Vice-Chairs:

Scott Brison
Peggy Nash

Mark Adler
Guy Caron
Raymond Côté

Randy Hoback
Brian Jean

Gerald Keddy
Murray Rankin

Andrew Saxton
Dave Van Kesteren

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Corneliu Chisu	Ed Holder	Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Eve Adams	Michael Chong	Carol Hughes	Ted Opitz
Dan Albas	François Choquette	Pierre Jacob	Erin O'Toole
Harold Albrecht	Olivia Chow	Roxanne James	LaVar Payne
Malcolm Allen	Rob Clarke	Peter Julian	Manon Perreault
Mike Allen	Joan Crockatt	Randy Kamp	François Pilon
Dean Allison	Jean Crowder	Matthew Kellway	Joe Preston
Stella Ambler	Nathan Cullen	Peter Kent	Anne Minh-Thu Quach
Rob Anders	Joe Daniel	Greg Kerr	Mathieu Ravignat
David Anderson	Patricia Davidson	Ed Komarnicki	Scott Reid
Charlie Angus	Don Davies	Daryl Kramp	Blake Richards
Scott Armstrong	Libby Davies	Mike Lake	Romeo Saganash
Keith Ashfield	Anne-Marie Day	Jean-François Larose	Jasbir Sandhu
Niki Ashton	Bob Dechert	Alexandrine Latendresse	Gary Schellenberger
Jay Aspin	Paul Dewar	Guy Lauzon	Kyle Seeback
Alex Atamanenko	Fin Donnelly	Hélène Laverdière	Djaouida Sellah
Paulina Ayala	Rosane Doré Lefebvre	Hélène LeBlanc	Bev Shipley
Joyce Bateman	Earl Dreeshen	Ryan Leef	Devinder Shory
Leon Benoit	Matthew Dubé	Pierre Lemieux	Rathika Sitsabaiesan
Tyrone Benskin	Linda Duncan	Megan Leslie	Joy Smith
Dennis Bevington	Pierre-Luc Dusseault	Chungsen Leung	Robert Sopuck
James Bezan	Rick Dykstra	Laurin Liu	Kennedy Stewart
Denis Blanchette	Steven Fletcher	Wladyslaw Lizon	Brian Storseth
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe	Mylène Freeman	Ben Lobb	Mark Strahl
Kelly Block	Royal Galipeau	Tom Lukiwski	David Sweet
Françoise Boivin	Cheryl Gallant	James Lunney	Glenn Thibeault
Charmaine Borg	Randall Garrison	Dave MacKenzie	David Tilson
Ray Boughen	Réjean Genest	Pat Martin	Lawrence Toet
Alexandre Boulerice	Jonathan Genest-Jourdain	Brian Masse	Philip Toone
Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet	Alain Giguère	Irene Mathysen	Brad Trost
Tarik Brahmi	Parm Gill	Colin Mayes	Bernard Trottier
Peter Braid	Yvon Godin	Phil McColeman	Susan Truppe
Garry Breitzkreuz	Robert Goguen	Cathy McLeod	Nycole Turmel
Ruth Ellen Brosseau	Peter Goldring	Costas Menegakis	Maurice Vellacott
Gordon Brown	Jacques Gourde	Ted Menzies	Mike Wallace
Lois Brown	Claude Gravelle	Rob Merrifield	Mark Warawa
Patrick Brown	Nina Grewal	Élaine Michaud	Chris Warkentin
Rod Bruinooge	Sadia Groguhé	Larry Miller	Jeff Watson
Brad Butt	Dan Harris	Dany Morin	John Weston
Paul Calandra	Jack Harris	Isabelle Morin	Rodney Weston
Blaine Calkins	Richard Harris	Marc-André Morin	David Wilks
Ron Cannan	Sana Hassainia	Marie-Claude Morin	John Williamson
John Carmichael	Laurie Hawn	Jamie Nicholls	Stephen Woodworth
Colin Carrie	Bryan Hayes	Rick Norlock	Terence Young
Andrew Cash	Russ Hiebert	Deepak Obhrai	Wai Young
Chris Charlton	Jim Hillyer	Gordon O'Connor	Bob Zimmer
Robert Chisholm			

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Rodney Weston

Vice-Chairs:

Robert Chisholm
Lawrence MacAulay

Ryan Cleary
Patricia Davidson
Fin Donnelly

Randy Kamp
Greg Kerr

Ryan Leef
Robert Sopuck

Philip Toone
John Weston

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael

Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Yvon Godin
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Gerald Keddy

Peter Kent
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Jonathan Tremblay
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chairs:	Paul Dewar Marc Garneau	
Mike Allen David Anderson Lois Brown	Peter Goldring Nina Grewal	Hélène Laverdière Laurin Liu	Romeo Saganash Gary Schellenberger	(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Eve Adams Mark Adler Dan Albas Harold Albrecht Stella Ambler Rob Anders Scott Armstrong Keith Ashfield Jay Aspin Joyce Bateman Leon Benoit James Bezan Kelly Block Ray Boughen Peter Braid Garry Breitkreuz Gordon Brown Patrick Brown Rod Bruinooge Brad Butt Paul Calandra Blaine Calkins Ron Cannan John Carmichael Colin Carrie Corneliu Chisu Michael Chong Rob Clarke Irwin Cotler	Joan Crockatt Joe Daniel Patricia Davidson Don Davies Bob Dechert Earl Dreeshen Rick Dykstra Steven Fletcher Royal Galipeau Cheryl Gallant Parm Gill Robert Goguen Jacques Gourde Richard Harris Laurie Hawn Bryan Hayes Russ Hiebert Jim Hillyer Randy Hoback Ed Holder Pierre Jacob Roxanne James Brian Jean Peter Julian Randy Kamp Gerald Keddy Peter Kent Greg Kerr Ed Komarnicki Daryl Kramp	Mike Lake Guy Lauzon Ryan Leef Pierre Lemieux Chungsen Leung Wladyslaw Lizon Ben Lobb Tom Lukiwski James Lunney Dave MacKenzie Wayne Marston Colin Mayes Phil McColeman Cathy McLeod Costas Menegakis Ted Menzies Rob Merrifield Larry Miller Marc-André Morin Rick Norlock Deepak Obhrai Gordon O'Connor Tilly O'Neill Gordon Ted Opitz Erin O'Toole LaVar Payne Ève Pécelet Joe Preston James Rajotte Scott Reid	Blake Richards Andrew Saxton Kyle Seeback Bev Shipley Devinder Shory Joy Smith Robert Sopuck Brian Storseth Mark Strahl David Sweet David Tilson Lawrence Toet Brad Trost Bernard Trotter Susan Truppe Dave Van Kesteren Maurice Vellacott Mike Wallace Mark Warawa Chris Warkentin Jeff Watson John Weston Rodney Weston David Wilks John Williamson Stephen Woodworth Terence Young Wai Young Bob Zimmer
--	---	---	--

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Vice-Chair:		
Irwin Cotler Nina Grewal	Pierre Jacob Wayne Marston	Scott Reid Gary Schellenberger	David Sweet (7)

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:

Pierre-Luc Dusseault

Vice-Chairs:Gerry Byrne
Gordon O'ConnorDiane Ablonczy
Jay Aspin
Denis BlanchetteRon Cannan
Anne-Marie DayEd Komarnicki
Pat MartinBernard Trottier
Dave Van Kesteren

(12)

Associate Members

Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Françoise Boivin
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael ChongRob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Paul Dewar
Earl Dreeshen
Linda Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter KentGreg Kerr
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Mathieu Ravignat
Scott ReidBlake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Susan Truppe
Nycole Turmel
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

HEALTH**Chair:** Joy Smith**Vice-Chairs:**Libby Davies
Hedy Fry

Eve Adams	Wladyslaw Lizon	Wayne Marston	Isabelle Morin	(12)
Earl Dreeshen	Ben Lobb	Dany Morin	David Wilks	
Laurie Hawn				

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Rob Clarke	Mike Lake	Gary Schellenberger
Mark Adler	Joan Crockatt	Guy Lauzon	Kyle Seeback
Dan Albas	Joe Daniel	Ryan Leef	Djaouida Sellah
Harold Albrecht	Patricia Davidson	Pierre Lemieux	Bev Shipley
Mike Allen	Bob Dechert	Megan Leslie	Devinder Shory
Dean Allison	Rick Dykstra	Chungsen Leung	Jinny Jogindera Sims
Stella Ambler	Steven Fletcher	Tom Lukiwski	Robert Sopuck
Rob Anders	Royal Galipeau	James Lunney	Brian Storseth
David Anderson	Cheryl Gallant	Dave MacKenzie	Mark Strahl
Scott Armstrong	Parm Gill	Colin Mayes	Mike Sullivan
Keith Ashfield	Robert Goguen	Phil McColeman	David Sweet
Jay Aspin	Peter Goldring	Cathy McLeod	Glenn Thibeault
Joyce Bateman	Jacques Gourde	Costas Menegakis	David Tilson
Leon Benoit	Nina Grewal	Ted Menzies	Lawrence Toet
James Bezan	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Brad Trost
Kelly Block	Bryan Hayes	Larry Miller	Bernard Trottier
Ray Boughen	Russ Hiebert	Christine Moore	Susan Truppe
Peter Braid	Jim Hillyer	Rick Norlock	Dave Van Kesteren
Garry Breitzkreuz	Randy Hoback	Deepak Obhrai	Maurice Vellacott
Gordon Brown	Ed Holder	Gordon O'Connor	Mike Wallace
Lois Brown	Carol Hughes	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	Mark Warawa
Patrick Brown	Roxanne James	Ted Opitz	Chris Warkentin
Rod Bruinooge	Brian Jean	Erin O'Toole	Jeff Watson
Brad Butt	Peter Julian	LaVar Payne	John Weston
Paul Calandra	Randy Kamp	Manon Perreault	Rodney Weston
Blaine Calkins	Gerald Keddy	Joe Preston	John Williamson
Ron Cannan	Peter Kent	James Rajotte	Stephen Woodworth
John Carmichael	Greg Kerr	Scott Reid	Terence Young
Colin Carrie	Ed Komarnicki	Blake Richards	Wai Young
Corneliu Chisu	Daryl Kramp	Andrew Saxton	Bob Zimmer
Michael Chong			

**HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH
DISABILITIES**

Chair: Phil McColeman

Vice-Chairs:

Rodger Cuzner
Jinny Jogindera Sims

Scott Armstrong
Alexandre Boulterice
Brad Butt

Joe Daniel
Sadia Groguhé

Colin Mayes
Cathy McLeod

Devinder Shory
Jonathan Tremblay

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet
Peter Braid
Garry Breitreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Chris Charlton
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Matthew Dubé
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Mylène Freeman
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Alain Giguère
Parm Gill
Yvon Godin
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Dan Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Irene Mathysen
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Manon Perreault
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Rathika Sitsabaiesan
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
Mike Sullivan
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: David Sweet

Vice-Chairs: Chris Charlton
Judy Sgro

Cheryl Gallant
Ed Holder
Brian Jean

Mike Lake
Phil McColeman

Anne Minh-Thu Quach
Kennedy Stewart

Glenn Thibeault
Mark Warawa

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Malcolm Allen
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Mauril Bélanger
Leon Benoit
Tyrone Benskin
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Charmaine Borg
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra

Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockett
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Dan Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Guy Lauzon
Hélène LeBlanc
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Brian Masse
Colin Mayes
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

INTERNATIONAL TRADE**Chair:**

Rob Merrifield

Vice-Chairs:Don Davies
Massimo PacettiRon Cannan
Russ Hiebert
Ed HolderBrian Masse
Ted MenziesMarc-André Morin
Erin O'TooleJasbir Sandhu
Devinder Shory

(12)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu ChisuMichael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockett
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Paul Dewar
Earl Dreesen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Marc Gameau
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg KerrEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Hélène Laverdière
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Mathieu Ravignat
Scott Reid
Blake RichardsAndrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Jinny Jogindera Sims
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Mike Wallace

Vice-Chairs:

Françoise Boivin
Sean Casey

Patrick Brown
Blaine Calkins
Bob Dechert

Robert Goguen
Pierre Jacob

Matthew Kellway
Ève Pécelet

Kyle Seeback
David Wilks

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Randall Garrison
Parm Gill
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Wayne Marston
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Murray Rankin

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Jinny Jogindera Sims
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

LIAISON

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	David Christopherson	
Harold Albrecht	Royal Galipeau	Phil McColeman	Joy Smith	(26)
Leon Benoit	Peter Kent	Rob Merrifield	David Sweet	
Gordon Brown	Greg Kerr	Larry Miller	David Tilson	
Chris Charlton	Daryl Kramp	Joe Preston	Mike Wallace	
Michael Chong	Hélène LeBlanc	James Rajotte	Chris Warkentin	
Pierre-Luc Dusseault	Pat Martin	Bev Shipley	Rodney Weston	

Associate Members

Malcolm Allen	Jean Crowder	Yvon Godin	Joyce Murray
Scott Andrews	Rodger Cuzner	Jack Harris	Pierre Nantel
Mauril Bélanger	Patricia Davidson	Carol Hughes	Peggy Nash
Carolyn Bennett	Don Davies	Peter Julian	Gordon O'Connor
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe	Libby Davies	Jim Karygiannis	Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Françoise Boivin	Paul Dewar	Kevin Lamoureux	Massimo Pacetti
Garry Breitkreuz	Stéphane Dion	Alexandrine Latendresse	Geoff Regan
Scott Brison	Kirsty Duncan	Megan Leslie	Judy Sgro
Gerry Byrne	Wayne Easter	Lawrence MacAulay	Scott Simms
John Carmichael	Mark Eyking	John McCallum	Jinny Jogindera Sims
Sean Casey	Hedy Fry	David McGuinty	Lise St-Denis
Robert Chisholm	Marc Garneau	John McKay	Peter Stoffer
Olivia Chow	Randall Garrison		

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:		
David Christopherson	Phil McColeman	Joe Preston	Chris Warkentin	(7)
Pat Martin	Larry Miller			

NATIONAL DEFENCE**Chair:**

Peter Kent

Vice-Chairs:Jack Harris
Joyce MurrayJames Bezan
Tarik Brahmi
Cheryl GallantJean-François Larose
Élaine MichaudRick Norlock
Ted OpitzBrian Storseth
John Williamson

(12)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu ChisuMichael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Randall Garrison
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg KerrEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Christine Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott ReidBlake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Peter Stoffer
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

NATURAL RESOURCES**Chair:** Leon Benoit**Vice-Chairs:**Peter Julian
Geoff ReganMike Allen
Kelly Block
Joan CrockattLinda Duncan
Claude GravelleRyan Leef
Christine MooreBrad Trost
Bob Zimmer

(12)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
James Bezan
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael ChongRob Clarke
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Yvon Godin
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Carol Hughes
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg KerrEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
John Rafferty
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake RichardsRomeo Saganash
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Kennedy Stewart
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
Glenn Thibeault
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Joe Preston	Vice-Chairs:	Kevin Lamoureux Alexandrine Latendresse	
Brad Butt Nathan Cullen Tom Lukiwski	Dave MacKenzie Ted Opitz	Scott Reid Blake Richards	Craig Scott Nycole Turmel	(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Corneliu Chisu	Randy Kamp	Kyle Seeback
Eve Adams	Michael Chong	Gerald Keddy	Bev Shipley
Mark Adler	David Christopherson	Peter Kent	Devinder Shory
Dan Albas	Rob Clarke	Greg Kerr	Joy Smith
Harold Albrecht	Joan Crockatt	Ed Komarnicki	Robert Sopuck
Mike Allen	Joe Daniel	Daryl Kramp	Brian Storseth
Dean Allison	Patricia Davidson	Mike Lake	Mark Strahl
Stella Ambler	Bob Dechert	Guy Lauzon	David Sweet
Rob Anders	Earl Dreeshen	Ryan Leef	David Tilson
David Anderson	Rick Dykstra	Pierre Lemieux	Lawrence Toet
Scott Armstrong	Steven Fletcher	Chungsen Leung	Philip Toone
Keith Ashfield	Royal Galipeau	Wladyslaw Lizon	Brad Trost
Jay Aspin	Cheryl Gallant	Ben Lobb	Bernard Trottier
Joyce Bateman	Parm Gill	James Lunney	Susan Truppe
Leon Benoit	Yvon Godin	Colin Mayes	Frank Valeriotte
James Bezan	Robert Goguen	Phil McColeman	Dave Van Kesteren
Kelly Block	Peter Goldring	Cathy McLeod	Maurice Vellacott
Ray Boughen	Jacques Gourde	Costas Menegakis	Mike Wallace
Peter Braid	Nina Grewal	Ted Menzies	Mark Warawa
Garry Breitzkreuz	Sadia Grogue	Rob Merrifield	Chris Warkentin
Gordon Brown	Richard Harris	Larry Miller	Jeff Watson
Lois Brown	Laurie Hawn	Rick Norlock	John Weston
Patrick Brown	Bryan Hayes	Deepak Obhrai	Rodney Weston
Rod Bruinooge	Russ Hiebert	Gordon O'Connor	David Wilks
Paul Calandra	Jim Hillyer	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	John Williamson
Blaine Calkins	Randy Hoback	Erin O'Toole	Stephen Woodworth
Ron Cannan	Ed Holder	LaVar Payne	Terence Young
John Carmichael	Roxanne James	James Rajotte	Wai Young
Colin Carrie	Brian Jean	Andrew Saxton	Bob Zimmer
Chris Charlton	Peter Julian	Gary Schellenberger	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Dave MacKenzie	Vice-Chair:		
Brad Butt	Philip Toone	Frank Valeriotte		(4)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

David Christopherson

Vice-Chairs:John Carmichael
Scott SimmsMark Adler
Dan Albas
Malcolm AllenJay Aspin
Alain GiguèreDan Harris
Bryan HayesBev Shipley
Stephen Woodworth

(12)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael ChongRob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Pierre-Luc Dusseault
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg KerrEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Richard Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott ReidBlake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
Glenn Thibeault
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:

Daryl Kramp

Vice-Chairs:Wayne Easter
Randall GarrisonMichael Chong
Rosane Doré Lefebvre
Roxanne JamesTed Menzies
Rick NorlockLaVar Payne
François PilonJean Rousseau
Rodney Weston

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Charmaine Borg
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John CarmichaelColin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Don Davies
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreesen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald KeddyPeter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
Joe Preston
John Rafferty
James Rajotte
Murray Rankin
Scott ReidBlake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

STATUS OF WOMEN

Chair: H el ene LeBlanc

Vice-Chairs:

Kirsty Duncan
Tilly O'Neill Gordon

Stella Ambler
Niki Ashton
Joyce Bateman

Joan Crockatt
Annick Papillon

Djaouida Sellah
Susan Truppe

Terence Young
Wai Young

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
Kelly Block
Fran oise Boivin
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Jean Crowder
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Anne-Marie Day
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Myl ene Freeman
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Sadia Groguh e
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne

Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trottier
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Bob Zimmer

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

Chair: Larry Miller

Vice-Chairs:

Olivia Chow
David McGuinty

Harold Albrecht
Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet
Peter Braid

Ed Komarnicki
Hoang Mai

Mike Sullivan
Lawrence Toet

Jeff Watson
Wai Young

(12)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Robert Aubin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Alexandre Boulerice
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Guy Caron

Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy

Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Isabelle Morin
Pierre Nantel
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Bob Zimmer

VETERANS AFFAIRS**Chair:**

Royal Galipeau

Vice-Chairs:

Jim Karygiannis

Peter Stoffer

Sylvain Chicoine
Corneliu Chisu
Parm GillLaurie Hawn
Bryan HayesWladyslaw Lizon
Ben LobbManon Perreault
John Rafferty

(12)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin CarrieMichael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockett
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Mylène Freeman
Cheryl Gallant
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed KomarnickiDaryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Pat Martin
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake RichardsAndrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chair: Greg Kerr

Joint Vice-Chairs: Carol Hughes
Scott Simms

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Marie-P. Charette-Poulin
Anne C. Cools
Nicole Eaton

Terry M. Mercer
Michel Rivard

Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Peter Goldring
Peter Kent
Peggy Nash

José Nunez-Melo
François Pilon
Brad Trost
Mark Warawa

(17)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Chris Charlton
Bob Runciman

Joint Vice-Chairs: Mauril Bélanger
Garry Breitkreuz

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Denise Batters
Larry W. Campbell
Céline Hervieux-Payette
Wilfred P. Moore

Nancy Ruth
Scott Tannas
Betty E. Unger

Dan Albas
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
Paulina Ayala
Rob Clarke

Réjean Genest
Sana Hassainia
Gary Schellenberger
Maurice Vellacott

(20)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Eve Adams
Mark Adler
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Joan Crockatt

Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Ed Holder
Roxanne James
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp

Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Brian Masse
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Bryan Hayes
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Erin O'Toole
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. JOE COMARTIN

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BRUCE STANTON

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Stephen Harper	Prime Minister
Hon. Bernard Valcourt	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Rob Nicholson	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Peter MacKay	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Rona Ambrose	Minister of Health
Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. John Baird	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Tony Clement	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Jim Flaherty	Minister of Finance
Hon. Peter Van Loan	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Jason Kenney	Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism
Hon. Gerry Ritz	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Christian Paradis	Minister of International Development and Minister for La Francophonie
Hon. James Moore	Minister of Industry
Hon. Denis Lebel	Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Hon. Leona Aglukkaq	Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council
Hon. Lisa Raitt	Minister of Transport
Hon. Gail Shea	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Julian Fantino	Minister of Veterans Affairs
Hon. Steven Blaney	Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Hon. Ed Fast	Minister of International Trade
Hon. Joe Oliver	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Shelly Glover	Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages
Hon. Chris Alexander	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Kellie Leitch	Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women
Hon. Maxime Bernier	Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture)
Hon. Lynne Yelich	Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular)
Hon. Gary Goodyear	Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)
Hon. Rob Moore	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. John Duncan	Minister of State and Chief Government Whip
Hon. Tim Uppal	Minister of State (Multiculturalism)
Hon. Alice Wong	Minister of State (Seniors)
Hon. Bal Gosal	Minister of State (Sport)
Hon. Kevin Sorenson	Minister of State (Finance)
Hon. Pierre Poilievre	Minister of State (Democratic Reform)
Hon. Candice Bergen	Minister of State (Social Development)
Hon. Greg Rickford	Minister of State (Science and Technology, and Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
Hon. Michelle Rempel	Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Hon. Mike Lake	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Gerald Keddy	to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Hon. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights
Mr. David Anderson	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. James Bezan	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Randy Kamp	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Jeff Watson	to the Minister of Transport
Mr. Rick Dykstra	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Mr. Pierre Lemieux	to the Minister of Agriculture
Mrs. Kelly Block	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Peter Braid	for Infrastructure and Communities
Ms. Lois Brown	to the Minister of International Development
Mr. Paul Calandra	to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Bob Dechert	to the Minister of Justice
Mrs. Cathy McLeod	to the Minister of Labour and for Western Economic Diversification
Mr. Andrew Saxton	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Scott Armstrong	to the Minister of Employment and Social Development
Ms. Eve Adams	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Dan Albas	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Parm Gill	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. Robert Goguen	to the Minister of Justice
Ms. Roxanne James	to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Mr. Chungsen Leung	for Multiculturalism
Mr. Costas Menegakis	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Mark Strahl	to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development
Mr. Bernard Trotter	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Mrs. Susan Truppe	for Status of Women
Mr. Erin O'Toole	to the Minister of International Trade

CONTENTS

Friday, November 8, 2013

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Respect for Communities Act

Bill C-2. Second reading.....	915
Ms. Boivin	915
Mr. Trost	917
Mr. Garrison.....	918
Mr. Morin (Laurentides—Labelle).....	918
Ms. Blanchette-Lamothe	918
Mr. Rankin	919
Ms. James	921
Mr. Lamoureux.....	921
Mrs. Day	922

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Clémence Le May

Mr. Bellavance	922
----------------------	-----

African Institute for Mathematical Sciences

Mr. Braid	922
-----------------	-----

Dorothy Mary Chambers

Mr. Rafferty	922
--------------------	-----

RCAF Veteran

Mr. Komarnicki	923
----------------------	-----

The Environment

Mr. Scarpaleggia	923
------------------------	-----

True Patriot Love Foundation

Mr. O'Toole.....	923
------------------	-----

Veterans' Week

Ms. Liu.....	923
--------------	-----

Remembrance Day

Mr. Keddy.....	924
----------------	-----

Ringside for Heroes Event

Mr. Gill.....	924
---------------	-----

Federal Public Service

Mr. Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord).....	924
--------------------------------------	-----

Immigration Success

Mr. Seeback.....	924
------------------	-----

Veterans' Contributions

Mrs. Day	924
----------------	-----

Financial Literacy Month

Mr. Norlock.....	925
------------------	-----

Veterans' Contributions

Mr. Garneau.....	925
------------------	-----

Liberal and New Democratic Parties of Canada

Mr. Leef.....	925
---------------	-----

Prime Minister of Canada

Mr. Giguère	925
-------------------	-----

Religious Freedom

Mr. Calandra	925
--------------------	-----

ORAL QUESTIONS

Ethics

Ms. Turmel.....	926
Mr. Calandra	926
Ms. Turmel.....	926
Mr. Calandra	926
Ms. Turmel.....	926
Mr. Calandra	926
Mr. Angus	926
Mr. Calandra	926
Mr. Angus	926
Mr. Calandra	927
Mr. Garneau	927
Mr. Calandra	927
Mr. Garneau	927
Mr. Calandra	927
Ms. Boivin	927
Mr. Calandra	927
Ms. Boivin	928
Mr. Calandra	928
Ms. Blanchette-Lamothe	928
Mr. Calandra	928
Ms. Blanchette-Lamothe	928
Mr. Calandra	928
Ms. Blanchette-Lamothe	928
Mr. Calandra	928
Mr. Harris (Scarborough Southwest).....	929
Mr. Calandra	929
Mr. Harris (Scarborough Southwest).....	929
Mr. Calandra	929
Mr. Angus	929
Mr. Calandra	929
Mr. Angus	929
Mr. Calandra	929
Mr. McGuinty	929
Mr. Calandra	929
Mr. McGuinty	929
Mr. Calandra	930
Mr. McGuinty.....	930
Mr. Calandra	930

Veterans Affairs

Mr. Garrison.....	930
Mr. Bezan	930
Mr. Brahma	930
Mr. Bezan	930
Ms. Doré Lefebvre.....	930
Mr. Gill.....	931

Mr. Rafferty	931
Mr. Gill	931
Intergovernmental Affairs	
Mr. Sweet	931
Mr. Uppal	931
Pensions	
Mr. Rankin	931
Mr. Saxton	931
Mr. Rankin	931
Mr. Saxton	931
Intergovernmental Affairs	
Mr. Caron	932
Ms. Bergen	932
Mr. Caron	932
Ms. Bergen	932
Natural Resources	
Mr. Lamoureux	932
Mrs. Block	932
Tourism	
Mr. Dion	932
Mr. Bernier	932
Foreign Affairs	
Ms. Laverdière	933
Mr. Baird	933
Ms. Laverdière	933
Mr. Baird	933
Status of Women	
Mr. Kramp	933
Ms. Leitch	933
Official Languages	
Ms. St-Denis	933
Mr. Gourde	933
Regional Economic Development	
Mr. Lapointe	933
Mr. Gourde	934
Government Priorities	
Mr. Komarnicki	934
Mr. Uppal	934
Passport Canada	
Mr. Patry	934
Ms. Bergen	934
Natural Resources	
Mr. Hyer	934
Mrs. Block	934
Democratic Reform	
Mr. Del Mastro	934
Mr. Poilievre	935

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Official Languages	
The Deputy Speaker	935

Drug-Free Prisons Act	
Mrs. Aglukkaq	935
Bill C-12. Introduction and first reading	935
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	935

Committees of the House

Library of Parliament

Mr. Trost	935
-----------------	-----

Foreign Affairs and International Development

Ms. Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	935
------------------------------------	-----

Petitions

Electronic Monitoring

Mr. Hayes	935
-----------------	-----

Restrictions on Navigation

Mr. Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	935
---------------------------------------	-----

Cluster Munitions

Mr. McGuinty	935
--------------------	-----

National Strategy for Dementia

Mr. Trost	935
-----------------	-----

Human Trafficking

Ms. Boivin	935
------------------	-----

Volunteer Firefighters

Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	935
---	-----

Animal Transportation

Ms. Doré Lefebvre	936
-------------------------	-----

Alvarez Rivera Family

Ms. Doré Lefebvre	936
-------------------------	-----

Fisheries and Oceans

Mr. Lamoureux	936
---------------------	-----

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Albas	936
-----------------	-----

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Respect for Communities Act

Bill C-2. Second reading	936
--------------------------------	-----

Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	936
---	-----

Mrs. McLeod	937
-------------------	-----

Mr. Lamoureux	938
---------------------	-----

Mr. Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	938
---------------------------------------	-----

Mr. Angus	939
-----------------	-----

Mr. Albas	940
-----------------	-----

Mr. Easter	940
------------------	-----

Mrs. McLeod	942
-------------------	-----

Mr. Garrison	942
--------------------	-----

Mr. McGuinty	943
--------------------	-----

Ms. Laverdière	943
----------------------	-----

Mr. Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	944
---------------------------------------	-----

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Navigation Restrictions

Mr. Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	945
---------------------------------------	-----

Motion	945
--------------	-----

Mr. Rankin	946
------------------	-----

Mr. Watson	946
------------------	-----

Mr. Watson	947
------------------	-----

Mr. Scarpaleggia	948
------------------------	-----

Mr. Rankin 949
Mr. Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)..... 951

APPENDIX

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.

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.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>